

A Union Made in My Blood:
Hereditary Right,
Anglo-Scottish Union,
and the
Jacobean Manipulation
of British History

J.B.R. Massey

PhD 2021

**A Union Made in My Blood:
Hereditary Right, Anglo-Scottish Union, and the
Jacobean Manipulation of British History**

Joseph B.R. Massey

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

Department of History, Politics & Philosophy
Manchester Metropolitan University

2021

Table of Contents

Dedication	1
Acknowledgments	2
Thesis Abstract	4
List of Abbreviations	5
Introduction	7
- Thesis Overview	
- Methodology	
- History and Memory	
- Hereditary Right and the English Crown	
- James VI & I's Succession to the English Throne	
- Scotland: A Hereditary Monarchy?	
- Anglo-Scottish Union	
- National Identity	
- James VI & I's Views on the Relationship Between Hereditary Right and Anglo-Scottish Union	
1. Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, and Hereditary Right	51
- Before 1603	
- Official Explanations of James VI & I's Hereditary Right	
- Unofficial Celebratory Texts	
- Genealogies	
- Histories	
- Conclusion	
2. Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, and Anglo-Scottish Union	91
- Unions of Houses and Crowns	
- Reviving Polydore Vergil: Before 1603	
- Reviving Polydore Vergil: Henry VII as Advocate for Anglo-Scottish Union	
- Reviving Polydore Vergil: Union Treatises	
- Reviving Polydore Vergil: Histories	
- Conclusion	
3. James VI & I's Descent from Margaret Tudor and Hereditary Right	129
- Before 1603	
- Official Uncertainty Over Its Representation	
- Celebrating James VI & I's Double Descent from Margaret Tudor	
- Protestant Paternal Ancestry	
- Conclusion	

4. James VI & I's Descent from Margaret Tudor and Anglo-Scottish Union	157
- The Marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots	
- The Divided Representations of James IV and James V	
- Conclusion	
5. Mary, Queen of Scots, and Hereditary Right	185
- Before 1603	
- Mary's Absence from Official Explanations of James VI & I's Succession	
- The Continuing Confessional Divide	
- Mary's Reburial in Westminster Abbey	
- James VI & I's Visit to Scotland in 1617	
- William Camden's <i>Annales</i>	
- Other Histories	
- Conclusion	
6. Mary, Queen of Scots, and Anglo-Scottish Union	255
- Invoking Mary to Support or Oppose Anglo-Scottish Union	
- The Precedent of Mary's Proposed Marriage to Edward VI	
- Mary's Reburial in Westminster Abbey	
- Conclusion	
Conclusion	277
Bibliography	289

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my Grandma, Sheila Mary Jackson, née Holliday (1933-2018). My Grandma was always one of my closest friends and greatest supporters. She encouraged my love of reading by giving me books from her almost weekly pile of new purchases, and I loved nothing more than searching through her bookshelves for hidden gems. We shared a particular passion for history as she was the keeper of our family stories, both from her own lifetime and previous generations. Grandma loved to tell us these stories, and as well as writing them down for posterity, I have carried on the family history research that we started together. She was fascinated by our local Cumbrian history, and I cherish the memories of our trips to Aspatria, Hayton, Whitehaven, and Workington in search of buildings connected to her own and our family's past. My own love of Cumbria's history and heritage can be traced back to her. She especially enjoyed reading historical fiction by writers such as Elizabeth Chadwick and Philippa Gregory, and it was partly due to these novels—alongside the *Horrible Histories* books—that I became interested in the Tudor monarchs, which later developed into my focus on the Stewart/Stuart monarchs. When I was an undergraduate, my Grandma told me that I had ignited her own love of history, which she remembered as being very dry and dull at school. As happy as that continues to make me, I owe even more credit to her. My Grandma did not live to see me begin this PhD, but almost every day I think of her and feel inspired by her enthusiasm for life, her love of learning, and her warm and giving nature. Thank you, Grandma—I would not be where I am today if it were not for you.

Acknowledgments

The person I owe the most to in life is my mother, Kerry Jackson. Thank you for raising me, feeding me, humouring me, and loving me. I always look forward to our walks in the Lake District when I come to visit, although you are much fitter than I currently am due to your regular ascents! From childhood you have embraced me as I am and encouraged me to pursue my passions, even when other pathways would have offered greater financial security. I hope that your faith in my choices will be rewarded very shortly, as I've run out of academic qualifications to acquire as a means of avoiding the turbulent job market!

I also thank my PhD supervisors, Dr Jonathan Spangler and Dr Rosamund Oates. I never planned to do a PhD. When I finished my undergraduate degree and was looking for work, I hoped that a master's degree would make me stand out as a job candidate. When I finished my master's degree and did find work, I missed historical research and didn't feel that I had achieved all I wanted in academia. Luckily for me, at that exact moment MMU offered the perfect scholarship for my research interests, accompanied by two excellent supervisors. Thank you for guiding me through my PhD, for providing feedback on my thesis drafts, and for reassuring me that I could do it at all. I am incredibly grateful for your time and support, and I hope that this thesis is a satisfying reflection of your efforts.

I would not have reached this stage of my academic journey if it were not for two exceptional people—Dr Julie Farguson and Dr Catriona Murray. As a former state school pupil, I struggled to meet the University of Oxford's standards for undergraduate writing. It was only in my second year that I met a teacher willing to devote the time and energy necessary to improve the quality of my essays: Dr Julie Farguson. Thank you for helping an overlooked, struggling student; I will always remember and appreciate what you did for me. It was a delight and privilege to be taught by Dr Farguson and then, during my master's degree at the University of Edinburgh, Dr Catriona Murray. I was also very fortunate to have Dr Murray supervise my master's thesis. Thank you for helping me develop the idea that has

now also become my PhD thesis, and for encouraging me to see a PhD as an achievable goal—something I never would have considered on my own.

I am grateful to my friends India Miller and Patrick Beardmore for letting me stay with them in late 2019 while I carried out further research in the British Library. It was during this trip that I photographed the manuscript drafts of William Camden's *Annales*, which not only form an integral part of my analysis in Chapter 5 but were also the most time-consuming and difficult sources to work with—and therefore the ones that give me the greatest sense of pride for having utilised.

Finally, I owe an incalculable debt to my wonderful partner, Dr Aidan Norrie. You like to joke that I'm only in a relationship with you for your outstanding personal library—and, I must admit, it has come in very handy over the past three years! However, I have much more to thank you for than library access, as you have been by my side throughout this long and occasionally difficult process. Thank you for always being able to explain the nuances of academia and PhDs, even when I can see no sense in it (which is surprisingly often). Thank you for guiding me through new experiences, such as presenting at my first academic conference and publishing my first piece of academic writing. Thank you for offering me reassurance about my progress and comforting me when I have been worried about the quality of my work or my approaching deadline. We have both faced challenges completing our PhD theses—and coping more generally—during a global pandemic, but we have always been able to rely on one another. Now, as my time as a PhD student comes to an end, I know that will also be the case in our future lives, wherever our dreams and ambitions may take us. I love you.

Thesis Abstract

When James VI & I succeeded to the English throne in 1603, his new position was justified as the result of the senior hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. This thesis analyses how official and unofficial Jacobean works represented James's inheritance of this hereditary claim. It explores whether objections previously made against James and his ancestors in the Elizabethan succession debates were subsequently resolved after James had secured the English throne, and whether this clarified the nature of the operation of the English succession. This thesis also analyses Jacobean representations of James's hereditary claim to the Scottish throne and, indeed, whether Scotland's monarchy was considered hereditary at all. Finally, it explores how these same ancestors were invoked to justify the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union as the legitimate outcomes of James's combined hereditary claims to the thrones of England and Scotland.

There has not yet been a thorough scholarly analysis of Jacobean representations of James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones. Additionally, there has been limited scholarly analysis of the views of both James and his subjects on the relationship between his hereditary claims and Anglo-Scottish union. This thesis demonstrates that most Jacobean works—both official and unofficial—were not attempting to define how the English succession operated or address former objections against the hereditary claims of James and his ancestors, as they did not want to renew these former debates and risk James's position being challenged. Additionally, the unwillingness of James's Protestant subjects to publicly discuss his mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, undermined his efforts to defend the hereditary nature of the Scottish crown. This thesis concludes that national and confessional identity ultimately determined how most English artists and writers represented James's hereditary claim to the English throne, and its relationship to Anglo-Scottish union. James's ancestry was used to anglicise both James himself and Anglo-Scottish union to appeal to an English audience, rather than relying solely on the legitimacy conveyed by hereditary right.

List of Abbreviations

Add	Additional
BL	British Library, London
CP	The Cecil Papers, Hatfield House Archives
MS	manuscript
STC	<i>A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640</i> , ed. by A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave, rev. by W.A. Jackson, F.S. Ferguson, and K.F. Pantzer (London: Bibliographic Society, 1976–1991).
SP	State Papers
TNA	The National Archives, Kew
Wing	<i>Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700</i> , ed. by Donald Wing (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1972–1988).

Introduction

Thesis Overview

Early in the morning of 24 March 1603, Elizabeth I, Queen of England and Ireland, died. A few hours later the succession of James VI, King of Scots, to the English and Irish thrones was proclaimed in London. The proclamation explained that James had succeeded ‘by Law, by Lineall succession, and undoubted Right’—meaning that he had the senior hereditary claim to the English throne—because he was ‘lineally and lawfully descended from the body of Margaret, daughter to the high and Renowned Prince, Henry the seventh King of England, France, and Ireland, his great Grandfather, the said Lady Margaret being lawfully begotten of the bodie of Elizabeth, daughter to King Edward the fourth’.¹ James VI had become James VI & I, King of England, Ireland and Scotland. The Elizabethan succession debates have been widely discussed by scholars; as this thesis shows, however, the nature of James VI & I’s hereditary claim to the English throne continued to be uncertain even after his succession, with an artist or writer’s national and confessional identity often determining how they represented James’s hereditary claim.

James’s succession to the English throne resulted in the personal union of England and Scotland under a shared monarch, known as the Union of the Crowns.² If

¹ *Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to call to his mercy out of this transitory life our sovereigne lady, the high and mighty prince, Elizabeth late Queene of England, France, and Ireland, by whose death and dissolution, the imperiall crowne of these realmes aforesaid are now absolutely, wholly, and solely come to the high and mighty prince, James the Sixt, King of Scotland...* (London, 1603; STC 8298). This proclamation was made at the order of Elizabeth I’s Privy Council, with the authority of England’s ‘Lords Spirituall and Temporall’. It was necessary for the English Privy Council to rely on the authority of the nobility and bishops because at the time of Elizabeth’s death, as their contemporary Sir Roger Wilbraham explains, ‘the authoritie of the councellers of estate did actuallie cease’, while the nobility remained ‘principall pillars’ to ‘withstand all attempt against the peace of the kingdome’. Roger Wilbraham, ‘The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests for the Years 1593-1616, Together with Notes in Another Hand for the Years 1642-1649’, *Camden Third Series*, 4 (1902), p. 54. The English Privy Council acknowledged that they were the ones who wrote and issued this proclamation in a letter to James written later that same day. English Privy Council to James VI & I, 24 March 1603, London. *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, ed. by John Hill Burton and David Masson, 14 vols (Edinburgh, 1877-1898) VI (1884), pp. 550-552.

² Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986), pp. 1-12. This situation was not unique to England, Ireland, and Scotland; H.G. Koenigsberger points out that ‘most states in the early modern period were composite states, including more than one country under the sovereignty of one ruler’. Quoted in J.H. Elliott, ‘A Europe of Composite Monarchies’, *Past & Present*, 137 (November 1992), 50.

James's succession was accepted to be the result of his senior hereditary claim, this meant that hereditary right was also responsible for securing the Union of the Crowns. James argued that his inheritance of the senior hereditary claims to the thrones of both England and Scotland, and his status as hereditary monarch in both kingdoms, legitimised and necessitated the permanent (or 'perfect') union of the two kingdoms as the single kingdom of Great Britain.³ This argument was disputed when James attempted to secure permanent Anglo-Scottish union through parliamentary legislation. Ultimately, James was unsuccessful in securing permanent union, which did not occur until the reign of his great-granddaughter, Queen Anne, in 1707. The Union of the Crowns, which was a purely dynastic union, nevertheless remained. As with discussions of James's hereditary claim, this thesis demonstrates that an artist or writer's national and confessional identity often determined how they discussed the relationship between James's hereditary claims and Anglo-Scottish union.

This thesis analyses how official and unofficial Jacobean works represented James VI & I's ancestors—from his great-great-grandparents, Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, to his parents, Mary, Queen of Scots, and Henry, Lord Darnley—in relation to James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, and Anglo-Scottish union (both the Union of the Crowns and permanent union). Throughout, this thesis considers how the histories and legacies of these ancestors were rewritten and revised in response to James's succession to the English throne and Anglo-Scottish union.

The first focus of this thesis is James VI & I's hereditary claim to the English throne, and how Jacobean works represented the passage of this hereditary claim from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York to James. It explores whether objections previously made against the hereditary claims of James and his ancestors in the Elizabethan succession debates—such as their legitimacy, nationality, and religion—were subsequently resolved in the Jacobean period, thereby clarifying how the English succession operated. Although scholars now recognise that James's succession had not been guaranteed and that it had to be justified when it

³ James's argument is discussed at greater length in the final section of the thesis introduction.

took place, there has not yet been a thorough analysis of the various official explanations offered for James's succession by hereditary right, or how James's subjects responded to these explanations.⁴ In addition, most scholars have focused on the early years of James's joint reign, while this thesis analyses works produced across the course of it (1603-1625). This thesis does not focus on debates over what power and authority hereditary monarchs were thought to have in general (compared to monarchs who ruled by conquest, for example), or more specifically in relation to the power of other institutions, such as parliament or the legal system. Instead, it contributes to our understanding of Jacobean conceptions of hereditary right and monarchical succession.

Alongside this focus on James's hereditary claim to the English throne, this thesis also analyses Jacobean representations of James's hereditary claim to the Scottish throne and, indeed, whether Scotland's monarchy was considered hereditary at all. This analysis revolves around the abdication of James's mother, Mary, Queen of Scots. Most scholars of Scottish history have only analysed James's efforts to defend the hereditary nature of the Scottish crown and his own succession by hereditary right *prior* to his succession to the English throne, overlooking the final twenty-two years of his reign.⁵ This thesis does not dwell on ideas of contractual monarchy and resistance theory, since it is concerned with the concept of hereditary

⁴ For example, see: David Colclough, "I Have Brought Thee Up to a Kingdome": Sermons on the Accessions of James I and Charles I', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 205-213; Susan Doran, '1603: A Jagged Succession', *Historical Research*, 93.61 (August 2020), 1-23; Rei Kanemura, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, 52.2 (April 2013), 317-342; Richard A. McCabe, 'Panegyric and Its Discontents: The First Stuart Succession', in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, pp. 19-36; Andrew McRae, 'Welcoming the King: The Politics of Stuart Succession Panegyric', in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, pp. 186-193; *Literature of the Stuart Successions: An Anthology*, ed. by Andrew McRae and John West (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017); Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), pp. 55-65.

⁵ For example, see: Rebecca W. Bushnell, 'George Buchanan, James VI and Neo-Classicism', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 91-111; Roger A. Mason, *Kingship and the Commonwealth: Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), pp. 187-241; Roger A. Mason, 'Certain Matters Concerning the Realm of Scotland: George Buchanan and Scottish Self-Fashioning at the Union of the Crowns', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 92.1 (April 2013), 38-65; Roger A. Mason, 'Rex Stoicus: George Buchanan, James VI and the Scottish Polity', in *New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland*, ed. by John Dwyer, Roger A. Mason, and Alexander Murdoch (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), pp. 9-25.

right rather than the balance of power between monarch and subject—monarchies can have varying degrees of power while remaining hereditary. Not only does this focus improve our understanding of James’s conception of the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy, but it also demonstrates whether James’s subjects accepted his views.

The second focus of this thesis is Jacobean Anglo-Scottish union, both the Union of the Crowns and the permanent union James tried, but failed, to secure. It considers how and why the ancestors James depended on for his English and Scottish hereditary claims—from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York to Mary, Queen of Scots, and Henry, Lord Darnley—were invoked to defend Anglo-Scottish union as the legitimate outcome of James’s combined senior hereditary claims to the thrones of England and Scotland. There has been limited scholarly analysis of the views of both James and his subjects on the relationship between his hereditary claims and Anglo-Scottish union, and existing works have not considered how James’s ancestors were invoked or represented in relation to union.⁶ This thesis adds to our understanding of how Jacobean officials justified the Union of the Crowns and permanent union based on hereditary right, and how James’s subjects responded to these arguments.

Throughout, this thesis analyses whether Jacobean historians altered pre-existing narratives of English and Scottish history to explain and justify James’s succession to the English throne and Anglo-Scottish union through hereditary right. Given the importance of history to national identity in the early modern period, and the longstanding historic conflict between England and Scotland that helped solidify each kingdom’s sense of identity in opposition to one another and the ‘foreignness’ of their neighbouring kingdom, it is important to consider how James’s Scottish ancestors (some of whom had been England’s enemies) were represented in England, and vice versa. Although there has been a great deal of scholarly interest in early modern English and Scottish history writing, the impact of James’s succession to the English throne and the Jacobean Anglo-Scottish union have

⁶ For example, see: Kanemura, ‘Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election?’, 317-342; Theodore K. Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561-1629* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), pp. 82-83.

largely been overlooked.⁷ This thesis explores if and how these events altered the representation of the ancestors James depended on for his hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones.

This thesis is divided into six main chapters that can be viewed as three pairs. The first chapter of each pair focuses on the representation of one or more of James VI & I's ancestors in relation to hereditary right, and the second chapter of each pair focuses on the representation of that same ancestor/s in relation to Anglo-Scottish union (both the Union of the Crowns and the proposed permanent union).

The first chapter of each pair analyses the invocation of these ancestors to explain James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones. These chapters consider how James's hereditary claims were explained by Jacobean officials and whether James's subjects adopted or rejected the official interpretation. In some chapters, the discussion of James's hereditary claim to the English throne outweighs the discussion of his hereditary claim to the Scottish throne. This is because James's succession to the English throne is the starting point of this thesis and was thus a new event that inspired discussion and debate, while he had already been on the Scottish throne for nearly four decades (though it was still a matter of concern, as is shown most clearly in Chapter 5).

The second chapter of each pair analyses the invocation of the ancestors James depended on for his hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones in relation to the Union of the Crowns and the proposed permanent Anglo-Scottish union. These chapters consider how these ancestors were invoked to defend the Union of the Crowns as the result of James's combined hereditary claims. They also consider how and why these ancestors were invoked in relation to James's argument that his combined hereditary claims justified and necessitated permanent union, and whether this suggests James's subjects agreed or disagreed with him.

⁷ For example, see: D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), pp. 55-64, 89-90; D.R. Woolf, 'Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory', *Canadian Journal of History/Annales Canadiennes d'Histoire*, 20.2 (1985), 175-176.

Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 focus on Henry VII and Elizabeth of York; Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 focus on James VI & I's descent from Margaret Tudor; and Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 focus on Mary, Queen of Scots. The discussion of James's ancestors is broken down into these groups for a variety of reasons. Specific complaints had been made against the hereditary claims of specific ancestors or lines of descent during the Elizabethan succession debates, so this structure allows consideration of if and how these complaints were addressed after James's succession to the English throne. Mary, Queen of Scots' abdication from the Scottish throne and the justification of it as a legitimate deposition was an issue that only related to her personal legacy. Finally, James's ancestors were invoked to different extents and in different ways in Jacobean discussions of Anglo-Scottish union, so analysing the ancestors separately and chronologically demonstrates why this was so.

This thesis concludes that national and confessional identity determined how most English artists and writers represented James VI & I's hereditary claim to the English throne. James's Protestant English subjects presented James as a suitable monarch for England by emphasising his English and Protestant ancestry, while at the same time downplaying his Scottish and Catholic ancestry, rather than relying solely on the legitimacy conveyed by hereditary right. Official explanations were intentionally ambiguous about the route by which James had inherited his English hereditary claim so that he could rely on multiple lines of descent. This explains why it was possible and indeed acceptable for unofficial works to offer different interpretations of the source of James's hereditary claim.

This thesis also demonstrates that most Jacobean works were not attempting to define how the English succession operated. Most of the objections that had previously been made against the English hereditary claims of James's ancestors in the Elizabethan succession debates were not addressed in the Jacobean period. For instance, whether foreigners and Catholics could succeed, or whether parliamentary legislation had authority over the succession, was not clarified. Instead, these objections were either ignored, or it was argued (though often implicitly rather than explicitly) that they had not been valid in the first place. As a result, the exact nature of the English succession, and whether hereditary claims were weakened or nullified by the holder being foreign, Catholic, or legally excluded, remained

unclear. Jacobean works did not want to renew these former debates and risk James's position being challenged, so they intentionally avoided these questions, or defended the seniority and validity of James's hereditary claim in all possible scenarios.

This thesis argues that, despite his concerted efforts, James failed to revise the reputation of his most controversial ancestor, Mary, Queen of Scots. Although James's Protestant subjects in both England and Scotland largely did not contradict his representation of his mother as an innocent victim whose most important legacy was providing him with his senior hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, they also refused to adopt it themselves. Instead, most of James's Protestant subjects remained publicly silent about Mary, and she was largely consigned to oblivion. James's Catholic subjects, by contrast, were much more willing to publicly discuss Mary, but they would not overlook her Catholicism and focus exclusively on her dynastic significance, as James wished.

While there was an understandable concentration of works produced immediately after the proclamation of James's succession, this thesis demonstrates that the nature of James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones continued to be a subject of discussion throughout his joint reign. This is particularly apparent when works such as histories are considered, which (unlike succession panegyrics) were produced across the course of the reign. There were also key moments of revived discussion of James's hereditary claims, such as during the parliamentary union debates, when it was debated whether James's combined hereditary claims justified and legitimised permanent Anglo-Scottish union.

As this thesis demonstrates, both official and unofficial Jacobean works justified and promoted the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union by anglicising them, rather than relying solely on James's argument that they were the natural and legitimate outcomes of his combined hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones. The Union of the Crowns was presented as a continuation and preservation of England's national history, identity, and monarchy, which would benefit the English people. However, works justifying James's English succession and works justifying the Union of the Crowns often differed over which of James's

lines of descent they emphasised as the source of his hereditary claim to the English throne. This demonstrates that artists and writers interpreted James's hereditary claims in different ways, depending on what it was they wished to legitimise.

While it was a common strategy to invoke Henry VII in defence of Anglo-Scottish union, most English works avoided invoking James's more recent ancestors because they were foreign, Catholic, and had mixed to negative reputations in England—regardless of their significance as the sources of James's hereditary claims. Those who did discuss James's inheritance of combined hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones through his maternal line often did so to celebrate his succession to the English throne as the union (or reunion) of 'Britain', which subsumed England and Scotland and made the people of both kingdoms British. Given that James's English subjects interpreted his hereditary claim to the English throne in a way that anglicised him, it is understandable that they did not support the loss of England's nationhood and their own English national identity as the result of that same hereditary claim. This demonstrates the importance of nationality not only to defences of James's succession to the English throne, but also Anglo-Scottish union.

Methodology

This thesis begins chronologically at the point of James's succession to the English throne because that event changed the relationship between England and Scotland. James then argued that his hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones legitimised and necessitated a permanent Anglo-Scottish union, giving his hereditary claims (and the ancestors who provided him with them) a new significance that they had not had before. Since this thesis concerns both James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones and their relationship to Anglo-Scottish union, it is limited to the period 1603 to 1625.

James succeeded not only to the throne of England in 1603, but also to the separate throne of Ireland. Various scholars have explored the events surrounding Elizabeth I's death and James's succession to the Irish throne.⁸ The focus of this thesis is not

⁸ See: Breandán Ó Buachalla, 'James our True King: the Ideology of Irish Royalism in the Seventeenth Century', in *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by D.

only James's 1603 successions, however, but also the resulting Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland and attempts to secure a permanent Anglo-Scottish union. This permanent union was not intended to incorporate Ireland, which would have remained a separate kingdom (as it did after the 1707 union of England and Scotland). As such, this thesis focuses on England and Scotland, but not the separate kingdom of Ireland. In addition, as Wales was annexed into the kingdom of England at this time, it is not discussed separately, as James did not have a separate succession in Wales.⁹

This thesis analyses both official and unofficial works, to demonstrate how influential the former was over the latter, and how far unofficial works were able and willing to diverge from official explanations of James's hereditary claims and their relationship to Anglo-Scottish union, and why they did so. In using both textual and visual sources, this thesis offers a more comprehensive understanding of how James's ancestors were represented in relation to his hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, the Union of the Crowns, and permanent Anglo-Scottish union in the Jacobean period. By analysing textual and visual sources together, we gain a fuller understanding of both groups and see how they related to

George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall, and Vincent Geoghegan (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 9-14; David Edwards, 'Securing the Jacobean Succession: The Secret Career of James Fullerton of Trinity College, Dublin', in *The World of the Galloglass: Kings, Warlords and Warriors in Ireland and Scotland*, ed. by Séan Duffy (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), pp. 188-219; Alan Ford, "'Firm Catholics" or "Loyal Subjects"?: Religious and Political Allegiance in Early Seventeenth-century Ireland', in *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, ed. by D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall, and Vincent Geoghegan (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), pp. 1-18; John Walter, 'The "Recusancy Revolt" of 1603 Revisited, Popular Politics, and Civic Catholicism in Early Modern Ireland', *The Historical Journal* (April 2021), 1-26 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X21000327>.

⁹ For early modern Wales and its annexation into the kingdom of England, see: J. Gwynfor Jones, *Early Modern Wales, c.1525-1640* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994); *Writing Wales, from the Renaissance to Romanticism*, ed. by Stewart Mottram and Sarah Prescott (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012); Peter Roberts, 'The English Crown, the Principality of Wales and the Council in the Marches, 1534-1641', in *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago*, ed. by Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 118-147; Peter Roberts, 'The Union with England and the identity of "Anglican" Wales', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, fifth series, 22 (1972), 49-70; Peter Roberts, 'Wales and England after the Tudor "Union": Crown, Principality and Parliament, 1543-1624', in *Law and Government under the Tudors*, ed. by Claire Cross, David Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 111-138; Peter Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Glanmor Williams, *Recovery, Reorientation and Reformation: Wales, c.1415-1642* (Oxford and Cardiff: Clarendon Press and University of Wales Press, 1987), reprinted as *Renewal and Reformation: Wales, c.1415-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

one another, as James and his subjects utilised both. The textual sources analysed include ballads, histories, panegyrics, petitions, poems, proclamations, religious treatises, sermons, speeches, and union treatises. Both manuscript and printed works are considered. The visual sources analysed include architecture, coins, engravings, heraldry, funerary monuments, and paintings. This thesis focuses on direct discussions of James's hereditary claims, so it will not include works that theorise about royal succession but do not comment openly on James's succession, such as William Shakespeare's plays *Macbeth* and *King Lear*.¹⁰

By analysing a wide range of sources, we gain a more comprehensive understanding of how James's ancestors were invoked and represented in the Jacobean period, and this thesis analyses many of them together for the first time. Some works—such as Francis Bacon's *Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh*, the Westminster Abbey funerary monument of Mary, Queen of Scots, and William Camden's *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*—have been analysed individually by various scholars, but not within the context of other Jacobean representations of the same ancestors. This thesis shows how typical or atypical these works were in the Jacobean period rather than studying them in isolation, allowing us to draw broader conclusions and to correct previous generalisations. While some of these sources have been analysed by scholars in relation to James's hereditary claims and Anglo-Scottish union, this thesis analyses others in this context for the first time.

In addition, by analysing a wide range of sources, we can understand how James's hereditary claims and Anglo-Scottish union were represented across the entire

¹⁰ For example, see: Sharon Alker and Holly Faith Nelson, 'Macbeth, the Jacobean Scot, and the Politics of the Union', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 47.2 (Spring 2007), 379-401; Andrew Hadfield, 'Shakespeare and Politics in the Time of the Gunpowder Plot', *The Review of Politics*, 78.4 (Autumn 2016), 571-588; Arthur F. Kinney, 'Scottish History, the Union of the Crowns and the Issue of Right Rule: The Case of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*', in *Renaissance Culture in Context: Theory and Practice*, ed. by Jean R. Brink and William F. Gentrup (London: Routledge, 2017; first published in 1993), pp. 18-53; Claire McEachern, 'The Englishness of the Scottish Play: *Macbeth* and the Poetics of Jacobean Union', in *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours*, ed. by Allan I. MacInnes and Jane Ohlmeyer (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002), pp. 94-112; Philip Schwyzer, 'The Jacobean Union Controversy and *King Lear*', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 34-47.

course of James's joint reign, rather than being limited to the early years, which is the period that most scholars have focused on. For example, although succession panegyrics and union treatises were only written in the early years of James's joint reign, histories were written throughout. It is not possible for all Jacobean representations of James's ancestors to be analysed in one thesis, but I hope the sample considered here still permits broader conclusions to be drawn.

This thesis offers new interpretations of what motivated some artists and writers—especially Jacobean historians—to produce their works and make certain claims within them. For example, there are many underutilised manuscript sources that reveal that James's involvement in, and influence over, Camden's *Annales* was greater than scholars have previously recognised, and that Camden made many additions and changes to the manuscript drafts prior to publication that reveal how his arguments relating to James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones changed over time, as discussed in Chapter 5.

There is an imbalance between English and Scottish works in this thesis, with the former outweighing the latter. This can be explained on two main grounds. Jacobean England had both a larger population and a larger publishing industry than Jacobean Scotland, so more works were being produced and published in England.¹¹ Also, although James's succession to the English throne had practical implications for Scotland, the need to explain and justify James's hereditary claim to the English throne was primarily of concern to James's new English subjects. The Union of the Crowns and debates over permanent Anglo-Scottish union, however, concerned both the English and the Scots, and writers from both kingdoms utilised union treatises to discuss what form permanent union should take, or whether it should go ahead at all. As such, Scottish writers are better represented in discussions of Anglo-Scottish union, though they were often targeting an English audience in the hope of influencing the form of permanent

¹¹ For example, see: Jonquil Bevan, 'Scotland', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695*, ed. by John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 687-700; Robert Dickson and John Philip Edmond, *Annals of Scottish Printing from the Introduction of the Art in 1507 to the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1890); Katherine S. Van Eerde, 'Robert Waldegrave: The Printer as Agent and Link Between Sixteenth-Century England and Scotland', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 34.1 (Spring 1981), 40-78.

union legislated by the English Parliament. It is important to analyse works from both countries because it reveals the similarities and differences in how the English and the Scots approached contemporary political issues affecting them both and how they depicted James's ancestors, some of whom were English and some of whom were Scots. This demonstrates how much national identity shaped the Jacobean representation of these ancestors.

This thesis focuses exclusively on works produced (and published, if they were put into print) by James himself, Jacobean officials, and James's subjects within the affected kingdoms, England and Scotland. This helps us to understand how official works explained and justified James's hereditary claims and Anglo-Scottish union, and how James's subjects responded, either in accord or disagreement. As discussed above, works produced in Ireland are beyond the scope of this thesis, as Ireland was not going to be incorporated in the proposed permanent Anglo-Scottish union. These topics were also discussed beyond James's kingdoms; however, those doing so were outside the affected kingdoms, and were often targeting a different audience.¹² As such, international discussions of these issues are beyond the scope of this thesis and deserve to be studied in more depth elsewhere.

The remainder of this introduction provides a historiographical overview of the key themes of this thesis. It discusses the existing scholarly works that have informed this thesis, positions this thesis within the wider scholarship, and highlights areas for expansion that are explored in this thesis. It focuses on the scholarship relating to history, memory, hereditary right in an English context, James's succession to the English throne, the hereditary nature of the Scottish throne, Anglo-Scottish union, national identity in early modern England and Scotland, and James's views on the relationship between hereditary right and Anglo-Scottish union.

¹² For example, engravings were published in Amsterdam and Paris that included genealogies and Latin texts explaining the source of James's hereditary claim to the English throne alongside portraits of James, his wife, and eldest son. These engravings were intended for an international audience, demonstrating by what right James had claimed the English and Irish thrones and what England and Ireland's new royal family looked like; works such as these were not intended for James's subjects. See: Nicolaas de Bruyn (engraver) and Jean le Clerc (publisher), *Iacobi. I. Britannicarum Insularum Monarchæ*, 1604, engraving and letterpress on paper, 48.5 x 36.2cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1974,1207.6; Claes Jansz Visscher (att.), *James I and Queen Anne*, undated, engraving on paper, 40.2 x 45.1cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1935,0413.82.

History and Memory

Representing James VI & I's ancestors in the Jacobean period involved reflecting on the past. Paulina Kewes explains that to 'recover the uses of the past in a variety of genres is essential for the understanding of early modern historical culture since, even if many of those genres are no longer recognized as history, early modern writers and readers treated them as such.'¹³ History was utilised in a variety of works, both textual and visual, and this thesis considers the use of history in Jacobean discussions of James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones and Anglo-Scottish union.

In the 1960s, F. Smith Fussner argued that a 'historical revolution' took place in England between 1580 and 1660, emphasising the growth of impartiality, accuracy, and 'rationalism' in history writing, as medieval chronicles were turned into humanist histories proper, sharply breaking from the religious past.¹⁴ The idea that a 'historical revolution' took place in the early modern period has since been criticised as a teleological and Whiggish interpretation.¹⁵ F.J. Levy points out that people 'were as strongly convinced in 1625 as in 1480 that they lived in a basically orderly universe ... God ruled the world in accordance with a plan known in its entirety only to Him, if partially discoverable by men'.¹⁶ The study of history continued to be valued as a tool for learning about God's providence. As Alexandra Walsham has shown, in early modern England there was a widespread belief in divine providence. This meant that 'God was no idle, inactive spectator upon the mechanical workings of the created world, but an assiduous, energetic deity who constantly intervened in human affairs ... History was the canvas on which the Lord etched His purposes and intentions'.¹⁷ Consequently, providentialism was central

¹³ Paulina Kewes, 'History and Its Uses: Introduction', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1&2 (March 2005), 5, reprinted as 'History and Its Uses', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), p. 5.

¹⁴ F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 307.

¹⁵ For example, see: Andrew Hadfield, 'Sceptical History and the Myth of the Historical Revolution', *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 29.1 (Winter 2005), 25-44.

¹⁶ F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1967), p. 287.

¹⁷ Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 2.

to historical discourse.¹⁸ History was also a combative tool for competing religious groups, as Felicity Heal and Christopher Highley in particular have shown.¹⁹

D.R. Woolf has written extensively about the use of history in early modern England.²⁰ Woolf claims that most English historians writing in the decades prior to the Wars of the Three Kingdoms had a shared understanding of the past and its meaning, as well as the subjects worthy of study: ‘There was little dialectical clash of ideas in Tudor historiography on a regular basis, and there were very few major historical controversies ... On most issues, at most times, late Tudor and early Stuart historians simply saw no need to pursue historical debate for its own sake.’²¹ As such, historians tried to avoid contradicting one another and were uncomfortable when their sources conflicted. According to Woolf, serious ideological dissent in history writing only occurred because of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. Before this there were few major historical controversies, with the characters and legacies of individual monarchs largely agreed upon.²² ‘What was lacking in Tudor and early Stuart historiography’, Woolf argues, ‘was a reason for divergent points of view: historical narrative had yet to be firmly tied to the wagon of ideological and political

¹⁸ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, pp. 2-3. See also: Alexandra Walsham, ‘Providentialism’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed’s Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 427-442; Martha McGill and Alasdair Raffae, ‘The Uses of Providence in Early Modern Scotland’, in *The Supernatural in Early Modern Scotland*, ed. by Julian Goodare and Martha McGill (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), pp. 160-177.

¹⁹ Felicity Heal, ‘Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past’, *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1&2 (March 2005), 109-132, reprinted in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Kewes, pp. 105-128; Christopher Highley, *Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

²⁰ D.R. Woolf, ‘Change and Continuity in English Historical Thought, c. 1590-1640’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1983); Daniel R. Woolf, ‘From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700’, *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1&2 (March 2005), 33-70, reprinted in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Kewes, pp. 31-67; Daniel Woolf, ‘Historical Writing in Britain from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of the Enlightenment’, in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing Volume 3: 1400-1800*, ed. by Jose Rabasa, Masayuki Sato, Edoardo Tortarolo, and D.R. Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 473-496; Woolf, *The Idea of History*; D.R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

²¹ Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 30.

²² Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 30-35.

conflict.²³ John D. Staines, however, has challenged these claims with the example of Mary, Queen of Scots, which is explored further in this thesis.²⁴

No 'major' histories were produced in Scotland during the period of James's joint reign, though history continued to be utilised in Scottish political discourse. Early modern Scottish histories have been studied primarily from the perspective of political theory, such as where they claimed authority was vested in the Scottish kingdom and what powers they presented the Scottish monarch as having. These subjects became especially important in relation to Mary, Queen of Scots' abdication in 1567, and George Buchanan's subsequent justification of it as a legitimate deposition.²⁵ In addition, scholars have analysed sixteenth-century Scottish histories that promoted Anglo-Scottish union.²⁶ The representation of Scotland in early modern English histories has also been considered, though not comprehensively.²⁷ These themes continued to be important after the Union of the Crowns, when the relationship between England and Scotland was even more heavily debated.

²³ Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 35.

²⁴ John D. Staines, *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560-1690* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), p. 9.

²⁵ For example, see: Margaret J. Beckett, 'The Political Works of John Lesley, Bishop of Ross (1527-96)' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2002), pp. 227-237; J.H. Burns, 'Politia Regalis Et Optima: The Political Ideas of John Mair', *History of Political Thought*, 2.1 (Spring 1981), 32-61; J.H. Burns, *The True Law of Kingship: Concepts of Monarchy in Early-Modern Scotland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 56-60, 64-65, 67-92; John C. Leeds, 'Universals, Particulars, and Political Discourse in John Mair's *Historia Maioris Britanniae*', in *The Impact of Latin Culture on Medieval and Early Modern Scottish Writing*, ed. by Alessandra Petrina and Ian Johnson (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2018), pp. 87-99; Mason, *Kingship and the Commonwealth*, pp. 181-184, 192-195; Mason, 'Rex Stoicus', in *New Perspectives*, ed. by Dwyer, Mason, and Murdoch, pp. 9-30; Andrew R.C. Simpson, 'Counsel and the Crown: History, Law and Politics in the Thought of David Chalmers of Ormond', *The Journal of Legal History*, 36.1 (2015), 3-42.

²⁶ Beckett, 'The Political Works of John Lesley', pp. 214, 237-238, 241, 247-249; Burns, *The True Law of Kingship*, pp. 62-67; Jane Dawson, *John Knox* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), p. 191; Crawford Gribbon, 'John Knox, Reformation History and National Self-fashioning', *Reformation & Renaissance Review*, 8.1 (2006), 48-66; Mason, *Kingship and the Commonwealth*, pp. 36-77, 243-251, 174-181, 261-263; Arthur H. Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2003), pp. 11-16, 97-102; Arthur H. Williamson, 'Scotland, Antichrist and the Invention of Great Britain', in *New Perspectives*, ed. by Dwyer, Mason, and Murdoch, pp. 34-42.

²⁷ For example, see: Dermot Cavanagh, 'Uncivil Monarchy: Scotland, England and the Reputation of James IV', in *Early Modern Civil Discourses*, ed. by Jennifer Richards (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 152-154, 157-159; Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 102-103; Scott Lucas, 'Holinshed and Hall', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Heal, Archer, and Kewes, pp. 208-209; Roger A. Mason, 'Scotland', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Heal, Archer, and Kewes, pp. 647-662; Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 58-60, 74, 120-121.

The impact of the Union of the Crowns on history writing and historical discourse has also received scholarly attention. For example, Woolf analyses how Jacobean histories reinterpreted the past to present the Union of the Crowns as historically legitimate and divinely ordained.²⁸ While Woolf does mention some of the ways in which this reinterpretation of past Anglo-Scottish relations affected the reputations of James's ancestors, his broad focus means they are only discussed anecdotally.²⁹ History was also used to oppose permanent Anglo-Scottish union. Rei Kanemura specifically analyses how the Norman Conquest was discussed in response to the constitutional questions raised by the Anglo-Scottish union debates, as 'both the King and his legally-minded subjects turned to the year 1066 as the crucial point which could determine the course for how to interpret and establish sovereignty in the Anglo-Scottish kingdom.'³⁰ Scholars, however, have primarily focused on Jacobean discussions of the antiquity of England and Scotland's laws and legal systems, rather than the use of more recent history in the union debates.³¹ Woolf considers 'the union of the kingdoms' to be 'a dead issue' by about 1609, and thus does not see it reflected in Jacobean histories written after this.³² Although permanent union might not have seemed likely by the 1610s, the Union of the Crowns was still a significant change that affected how English historians perceived Scotland and vice versa. The existing scholarship relating to the Jacobean representation of James's ancestors is discussed in their appropriate chapters below.

²⁸ Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 55-72, 101, 127.

²⁹ For example, Woolf compares Edward Ayscu's positive representation of James IV of Scotland with William Martyn's negative one, suggesting Martyn's criticism was the reason he was arrested. Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 96-97.

³⁰ Rei Kanemura, 'Historical Perspectives on the Anglo-Scottish Union Debate: Re-reading the Norman Conquest in the 1610s', *History of European Ideas*, 40.2 (2014), 159.

³¹ For example, see: Karin Bowie, "'A Legal Limited Monarchy": Scottish Constitutionalism in the Union of the Crowns, 1603-1707', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 35.2 (2015), 131-154; Glenn Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 20-53; Brian P. Levack, 'Toward a More Perfect Union: England, Scotland, and the Constitution', in *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J.H. Hexter*, ed. by Barbara C. Malament (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), pp. 57-74; J.G.A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, second edition with retrospect (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 30-31, 285; Sommerville, J.P., 'King James VI and I and John Selden: Two Voices on History and the Constitution', in *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, ed. by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), pp. 290-322.

³² Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 72.

According to Richard L. Kagan, official histories were ubiquitous in early modern Europe ‘because most princes employed chroniclers to write “official histories” especially designed to celebrate their victories, augment their reputations, and defend their interests and concerns.’ Kagan explains that official history ‘is often designed to court public opinion, legitimate a ruler’s claim to power, or rally support for a particular political program or set of beliefs.’³³ James VI & I’s involvement in the creation of William Camden’s *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha* (first volume published in 1615, second volume published in 1625) has been analysed by numerous scholars, whose works are discussed in Chapter 5.

Written works were not the only means by which people in the Jacobean period learned about the past—especially events within living memory. Judith Pollmann defines memory as ‘a form of individual or collective engagement with the past that meaningfully connects the past to the present’.³⁴ Pierre Nora explains that memory ‘remains in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation’.³⁵ Peter Burke claims that ‘the social memory, like the individual memory, is selective’ and can be subject to ‘collective but unofficial’ censoring, where ‘groups, like individuals, suppress what it is inconvenient to remember’—

³³ Richard L. Kagan, *Clio and the Crown: The Politics of History in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), p. 3.

³⁴ Judith Pollmann, *Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 1. For more scholarship on memory in the early modern period, see: Jonathan Baldo, *Memory in Shakespeare’s Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York: Routledge, 2012); Kate Chedgzoy, Elspeth Graham, Katharine Hodgkin, and Ramona Wray, ‘Researching Memory in Early Modern Studies’, *Memory Studies*, 11.1 (2018), 5-20; Adam Fox, ‘Custom, Memory and the Authority of Writing’, in *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 89-116; Andrew Hiscock, *Reading Memory in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, and Jasper van der Steen (eds.), *Memory Before Modernity: Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz (eds.), *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010); Peter Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); Garrett A. Sullivan Jr., *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Andy Wood, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

³⁵ Pierre Nora, ‘Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*’, *Representations*, 26 (Spring 1989), 8.

‘social amnesia’, as Burke describes it.³⁶ As Adam Fox points out, however, ‘there could be something inherently subversive about popular perceptions of the past. What ordinary men and women remembered was not usually the stuff of learned or officially approved versions of the past ... their memories could be irreverent and even seditious in the details which they chose to retain, or forgot, and in the way they chose to construe them.’³⁷ Some of James VI & I’s ancestors had been alive during the lifetimes of James’s subjects, and so this thesis considers how they were remembered in the Jacobean period.

Alongside remembering, however, there was also the process of forgetting. Andy Wood explains that ‘the formation of official historical memories might involve the erasure of certain key events or the sanctioning of a forgetting process’.³⁸ Paul Connerton defines seven types of forgetting, including: repressive erasure (a forceful attempt to make people forget what came before); prescriptive forgetting (which differs from erasure because it is believed to be in the interests of all parties and can thus be publicly acknowledged); and forgetting that is constitutive in the formation of a new identity (where remembering may undermine someone’s current sense of identity).³⁹ William E. Engel defines oblivion as ‘a state or quality of something being utterly forgotten, something that once loomed large in consciousness but which now is as if it never were.’⁴⁰ According to Pollmann, acts of oblivion ‘were a favourite instrument in any peacemaker’s toolkit’ that helped to produce ‘a narrative that, by bracketing off and ‘forgetting’ one part of the past, encouraged people to reinvent a new form of continuity between past and present.’⁴¹ The process of forgetting is particularly relevant to the case of Mary, Queen of Scots, as discussed in Chapter 5. It is also important to recognise what people chose *not* to forget, and analyse why; for example, that some of Scotland’s former monarchs had been England’s enemies, as discussed in Chapter 4.

³⁶ Peter Burke, *Varieties of Cultural History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), pp. 46, 57-58.

³⁷ Adam Fox, ‘Remembering the Past in Early Modern England: Oral and Written Tradition’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9 (1999), 238.

³⁸ Wood, *The Memory of the People*, p. 25.

³⁹ Paul Connerton, ‘Seven Types of Forgetting’, *Memory Studies*, 1.1 (January 2008), 59-71.

⁴⁰ William E. Engel, ‘The Decay of Memory’, in *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe’s Legacies*, ed. by Christopher Ivic and Grant Williams (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 22. See also: Sullivan, *Memory and Forgetting*, pp. 25-43; Pollmann, *Memory in Early Modern Europe*, pp. 140-158.

⁴¹ Pollmann, *Memory in Early Modern Europe*, pp. 141, 154.

One means by which governments aimed to control the circulation of ideas is through censorship. According to John Barnard, censorship in early modern Britain, ‘far from being pervasive or by the 1630s virtually totalitarian in its repressiveness, was essentially *ad hoc*, inconsistent, opportunistic and usually ineffective.’⁴² Annabel Patterson claims that in early modern England, authorities and writers created a set of conventions ‘as to how far a writer could go in explicit address to the contentious issues of his day, and how, if he did *not* choose the confrontational approach, he could encode his opinions so that nobody would be *required* to make an example of him.’⁴³ Mark Bland counters Patterson’s argument, asserting that ‘any general inference used in turn to interpret texts where there is no external evidence at all of interference is a highly dubious procedure.’⁴⁴ Bland claims instead that ‘only rarely would a book impinge on the limits of what might be acceptable, and, even then, the authorities were inclined to tolerance of all except the most religiously virulent or politically compromised.’⁴⁵ Cyndia Susan Clegg points out how few attempts there were to suppress books or punish their writers or printers in the Jacobean period.⁴⁶ The unusual cases of Edward Ayscu and William Martyn are discussed in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.

⁴² John Barnard, ‘Introduction’, in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume IV*, ed. by Barnard and McKenzie, p. 3. See also: Janet Clare, *‘Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority’: Elizabethan and Jacobean Censorship* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990); Richard Dutton, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000); Richard Dutton, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991); Richard Dutton, ‘Patronage, Licensing, and Censorship’, in *A Concise Companion to English Renaissance Literature*, ed. by Donna B. Hamilton (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), pp. 75-93; Sheila Lambert, ‘The Printers and the Government, 1604-1640’, in *Aspects of Printing from 1600*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987), pp. 1-29; Sheila Lambert, ‘State Control of the Press in Theory and Practice: The Role of the Stationers’ Company Before 1640’, in *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France, 1600-1910*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St. Paul’s Bibliographies, 1992), pp. 1-32; Anthony Milton, ‘Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England’, *The Historical Journal*, 41.3 (1998), 625-651; Julian Roberts, ‘The Latin Trade’, in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume IV*, ed. by Barnard and McKenzie, pp. 144-150; D.R. Woolf, ‘The Power of the Past: History, Ritual and Political Authority in Tudor England’, in *Political Thought and the Tudor Commonwealth: Deep Structure, Discourse and Disguise*, ed. by Paul A. Fideler and T.F. Mayer (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 19-50.

⁴³ Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984; 1991 edition), p. 12.

⁴⁴ Mark Bland, “‘Invisible Dangers’: Censorship and the Subversion of Authority in Early Modern England”, *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 90.2 (1996), 180.

⁴⁵ Bland, ‘Censorship and the Subversion of Authority’, 181.

⁴⁶ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, p. 19.

There have been fewer studies of censorship in early modern Scotland. Alastair Mann explains that post-publication censorship, rather than pre-emptive censorship, was the most common variety because ‘deviant writers and printers gave no warning of their intentions.’⁴⁷ Scottish censorship consisted of statutes against heresy and the crime of ‘leasing-making’—‘the spreading of harmful ideas and untruths fomenting discord between the people, the king and his government’—with the latter becoming ‘synonymous with slander, spoken, written or printed, of the crown and government’ from the 1550s, and not merely of the monarch.⁴⁸ Only 13 books were officially banned between 1570 and 1629.⁴⁹ In May 1603 the Scottish Privy Council issued a proclamation against the circulation of unapproved news that, in Mann’s words, ‘reflected the anxiety of the government to keep control of public information with the king having re-located to London ... The information dialogue between England and Scotland was now of particular sensitivity’. In 1609, an ‘Act against Scandalous Speeches and Libels’ was issued to ‘suppress Scottish slanders against the people and nation of England as James strove to encourage his British project’, but with little success.⁵⁰ As this thesis shows, however, silence was a more common form of resistance than open attacks.

Hereditary Right and the English Crown

By the seventeenth century, as Howard Nenner explains, ‘the particulars of hereditary succession appeared to have been fully settled with respect to the descent of the [English] crown. Primogeniture dictated heritable right in order of age and of sex; the *per stirpes* principle allowed for a deceased child to be represented in the order of succession by his or her heir; there was no Salic Law and therefore no bar either to female rule or to inheritance through a female line; and aliens who were not allowed to inherit English land were none the less eligible to take by inheritance, as were those whose blood had been corrupted by treason.’ The English succession appeared to operate according to strict hereditary right, and so ‘there would never

⁴⁷ Alastair J. Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade, 1500 to 1720: Print Commerce and Print Control in Early Modern Scotland* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000), p. 178.

⁴⁸ Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade*, p. 164. New, stricter statutes were introduced during James VI’s majority. Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade*, pp. 164-165.

⁴⁹ Alastair J. Mann, ‘Parliaments, Princes, and Presses: Voices of Tradition and Protest in Early Modern Scotland’, in *Sites of Discourse—Public and Private Spheres—Legal Culture*, ed. by Uwe Böker and Julie A. Hibbard (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), p. 85; Mann, *Scottish Book Trade*, p. 179, 182-185, 254.

⁵⁰ Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade*, pp. 173-174.

be a contested succession because the identity of the heir to the throne would not be a matter of conjecture or dispute, but would at all times be known.’⁵¹ Nenner acknowledges, however, that this was how hereditary right ideally operated; in actuality, as was clearly demonstrated in the Elizabethan succession debates, disputes could arise over who was the senior hereditary claimant. Michelle M. Dowd points out that when it came to royal succession, ‘the system of patrilineage aroused considerable, and often heated, debate as to its precise application.’⁵²

The Elizabethan succession debates revealed disagreements over the nature of hereditary right. Jean-Christophe Mayer explains: ‘To assert that heredity was the determinant right to be considered to settle the succession solved nothing—it even created further difficulties. Such a proposition could not withstand the test of English history itself.’ This was because hereditary succession had been breached as often as it had been observed.⁵³ According to Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, English laws and customs concerning monarchical succession ‘were far from clear-cut.’ It was debated whether foreigners could succeed to the English throne, ‘since common law prohibited aliens from inheriting property, and a statute of 1351 (25 Edward III) excluded from the succession those born outside the monarch’s allegiance’ except for the ‘*enfants du roi*’, though it was unclear ‘whether the wording referred just to Edward III’s children or to the royal family in general.’ Illegitimacy and the authority of the English Parliament over the succession were also concerns, as ‘Henry VIII had contravened common law and placed his bastard daughters in the line of succession by statute’ and Henry’s will, authorised by an Act of Parliament, ‘added to the legal mess’ by ‘privileging the line of his younger sister Mary, Duchess of Suffolk, and ignoring that of the elder sister Margaret’, disregarding the principle of primogeniture.⁵⁴ Finally, the religious divide caused by the Reformation resulted in candidates being supported or opposed based on

⁵¹ Nenner, *The Right to be King*, p. 8.

⁵² Michelle M. Dowd, *The Dynamics of Inheritance on the Shakespearean Stage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 36.

⁵³ Jean-Christophe Mayer, ‘Introduction: Breaking the Silence’, in *Breaking the Silence on the Succession: A Sourcebook of Manuscripts and Rare Elizabethan Texts (c.1587-1603)*, ed. by Jean-Christophe Mayer (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2003), pp. 14-15.

⁵⁴ Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, ‘The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 21-22.

their confessional identities.⁵⁵ As a result of this confusion, Doran and Kewes explain, people ‘promoted those rules that worked in the interest of their own favoured candidate’.⁵⁶ This thesis considers if and how these former objections to the hereditary claims of James and his ancestors were resolved after James’s succession to the English throne.

In recent decades, research on the Elizabethan succession debates—arguments over who should succeed to the English and Irish thrones on the death of the childless Elizabeth I—has shown that James VI & I could not be confident of his eventual succession.⁵⁷ James’s position as the senior claimant was neither universally recognised nor officially acknowledged.⁵⁸ Candidates were not judged purely on the basis of their hereditary claim; other conditions such as religion, nationality, and legal or parliamentary exclusion might overrule hereditary right, and a candidate’s hereditary claim might be dismissed if they were thought to be illegitimate. Marie Axton explains that English common lawyers applied the theory of the king’s two bodies—which claimed that the monarch had a body natural and a body politic (the latter providing the monarchy with ‘corporate perpetuity’, meaning that the monarch and their successor were effectively the same person)—to the succession in Elizabeth’s reign.⁵⁹ Succession treatises written in support of Mary, Queen of Scots, and James VI used the theory to argue that laws that prevented foreigners from inheriting property in England did not apply to the English crown, as the crown was not property.⁶⁰ According to Nenner, the Elizabethan succession debates ‘served to underscore the absence of a known and certain rule of succession.

⁵⁵ For example, see: Victor Houlston, ‘Filling in the Blanks: Catholic Hopes for the English Succession’, *SEDERI*, 25 (2015), 77-104; Paulina Kewes, ‘The Puritan, the Jesuit and the Jacobean Succession’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. Doran and Kewes, pp. 47-70; Thomas M. McCoog, ‘Harmony Disrupted: Robert Parsons, S.J., William Crichton, S.J., and the Question of Queen Elizabeth’s Successor, 1581-1603’, *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 73.145 (2004), 149-220.

⁵⁶ Doran and Kewes, ‘The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, p. 22.

⁵⁷ Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, ‘Introduction: A Historiographical Perspective’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, p. 4; Nenner, *The Right to be King*, pp. 13-25.

⁵⁸ Doran and Kewes, ‘Introduction’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, p. 4.

⁵⁹ Marie Axton, *The Queen’s Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), p. 12, 27-28.

⁶⁰ Axton, *The Queen’s Two Bodies*, pp. 15-21.

Irrespective of who would be the next sovereign, it was not clear by what right this new monarch was to take the crown.’⁶¹

Scholars have also recognised James’s resistance to the idea that the English Parliament had authority over the succession or the ability to elect a monarch. Jean-Christophe Mayer argues that to ‘base James’ claim to the throne of England on heredity was dire ... the Scottish king, given the circumstances, had little room for manoeuvre and ... this was as much an ideological as a (risky) strategic choice.’ Mayer proposes that James chose to depend on his hereditary claim in response to *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inghland* (1595), attributed to Robert Persons, which argued that the English Parliament could nominate an heir to the throne. In response, James ‘placed his bets on a defence of heredity as an indefeasible right, one which lay beyond the reach even of such perennial and respected institutions as parliament.’⁶² Doran explains this succinctly: ‘By winning over Cecil and other English noblemen James made sure of the succession; no rival candidate reared his or her head; no parliament was called to choose a successor.’⁶³ Conrad Russell concurs, arguing that the Third Succession Act of 1543 and the Treason Act of 1571 acknowledged the English Parliament’s power to determine the succession, and ‘if they were valid, he [James] was not king. This was why it was so vital to James to assert that succession passed by lineal hereditary right, all Acts of Parliament and other exercises in law notwithstanding.’⁶⁴ This thesis further explores how James and his supporters denied the authority of the English Parliament over the succession, and the more conflicted views of his subjects.

James himself theorised about the nature of monarchy and royal succession. In *The True Law of Free Monarchies* (1598), James argued that the hereditary nature of monarchy was God’s will, ‘the lineall succession of crownes being begun among the people of God, and happely continued in divers Christian common-welths. So as no objection either of heresie, or whatsoever private statute or law may free the

⁶¹ Nenner, *The Right to be King*, p. 26.

⁶² Mayer, ‘Introduction: Breaking the Silence’, in *Breaking the Silence on the Succession*, ed. by Mayer, pp. 15-16.

⁶³ Susan Doran, ‘James VI and the English Succession’, in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 42.

⁶⁴ Conrad Russell, ‘1603: The End of English National Sovereignty’, in *The Accession of James I*, ed. by Burgess, Wymer, and Lawrence, pp. 4-5.

people from their oath giving to their King, & his succession'.⁶⁵ Subjects had no right to oppose the succession of the senior hereditary claimant to the throne, regardless of their confessional identity or laws that might claim to exclude them. Once James had succeeded to the English throne, he asserted in his first speech to the English Parliament that 'God by my Birthright and lineall descent' had put him there, and this was 'immediately after it pleased God to call your late Sovereigne'.⁶⁶ James argued that his succession had been automatic on Elizabeth's death, because hereditary right was unchallengeable and unfettered by conditions.

James VI & I's Succession to the English Throne

Scholars now attribute James VI & I's smooth succession to English throne to the successful manoeuvrings of Robert Cecil and his allies in Elizabeth I's final years and the hours following her death.⁶⁷ James and his supporters, however, attributed his succession to hereditary right. This claim must be understood in the context of the Elizabethan succession debates, when James's succession had never been guaranteed. The explanations and justifications offered to James's new subjects were intended to persuade them to accept him as their rightful king. James and his supporters also wanted to prevent any rival claimants gaining support, which was a cause of genuine concern.⁶⁸ It was necessary for James's claim to be explained

⁶⁵ James VI & I, *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (Edinburgh, 1598; STC 14409), E2v; James VI & I, 'The Trew Law of Free Monarchies', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 82.

⁶⁶ James VI & I, *The Kings Majesties Speech, as it was Delivered by him in the Upper House of the Parliament, to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, On Munday the 19. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of this Present Parliament, and the First Parliament of his Majesties Raigne* (London, 1604; STC 14390), A3v; James VI & I, 'A Speech, as it was Delivered in the Upper House of the Parliament to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, on Munday the XIX. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of the First Parliament', in *King James VI & I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 132; *The Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2d 1628. In the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First* (London, 1742), p. 142.

⁶⁷ Alexander Courtney, 'The Scottish King and the English Court: The Secret Correspondence of James VI, 1601-3', in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, pp. 134, 144-146; Jean-Christophe Mayer, 'Introduction', in *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England. Politics, Polemics, and Cultural Representations*, ed. by Jean-Christophe Mayer (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2004), pp. 9-11; Richard A. McCabe, 'Panegyric and Its Discontents: The First Stuart Succession', in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, pp. 35-36; Michèle Vignaux, 'The Succession and Related Issues through the Correspondence of Elizabeth, James, and Robert Cecil', in *The Struggle for the Succession*, ed. by Mayer, pp. 65-88.

⁶⁸ The English Privy Council ordered the navy to be ready against foreign invasion and officials throughout the kingdom to be prepared to quash uprisings. Wilbraham, 'The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham', p. 54.

because many of his new subjects might have been unaware of what it was, since the Elizabethan government had officially forbidden all discussion of the succession. As Richard A. McCabe observes, 'How the Stuart succession had come about remained a mystery to many.'⁶⁹

Howard Nenner's *The Right to be King* (1995) was one of the first scholarly interrogations of the explanations given for James's succession to the English throne. Nenner explains that the proclamation of James's succession appeared to be 'a vindication of James's hereditary claim to the throne ... The message being conveyed categorically was of an indisputable, as well as an undisputed, succession.'⁷⁰ Nenner correctly points out, however, that 'James's accession, for all of its accompanying assertions of an indefeasible right of inheritance, failed none the less to resolve all of the lingering questions about his, or any monarch's, right to be king.'⁷¹ James's new subjects wanted to understand and explain what his claim to the English throne was, but they were not unanimous in their interpretation of it. Nenner sees this as a consequence of the Elizabethan succession debates, which had 'served to underscore the absence of a known and certain rule of succession.'⁷² Unlike other works, Nenner considers the entirety of James's joint reign and does not concentrate exclusively on the period immediately following Elizabeth I's death. The only later example Nenner elaborates on, however, is the debate in the 1614 English Parliament over the naturalisation of James's son-in-law, Frederick, Elector Palatine of the Rhine. By this time, Nenner claims, James's 'confidence in the outcome of a natural, unregulated route to the throne had apparently been shaken ... it suggested that James did not regard his own accession in 1603 as having settled the question of whether an alien could inherit the throne'.⁷³ This thesis argues that this was because James was widely presented as English (or sufficiently English) when he succeeded to the English throne.

⁶⁹ McCabe, 'Panegyric and Its Discontents', in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, p. 25.

⁷⁰ Nenner, *The Right to be King*, p. 61.

⁷¹ Nenner, *The Right to be King*, p. 62.

⁷² Nenner, *The Right to be King*, p. 26.

⁷³ Nenner, *The Right to be King*, pp. 64-66.

According to Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, after contested royal successions ‘people tended to jump on the bandwagon of the successful candidate, or at least to keep quiet about their misgivings, making the outcome seem more inevitable than it actually was.’ Doran and Kewes recognise this trend in the proclamation of James’s succession, the celebratory texts that followed, and the festivities that accompanied James’s journey to London. ‘Modern scholars have perhaps been taken in by this showmanship. And they have too readily inferred that everyone believed in James’s hereditary title to the English crown,’ which was even disputed *during* James’s reign.⁷⁴ McCabe emphasises the importance of the proclamation of James’s succession, which ‘offered the English nation a very plausible solution to the apparently intractable problem of the succession, and one that was likely to endure, as virtually every commentator noted, because of James’s ample progeny.’⁷⁵

Scholars have more recently begun to analyse texts produced in response to the proclamation of James’s succession. For example, Andrew McRae and John West point out that ‘the succession literature, in general, captures a moment in which voices of celebration and hope predominated’ due to James’s Protestantism, progeny, and familiarity.⁷⁶ McCabe discusses the panegyrics published following the proclamation of James’s succession and the importance they attach to James’s Protestantism in particular.⁷⁷ McRae discusses succession panegyrics as a literary genre that assess ‘not only the Scottish king but also the implications of the succession for their own authorial and political identities.’⁷⁸ This is particularly important in terms of the Union of the Crowns that resulted from James’s succession, and analysing how unofficial works represented James’s hereditary claim adds to our knowledge of the Jacobean conception of hereditary right.

⁷⁴ Doran and Kewes, ‘Introduction’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, p. 12.

⁷⁵ McCabe, ‘Panegyrics and Its Discontents’, in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, p. 35.

⁷⁶ Andrew McRae and John West, ‘Introduction’, in *Literature of the Stuart Successions*, ed. by McRae and West, pp. 29-31.

⁷⁷ McCabe, ‘Panegyric and Its Discontents’, in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, pp. 19-36.

⁷⁸ McRae, ‘Welcoming the King’, in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, p. 189.

Scholars have also considered alternative means by which James's succession to the English and Irish thrones was explained. Doran explains that 'not everyone bought into the notion of James's indisputable hereditary title, and many believed that he had indeed been elected by the great men gathered at Richmond Palace.' The possibility of James being an elected monarch was raised in some of the works produced after his proclamation.⁷⁹ There is room for further analysis of the alternative means by which James's succession was explained, and how this might have impacted on his potential power and status as England's monarch. That, however, is not the focus of this thesis.

Scotland: A Hereditary Monarchy?

The hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy was also debated in the early modern period, particularly in relation to the abdication of Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1567, which was quickly justified as a legitimate deposition.⁸⁰ J.H. Burns describes George Buchanan's *De Jure Regni Apud Scotos* (probably written in late

⁷⁹ Doran, '1603: A Jagged Succession', 6. See also: Kanemura, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election?', 317-342.

⁸⁰ For further discussion of Mary's abdication, see: Burns, *The True Law of Kingship*, pp. 185-208; Antonia Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969; reprinted 2015), pp. 409-433; John Guy, *'My Heart is My Own': The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Harper Perennial, 2004), pp. 341-352, 362-366; Mason, *Kingship and the Commonwealth*, pp. 190-194; Kristen Post Walton, *Catholic Queen, Protestant Patriarchy: Mary, Queen of Scots, and the Politics of Gender and Religion* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 137-164; Retha M. Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 161-165, 173-185; Jenny Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991), pp. 165-177. For discussions of Calvinism, contractual monarchy and resistance theory, see: Glen Bowman, 'Early Calvinist Resistance Theory: New Perspectives on an Old Label', *Journal of Law and Religion*, 23.1 (2007), 309-319; Dawson, *John Knox*, pp. 84, 86-88, 128-129, 133, 136, 139-140, 143, 145-147, 156-157, 163, 169-171, 213-214, 240, 243, 246, 317; Jane Dawson, 'Scotland and the Example of Geneva', *Theology in Scotland*, 16.2 (2009), 55-73; Jane E.A. Dawson, 'Trumpeting Resistance: Christopher Goodman and John Knox', in *John Knox and the British Reformations*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 130-155; Jane E.A. Dawson, 'The Two John Knoxes: England, Scotland and the 1558 Tracts', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 43.4 (October 1991), 555-576; Robert M. Kingdon, 'Calvinism and Resistance Theory, 1550-1580', in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, ed. by J.H. Burns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 194-218; Roger A. Mason, 'Introduction', in *John Knox: On Rebellion*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. viii-xxiv; Mason, *Kingship and the Commonwealth*, pp. 139-164; Roger A. Mason, 'Knox, Resistance and the Moral Imperative', *History of Political Thought*, 1.3 (Autumn 1980), 411-436; Roger A. Mason, 'Knox, Resistance and the Royal Supremacy', in *John Knox and the British Reformations*, ed. by Mason, pp. 154-175; Graeme Murdoch, *The Intellectual, Political and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches, c. 1540-1620* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 54-75; Quentin Skinner, 'The Origins of the Calvinist Theory of Revolution', in *After the Reformation*, ed. by Malament, pp. 309-330; David VanDrunen, 'The Use of Natural Law in Early Calvinist Resistance Theory', *Journal of Law and Religion*, 21.1 (2006), 143-167.

1567 but only published in 1579) as the most important Scottish contribution to this ideological debate.⁸¹ Burns explains that Buchanan ‘sought to persuade the educated public ... that her deposition was in full accord both with the basic principles of political society and with the specific norms of the Scottish constitution.’⁸² Buchanan’s contractual theory of monarchy meant that if the monarch broke their pact with their subjects by becoming a tyrant, their subjects could legally depose and kill them.⁸³

Buchanan also wrote *De Maria Scotorum Regina* (commonly known as *Ane Detectioun of the Duinges of Marie Quene of Scottes*), a work intended to persuade Elizabeth I that the Scottish lords had been justified in deposing Mary due to her tyrannous behaviour and involvement in the murder of her husband, Henry, Lord Darnley, with her supposed lover, James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell. It was presented to the English commission that adjudicated between Mary and the Scottish lords in 1568-1569, then published in Latin and various translations.⁸⁴

⁸¹ Burns, *The True Law of Kingship*, p. 185. George Buchanan, *De Jure Regni Apud Scotos* (Edinburgh, 1579; STC 3973). The dating of *De Jure Regni Apud Scotos* is discussed in Roger A. Mason and Martin S. Smith, ‘Introduction’, in *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots: A Critical Edition of George Buchanan’s ‘De Jure Regni apud Scotos Dialogus’*, ed. by Roger A. Mason and Martin S. Smith (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. xxvii-xxix.

⁸² Burns, *The True Law of Kingship*, pp. 188-189.

⁸³ Burns, *The True Law of Kingship*, p. 208. See also: Nathalie Catellani-Dufrêne, ‘L’icône et l’idole. Les représentations de Marie Stuart dans l’œuvre de George Buchanan’, *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 36.4 (Autumn 2013), 81-100; Mason and Smith, ‘Introduction’, in *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship*, ed. by Mason and Smith, pp. xlv-lxxi; Hugh Trevor-Roper, *The Invention of Scotland: Myth and History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 48-54; Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness*, pp. 107-115; Jenny Wormald, ‘Resistance and Regicide in Sixteenth-Century Scotland: The Execution of Mary Queen of Scots’, *Majestas*, 1 (1993), 67-87.

⁸⁴ Gordon Donaldson, *The First Trial of Mary, Queen of Scots* (New York: Stein and Day, 1969), pp. 83, 137-138, 220-221; Mason and Smith, ‘Introduction’, in *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship*, ed. by Mason and Smith, pp. xxx-xxxii; Mason, ‘Rex Stoicus’, in *New Perspectives*, ed. by Dwyer, Mason, and Murdoch, pp. 9-25; Tricia McElroy, ‘Performance, Print and Politics in George Buchanan’s *Ane Detectioun of the duinges of Marie Quene of Scottes*’, in *George Buchanan: Political Thought in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Roger A. Mason and Caroline Erskine (London: Routledge, 2012), p. 49; James Emerson Phillips, *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth-Century Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964), pp. 61-68; Staines, *The Tragic Histories*, pp. 27-50. George Buchanan and Thomas Wilson (att.), *De Maria Scotorum Regina, totâque eius contra Regem coniuratione, fodo cum Bothuelio adulterio, nefaria in maritum crudelitate & rabie, horrendo insuper & deterrimo eiusdem parricidio: plena & tragica planè historia* (London, 1571; STC 3978). George Buchanan, *Ane Detectioun of the Duinges of Marie Quene of Scottes* (London, 1571; STC 3981). George Buchanan, *Ane Detectioun of the Doingis of Marie Quene of Scottis* (St Andrews, 1572; STC 3982).

Finally, in 1582, Buchanan published his history of Scotland, *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*.⁸⁵ The history, in Roger A. Mason's words, 'flesh[ed] out the more abstract vision of a classical Scottish republic adumbrated in the *De Jure Regni*, and historicis[ed] the civic values, rooted in reason and natural law, which the Scottish nobility had allegedly acted on in deposing Mary'.⁸⁶ Buchanan's works argued that Scotland had always been an elective monarchy (exaggerating and fabricating evidence to do so), and pointed to historic examples of Scottish monarchs being deposed to justify Mary's deposition.⁸⁷ Jenny Wormald argues that political theorists such as Buchanan 'did not significantly change, let alone dictate, the realities of Scottish politics', as their elective and contractual theories did not threaten the theoretical basis of monarchy firmly grounded, since the early fourteenth century, in primogeniture.⁸⁸

However, it is clear from James VI's subsequent reassertion of royal authority that he found Buchanan's ideas threatening.⁸⁹ Buchanan served as James's childhood tutor, an arrangement that likely ended in 1579 when James was declared an adult ruler at the age of thirteen, and Buchanan died in 1582.⁹⁰ Mason argues that Scottish

⁸⁵ George Buchanan, *Rerum Scoticarum Historia* (Edinburgh, 1582; STC 3991).

⁸⁶ Mason, *Kingship and the Commonweal*, p. 182. See also: Mason, 'Rex Stoicus', in *New Perspectives*, ed. by Dwyer, Mason and Murdoch, pp. 25-30.

⁸⁷ J.H. Burns, 'The Political Ideas of George Buchanan', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 30.1.109 (April 1951), 60-68; Mason, *Kingship and the Commonweal*, p. 191; Mason and Smith, 'Introduction', in *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship*, ed. by Mason and Smith, pp. xv-lxxi; Hugh Trevor-Roper, *George Buchanan and the Ancient Scottish Constitution* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1966), pp. 12-16.

⁸⁸ Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: The Scottish Context and the English Translation', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 42.

⁸⁹ For example, see: Bushnell, 'George Buchanan, James VI and Neo-Classicism', in *Scots and Britons*, ed. by Mason, pp. 91-111; Aysha Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 264-313. Mary, Queen of Scots, was also concerned to suppress Buchanan's works. Mary's response is discussed in Phillips, *Images of a Queen*, pp. 63-64, 70, 256n56; Staines, *The Tragic Histories*, p. 37. The focus of this thesis, however, is James's response in the period 1603-1625.

⁹⁰ There does not appear to be any concrete evidence of when James's time as Buchanan's pupil came to an end; Aysha Pollnitz suggests it was when Esmé Stewart became James's favourite in 1579. Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, pp. 296-297. For James's time as Buchanan's pupil, see: D. M. Abbott, 'Buchanan, George (1506-1582)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3837>; Maurice Lee Jr., *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), pp. 31-37; Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, pp. 264-313; Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: A Life of James VI & I* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2003), pp. 38-45; George F. Warner (ed.), 'The Library of James VI. 1573-1583 from a Manuscript in the hand of Peter Young, his Tutor', in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, 1 (Edinburgh, 1893), xiii-xxix; D. Harris Willson, *King James VI and I* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1956), pp. 19-27.

presbyterians adopted Buchanan's ideas wholesale in their struggle with James for control over the Scottish kirk, and this was a major motivation for James to write his own political treatises.⁹¹ In 1584, when James was seventeen years old, the Scottish Parliament passed an act condemning 'wicked and licencious publick and private speches, and untrew calumnies' that were 'to the dishonour and prejudice of his Hienes, his Parents, Progenitours, and Estaite'. Buchanan's *De Jure Regni Apud Scotos* and *Rerum Scoticarum Historia* were condemned as being 'not meete to remaine as Recordes of trueth to the posteritie', with copies to be handed in so that offensive material could be removed.⁹²

James's concern was not merely for Mary's reputation, but the implications such attacks had on his own status and authority.⁹³ This also shaped his response to Mary's impending execution, an event that further undermined the ideology of divine-right monarchy that the justifications of her abdication as a legitimate deposition had already shaken. Only God could punish monarchs, James argued in a letter to Elizabeth I—an argument he would continue to make.⁹⁴ Mary's execution

⁹¹ Mason, *Kingship and the Commonweal*, pp. 189, 195, 200.

⁹² *The Lawes and Actes of Parliament Maid Be King James the First, And His Successours Kinges of Scotland: Uisied, Collected and Extracted Furth of the Register* (Edinburgh, 1597; STC 21877), Acts of Parliament from the reign of James VI, 59v-60r; 'Ane act for punisment of the authoris of the slanderous and untrew calumneis spokin aganis the kingis majestie, his counsell and procedingis, or to the dishonour and prejudice of his hienes, his parentis, progenitouris, croun and estate', 22 May 1584. Keith M. Brown et. al. (ed.), *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707* (St Andrews, 2007-2021), 1584/5/14 <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1584/5/14> [accessed 16 June 2021]. Mason points out this act was 'part of a legislative package—the so-called Black Acts—which constituted his first attempt to stem the presbyterian tide', and so must be understood in that context. Mason, *Kingship and the Commonweal*, p. 201.

⁹³ According to Susan Doran, James's efforts to save his mother's life were not 'half-hearted or insincere, because of his ambition to secure the English succession, as many historians have suggested' but rather 'he pursued Mary's case energetically and forcefully, for he believed that his own honour and that of the Scottish nation were at stake'; it was not due to any personal attachment to his absentee mother. James wanted to defend the honour of his dynasty and denounce Elizabeth's claim to have jurisdiction over Mary, which 'undermined his own rights and status as king of Scotland' since it 'implied an English overlordship over his realm, a claim which the Stewart kings had long resisted.' Susan Doran, 'Revenge her Foul and Most Unnatural Murder? The Impact of Mary Stewart's Execution on Anglo-Scottish Relations', *History*, 85.280 (October 2000), 589, 599.

⁹⁴ In a letter to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, James criticised Mary's actions but argued that 'proceeding by subjectis against a free prince of the best bloode in europe' was damaging to all monarchs. James VI to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 4 December 1586. BL Add MS 32092, fol. 56r. In a letter to Elizabeth, James asked how she could 'putt to death a free soveraigne prince ... & touching hir nearlie in proximitie of bloode quhat lau of godd can permitt that justice shall strikke upon thaim quhome he hes appointid supream dispensatouris of the same under him, quhom he hath callid goddis & thairfore subjectid to the censoure of none in earth, quhose anointing by godd can not be defylid be man unrevenged by the authoure thairof'? James VI to Elizabeth I, 26 January 1587. BL Cotton MS Caligula C VIII, fol. 192v.

did, however, enable James to shape his mother's posthumous legacy. Instead of drawing attention to Mary's controversial political and religious reputation, James focused on Mary's dynastic significance as the source of his hereditary claim to the Scottish throne. For example, Anna of Denmark's 1590 Edinburgh entry included a genealogical tree that depicted the couple's shared descent from Christian I of Denmark-Norway. Accompanying verses stressed the hereditary right of the Stewart monarchs to the Scottish throne, and Mary was praised as James's mother.⁹⁵ This asserted that Scotland had a hereditary, not an elective, monarchy.

There has been much less scholarly analysis of debates over the hereditary nature of the Scottish crown after James's succession to the English throne.⁹⁶ Mason argues that 'in England after 1603, the threat posed by Buchanan and the Scottish presbyterian clergy was less immediate and pressing than it had appeared in Scotland in the mid-1590s.'⁹⁷ James, however, continued to commission works to assert that Scotland's monarchy was hereditary and Mary's abdication was not a legitimate deposition, as will be discussed in this thesis.

⁹⁵ Peter Graves (trans.), 'The Danish Account of the Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark', in David Stevenson, *Scotland's Last Royal Wedding: The Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1997), pp. 115-116.

⁹⁶ Scholars have tended to overlook the period of James's joint reign, resuming analysis of Buchanan's influence in the period of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms and beyond. See: John Coffey, 'George Buchanan and the Scottish Covenanters', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought*, ed. by Mason and Erskine, pp. 189-204; Martin Dzelzainis, 'Milton, *Macbeth*, and Buchanan', *The Seventeenth Century*, 4.1 (Spring 1989), 55-66; Caroline Erskine, 'George Buchanan, English Whigs and Royalists, and the Canon of Political Theory', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought*, ed. by Mason and Erskine, pp. 229-248; Caroline Erskine, 'George Buchanan and Revolution Principles', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought*, ed. by Mason and Erskine, pp. 289-306; Sue Fang Ng, 'Milton, Buchanan, and King Arthur', *The Review of English Studies*, 70.296 (September 2019), 659-680; Clare Jackson, 'Buchanan in Hell: Sir James Turner's Civil War Royalism', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought*, ed. by Mason and Erskine, pp. 205-228; Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade*, p. 180; Francis Oakley, 'On the Road from Constance to 1688: The Political Thought of John Major and George Buchanan', *Journal of British Studies*, 1.2 (May 1962), 1-31; Trevor-Roper, *The Invention of Scotland*, pp. 63-72. Andrew Hadfield briefly considers the possible impact of Buchanan's political theory on Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (1606) and David Hume of Godscroft's *De Unione Insulae Britannicae* (1605). Andrew Hadfield, *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Matter of Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 43-58. Mason argues that Buchanan's *Rerum Scoticarum Historia* 'was seen less as a handbook of political radicalism' at the time of the Union of the Crowns 'and more as a source of cultural reassurance, reaffirming the antiquity of the Scottish monarchy and the autonomous origins of the Scottish people, while also providing a comprehensive 'map' of northern Britain that was critical in defending Scotland's distinct identity within the new British *imperium*.' However, this does not include an analysis of how Buchanan's political ideology was discussed in the Jacobean period. Mason, 'Certain Matters Concerning the Realme of Scotland', 41.

⁹⁷ Mason, *Kingship and the Commonweal*, p. 238.

Anglo-Scottish Union

With James VI & I's succession to the English throne in 1603, England and Scotland began to share a monarch in a personal union; however, they remained separate kingdoms with their own pre-existing political and legal institutions. This is known as the Union of the Crowns.⁹⁸ James wanted to change this, and on 19 May 1603 it was proclaimed that 'his Majestie doth hereby repute, hold and esteeme both the two Realmes as presently united, and as one Realme and Kingdome, and the Subjects of both the Realmes as one people, brethren and members of one body.' James already considered England and Scotland to be one kingdom because he was the rightful hereditary monarch of them both; therefore, in his view, it was only necessary for this personal union to be 'perfected' and made permanent by parliamentary legislation.⁹⁹ According to Conrad Russell, James's concern 'was not necessarily to produce a full uniformity between the kingdoms ... but simply to ensure that he ruled over a single state. This was an urgent practical necessity, because if he ruled over two states, they had two different laws of succession, and therefore might again become divided.'¹⁰⁰ This resulted in the Anglo-Scottish union debates, which have been the subject of intense scholarly analysis.¹⁰¹ This section provides an overview of the union debates and the existing scholarship.

⁹⁸ For a discussion of the Union of the Crowns, see: Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 1-12.

⁹⁹ James VI & I, 'Proclamation for the Uniting of England and Scotland, 19 May 1603, Greenwich,' in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625*, ed. by James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), p. 19; James VI & I, *By the King. Forasmuch as the Kings Majestie, in his Princely Disposition to Justice...* (London, 1603; STC 8314).

¹⁰⁰ Conrad Russell, *King James VI and I and his English Parliaments*, ed. by Richard Cust and Andrew Thrush (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 30-31. This challenges earlier claims that James wanted total uniformity; for example, see David Harris Willson, 'King James I and Anglo-Scottish Unity', in *Conflict in Stuart England: Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein*, ed. by William Appleton Aiken and Basil Duke Henning (London: Jonathan Cape, 1960), pp. 44-45.

¹⁰¹ For broader analysis of the Anglo-Scottish union debates, see: Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*; Brian P. Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 1-91, 179-194; Wallace Notestein, *The House of Commons, 1604-1610* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), pp. 78-85, 211-254, 445-446, 456-461, 488, 491-492; Jenny Wormald, 'The Creation of Britain: Multiple Kingdoms or Core and Colonies?', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 2 (1992), 175-194; Conrad Russell, 'The Anglo-Scottish Union 1603-1643: A Success?', in *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, ed. by Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 238-256; Robert Lawson-Peebles, 'A Conjoined Commonwealth: The Implications of the Accession of James VI and I', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 46 (2016), 56-74.

When the English Parliament met on 19 March 1604, James delivered a speech in support of permanent Anglo-Scottish union.¹⁰² The debates that followed, however, revealed English resistance on various grounds. Some scholars have studied the broader English response to the proposed permanent union.¹⁰³ The arguments put forward by certain individuals, such as Edwin Sandys and Francis Bacon, have been analysed comprehensively.¹⁰⁴ The proposed union of England and Scotland's legal systems and laws, and the use of legal arguments to oppose permanent union, have also been the subject of numerous studies.¹⁰⁵ On 2 June, the House of Commons finally agreed to an act that established a Union Commission to negotiate terms.¹⁰⁶ James also summoned the Scottish Parliament, telling them that their only business

¹⁰² James VI & I, *The Kings Majesties Speech ... On Munday the 19. day of March 1603*; James VI & I, 'A Speech ... on Munday the XIX. day of March 1603', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, pp. 132-146; *The Journals of the House of Commons*, pp. 142-146.

¹⁰³ For example, see: Conrad Russell, 'James VI and I and Rule Over Two Kingdoms: An English View', *Historical Research*, 76.192 (2003), 151-163; Russell, *King James VI and I and his English Parliaments*, ed. by Cust and Thrush, pp. 19, 30-38, 56-57, 62, 123-139; Rei Kanemura, 'The Idea of Sovereignty in English Historical Writing, 1599-1627' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2012), pp. 77-102; Brett F. Parker, 'Recasting England: The Varieties of Antiquarian Responses to the Proposed Union of Crowns, 1603-1607', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 43.2 (2013), 393-417; Sarah Waurechen, 'Imagined Politics, Failed Dreams, and the Beginnings of an Unacknowledged Britain: English Responses to James VI and I's Vision of Perfect Union', *Journal of British Studies*, 52 (2013), 575-596; Deborah Killroy, 'All the King's Men? A Demographic Study of Opinion in the First English Parliament of James I, 1604-10', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 41.1 (2021), 1-23.

¹⁰⁴ For example, see: Joel J. Epstein, 'Francis Bacon and the Issue of Union, 1603-1608', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 33.2 (1970), 121-132; David Martin Jones, 'Sir Edward Coke and the Interpretation of Lawful Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England', *History of Political Thought*, 7.2 (1986), 321-340; Markku Peltonen, 'Bacon's Political Philosophy', in *The Cambridge Companion to Bacon*, ed. by Markku Peltonen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 283-310; Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman*, pp. 57-86; Theodore K. Rabb, 'Sir Edwin Sandys and the Parliament of 1604', *The American Historical Review*, 69.3 (1964), 646-670; Harvey Wheeler, 'The Constitutional Ideas of Francis Bacon', *The Western Political Quarterly*, 9.4 (1956), 927-936; Willson, 'King James I and Anglo-Scottish Unity', in *Conflict in Stuart England*, ed. by Aiken and Henning, pp. 43-55.

¹⁰⁵ For example, see: Brian P. Levack, 'English Law, Scots Law and the Union, 1603-1707', in *Law-Making and Law-Makers in British History*, ed. by Alan Harding (London: Royal Historical Society, 1980), pp. 105-119; Levack, 'Toward a More Perfect Union', in *After the Reformation*, ed. by Malament; Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*, pp. 284-285; Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution*, pp. 23-25, 126-127, 149; Brian P. Levack, 'Law, Sovereignty and the Union', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 213-237; Hector L. MacQueen, 'Regiam Majestatem, Scots Law, and National Identity', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 74.1.197 (1995), 1-25; Alain Wijffels, 'A British *ius commune*? A Debate on the Union of the Laws of Scotland and England during the First Years of James VI/I's English Reign', *Edinburgh Law Review*, 6.3 (2002), 315-355; Conrad Russell, 'Topsy and the King: The English Common Law, King James VI and I, and the Union of the Crowns', in *Law and Authority in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to Thomas Garden Barnes*, ed. by Buchanan Sharp and Mark Charles Fissel (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), pp. 336-345; Bowie, "'A Legal Limited Monarchy'".

¹⁰⁶ *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 231.

was to agree to a Union Commission and confirm his choice of Scottish commissioners.¹⁰⁷ The Scottish response to the Union of the Crowns and the Anglo-Scottish union debates, as well as the practical impact of the Union of the Crowns on Scotland, has also been analysed.¹⁰⁸ The Scottish Parliament met on 11 July and passed an act appointing Scottish commissioners to meet with their English counterparts.¹⁰⁹ The Union Commission first met on 20 October and they presented their proposals to James on 6 December.¹¹⁰ On 7 July 1604, James prorogued the English Parliament, which did not meet again until 5 November 1605. After James's speech on 9 November, it was prorogued until 21 January 1606.¹¹¹

The English Parliament resumed in November 1606 to discuss the Union Commission's proposals.¹¹² In April 1607, however, the Commons agreed to defer the union question until the next parliamentary session.¹¹³ In May 1607, James presented a union bill to the Commons titled 'An Act for the continuance and preservation of the blessed Union of the Realmes of England and Scotland, and for the abolishing and takeing away of all Hostile Laws and Statutes, and Customes that may disturbe or hinder the same.'¹¹⁴ It was eventually reduced to a bill 'for the

¹⁰⁷ James VI & I to the Scottish Parliament, 12 June 1604, Greenwich. *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, ed. by John Hill Burton and David Masson, 14 vols (Edinburgh, 1877-1898), VII (1885), p. 458.

¹⁰⁸ For example, see: Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack (eds.), *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1985); Keith M. Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992); Roger A. Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Charles Withers, 'Geography, Royalty and Empire: Scotland and the Making of Great Britain, 1603-1661', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 113.1 (1997), 22-32; Julian Goodare, *The Government of Scotland, 1560-1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 107, 109-111, 140-148; Mason, 'Certain Matters Concerning the Realme of Scotland', 38-65; Roger A. Mason, '1603: Multiple Monarchy and Scottish Identity', *History*, 105.366 (2020), 402-421; Jenny Wormald, 'The Happier Marriage Partner: The Impact of the Union of the Crowns on Scotland', in *The Accession of James I*, ed. by Burgess, Wymer, and Lawrence, pp. 69-87; Jenny Wormald, 'One King, Two Kingdoms', in *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, ed. by Alexander Grant and Keith Stringer (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 123-132.

¹⁰⁹ 'Commissioun for the unioun', 11 July 1604. *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, ed. Keith M. Brown et al. (St Andrews, 2007-2020), 1604/4/20 <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1604/4/20> [accessed 21 April 2020].

¹¹⁰ Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 62, 73-74.

¹¹¹ *Journals of the House of Lords Beginning Anno Vicesimo Elizabethæ Reginae*, volume 2 (n.d.), pp. 344, 355-360; *The Journals of the House of Commons*, pp. 256-257.

¹¹² Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, p. 93; Russell, *King James VI and I and his English Parliaments*, ed. by Cust and Thrush, p. 46.

¹¹³ *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 297; *Journals of the House of Lords*, volume 2, p. 413.

¹¹⁴ Robert Bowyer, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606-1607*, ed. by David Harris Willson (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), p. 289.

utter Abolition of all memory of hostility’ (a repeal of England’s hostile laws towards Scotland) and was passed by both Houses.¹¹⁵ This was nowhere near what James had hoped for and, on 4 July, he prorogued the English Parliament.¹¹⁶ James secured the English naturalisation of the post-Nati (Scots born after his succession to the English throne) through a common law judgement in *Calvin’s Case* (1607).¹¹⁷ The union question was only briefly revived in the 1610 session of the English Parliament, to no avail, and that was effectively the end of attempts to secure permanent Anglo-Scottish union in the Jacobean period.¹¹⁸ Looking beyond the parliamentary debates, the cultural impact of the Union of the Crowns and the union debates has been extensively studied, especially in Jacobean plays.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 379; Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 125-126.

¹¹⁶ Russell, *King James VI & I and his English Parliaments*, ed. by Cust and Thrush, pp. 62-63.

¹¹⁷ Russell, ‘Topsy and the King’, in *Law and Authority in Early Modern England*, ed. by Sharp and Fissel, p. 73.

¹¹⁸ Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, p. 137.

¹¹⁹ For example, see: Axton, *The Queen’s Two Bodies*, pp. 131-147; David J. Baker, ‘“Stands Scotland Where it Did?”: Shakespeare on the March’, in *Shakespeare and Scotland*, ed. by Willy Maley and Andrew Murphy (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 20-36; Philippa Berry and Jayne Elisabeth Archer, ‘Reinventing the Matter of Britain: Undermining the State in Jacobean Masques’, in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. by David J. Baker and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 119-134; Martin Butler, *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 91-124; Joseph Campana, ‘The Child’s Two Bodies: Shakespeare, Sovereignty and the End of Succession’, *English Literary History*, 81.3 (2014), 814-816, 823, 833-834; Mary Floyd-Wilson, ‘Delving to the Root: *Cymbeline*, Scotland, and the English Race’, in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. by Baker and Maley, pp. 101-115; Andrew Hadfield, ‘*Hamlet’s* Country Matters: The “Scottish Play” Within the Play’, in *Shakespeare and Scotland*, ed. by Maley and Murphy, pp. 87-103; Andrew Hadfield, ‘Shakespeare and Politics in the Time of the Gunpowder Plot’; Hadfield, *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Matter of Britain*; Alker and Nelson, ‘*Macbeth*, the Jacobean Scot, and the Politics of the Union’; Lisa Hopkins, ‘*Cymbeline*, the *Translatio Imperii*, and the Matter of Britain’, in *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly*, ed. by Willy Maley and Philip Schwyzer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 143-156; Christopher Ivic, ‘Shakespeare’s Elizabethan England/Jacobean Britain’, in *Celtic Shakespeare: The Bard and the Borders*, ed. by Willy Maley and Rory Loughnane (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 103-118; Christopher Ivic, *The Subject of Britain, 1603-25* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020); Arthur F. Kinney, ‘Scottish History, the Union of the Crowns and the Issue of Right Rule’; Megan Lloyd, *The Valiant Welshman, the Scottish James, and the Formation of Great Britain* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2018); Willy Maley, *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 7-44; Sally Mapstone, ‘Shakespeare and Scottish History: A Case Study’, in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. by Juliette Wood and Sally Mapstone (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), pp. 158-193; Tristan Marshall, *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages under James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, reprinted 2018); McEachern, ‘The Englishness of the Scottish Play’, in *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by MacInnes and Ohlmeyer, pp. 94-112; Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590-1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 138-191; Harry N. Paul, *The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, Why, and How It Was Written By Shakespeare* (New York: Macmillan, 1950); Murray Pittock, ‘From Edinburgh to London: Scottish Court Writing and 1603’, in *The Stuart Courts*, ed. by Eveline Cruickshanks (Stroud: Sutton, 2000), pp. 13-28; Neil

Despite this widespread scholarly interest in the Union of the Crowns and the permanent union debates, there has been little analysis of how the ancestors James depended on for his English and Scottish hereditary claims were invoked in relation to Anglo-Scottish union. Scholars have typically only analysed specific examples without putting them into the broader context of other invocations of that ancestor or the reputation of that ancestor more generally.¹²⁰ This thesis analyses the various invocations of these ancestors in relation to Anglo-Scottish union together, in order to understand more fully how and why they were being invoked, and why particular ancestors were invoked more than others. This contributes to our knowledge of how James's subjects responded to his argument that his combined hereditary claims legitimised and justified not only the Union of the Crowns but also permanent Anglo-Scottish union, which is discussed later in this introduction.

National Identity

Scholars have also studied the formation of 'national identities' in early modern England and Scotland, and the impact the Union of the Crowns had on them.¹²¹ The beginning of an increased sense of national consciousness in England is typically traced to Henry VIII's break from the Catholic Church.¹²² It is then thought to have

Rhodes, 'Wrapped in the Strong Arms of the Union: Shakespeare and King James', in *Shakespeare and Scotland*, ed. by Maley and Murphy, pp. 37-52; Schwyzer, 'The Jacobean Union Controversy and *King Lear*', in *The Accession of James I*, ed. by Burgess, Wymer, and Lawrence, pp. 34-47; Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*, pp. 151-174; Allison S. Steenson, 'Writing Sonnets as a Scoto-Britane: Scottish Sonnets, the Union of the Crowns, and Negotiations of Identity', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 41 (2016), 195-210; Christopher Wortham, 'Shakespeare, James I and the Matter of Britain', *English*, 45.182 (Summer 1996), 97-122.

¹²⁰ For example, see: Willson, 'King James I and Anglo-Scottish Unity', in *Conflict in Stuart England*, ed. by Aiken and Henning, pp. 43-44; Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 33, 35, 44, 49, 52-53, 60-61; Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack, 'Introduction', in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, ed. by Bruce Galloway and Brian P. Levack (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1985), pp. xix, xxxi, xlix; Roger A. Mason, 'Imagining Scotland: Scottish Political Thought and the Problem of Britain, 1560-1650', in *Scots and Britons*, ed. Mason, p. 7; Jenny Wormald, 'The Union of 1603', in *Scots and Britons*, ed. by Mason, pp. 39-40; Sybil M. Jack, 'National Identities within Britain and the Proposed Union in 1603-1607', *Parergon*, 18.2 (2001), 100 and n. 83; Waurechen, 'Imagined Polities, Failed Dreams', 589.

¹²¹ Colin Kidd claims that nationalism is a misleading term to apply to the early modern period, 'which witnessed national consciousness but nothing so explicit or doctrinaire as nineteenth- and twentieth-century nationalisms.' Colin Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 6.

¹²² For example, see: Herbert Grabes (ed.), *Writing the Early Modern English Nation: The Transformations of National Identity in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001); Cathy Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

developed and intensified in the Elizabethan period.¹²³ The formation of a Scottish national identity is typically traced to the medieval period, as a form of resistance to English claims to suzerainty over Scotland. This emphasised Scotland's independent origins and continued separation from its southern neighbour.¹²⁴ This thesis considers how national identity influenced the representation of James VI & I's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, and the use of hereditary right to justify the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union.

These English and Scottish national identities co-existed alongside and competed with the concept of Britain and a British identity. The idea of Britain was often invoked to assert England's right to rule over Scotland, including the historical myth that Britain had been founded by the Trojan Brutus. By the Jacobean period, however, the claim that Britain had previously been united and the truth of the Brutus origin myth were being disputed by English scholars.¹²⁵ The Scots, meanwhile, had their own mythical founder, Scotia, to assert their independent creation.¹²⁶ The Scots also proclaimed their own British origins that were not subservient to England.¹²⁷ The idea of a shared British identity was further

¹²³ For example, see: Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

¹²⁴ For example, see: Dauvit Broun, 'The Birth of Scottish History', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 76.1.201 (April 1997), 4-22; Dauvit Broun, 'Dunkeld and the Origin of Scottish Identity', *The Innes Review*, 48.2 (Autumn 1997), 112-124; Dauvit Broun, 'The Origin of Scottish Identity', in *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past*, ed. by Claus Bjørn, Alexander Grant, and Keith J. Stringer (Copenhagen: Academic Press, 1994), pp. 40-45; Roger A. Mason, 'Scotching the Brut: Politics, History and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Britain', in *Scotland and England 1286-1815*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1987), pp. 60-64; Claire McEachern, 'Literature and National Identity', in *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, ed. by David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 314-325; Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness*.

¹²⁵ See: John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 115-117; Philip Mark Robinson-Self, *Early Modern Britain's Relationship to Its Past: The Historiographical Fortunes of the Legends of Brute, Albina, and Scota* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2019), pp. 33-61; Daniel Woolf, 'Senses of the Past in Tudor Britain', in *A Companion to Tudor Britain*, ed. by Robert Tittler and Norman Jones (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), pp. 408-410.

¹²⁶ Keith Robbins, *Great Britain: Identities, Institutions and the Idea of Britishness* (Harlow: Addison Wesley, 1998; Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp. 23-26; Mason, 'Scotching the Brut', in *Scotland and England 1286-1815*, ed. by Mason, pp. 60-76; Stewart Mottram, *Empire and Nation in Early English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008), pp. 9-10; Robinson-Self, *Early Modern Britain's Relationship to Its Past*; Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*, pp. 5-6.

¹²⁷ For example, see: Dauvit Broun, 'Britain and the Beginning of Scotland', *Journal of the British Academy*, 3 (2015), 107-137; Dauvit Broun, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain from the Picts to Alexander III* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007); Daniel Davies,

contemplated in the sixteenth century, when the Rough Wooing and Protestant Reformation inspired discussions about a united Protestant Britain, defending itself against continental Catholic powers.¹²⁸

Alan MacColl explains that there were competing definitions of ‘Britain’ in the medieval and early modern period: it could mean ‘England, or England and Wales, to the exclusion or subordination of Scotland,’ ‘the southern part of the whole island ... geographically separate from its northern neighbor,’ or ‘the Scottish conception, emerging in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, of a larger British polity in which England and Scotland are equal participants.’¹²⁹ Roger A. Mason points out that ‘Britain was not for Scots a neutral geographical descriptor. On the contrary, it was loaded with connotations of English superiority’.¹³⁰ As Susan Doran has shown, perceptions of James’s national identity—English, Scottish, or British—influenced support for his candidacy in the Elizabethan succession debates.¹³¹ This thesis expands on Doran’s work by analysing Jacobean perceptions of James’s national identity and the role it was thought to play in justifying his succession to the English throne.

The Union of the Crowns was an important turning point for ideas of English, Scottish, and British national identity. Jenny Wormald claims that ‘The difficulty

‘Medieval Scottish Historians and the Contest for Britain’, *Modern Language Quarterly*, 82.2 (June 2021), 149-175.

¹²⁸ Jane Dawson, ‘Anglo-Scottish Protestant Culture and Integration in Sixteenth-Century Britain’, in *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, ed. by Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (London: Longman, 1995), pp. 87-114; Jane E.A. Dawson, *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary Queen of Scots: The Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 1-10, 86-110; Jane Dawson, ‘Scotland, Ireland and the Vision of a ‘British’ Protestant Reformation’, *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 106.424 (Winter 2017/2018), 439-447; Mason, ‘Imagining Scotland’, in *Scots and Britons*, ed. by Mason, pp. 3-13; Roger A. Mason, ‘The Scottish Reformation and the Origins of Anglo-British Imperialism’, in *Scots and Britons*, ed. by Mason, pp. 161-186; Williamson, ‘Scotland, Antichrist and the Invention of Great Britain’, in *New Perspectives*, ed. by Dwyer, Mason, and Murdoch, pp. 34-42; Arthur H. Williamson, ‘Patterns of British Identity: ‘Britain’ and its Rivals in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, in *The New British History: Founding a Modern State 1603-1715*, ed. by Glenn Burgess (London: I.B. Tauris, 1999), pp. 138-172. Wormald, by contrast, argues that shared Protestantism was a weak basis for British unity. Jenny Wormald, ‘“A Union of Hearts and Minds?”: The Making of the Union between Scotland and England, 1603’, *Revista Internacional de los Estudios Vascos*, 5 (2009), 119-120.

¹²⁹ Alan MacColl, ‘The Meaning of “Britain” in Medieval and Early Modern England’, *Journal of British Studies*, 45.2 (April 2006), 269.

¹³⁰ Mason, ‘1603: Multiple Monarchy and Scottish Identity’, 11.

¹³¹ Susan Doran, ‘Polemic and Prejudice: A Scottish King for the English Throne’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, pp. 215-235.

in 1603 was that the English were not particularly interested in “king of each” [kingdom], infinitely preferring that James should now be king of England.’¹³² J.P. Sommerville explains that if the loyalties of James’s subjects had been solely to his person or dynasty (since scholars had previously argued that people were loyal to dynasties rather than nations before the eighteenth century), then ‘it is difficult to see how he could have encountered such serious problems in his attempts to unite England and Scotland.’¹³³ Sybil M. Jack analyses how English and Scottish national identity undermined James’s efforts to permanently unite the two kingdoms, due to his subjects’ attachment to their own kingdom’s name, history, and laws. Once it became clear that permanent union would not occur, ‘the sense of national difference grew rather than diminished even though practical co-operation tended to increase.’¹³⁴ Continued Anglo-Scottish hostility in the Jacobean period maintained and solidified separate senses of national identity. After the Union of the Crowns, Mason claims, James’s Scottish subjects saw the name ‘Britain’ as ‘simply England writ large.’¹³⁵ Wormald argues that ‘in the long run the English resolved the problem’ of their new status under the Union of the Crowns ‘by using “England” interchangeably with “Britain”.’¹³⁶ This thesis argues that the attachment of James’s English subjects to their own national identity influenced their justifications of his succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns.

As Christopher Ivic explains, ‘James, the self-proclaimed British king, sought to incite discourse on Britain and Britishness, to foster a British national consciousness’, so many of his subjects ‘found themselves rethinking their place within an emergent multi-national British polity.’¹³⁷ As Wormald points out, however, what James himself meant by calling himself ‘King of Great Britain’ is obscure ‘and it is actually very doubtful if even he quite knew.’¹³⁸ Wormald

¹³² Wormald, ‘The Union of 1603’, in *Scots and Britons*, ed. by Mason, p. 33.

¹³³ J.P. Sommerville, ‘Literature and National Identity’, in *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, ed. by Loewenstein and Mueller, p. 462.

¹³⁴ Jack, ‘National Identities within Britain and the Proposed Union’, 101.

¹³⁵ Mason, ‘1603: Multiple Monarchy and Scottish Identity’, 11.

¹³⁶ Wormald, “‘A Union of Hearts and Minds?’”, 112.

¹³⁷ Christopher Ivic, ‘Mapping British Identities: Speed’s *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine*’, in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. by Baker and Maley, p. 135.

¹³⁸ Jenny Wormald, ‘James VI, James I and the Identity of Britain’, in *The British Problem, c. 1530-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago*, ed. by Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), p. 148.

describes the use of the term 'Britain' in the context of the Union of the Crowns as 'casual and slap-happy.'¹³⁹ Tristan Marshall claims that Britishness was 'an idea stimulated by James Stuart's accession to the English throne and taken up by playwrights and antiquarians, not all of whom, to follow the established line of literary criticism, pursued an oppositional agenda.'¹⁴⁰ Marshall's study of the representation of Great Britain on the London stage over the course of James's joint reign challenges the idea that 'interest in Britain faded out of the public consciousness at the same time as concern for Union', and shows that James was 'a lot more successful in stimulating interest in Great Britain outside Parliament than he ever was inside, which suggests that we should be wary of continually looking to Parliament in our efforts to understand Jacobean politics.'¹⁴¹ Marshall concludes that 'While it is too early to speak of there being a British *nation* in the first quarter of the seventeenth century there certainly was an attempt to define a British *identity*.'¹⁴² This thesis demonstrates that James's English subjects were divided over whether they wanted to celebrate his status as England's monarch alone or as the shared monarch of both kingdoms; the former group anglicised him through his paternal ancestry while the latter group celebrated his maternal ancestry for creating 'Great Britain' through James's combined English and Scottish hereditary claims.

James VI & I's Views on the Relationship Between Hereditary Right and Anglo-Scottish Union

James's succession to the English throne brought about an unprecedented situation—the personal union of England and Scotland under a shared monarch. As such, James's hereditary claim not only had to explain and justify his succession, but also the resulting Union of the Crowns. Rei Kanemura points out that although James's peaceful succession to the English throne 'quelled the succession debate, the concepts and the questions were translated into the new debate over the proposed union with Scotland, prompted by the king himself.'¹⁴³ James argued that permanent Anglo-Scottish union was justified and necessitated by his status as

¹³⁹ Wormald, 'The Union of 1603', in *Scots and Britons*, ed. by Mason, p. 23.

¹⁴⁰ Marshall, *Theatre and Empire*, p. 185.

¹⁴¹ Marshall, *Theatre and Empire*, p. 55. Christopher Ivic concurs. Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 9.

¹⁴² Marshall, *Theatre and Empire*, p. 185.

¹⁴³ Kanemura, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election?', 336.

legitimate hereditary monarch of both England and Scotland. James's conception of permanent union, therefore, depended on the acceptance of the idea that he had succeeded to both thrones by hereditary right (rather than by any other means, such as election) and that this was a suitable basis for permanently uniting two kingdoms. This encourages us to think about these two issues—succession and union—as interconnected, when they have typically been studied separately in the existing scholarship. As Kanemura explains, 'The king and his supporters endorsed the understanding that both kingdoms were his inviolable inheritance and that the regal union was the work of God and nature.'¹⁴⁴ Despite widespread scholarly interest in James's political views, however, James's interpretation of the relationship between hereditary right and Anglo-Scottish union has received limited attention. This thesis considers how official works promoted James's views, and whether James's subjects accepted or rejected his views, through the lens of their representations of his ancestors.

James issued the 'Proclamation for the Uniting of England and Scotland' on 19 May 1603, which declared that it had pleased God 'by his Majesties lawfull succession to the Imperiall Crowne of England, not onely to remove this difference' between the borders of England and Scotland, 'but also to furnish his Highnesse with power and force sufficient to prosecute that his Majesties Royall and worthy resolution, as his Highnesse hath already begunne'. It also announced James's resolution 'that the sayd happy Union should bee perfected, the memory of all preterite Discontentments abolished, and the Inhabitants of both the Realmes to be the Subjects of one Kingdome', with James's subjects in the meantime commanded to 'repute, hold, and esteeme both the two Realmes as presently united, and as one Realme and Kingdome, and the Subjects of both the Realmes as one people, brethren and members of one body'.¹⁴⁵

In his first speech to the English Parliament on 19 March 1604, James explained that the union of England and Scotland was an 'inward Peace annexed to my

¹⁴⁴ Kanemura, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election?', 336.

¹⁴⁵ James VI & I, 'Proclamation for the Uniting of England and Scotland, 19 May 1603, Greenwich,' in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1*, ed. by Larkin and Hughes, pp. 18-19; James VI & I, *By the King. Forasmuch as the Kings Majestie, in his Princely Disposition to Justice...*

Person' and 'made in my blood', meaning it was the result of his combined senior hereditary claims to both thrones.¹⁴⁶ He then put forward arguments in favour of permanent Anglo-Scottish union. When objections arose, James spoke to the English Parliament again on 20 April, saying that he wanted union legislation so that his subjects would properly understand that England and Scotland were united in 'One Allegiance, and loyal Subjection, in Me and My Person, to My Person and My Posterity for ever.' He argued that the union of the two kingdoms was 'already set down in the Recognition of [my] just Possession of the Crowns' of both, which had come about 'by the great Blessing of God.' He claimed that God had already caused the English and Scots to begin to develop a 'Uniformity of Manners and Customs', so by 'Finishing' what God had started with union legislation, 'the true Meaning of that Acknowledgement in My Recognition may be performed and accomplished.'¹⁴⁷ According to John Cramsie, 'James effectively claimed two imperial crowns ... which, by virtue of divine providence, had become one temporal and spiritual *imperium* in his person'.¹⁴⁸

James's argument that hereditary right was an appropriate basis for permanent union was disputed. Edwin Sandys told the House of Commons that James's union of England and Scotland was a union by marriage (meaning that James had succeeded to both thrones because he had inherited both senior hereditary claims) and, Sandys argued, there was no precedent for a union by marriage resulting in two countries adopting a shared name or pursuing a 'union of lawes, customes, privileges, and stiles of honor, as name and dignities.'¹⁴⁹ Sandys also claimed that by changing name, the kingdom of England would be dissolved, along with its

¹⁴⁶ James VI & I, *The Kings Majesties Speech ... On Munday the 19. day of March 1603*, A4v; James VI & I, 'A Speach ... on Munday the XIX. day of March 1603', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 135; *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 143.

¹⁴⁷ *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 180. It was common for union treatises to argue that a permanent union of England and Scotland was God's will. James's own statements about providence are further examples of this. See: Francis Bacon, *A Briefe Discourse, Touching the Happie Union of the Kingdomes of England, and Scotland* (London, 1603; STC 1117), sig. A7v-A8r; John Gordon, *England and Scotlands Happinesse in Being Reduced to Unitie of Religion* (London, 1604; STC 12062.3), p. 5; Thomas Craig, *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae Tractatus* by Sir Thomas Craig, ed. and trans. by C. Sanford Terry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1909), p. 264.

¹⁴⁸ John Cramsie, 'The Philosophy of Imperial Kingship and the Interpretation of James VI and I', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Houlbrooke, p. 55.

¹⁴⁹ 'Notes of a speech [in the House of Commons] by Sir Edwin Sandys on Unions as being threefold; by marriage, by election, or by conquest.' 26 April 1604. TNA SP 14/7, fol. 161r.

parliament and laws, and replaced by a new kingdom.¹⁵⁰ English judges confirmed that if the name England was replaced with Great Britain, this would necessarily be followed by ‘an utter extinction of all the laws now in force’, which would all have to be replaced.¹⁵¹

James proclaimed himself ‘King of Great Britain’ on 20 October 1604, reiterating his argument that ‘the blessed Union, or rather Reuniting of these two mightie, famous, and ancient Kingdomes of England and Scotland, under one Imperiall Crowne’ was God’s will, as ‘it hath pleased God to reserve many yeeres in his Providence to our Person, and now in the fulnesse of the time of his Disposition, to bestow upon Us’ the crown of England. James argued that the union of England and Scotland was ‘not inforced by Conquest and violence, nor contracted by doubtfull and deceivable points of transaction, but naturally derived from the Right and Title of the precedent Princes of both Kingdomes, concurring in our Person, alike lineally descended from the blood of both through the Sacred conjunction of Wedlocke.’¹⁵² As Conrad Russell explains, ‘James was claiming the authority of God for his own political choices. His underlying thinking was that his own personal authority, by being common to both realms, turned them into a single kingdom, all laws, parliaments and councils notwithstanding.’¹⁵³

On 18 November 1606, James spoke to the English Parliament again, making the same argument that ‘this happy Union is already in his person made by the Singuler Providence of God; That now it only remayneth that the same be confirmed by the Parliament.’¹⁵⁴ Unfortunately, no agreement could be reached. James was disappointed, declaring to them on 31 March 1607 that when he first suggested a permanent union, ‘I then thought there could have bene no more question of it, then of your declaration and acknowledgement of my Right unto this Crowne, and that,

¹⁵⁰ *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 186. Sandys also brought this point up when speaking to the Union Committees on 7 March 1607: Bowyer, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer*, pp. 219-220. For Sandys’ speech, see: Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman*, pp. 82-83.

¹⁵¹ Robert Cecil to the Earl of Mar, 28 April 1604. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, 7 vols (London, 1861-1874), III (1868), p. 200.

¹⁵² James VI & I, ‘Proclamation concerning the Kings Majesties Stile, of King of Great Britaine, 20 October 1604, Westminster Palace,’ in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1*, ed. by Larkin and Hughes, pp. 94-98.

¹⁵³ Russell, ‘James VI and I and Rule Over Two Kingdoms’, 160.

¹⁵⁴ Bowyer, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer*, p. 185.

as two Twinnes, they would have growen up together.’¹⁵⁵ James’s assumption was that the personal union of England and Scotland under one hereditary monarch—the individual with the senior hereditary claims to both thrones—would naturally lead to a permanent union. The reluctance of English MPs to support his union project had proved otherwise. When James spoke to the English Parliament again on 2 May, he explained that the union of England and Scotland was ‘already a perfect Union in me, the Head’, because ‘it is an Union in my Blood and Title.’ However, it was not ‘an accomlisht and full Union; for that Time must ripen and work.’ James was reasserting his belief that a permanent union would naturally develop from the personal union of England and Scotland under one hereditary monarch. However, he was changing what he meant by a ‘perfect’ union, as he had previously stated that the personal union needed to be ‘perfected’ to become a permanent union.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁵ James VI & I, *His Majesties Speech to both the Houses of Parliament, in his Highnesse Great Chamber at Whitehall, the day of the Adjournement of the Last Session, which was the Last Day of March 1607* (London, 1607; *STC* 14395), B2r; James VI & I, ‘A Speach to Both the Houses of Parliament, Delivered in the Great Chamber at White-Hall, the Last Day of March 1607’, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 160.

¹⁵⁶ *The Journals of the House of Commons*, pp. 366-367.

1. Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, and Hereditary Right

The growing scholarship on the Elizabethan succession debates and James VI & I's succession to the English throne has demonstrated that the latter event was not guaranteed, had been opposed on various grounds, and could be interpreted in different ways—as the result of hereditary right, election, nomination, conquest, or even a combination of factors. As Susan Doran explains, ‘the framers of the accession proclamation felt the need to hammer home James’s indisputable right by bloodline from his [great] grandmother Margaret, the daughter of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York’ in response to previous objections against James’s claim.¹ There has not yet been a thorough analysis of Jacobean representations of James’s inheritance of a hereditary claim from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, however, and what this reveals about Jacobean understandings of hereditary right. That is the focus of this chapter, which considers various media to show the different ways hereditary right could be represented. There has also been limited academic study of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York’s posthumous reputations in the Jacobean period, with most scholars focusing on specific Jacobean works (especially Francis Bacon’s *Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh*) rather than considering their representation as a whole or in a broader, thematic sense.²

This chapter analyses how influential the official narrative of James’s succession established in the initial proclamation—that he had succeeded to the English throne due to the hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York—was over his subjects, as expressed in unofficial celebratory texts, genealogies, and histories. It argues that James’s descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York was used to anglicise him, and to emphasise dynastic continuity and stability. This chapter also analyses Jacobean attitudes towards the Tudor origin myth of the Union of the Houses of Lancaster and York, as many artists and writers continued to attach it to James as it had been attached to his predecessors on the English throne, but some openly challenged it. Overall, this chapter contributes to our

¹ Susan Doran, ‘1603: A Jagged Succession’, *Historical Research*, 93.61 (August 2020), 5.

² Sydney Anglo, for example, only analyses the Jacobean works of George Buck and Francis Bacon. Sydney Anglo, ‘Ill of the Dead: The Posthumous Reputation of Henry VII’, *Renaissance Studies*, 1.1 (1987), 34-39.

knowledge of the Jacobean conception of hereditary right, and how the medium used by Jacobean artists and writers influenced its representation.

Before 1603

This section briefly explains who Henry VII and Elizabeth of York were and what their significance was to James VI & I before 1603. Henry VII (1457-1509) secured the English throne in 1485, when he defeated Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth Field. Henry was descended from John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster (Edward III's fourth son), by his third wife, Katherine Swynford, though their children were born prior to their marriage and subsequently legitimised, leaving their hereditary claim to the English throne open to debate. In 1486, Henry married Elizabeth of York (1466-1503), the eldest daughter of the late Edward IV and arguably the senior Yorkist claimant to the English throne after the disappearance of her brothers, Edward V and Richard, Duke of York. Scholars have shown that Henry's own hereditary claim to the English throne was questionable, as his successful seizure of the crown had also depended on military conquest, papal and parliamentary recognition, and a popular marriage to the eldest daughter of a respected former English monarch.³

The Tudor origin myth, established by Henry VII and his supporters and reaffirmed during the reigns of the successive Tudor monarchs, argued that the Wars of the Roses, a dynastic conflict over the English throne in the second half of the fifteenth century, was ended by Henry and Elizabeth's marriage, a marriage that united the rival houses of Lancaster and York and their competing hereditary claims.⁴ This narrative was an oversimplification, as there had continued to be intrigue and even open warfare afterwards, but the marriage continued to be celebrated throughout the sixteenth century.⁵ The marriage was visually represented by the Tudor rose,

³ Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), p. 3; S.B. Chrimes, *Henry VII* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 65-66; J.L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 81, 191; Sean Cunningham, *Henry VII* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), pp. 120-121.

⁴ See: Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 8-37; Chrimes, *Henry VII*, pp. 50-53, 60-62, 65-66; Cunningham, *Henry VII*, pp. 11, 44, 47-50; S.J. Gunn, 'Henry VII (1457-1509)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12954>.

⁵ Edward Hall's *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke* (1548) reaffirmed the narrative of Henry and Elizabeth's marriage uniting the rival houses, with their

uniting the red rose of Lancaster and the white rose of York, which, according to Sydney Anglo, ‘quickly became the favourite and most characteristic Tudor badge.’⁶ The Tudor rose was an almost omnipresent decorative feature at the Tudor court.⁷ As C.S.L. Davies argues, the name ‘Tudor’ was not used by the monarchs themselves or by their contemporaries to identify them as a distinct dynasty.⁸ They were, however, represented as unique compared to their predecessors due to their descent from the Union of the Houses.

Not all sixteenth-century writers celebrated the Union of the Houses and the hereditary claim it was said to have given the Tudor monarchs. Most controversially, in *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inghland* (1595), attributed to Robert Persons, it was argued that Henry VII’s only claim to the English throne was by right of his Yorkist wife, as the Beaufort line was illegitimate and thus incapable of succeeding to the English throne. Even Henry’s marriage was not enough to legitimise his rule, as Persons argued that the Lancastrian hereditary claim was superior to the Yorkist, and that the senior Lancastrian claimant was Philip II of Spain.⁹ In response to this attack, James VI’s supporters rallied around the Tudor origin myth, attaching it to James even before his succession to the English throne in defence of his hereditary claim.¹⁰

bloodlines and hereditary claims combined in their son, Henry VIII. See: Henry A. Kelly, *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare’s Histories* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), pp. 110-111, 135-137. One of the most interesting representations of the union of the houses was in a pageant for Elizabeth I’s 1559 entry into London. The pageant was made up of three tiers and ‘Upon the lowest stage was made one seate Royall, wherein were placed two personages representynge Kyng Henrie the Seventh, and Elyzabeth his wyfe, daughter of Kyng Edward the Fourth,’ with Henry’s throne ‘enclosed in a Read Rose’ and Elizabeth of York’s ‘enclosed with a Whyte Rose’. From these two roses ‘sprang two branches gathered into one,’ that united in Henry VIII, sat on the tier above with Anne Boleyn, from whom ‘proceeded upwardes one braunche’ to the final tier, where Elizabeth I herself was represented. This was a visualisation of Edward Hall’s narrative, affirming that the houses of Lancaster and York were united through the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, a union that was maintained in their descendants. John Nichols (ed.), *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols (London, 1823), I, p. 41.

⁶ Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*, p. 37. See also: Sydney Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992), pp. 81-85, 90-97; Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 66-68.

⁷ H.M. Colvin, D.R. Ransome, and John Summerson, *The History of the King’s Works: Volume III, 1485-1660 (Part 1)* (London: HMSO, 1975), pp. 213, 217.

⁸ C.S.L. Davies, ‘Tudor: What’s in a Name?’, *History*, 97.325 (January 2021), 24-42.

⁹ Robert Persons (att.), *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inghland* (Antwerp, 1595; STC 19398), part 2, pp. 6-9, 41-49, 52-53, 110-111.

¹⁰ For example, see: John Colville, *The Palinod of John Colvill wherein he doth Penitently Recant his Former Proud Offences, Specially that Treasonable Discourse Lately Made by him Against the*

Henry VII also had a posthumous reputation for wisdom, in large part due to the perceived success of the Union of the Houses.¹¹ The sixteenth-century historian Edward Hall, who summarised the nature of each monarch's reign in his chapter titles, described Henry's as 'politique governaunce'.¹² Elsewhere, Henry was typologised as 'the Salomon of his tyme' and 'the Salomon of our Kings' (just as James VI & I would later be described).¹³

Official Explanations of James's Hereditary Right

The succession of James VI & I to the English throne required explanation and justification due to the uncertainty of the Elizabethan succession debates. As Richard A. McCabe observes, 'The sheer repetitiveness of the succession rhetoric suggests a claim attempting to validate itself through constant iteration, to drown objections in an officially orchestrated chorus of approval.'¹⁴ In this section, official explanations are defined as those that were either put forward by James himself or by his supporters with his approval: the English Privy Council's proclamation of his succession; James's speech to the English Parliament on 19 March 1604; the *Act of Recognition of the King's Title* (1604); and the decoration of James's English royal residences. Although the proclamation of James's succession has been the subject of some scholarly analysis, other official explanations have received far less attention.¹⁵

Undoubted and Indeniable Title of his Dread Sovereigne Lord, King James the Sixt, Unto the Crowne of England, after Decease of her Maiesty Present (Edinburgh, 1600; STC 5587), B6v; Thomas Craig, *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England, in Two Books*, ed. and trans. by James Gadderar (London, 1703; ESTC T144321), pp. 133, 377-380, 385, 249.

¹¹ Henry VII's posthumous reputation for wisdom, and the analogy of him being a Solomon specifically, is discussed in Anglo, 'Ill of the Dead', 28-29.

¹² Edward Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke* (London, 1548; STC 12721), 1r [of account of Henry VII's reign].

¹³ Sir Richard Shelley to Sir Francis Walsingham, 31 August 1582. TNA, SP 99/1, fol. 11v; 'The Question is whether it were behoovefull for her Ma^{tie}: to putt ye Scot: Queene to death or to keepe her in prison', January 1587. TNA SP 12/45, fol. 57v.

¹⁴ Richard A. McCabe, 'Panegyric and Its Discontents: The First Stuart Succession', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 36.

¹⁵ For discussions of the proclamation of James's succession, see: Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, 'Introduction: A Historiographical Perspective', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), p. 12; Christopher Ivic, *The Subject of Britain, 1603-25* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), pp. 20-21; James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (eds.), *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 1-4 and notes; McCabe, 'Panegyrics and Its Discontents', in

As this section demonstrates, these official explanations of James's succession are all in agreement and can thus be regarded as an official programme intended to influence how James's subjects perceived his right to rule. They argue that James had succeeded to the English throne through the hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, which also guaranteed England's continued peace by maintaining the Union of the Houses in James's person. The Tudor origin myth was attached to the new Stuart monarch, anglicising James, and stressing dynastic continuity between him and his predecessors rather than presenting him as the first of a new, foreign dynasty.

The first and most influential explanation of James's succession was the English Privy Council's proclamation, which James had seen and approved in advance.¹⁶ The proclamation established an official narrative that James and his subjects continued to use. Nenner describes it as being, on the surface, 'a vindication of James's hereditary right to the throne ... emphasised by tracing James's lineage through his Tudor great-grandmother, Margaret, to Henry VII and through his great-great-grandmother, Elizabeth of York, to Edward IV.' Nenner also suggests that the parliamentary entailment of the English crown to Henry VII and his descendants was conspicuous by its absence, to deny the idea that the English Parliament had played any role in James's succession.¹⁷ Doran points out that the proclamation 'focused on James's "true descent" from the English-born Henry VII

Stuart Succession Literature, ed. by Kewes and McRae, pp. 35-36; *Literature of the Stuart Successions: An Anthology*, ed. by Andrew McRae and John West (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), pp. 29-34 and notes; Erin Murphy, *Familial Forms: Politics and Genealogy in Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011), pp. 50-51; Nenner, *The Right to be King*, p. 61.

¹⁶ According to Edward Bruce, writing the day after James's succession, the proclamation 'is set of muscke that sondeth so sueitly in the ears of [James], that he can alter no nots in so agreeable ane harmonie; in reading he weighed all the words of it in the ballanc of hes owen head, wyth great affection prasing both the pen and provident of that counsellour that inspyred suche a resolution.' Edward Bruce to Henry Howard, 25 March 1603. John Bruce (ed.), *Correspondence of King James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1861), p. 47.

¹⁷ Nenner, *The Right to be King*, p. 61. David Colclough states that 'While the proclamation began by emphasizing James's claim to the throne by lineage, through descent from Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, along with a number of responses to the succession, it employed a range of different legitimating strategies.' However, Colclough does not explain what these are, pointing to a future publication by Paulina Kewes. David Colclough, "'I Have Brought Thee Up to a Kingdome": Sermons on the Accessions of James I and Charles I', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 210.

and Elizabeth of York’, emphasising the importance of nationality in explanations of James’s hereditary claim.¹⁸ As this section will demonstrate, there is also another notable aspect of the proclamation that has been underexplored—its invocation of the Union of the Houses.

The English Privy Council’s proclamation argues that James had succeeded to the English throne by hereditary right, as he was ‘lineally and lawfully descended from the body of Margaret, daughter to the High and Renowned Prince, Henrie the seventh King of England, France, and Ireland, his great Grandfather, the said Lady Margaret being lawfully begotten of the body of Elizabeth, daughter to King Edward the fourth’.¹⁹ With the death of Elizabeth I, there were no further male-line descendants of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, so the throne passed to the senior female-line descendant, James VI & I, as James’s great-grandmother was Margaret Tudor—Henry and Elizabeth’s eldest daughter. This proclamation attempts to make James’s claim to the English throne appear unchallengeable by presenting hereditary right as the natural and lawful means by which the English succession operates. James’s succession is said to have taken place immediately after Elizabeth I’s death, when the English crown passed ‘absolutely, wholly, and solely’ to him.²⁰

The proclamation implicitly assures the English people that the uncertainty of the Elizabethan succession debates had been completely unjustified, as there was never any possibility of someone other than James succeeding to the English throne. The proclamation also does not suggest that any other means of securing the throne, such as election or nomination, is possible. It asserts that James had succeeded ‘by law’, but this is intentionally vague, since it could refer to divine law, human law, or both, and thus does not openly acknowledge that the English Parliament or legal system had authority over the succession. Additionally, there is no implication that those issuing the proclamation had chosen James as monarch; they were merely informing James’s new subjects of what had already taken place. This interpretation

¹⁸ Doran, ‘1603: A Jagged Succession’, 7.

¹⁹ Henry VII was actually James’s great-great-grandfather.

²⁰ *Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to call to his mercy out of this transitory life our sovereigne lady, the high and mighty prince, Elizabeth late Queene of England, France, and Ireland, by whose death and dissolution, the imperiall crowne of these realmes aforesaid are now absolutely, wholly, and solely come to the high and mighty prince, James the Sixt, King of Scotland...* (London, 1603; *STC* 8298).

is affirmed in the letter that the English Privy Council wrote to James on the same day, saying that James had ‘ane sole, uniforme and constant impressioun of richt of blood as nixt of kinreid to our Soverane deceessed, and consequentlie by the lawis of this realme trew and nixt air to hir kingdomes and dominiones’.²¹

The proclamation unintentionally admits, however, that the principle of hereditary right was not as straightforward as the English Privy Council wished to make it appear. James’s hereditary claim to the English throne is not described as coming solely from Henry VII, but also from Henry’s wife, Elizabeth of York. Elizabeth had not been a reigning sovereign as her husband was, but her significance was made clear by mentioning her father, Edward IV. According to the proclamation, it was by Henry and Elizabeth’s ‘happy conjunction’ that ‘the houses of Yorke and Lancaster were united, to the joy unspeakeable of this Kingdome, formerly rent & torne by the long dissention of bloody and Civil Warres’.²² This was the Tudor origin myth of the Union of the Houses, which avoided judging between two competing hereditary claims—which should have been both unnecessary and impossible in a strictly hereditary system—in favour of celebrating their union by marriage. James’s supporters, however, wanted to attach the Tudor origin myth to their new monarch to emphasise dynastic continuity in the face of what might otherwise have been interpreted as a dangerous political change. Jacobean writers simply had to point out that Margaret Tudor, James’s great-grandmother, was also the product of the united Lancastrian and Yorkist bloodline, to extend the Tudor origin myth to James.²³ The proclamation implies that James embodied the peace secured by Henry and Elizabeth’s marriage—a claim that James himself later made explicit in his first speech to the English Parliament.

²¹ English Privy Council to James VI & I, 24 March 1603, London. *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, ed. by John Hill Burton and David Masson, 14 vols (Edinburgh, 1877-1898), VI (1884), pp. 550-551.

²² *Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God...*

²³ For example, see: *An Excellent New Ballad, Shewing the Petigree of our Royall King James the First of that Name in England. To the Tune of, Gallants All Come Mourne with Mee* (London, 1603; STC 14423); Anthony Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall. King James His Arrivall. And Romes Downefall* (London, 1603; STC 18586), sig. C3r; George Buck, *Δαφνις Πολυστεφανος [Daphnis Polystephanos] An Eclog Treating of Crownes, and of Garlandes, and to Whom of Right they Appertaine. Addressed, and Consecrated to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1605; STC 3996), sig. A3v.

On 19 March 1604, James gave his first speech to his first English Parliament, in which he presented his own interpretation of his claim to the English throne.²⁴ The initial audience for this speech was the members of the Commons and Lords, who were England's most important local representatives, officials, and landowners—it was, therefore, important to James that they accept his understanding of how he had come to the English throne. Jane Rickard points out that 'Parliament formed a particularly important occasion for royal self-representation and here, as he was acutely conscious, James was facing an often resistant audience, and engaging in a public act that would be reported and discussed beyond its immediate context.'²⁵ One way for James to control how his speeches were received and understood by the wider public was to have them officially published, as was the case here.²⁶

In this speech, James declared that God had secured England's internal peace 'with my Person' because of his 'descent lineally out of the loynes of *Henrie* the seventh', as through this descent 'is reunited and confirmed in mee the Union of the two princely Roses of the two houses of *Lancaster* and *Yorke*, whereof that King of happy memorie was the first Uniter'.²⁷ James asserted that his descent from Henry and Elizabeth not only gave him the senior hereditary claim to the English throne, but also the unique ability to guarantee England's internal peace, as the physical embodiment of the dynastic union that had ended the Wars of the Roses. The implication was that, if someone took the throne who was not descended from Henry and Elizabeth, the dynastic dispute at the centre of the Wars of the Roses would resume, resulting in another civil war. This may have been a response to

²⁴ James repeated the same speech again three days later, because 'He supposed many of the Commons of the Lower House were absent when He then delivered the same.' *Journals of the House of Lords Beginning Anno Vicesimo Elizabethæ Reginae*, volume 2 (n.d.), p. 265.

²⁵ Jane Rickard, *Authorship and Authority: The Writings of James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 123.

²⁶ Rickard, *Authorship and Authority*, p. 124.

²⁷ James VI & I, *The Kings Majesties Speech, as it was Delivered by him in the Upper House of the Parliament, to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, On Munday the 19. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of this Present Parliament, and the First Parliament of his Majesties Raigne* (London, 1604; STC 14390), A4v; James VI & I, 'A Speech, as it was Delivered in the Upper House of the Parliament to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, on Munday the XIX. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of the First Parliament', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 134; *The Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2d 1628. In the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First* (London, 1742), pp. 142-143.

Robert Persons's argument that the Infanta Isabella had a superior hereditary claim to the English throne than James, as Isabella was descended from the Lancastrian line but not from the marriage of Henry and Elizabeth, and thus could not be associated with the Union of the Houses. The proclamation of James's succession mentions the importance of Henry and Elizabeth's marriage, but does not reach James's conclusion: that descent from Henry and Elizabeth gave James advantages above and beyond 'standard' hereditary right. The writers of the proclamation may have assumed that the English people were already familiar with the Tudor origin myth, so it was not necessary to explain that James's succession would guarantee a continuation of that peace. James, however, made this meaning overt to explain how his succession benefited the English people.

The English Parliament also affirmed that James had succeeded by hereditary right, while not claiming any role for themselves in his succession. The *Act of Recognition of the King's Title* (1604) acknowledges James's 'immediate, lawful, and undoubted Succession, Descent, and Right of the Crown'.²⁸ The act begins by stating that England had greatly benefited when 'God blessed this kingdom and nation by the happy union and conjunction of the two noble houses of York and Lancaster, thereby preserving this noble realm, formerly torn and almost wasted with long and miserable dissension and bloody civil war'. James had inherited the combined hereditary claims of both Lancaster and York, justifying his succession to the English throne. Parliament, 'being bounden thereunto both by the laws of God and man', recognises that James's succession had taken place immediately on Elizabeth I's death 'by inherent birthright and lawful and undoubted succession ... being lineally, justly and lawfully next and sole heir of the blood royal of this realm'. This concurs with the explanation given in the proclamation of James's succession. The English Parliament's stated reason for passing this act was 'as a memorial to all posterities ... of our loyalty, obedience and hearty and humble affection'.²⁹ The act was not presented as a requirement for legitimising James's succession, but it was evidently considered beneficial to James.³⁰ Additionally,

²⁸ *Journals of the House of Lords*, volume 2, p. 267.

²⁹ Act of Recognition of the King's Title, 1604. *Selected Documents of English Constitutional History*, ed. by G.B. Adams and H. Morse Stephens (London: Macmillan, 1901), pp. 326-327.

³⁰ As David Weil Baker explains, the title on which James based his claim to the throne 'was a title to which Parliament was definitely not essential, and, from the way in which the title was

although the act did not claim that parliament had authority over the succession in general, it also did not deny it, thereby leaving it intentionally ambiguous.

James's hereditary claim was promoted not only through public statements such as these, but also in the physical space of the royal court through James's adoption of the Tudor rose emblem. The English royal residences were visited by elite figures from James's own kingdoms and abroad, and James wanted them to acknowledge his succession to the English throne on the grounds of hereditary right. Scholars have shown very little interest in the decorative schemes of James's residences, probably due to the limited surviving records of what was displayed and because James was not a patron of the arts on the scale of his wife, Anna of Denmark, or their son, Charles I.³¹ The English royal residences that James inherited were already decorated with a profusion of Tudor roses, and so these dynastic emblems were almost constantly surrounding him.³² James also continued to use the Tudor rose himself, which represented his hereditary claim to the English throne as senior descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, and his embodiment of the Union of the Houses. This emphasised continuity between James and his predecessors and demonstrated James's suitability as England's monarch due to his English lineage.³³

presented to the English people, one would not know that Parliament had ever played a role in the succession. Thus, according [sic] to the 1603 proclamation announcing the succession of James and its subsequent "recognition" by Parliament in 1604, his title to the throne depended entirely on his descent, from Henry VII via Henry's daughter Margaret as well as from Edward IV via his daughter Elizabeth of York.' David Weil Baker, 'Jacobean Historiography and the Election of Richard III', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 70.3 (September 2007), 312.

³¹ Roy Strong claims that James 'had no interest in the visual arts and loathed even sitting for his portrait. Apart from bringing the collection of ancestral portraits south, he is not known to have purchased a single work of art.' Roy Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986; reprinted by Pimlico, 2000), pp. 140-141. Neil Cuddy claims that when it came to culture, James's court was 'less original' and it was his 'wife and sons who made contact most actively with the English cultural mainstream'. Neil Cuddy, 'Dynasty and Display: Politics and Painting in England, 1530-1630', in *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630*, ed. by Karen Hearn (London: Tate Publishing, 1995), p. 18. These dismissals are reflected in the lack of scholarly analysis of the decoration of James's residences.

³² See: Simon Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), pp. 100-102, figs. 75, 126, 127, 139a, 265, 274, 282, 284, 301, 313.

³³ For example, a portrait of James by Daniel Mytens, which survives in multiple copies, shows him seated in front of a cloth of state decorated with a Tudor rose. Daniel Mytens, *King James I of England and VI of Scotland*, 1621, oil on canvas, 148.6 x 100.6 cm. National Portrait Gallery, London, inv. no. NPG 109; After Daniel Mytens, *King James I (James VI of Scotland) (1566-1625) in Garter Robes*, seventeenth century, oil on canvas, 61.9 x 42.2 cm. Ham House, Surrey (National Trust), inv. no. NT 1140214; Studio of Daniel Mytens, *King James I (James VI of Scotland) (1566-1625)*, c. 1621-1625, oil on canvas, 244.5 x 175.5 cm. Knole, Kent (National Trust), inv. no. NT 129891. James's servants continued to wear liveries decorated with red and

The Tudor rose was also visually associated with James's children and grandchildren, asserting that the English succession would continue to operate according to hereditary right and that they also embodied the peace established by the Union of the Houses.³⁴

The official explanations discussed above were consistent in asserting that James had succeeded to the English throne through the senior hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. By doing this, the official explanations reaffirmed the popular Tudor origin myth of the Union of the Houses, attaching it to James just as it had been attached to his predecessors on the English throne. This was an example of continuity in English political discourse, reassuring the English people that James's succession was a cause for celebration, rather than concern. James's ancestry was used to anglicise him as another Tudor monarch, instead of acknowledging him to be the first monarch of a new, foreign dynasty.

The Tudor origin myth encouraged the English people not to debate whether the Lancastrian or Yorkist hereditary claim was senior, but to focus on celebrating their union by marriage and the peace it was said to have secured. In a strictly hereditary system, it should have been possible to determine which hereditary claim was senior; however, this possibility had been rejected for over a century, and Robert Persons's attack on James's hereditary claim by denying the Tudor origin myth gave James and his supporters an additional reason to defend it.

white roses, as recorded in Exchequer payments. Frederick Devon (ed.), *Issues of the Exchequer; Being Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue During the Reign of King James I* (London, 1836), pp. 11-12, 43, 67. The collar of the Order of the Garter continued to feature the red rose of Lancaster, as shown in Paul van Somer's portrait of James VI & I, and on the surviving collar that was given by James to his brother-in-law, Christian IV of Denmark and Norway, in 1603. Paul van Somers, *James VI & I (1566-1625)*, c. 1620, oil on canvas, 227 x 149.5cm. Royal Collection, UK, inv. no. RCIN 404446; *The Collar of the Order of the Garter*, 1603, gold and enamel, 55cm (length). Rosenborg Castle, Denmark, inv. no. Rosenborg 1.37.

³⁴ For example, a suit of armour made for Prince Henry is decorated with Tudor roses, Scottish thistles and French fleur-de-lis. Jacob Halder, *Armour garniture of Henry, future Prince of Wales, for the field, tourney, tilt and barriers*, c. 1608, blued steel, gilt, brass, and copper-zinc alloys, etched. Royal Collection, UK, inv. no. RCIN 72831. A painting of the three eldest children of James's daughter, Elizabeth Stuart, Electress of the Palatinate and Queen of Bohemia, is decorated with a red and white rose. German School, *Frederick Henry, Charles Louis and Elizabeth: Children of Frederick V and Elizabeth of Bohemia*, c. 1618-1619, oil on canvas, 135.3 x 140 cm. Royal Collection, UK, inv. no. RCIN 404329. According to a 1639 inventory, this painting was taken from Heidelberg and given to James by Sir Henry Wotton. By 1639 the painting was on display in the Privy Gallery of Whitehall Palace, and it may have been put on display there during James's reign. Oliver Millar (ed.), 'Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', *Walpole Society*, 37 (1958-1960), 34.

James claimed that England's internal peace was guaranteed by his descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, because otherwise the dynastic conflict of the Wars of the Roses would resume. This was an assertion that not only did James have the senior hereditary claim to the English throne, but that his specific line of descent guaranteed England's peace, as he was the physical embodiment of the Union of the Houses (in a way that other claimants, such as the Infanta Isabella, could not be). As such, official explanations justified James's succession to the English throne not only on the grounds that he had the senior hereditary claim, but also by asserting that it also benefited the English people—a benefit that built on, but was additional to, hereditary right.

Unofficial Celebratory Texts

The proclamation of James VI & I's succession to the English throne inspired the speedy publication of numerous unofficial celebratory panegyrics, poems, sermons, and more by his new subjects, which were all clearly influenced by the proclamation as many of them repeat it or directly refer to it.³⁵ From these celebratory texts, Richard A. McCabe deduces that many had 'anticipated a lengthy period of anarchy as rival claimants battled for recognition' and although they were clearly relieved, they 'struggled to comprehend what had actually occurred in constitutional terms.'³⁶ Despite a growing scholarly interest in the literature of James's succession, the representation of James's hereditary claim to the English throne in unofficial celebratory texts has not been broadly analysed. This section focuses on how unofficial celebratory texts represent James's hereditary claim to the English throne as a descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, to determine the extent to which James's new subjects publicly agreed with the official explanations discussed above, how they diverged, and what this demonstrates about their

³⁵ The earliest unofficial celebratory text was registered with the Stationers' Company on 30 March 1603—less than a week after Elizabeth I's death—and works relating to James's succession continued to be registered and published over the following months. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London. 1554-1650 A.D.*, ed. by Edward Arber, 5 vols (London, 1875-1894), III (1876), pp. 93v-100r. Robert Fletcher wrote that 'the first proclamation was excellently penned touching his Majesties most lawful right and lineall succession'. Robert Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle Shewing His Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title To All His Kingdomes* (London, 1603; STC 11086), A3r.

³⁶ McCabe, 'Panegyrics and Its Discontents', in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, p. 22.

understanding of the concept of hereditary right and the operation of the English succession, which was more complex than the official explanations suggest.

A brief biographical overview of the writers discussed in this section is provided here. John Hayward (not to be confused with Sir John Hayward, the historian and civil lawyer) was rector of St Mary Woolchurch, London, from 1594 until his death in 1618.³⁷ One of Hayward's three known published pamphlets was a sermon he preached at Paul's Cross on 27 March 1603 in celebration of James's succession. Leonel Sharpe was a clergyman who later served as Prince Henry's chaplain, though he was imprisoned in 1614 for encouraging anti-Scottish sentiment.³⁸ Sharpe preached a sermon on James's succession at Great St Mary's, Cambridge, on 28 March that was later published. According to David Colclough, Sharpe 'went out of his way to deliver a forensic analysis and justification' of James's title(s) to the throne.³⁹ Anthony Nixon was a pamphleteer, described by Anthony Parr as a 'freelance Jacobean hack, ready to turn his hand to any subject and to plagiarize his fellow writers in the process.'⁴⁰ Nixon registered his work, *Elizaes Memoriall. King James His Arrivall. And Romes Downefall*, with the Stationers' Company on 12 April 1603.⁴¹ Robert Fletcher was a poet and low-ranking royal servant during the reigns of Elizabeth and James.⁴² Fletcher dates the dedication of his work, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle Shewing His Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title To All His Kingdomes*, to 23 April 1603. Michael Drayton was a poet and playwright who wrote *To the Majestie of King James. A Gratulatorie Poem* (1603). According to Andrew McRae and John West, Drayton 'perceived poetry as having an influential, and often prophetic, role within the nation.'⁴³

³⁷ J.M.S. Brooke and A.W.C. Hallen (eds.), *The Transcript of Registers of the United Parishes of St Mary Woolnoth and St Mary Woolchurch Haw in the City of London, from their Commencement 1538 to 1760* (London, 1886), pp. 297, 388. I thank Aidan Norrie for providing me with this reference.

³⁸ See: Edward Irving Carlisle, 'Sharp or Sharpe, Leonel (1559-1631)', *Dictionary of National Biography*, 52 (London, 1897), 411-412.

³⁹ Colclough, 'Sermons on the Accessions of James I and Charles I', in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, p. 210.

⁴⁰ Anthony Parr, 'Nixon, Anthony (fl. 1592-1616)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/20206>.

⁴¹ *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, ed. by Arber, III, p. 94v.

⁴² Nick de Somogyi, 'Fletcher, Robert (fl. 1581-1606)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9741>.

⁴³ *Literature of the Stuart Successions*, ed. by McRae and West, p. 38.

Most of these unofficial celebratory texts offer very similar explanations of James's hereditary claim to the English throne, showing the influence of the official proclamation. They typically describe Henry VII as the heir of the house of Lancaster and Elizabeth of York as the heir of the house of York, with their marriage uniting the red and white roses, and James inheriting his hereditary claim from them. For example, Hayward writes: 'For propinquity of bloud, he is the next and rightfull heire of *Henrie* the seventh of famous memorie, of the house of Lancaster, & of *Elizabeth* his wife ayre of the house of Yorke.'⁴⁴ Nixon claims that James had succeeded by 'Lineall discent and rightfull claime' because he was 'Sprung from the line of that most roiall race / *Henry* the seventh who raigning married / *Elizabeth* fourth *Edwards* daughters grace, / Uniting the white Rose and the red, / The houses two of *Yorke* and *Lancastar*, / Which long before dissention did sever.'⁴⁵ Like the official proclamation, these works not only argue that James had succeeded to the English throne as the legitimate heir of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, but also reaffirm the Tudor origin myth of the Union of the Houses and attach it to James.

Sharpe also argues that James's hereditary claim was strengthened by parliamentary legislation, a topic that the official explanations intentionally do not discuss. Sharpe explains that Henry VII married Elizabeth of York and 'entailed the Crowne of England by Act of Parliament to the issue of their two bodies lawfully begotten'

⁴⁴ John Hayward, *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed. A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse, the 27 of March 1603. Being the Next Sunday After Her Majesties Departure* (London, 1603; STC 12984), D7r. Another example is *King James his welcome to London*, which narrates the history of the dynastic conflict that led to the Wars of the Roses from Richard II's deposition, favouring the Yorkist claim over the Lancastrian as senior. However, it still celebrates Henry and Elizabeth's marriage as joining 'in one / *Lancaster* and *Yorke*, the houses of renowne. / Then was all peace concluded'. Henry had 'two young Princes, and one Princely gerle. / *Margret* by name, from out whose lineall race / Thou didst discend, and justly claim'st thy place.' The poem, however, does not explain James's descent from Margaret. Henry's 'worthy selfe sate not so sure' on the English throne, 'But traytors still rebellion did procure.' I.F., *King James his welcome to London. With Elizaes Tombe and Epitaph, and our Kings Triumph and Epitomie* (London, 1603; STC 10798), B1v.

⁴⁵ Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall*, C3r. See also: *An Excellent New Ballad*; Michael Drayton, *To the Majestie of King James. A Gratulatorie Poem* (London, 1603; STC 7231), Br-B2r; Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle*, A4r. Drayton begins with the marriage of Catherine of Valois and Owen Tudor, as he also wants to show that James had 'British' blood through his Welsh Tudor descent. Their son, Edmund Tudor, Earl of Richmond, married Lady Margaret Beaufort. See: Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, pp. 57-60. Drayton's poem is accompanied by a genealogy showing James's descent from Henry and Elizabeth, and through them from the Lancastrian and Yorkist descendants of Edward III, affirming that the Union of the Houses was maintained in James's person.

(though this is incorrect, as the act only mentioned Henry), so now that their son's line had failed, 'the sonne lawfully descending of his eldest daughter, both by father and mother side, ought now by the same right to enjoy it.'⁴⁶ Sharpe defends James's succession to the English throne by hereditary right, but also asserts that James's hereditary claim was prescribed by the English Parliament. Later, when disputing the argument that Henry VIII's will allowed the English crown to be inherited by someone who was not the senior hereditary claimant, Sharpe asks why, if man's wishes were regarded 'as a meane of Gods ordinance ... should not the entaile of the crowne by act of parliament made by Henry the seventh' prevail above Henry VIII's 'pretended and uncertaine' will? Henry VII's parliamentary entailment could be interpreted as 'establishing the right of the crowne in the lawfull issue of his eldest daughter, the issue of his sonne failing'. Here, Sharpe admits that the entailment was only a flawed earthly authority, when 'it is God not man' who must dispose of crowns 'at his pleasure.'⁴⁷ Sharpe was willing to put forward multiple arguments in defence of James's succession, accepting the authority of parliamentary legislation when it suited him and disputing it when it did not, but concluding that James was England's rightful monarch in both scenarios.

The unofficial celebratory texts frequently mention the English people's fears about what would happen when Elizabeth I died and their uncertainty over who would succeed to the throne due to the existence of rival claimants.⁴⁸ This undermined the

⁴⁶ Leonel Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge before the Universitie, the Knights, and Chiefe Gentlemen of the Shiere, the Maior and Townesmen, the 28. of March* (Cambridge, 1603; STC 22376), pp. 17-18.

⁴⁷ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 27. Sharpe also argues that the succession to the crown could not be controlled by parliamentary legislation. Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, pp. 23-24.

⁴⁸ For example, Hayward recalls the widespread fear that the change in monarchs would be 'dangerous', as it was thought that Catholics would seize power. Hayward, *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed*, C8r-C8v. Fletcher claims that while travelling in his capacity as Elizabeth's servant, he had heard some 'dispute of his Majesties just and most lawfull Title'. Fletcher therefore addresses his work to those who denied that James was 'the true lineall, most honourable heire and lawfull successor' to the English throne. Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle*, A2r, A3r. The writer of *Northerne Poems* discusses Cardinal William Allen's claim that Elizabeth's death would result in a civil war between 'All that have title or the crowne may claime' unless England converted to Catholicism, but James was 'the first in pedegree ... whom God hath plac'd in regall throne', so there was no civil war. *Northerne Poems Congratulating the Kings Majesties Most Happy and Peaceable Entrance to the Crowne of England* (London, 1604; STC 14427), pp. 18-19. Sharpe, meanwhile, states that the Infanta Isabella was 'our feare, from which the Lord of heaven hath delivered England', a reference to her candidacy for the English throne. Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 13. Sharpe explains that if the descendants of Henry and Elizabeth's younger daughter or Lady Arbella Stuart (whose hereditary claims were inferior to James's) had

official narrative that James's succession had been inevitable and unchallengeable due to his senior hereditary claim. According to Sharpe, the English feared former conflicts would resume and a dynastic war over the succession would erupt, as 'the wofull face of civill warres betweene the two houses of Yorke and Lancaster was still before our eies'.⁴⁹ By contrast, the official explanations do not acknowledge that there had ever been any doubts about James's prospects of succeeding, or that there had been any rival candidates or opponents to James's claim. However, the regular assertion in the official explanations that James's succession guaranteed the continuation of England's peace was clearly an implicit response to these widespread English fears of dynastic warfare.

Some unofficial celebratory texts also suggest that James had succeeded by means other than hereditary right, revealing continued uncertainty and disagreement over the operation of the English succession and the nature of James's claim to the English throne. It is common for celebratory texts to directly refer to the English Privy Council's proclamation of James's succession and the relief that it brought, as it is credited with preventing the emergence of rival claimants and conflict over the throne.⁵⁰ For example, Nixon claims that God 'Did guide our Nobles hearts with one accord, / The worthiest Prince in *Europe* to elect, / King *James* the first, next heire to the Crowne, / To rule this Land'.⁵¹ The use of the word 'elect' implies that

been allowed to succeed, it might have resulted in a war between the rival claimants that let England fall 'into the jawes of a Spanish tyrant'. Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, pp. 43-44.

⁴⁹ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 43.

⁵⁰ For example, Drayton begins his poem by praising the 'Counsailes wisdome, and their grave fore-sight' in proclaiming James's succession, describing their actions as a 'well-prepared pollicie, and care, / For theyr indoubted Sovereigne', as they acted to oppose 'Other vaine titles' to the throne. As a result, violent destruction was 'Frustrate by their great providence and power'. Drayton, *To the Majestie of King James*, A3r. Drayton reminds his readers that a contested succession would have led to violence, had the Privy Council not prevented it. James's claim might have been 'indoubted', but that did not guarantee his succession as there had been rival candidates; Ivic describes the opening lines of Drayton's poem as 'remarkable for the emphasis they place on conciliar election: that is, the representation of the Privy Council as kingmakers.' Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 58. Hayward claims that God had guided 'the harts of our noble governors' to proclaim James's succession, disappointing Catholics and turning 'our feare into comfort'. The proclamation had 'stilled the ragings of the people' and suppressed the 'enemies of true religion' and peace. If it was not for the speedy proclamation, Hayward suggests, conflict would have erupted and James's succession would have been opposed. Hayward dwells on the fact that people had not known what was going to happen when Elizabeth died and feared the worst. James's succession was only guaranteed when the Privy Council proclaimed it, and only then did potential opponents withdraw. In Hayward's account, it was the Privy Council who held all the cards—even if they were being guided by God. Hayward, *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed*, D2v.

⁵¹ Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall*, B3v, D6v.

England's elite were responsible for James's succession, even if he was already 'next heire'. Jessica Lazar argues that Nixon's poem is purposefully ambiguous, suggesting 'both the power of the decision process and the inevitability of its outcome'.⁵² Sharpe is unique in making clear that by the proclamation James's 'right is rather declared then given unto him: for it is he that gives force to the proclamation, and not the proclamation right to him'.⁵³ Sharpe, however, still praises England's elite for 'the light we received from the blessed union of the lords of the Counsell, of the Nobilitie, and of the Cleargie by their proclamation' of James's succession, and asks 'what endlesse miseries should we have endured, if they had stood devided upon the matter, and given contrarie direction for the receiving of any other?'.⁵⁴ Although Sharpe makes clear that the proclamation was not an election, he still asserts that without it England might have fallen into dynastic conflict, going against the official narrative of James's succession being inevitable due to his senior hereditary claim.

Some unofficial celebratory texts also imply that Elizabeth I had the authority to choose her successor, challenging the official narrative by suggesting that the English succession operated according to nomination rather than strict hereditary right. These texts claim that, although Elizabeth appeared to have kept her choice a secret, it was in fact James.⁵⁵ Whether or not Elizabeth was believed to have the authority to choose her successor, contemporaries still valued her judgement, repeating the (probably untrue) story that she had chosen James to succeed her on her deathbed.⁵⁶ James's hereditary claim might have been the most important

⁵² Jessica Lazar, '1603. *The Wonderfull Yeare: Literary Responses to the Accession of James I*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2016), p. 260.

⁵³ The proclamation's value was in explaining James's hereditary claim, since 'malitious bookes' written against it and the ban on discussing the succession in Elizabeth's reign made people ignorant of it. Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 14.

⁵⁴ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 38.

⁵⁵ For example, Fletcher writes of Elizabeth: 'the Lord did harbour in her brest, / which she kept secret more than fortie yeare: / Who should succeed her'. Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle*, B1v. Fletcher claims that although Elizabeth 'might seeme to conseale from us her heire apparent ... yet you may see that her most prudent Counsell surviving her most gracious Majesty did presently proclaime this royall Gentleman to be our King and blessed substitute sent of God.' Fletcher reminds his readers that the succession had not been agreed upon during Elizabeth's lifetime and that Elizabeth herself had refused to publicly name a successor. Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle*, A3v.

⁵⁶ Contemporary accounts supporting it include: Marin Cavalli, Venetian Ambassador in France, to the Doge and Senate, 20 April 1603. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. by Horatio F. Brown, Rawdon Brown, G. Cavendish Bentinck, and Allen B. Hinds, 38

justification for his succession, but some celebratory texts also assert that Elizabeth could nominate her successor by royal prerogative—meaning that she could have chosen someone other than James, even if they do not acknowledge this possibility.

An anonymous ballad combines hereditary right, nomination, and election in its explanation of James's succession, offering an even more complicated interpretation of how the English succession operated and suggesting that James's hereditary claim alone was not sufficient. The ballad affirms that James was 'Of King HENRIES lineage'; however, it also states that Elizabeth I had assigned 'All her State' to James. Finally, it claims that 'The Nobles of this our Land ... Have set to their willing hands ... Giving him his lawfull right'—the English crown.⁵⁷ James's succession is not presented as the result of hereditary right alone but as a combination of factors.⁵⁸ Although addressed to James's English subjects, the ballad was printed in Edinburgh by Robert Waldegrave, James's printer, which, according to McRae and West, 'suggests a possible effort to manipulate popular opinion, rather than a more genuine expression of the public's joy.'⁵⁹ The ballad does not concur with the official explanations of James's succession to the English throne, however, which suggests that it was either not an officially sanctioned publication or reveals a fear among Jacobean officials that justifying James's

vols (London: HMSO, 1864-1947), X (1900), pp. 42-57; John Clapham, 'Certain Observations concerning the Life and Raigne of Elizabeth Queen of England', BL Add MS 22925, fol. 44v (transcribed, largely accurately, in Evelyn Plummer Read and Conyers Read (eds.), *Elizabeth of England: Certain Observations Concerning the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth by John Clapham* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1951), pp. 98-99). Contemporary accounts refuting the idea Elizabeth chose James as her successor on her deathbed include: *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. by Norman Egbert McClure, 2 vols (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939), I, pp. 188-189; Catherine Loomis, 'Elizabeth Southwell's Manuscript Account of the Death of Elizabeth I', *English Literary Renaissance*, 26.3 (1996), 492. For further discussion of how James was presented as Elizabeth's chosen successor, see: Catherine Loomis, "'Withered Plants Do Bud and Blossome Yeelds": Naturalizing James I's Succession', in *Law and Sovereignty in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Robert S. Sturges (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2011), pp. 133-150.

⁵⁷ *A New Song to the Great Comfort and Rejoycing of All True English Harts, at our Most Gracious King JAMES his Proclamation, Upon the 24. of March Last Past in the Cittie of London. To the Tune of Englands Pride is Gone* (Edinburgh, 1603; STC 14426.7).

⁵⁸ Similarly, Leonel Sharpe lists numerous reasons to support James's succession, even if his hereditary claim is presented as the main legitimising factor: James's hereditary claim; 'the might of his partie, by which he is able to defend that right'; 'the merit of his person'; Elizabeth's consent; the benefits James's succession would bring; and 'the endlesse miseries' England would have suffered 'if we had bin devided upon this point, or had received any other.' Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 17.

⁵⁹ *Literature of the Stuart Successions*, ed. by McRae and West, p. 51.

succession on the grounds of hereditary right alone would not be effective, and so they had to provide additional defences.

Many of these unofficial celebratory texts were written in direct response to the official proclamation of James's succession to the English throne, and they usually repeated its core narrative—that James's succession was due to the senior hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, and that his descent from them meant that he also embodied the Union of the Houses. This reaffirmed and further disseminated the official narrative of James's succession, as well as revealing the willingness of James's English subjects to anglicise him as another Tudor monarch through his descent from Henry and Elizabeth, rather than present him as the first monarch of a new, foreign dynasty.

However, the unofficial celebratory texts also deviated from the official explanations, offering a more complicated interpretation of how James had come to the English throne and the operation of the English succession. For example, the texts tried to strengthen James's position by giving him numerous claims to the English throne—such as Elizabeth I's nomination and the parliamentary entailment of the crown to Henry VII and Elizabeth of York's descendants—rather than depending solely on his hereditary claim. They also reminded readers that James's succession had not been guaranteed and that other candidates had been proposed, and they recalled previous fears over what would happen when Elizabeth I died and the possibility that a war would break out over the succession. While the official explanations implicitly acknowledged these fears by asserting that James's descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York guaranteed England's peace, the unofficial celebratory texts openly discussed them, contradicting the official explanations by admitting that James's succession had not been inevitable and unchallengeable due to his senior hereditary claim.

Although the unofficial celebratory texts mostly presented James's hereditary claim as the main *de jure* justification for his succession to the English throne, they did not present it as the *de facto* reason he had successfully secured the throne. The texts repeatedly praised the English Privy Council and elite for proclaiming James's succession, claiming that it had prevented a war over the succession. By doing so,

however, these texts presented the English Privy Council and elite as playing a necessary role in the succession, or even having some choice in the matter; they might simply have been confirming James's existing right, but his succession would not have been guaranteed otherwise.

Genealogies

James VI & I's succession to the English throne was the first to be accompanied by the production of a plethora of genealogies, both manuscript and engraved, to explain and justify why a specific monarch had succeeded. As such, these genealogies provide useful information about how James's succession was understood by his contemporaries. As Sara Trevisan explains, 'From the moment of his accession, the pedigree of James VI and I and the legitimacy it conferred upon him were systematically imposed onto the public sphere, for the first time in English history, through the medium of print.'⁶⁰ This development can be partially explained as technological; however, the large number of genealogies was also likely due to the circumstances of James's succession. According to Antony Griffiths, there was an 'obvious need ... to explain how the Scottish royal family were related to the Tudors, and hence why James ... was the legitimate heir'.⁶¹ Despite scholarly awareness of the significance of Jacobean genealogies, there has yet to be a broad analysis of how James's descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York was represented in this medium. This section demonstrates that genealogies were an appropriate and effective medium for promoting James's succession based on hereditary right, but also that genealogies could take different forms that complicated their representation of James's hereditary claim.

The smallest genealogies visualise the description of James's descent from the proclamation of his succession, and therefore they defend the official narrative that he had succeeded to the English throne by the hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. Jacobean printers anticipated public interest in understanding the source of James's hereditary claim and his relationship to

⁶⁰ Sara Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2020), p. 174.

⁶¹ Antony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689* (London: British Museum Press, 1998), p. 45.

England's previous monarchs. The title of Benjamin Wright's 1603 genealogy explains that it shows how James was *Decended From Ye Victorious King Hry 7 & Elizabeth His Wife Wherein Ye 2 Devided Families Ware United Together*.⁶² Renold Elstrack produced an engraving that combines a small genealogy with portraits of James, Anna of Denmark, and Prince Henry. The genealogy shows James's double descent from Henry and Elizabeth, and a text panel below James's portrait explains that he was 'the only true and next Inheritor unto King H.7. and Elizabeth his Queene. protracted from Lady Margaret. y^e eldest daughter of them both. In whose most happy conjunction ended y^e civill discensions of those towe devided families of Lancaster & York'.⁶³ These small genealogies demonstrate that James's descent from Henry and Elizabeth preserved the Union of the Houses in his person and made him the senior hereditary claimant to the English throne. As a result, they most closely resemble the proclamation of James's succession, reinforcing its message.

Larger genealogies are more ambitious in their representation of James's ancestry, but this also complicates their explanation of James's hereditary claim, as they do not simply repeat the official narrative of his descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. For example, Renold Elstrack produced a genealogy that traces James's descent from William the Conqueror and Matilda of Flanders.⁶⁴ Every English monarch is depicted with a half-length portrait, but the only couples depicted are

⁶² Benjamin Wright, *The Roiail Progenei of our Most Sacred King James*, 1603, engraving on paper, 37.2 x 27cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1882,0812.540.

⁶³ Renold Elstrack (engraver) and John Speed (publisher), *James I and Anne of Denmark*, undated, c. 1603, engraving on paper, 28.3 x 37.8cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. no. 28.7.13. The significance of James's double descent is analysed in Chapter 3. This engraving appears to have been the basis for a series of engravings published on the continent in the early years of James's joint reign to explain his hereditary claim to the English throne, for example: Claes Jansz Visscher (att. engraver), *James I and Queen Anne* (undated), engraving on paper, 40.2 x 45.1cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1935,0413.82; Nicolaas de Bruyn (engraver) and Jean le Clerc (publisher), *Iacobi. I. Britannicarum Insularum Monarchæ* (1604), engraving and letterpress on paper, 48.5 x 36.2cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1974,1207.6. For more on these engravings, see: Sara Ayres and Joseph B.R. Massey, 'Images of Anna of Denmark, Series B: The English and Irish Accession', *Depicting Anna of Denmark* (blog), 11 June 2021 <https://depictingannaofdenmark.blogspot.com/2021/06/room-2-images-of-anna-of-denmark-series.html> [accessed 6 July 2021].

⁶⁴ The genealogy features on a multi-sheet map of England, Ireland, and Wales by the cartographer and historian John Speed. Renold Elstrack, *The Most Royall Progeny of the Kings of England Continued from William Sirmamed Conquerour to Our Most Gracious Sovereaigne James the First King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland*, included on John Speed, *The Invasions of England and Ireland*, c. 1603-1604, engraving on paper, 164 x 218cm. Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, inv. no. GE DD-6056.

William and Matilda, Henry and Elizabeth, and James and Anna. This demonstrates the importance of Henry and Elizabeth's marriage, which a text panel describes as 'The most happy uniting of the towe Princely Families of Lancaster and Yorke', whose 'cyvill dissentions' had caused much spilling of blood.⁶⁵ A Tudor rose grows from the branch that leads to James, confirming that the Union of the Houses was maintained in his person. The genealogy also includes other candidates suggested in the Elizabethan succession debates—Lady Arbella Stuart and the earls of Hertford, Derby, and Huntingdon—which, as Trevisan points out, is unique among Jacobean genealogies. Trevisan believes this was intended 'to dispel once again all genealogical recriminations concerning James's legitimacy.'⁶⁶ Although James's hereditary claim is presented as superior, this still reminds the viewer that James's succession had not always been considered inevitable and other candidates had been proposed.

Morgan Colman's genealogy offers a more complex interpretation of James's hereditary claim to the English throne than the official explanations, as it presents him as not only the senior surviving descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, but also of the Saxon monarchs of England through his Scottish ancestry. Colman, who served as a secretary and steward to numerous powerful men in Elizabeth I's reign, produced a large manuscript genealogy, the *Arbor Regalis* (dated 24 March 1604[5]), along with an engraved version published in 1607.⁶⁷ The *Arbor Regalis*

⁶⁵ No spouses are included, except for Mary, Queen of Scots, and Henry, Lord Darnley, to represent James's double descent from Margaret Tudor (discussed in Chapter 3).

⁶⁶ Trevisan, *Royal Genealogies*, p. 256.

⁶⁷ Morgan Colman, *Arbor Regalis*, dated 1604[5], Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I; BL Add MS 17970; College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18. The engraved version is: Morgan Colman, *Genealogy of James VI and I and Anna of Denmark*, 1607, engraving. BL General Reference Collection 604.1.5. A short biography of Colman is included in Joseph B.R. Massey, 'The Saxon Connection: St Margaret of Scotland, Morgan Colman's Genealogies, and James VI & I's Anglo-Scottish Union Project', *Royal Studies Journal*, 8.1 (2021), 108-110. The *Arbor Regalis* may have been commissioned by James. In 1622 James paid Colman £250 for 'making two large beautiful tables, standing in his Majesty's privy lodgings at Whitehall, and for making many of the genealogical tables for his Majesty's honour and service'. This appears to be a payment for work done at an earlier date, rather than a new commission. Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 263. Alternatively, Colman may have produced an initial copy to secure James's patronage, and James then commissioned additional copies. On the engraved version of the genealogy produced in 1607, Colman thanked James and his wife, Anna of Denmark, for their 'Princely goodnesse, and roial munificence graciously extended towards him', evidence that they were acting as his patrons or had rewarded him for his services at an early date. Morgan Colman, *Genealogy of James VI and I and Anna of Denmark*, 1607, engraving. BL General Reference Collection 604.1.5. One of the surviving copies was specifically intended for Anna of Denmark, so this copy may have been a gift to, or commission from, Anna. We can deduce this because it is decorated on the left and right

may have been on display at court, which would have made the genealogy visible to elite visitors.⁶⁸ On the *Arbor Regalis*, Henry and Elizabeth are described as the heirs of the houses of Lancaster and York, and their marriage is represented by clasped hands emerging from their roundels. A new family line grows from these hands which culminates in James VI & I. The branches that grow from James and Anna's own marriage are blooming with red and white roses, a visual reminder that the Lancastrian and Yorkist hereditary claims were united in James and his descendants. Although Colman's genealogy affirms that James had succeeded by the hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, it presents his Saxon hereditary claim as senior, diverging from the official explanations of James's succession.

The *Lyte Pedigree* and its accompanying booklet demonstrate how a single person could simultaneously hold two contradictory interpretations of James's hereditary claim to the English throne. Thomas Lyte, an antiquarian from Somerset, presented the original manuscript genealogy to James in 1610.⁶⁹ Arnold Hunt, Dora Thornton, and George Dalglish argue that the *Lyte Pedigree* represents 'the idea of multiple lines of succession converging providentially on James ... to put James's right to the throne beyond all reasonable doubt.'⁷⁰ In an accompanying booklet, dated 1605 and appearing to be intended for publication, Lyte argues that, after the murder of Richard II, 'the right of succession' did not pass to the Lancastrians but to the Yorkists, making Elizabeth of York rightful heir to the throne.⁷¹ According to Lyte, Richard III's 'tragicall government' caused John Morton, Bishop of Ely, to plan the union of the rival houses 'by advancing the title of Henry ... as next and immediat heir of the Lancastrian Famelie'. After Henry was crowned, 'to extinguish all future

edges with the coats of arms of various Danish, English, German and Scottish royal women, described as 'heroines' who are 'presented in order to perfectly instruct.' This is discussed at greater length in Massey, 'The Saxon Connection', 90. Morgan Colman, *Arbor Regalis*, 1604[5], illuminated parchment on canvas. Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I.

⁶⁸ An Exchequer payment from 1622 mentions 'two large beautiful tables' created by Colman that were 'standing in his Majesty's privy lodgings at Whitehall'. Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 263. This is discussed at greater length in Massey, 'The Saxon Connection', 102-103.

⁶⁹ The original genealogy does not survive, but a smaller, contemporary copy does. Thomas Lyte, *The Lyte Pedigree*, c. 1605, ink on parchment. BL Add MS 48343. The information about the presentation of the *Lyte Pedigree* to James is recorded in Thomas Lyte, *Britaines Monarchie*, c. 1605. BL Add MS 59741, fol. 6v.

⁷⁰ Arnold Hunt, Dora Thornton, and George Dalglish, 'A Jacobean Antiquary Reassessed: Thomas Lyte, the Lyte Genealogy and the Lyte Jewel', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 96 (2016), 184.

⁷¹ BL Add MS 59741, fols 18v-19r.

strife betwixt y^e said Famelies’, he ‘espoused the most noble and vertuous Ladie Elizabeth eldest daughter to Edward the Fourth’.⁷² Lyte claims that this marriage ended the Wars of the Roses, and from it ‘the right of succession descended’ to James ‘by his great grandmother Margaret eldest daughter to Henry the Seaventh whereby he is assended to the heigh of Monarchiall government of all Britaine.’⁷³ Although Lyte celebrates the marriage as the Union of the Houses and the source of James’s hereditary claim, he still challenges the Tudor origin myth by asserting that Elizabeth’s hereditary claim was superior to Henry’s, rather than ignoring this debate. However, Lyte also implicitly rebukes Robert Persons’s argument that there were Lancastrian claimants ahead of James, as James’s Yorkist claim is presented as superior to all Lancastrian claims.

Lyte’s representation of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York’s marriage is more conventional in his genealogy, demonstrating that the medium an artist or writer used influenced their representation of the source of James’s hereditary claim. A large oval cartouche below their portraits explains that Henry ‘became y^e aparent heir of y^e house of Lancaster who by that royall match w^t Elizabbeth y^e eldest daughter of Edward y^e 4 conjoynd y^e tow Princely Famelies’ who had ‘continued in civell discention’ since the death of Richard II.⁷⁴ A rectangular cartouche below elaborates: ‘By that most happye and blessed union of the tow Princely Houses of Yorke & Lancaster ceased that unnaturall discention in y^e bloud royall of this Realme’.⁷⁵ A cartouche below James explains that he succeeded to the English throne as ‘next & imediat heir to Henry y^e 7 and Elizabeth his Queene descended from the Lady Margaret there eldest daught’r’. The sheet showing James’s descent from Henry and Elizabeth is missing; however, the branches that grow from both Henry and Elizabeth’s marriage and James and Anna’s marriage are decorated with roses, showing that the Union of the Houses and the combined Lancastrian and

⁷² BL Add MS 59741, fols 19r-19v.

⁷³ BL Add MS 59741, fols 19r-19v.

⁷⁴ Thomas Lyte, *The Lyte Pedigree*, c. 1605, ink on parchment. BL Add MS 48343, sheet 3. Lyte emphasises the couple’s significance by including oval portrait miniatures of them both and three cartouches around them. BL Add MS 48343, sheet 4. Lyte used the same woodblock portraits of Henry and Elizabeth as Elstrack’s 1603 genealogy. They also have the same blank space left at the bottom of the oval portrait, where Elstrack has included text but Lyte has not. Renold Elstrack (engraver) and John Speed (publisher), *The Most Happy Unions Contracted Betwixt the Princes of the Blood Royall of Theis Towe Famous Kingdomes of England & Scotland*, 1603, engraving on paper, 46.4 x 39.3cm. STC 23039g.3. British Museum, inv. no. 1856,0614.149.

⁷⁵ BL Add MS 48343, sheet 3.

Yorkist hereditary claims continued through James to the next generation.⁷⁶ Unlike his more critical booklet, Lyte's genealogy celebrates Henry and Elizabeth's marriage in a completely conventional manner, which reveals how hereditary right could be represented differently in textual and visual mediums.

Genealogies were a convenient medium for reinforcing the narrative put forward in the official explanations of James's succession to the English throne, as their focus on the familial relationship between monarchs clearly presented the English succession as operating according to hereditary right. Unlike the unofficial celebratory texts, there was no room for alternative interpretations of how James had succeeded to the English throne—such as election or nomination—in Jacobean genealogies. As a result, genealogies were a very successful format for promoting the official explanation of James's succession.

Jacobean genealogies maintained the Tudor origin myth by presenting the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York as the means by which the Wars of the Roses ended, through the union of their competing hereditary claims (which the genealogies did not attempt to judge between). They also depicted James as the inheritor of the united Lancastrian and Yorkist hereditary claims and the embodiment of the Union of the Houses, surrounding him and his offspring with Tudor roses (just as they were in his residences). This anglicised James and affirmed that he was another Tudor monarch rather than the first monarch of a new, foreign dynasty. Thomas Lyte questioned the Tudor origin myth by asserting that the Yorkist hereditary claim to the English throne was superior to the Lancastrian hereditary claim, though he only did this in an accompanying booklet, while his genealogy celebrated the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York and James's descent from it in the conventional manner.

The major complication in genealogical representations of James's hereditary claim to the English throne was deciding how far back it was necessary to trace it. The smaller genealogies only depicted his descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, visually repeating the narrative of the official explanations and asserting that

⁷⁶ BL Add MS 48343, sheet 3.

this was sufficient to justify James's succession to the English throne. Larger genealogies went further back, however, which increased the chances of them disagreeing about the nature of hereditary right; for example, Renold Elstrack's genealogy traced James's descent from William the Conqueror, accepting William's conquest as a legitimate starting point for a hereditary monarchy, while Morgan Colman's genealogy removed William from the line of England's monarchs in favour of tracing James's descent from the Saxon monarchs. These genealogists did agree, however, that James was Henry and Elizabeth's senior surviving descendant, and thus England's rightful hereditary monarch.

Histories

The official explanations of James VI & I's succession to the English throne focused on his descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, attaching the Tudor origin myth to England's new monarch. This section considers whether Jacobean historians updated the work of their predecessors to do the same. Scholarly interest in Jacobean histories of Henry VII's reign has been very uneven, with most works focusing on Francis Bacon's *Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1622). The histories of Edward Ayscu and John Speed, which are also discussed here, have been the subject of much less scholarly attention.⁷⁷ The publication of these histories was spread out across James's joint reign, rather than being concentrated at the beginning as many of the works discussed in the previous sections were. As a result, these histories demonstrate how attitudes towards James's hereditary claim to the English throne changed over time.

⁷⁷ For Ayscu's history, see: Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 94-96; Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986), pp. 51, 55n.46; Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, pp. 203-205; Sarah Waurechen, 'Imagined Politics, Failed Dreams, and the Beginnings of an Unacknowledged Britain: English Responses to James VI and I's Vision of Perfect Union', *Journal of British Studies*, 52 (2013), 593; D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), pp. 58-61. For Speed's history, see: Baker, 'Jacobean Historiography and the Election of Richard III', 315-317, 329-332; F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), pp. 178-179, 266; F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1967), pp. 196-199; Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 64-72.

Edward Ayscu, a historian from Lincolnshire of whom we know very little, appears to have only produced one work, *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland*, published in 1607. D.R. Woolf presumes that the history was ‘written in the early years of the reign of James I,’ as ‘it was clearly inspired by the project to unite the kingdoms of Scotland and England.’⁷⁸ Woolf also claims that ‘Ayscu read his history backwards from the great consummation of 1603’.⁷⁹ Internal evidence shows, however, that Ayscu wrote most of the history before James’s succession to the English throne.⁸⁰ Had Ayscu managed to complete and publish the history before Elizabeth I’s death,

⁷⁸ D.R. Woolf, ‘Ayscu [Ayscough], Edward (1550-1616/17)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/69723>.

⁷⁹ Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 59. Ivic also appears to assume that Ayscu’s history was written after James’s succession to the English throne, describing it as a ‘Jacobean history’. Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 204.

⁸⁰ Ayscu admits in the dedication that he was already working on the history in Elizabeth I’s reign, but when he was taking a break from it ‘Gods wisdom and goodnesse’ was revealed ‘by the generall applause of all men, for the most happy issue of so dangerous an alteration in our state’—James’s succession to the English throne. Ayscu had then considered his book to be ‘needlesse to the world, his end attained, and date expired’, because it would not do ‘the great principally intended’. Edward Ayscu, *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (London, 1607; STC 1014), A4. In his letter to the reader, Ayscu claims that he was motivated to write his history because although ‘the right and title of King James was pregnant enough’, even those who supported his claim ‘forecast some perill in his Majesties accesse and passage unto it’. Ayscu, *A Historie*, A5v. There is also internal evidence that shows the history was written before James’s succession. For example, when discussing the inheritance of the Lennox family’s English lands, Ayscu writes that ‘King James, in regard of his just title and claime to these lands, receiveth of thee Queenes majesty that now is an yearely pension.’ Ayscu’s use of the present tense when discussing both the subsidy James received from Elizabeth and Elizabeth herself ‘that now is’ makes clear that he was writing in Elizabeth’s lifetime. Ayscu later tried to update his references to Elizabeth; however, he missed this one. Ayscu, *A Historie*, pp. 301-302. Ayscu claims that his friends had encouraged him to publish the work anyway because it might still ‘do some good service’. Ayscu, *A Historie*, A3v-A4r. When Ayscu first wrote the history is harder to determine, though it is of less concern here, as it is analysed in the context of when it was published. Ayscu’s reference to the subsidy James VI was receiving from Elizabeth I, which appears in Ayscu’s account of the year 1544, dates the time of writing to 1586 (when James first received the subsidy) or later. This suggests that Ayscu wrote his main narrative between 1586 and 1603, after James began to receive a subsidy from Elizabeth and prior to James’s succession to the English throne. Julian Goodare, ‘James VI’s English Subsidy’, in *The Reign of James VI*, ed. Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000), p. 115. Ayscu’s main narrative goes up to the year 1573. Ayscu then added entries for the years 1587 and 1603, covering Mary, Queen of Scots’ execution and James’s succession to the English throne, with the excuse that ‘nothing of importance hath bin atte[m]pted by the one or other Nation’ to explain the narrative gaps. Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 393. Perhaps Ayscu simply did not get around to completing his history beyond 1573 before James’s succession to the English throne created a new impetus to have it published; or perhaps Ayscu wanted to avoid discussing Anglo-Scottish relations during James’s adult reign in Scotland, which could be controversial. After concluding his account of the year 1573, Ayscu writes that ‘Since that time, now for these thirty yeares wel-nere nothing of importance hath bin atte[m]pted by the one or other Nation, to the breach of the most happy peace and concord betweene them.’ This would date the writing of this final section of the history, including his accounts of the years 1587 and 1603, to circa 1603. Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 393.

it would have been a unique contribution to the Elizabethan succession debates: the only complete history written in support of James's candidacy.⁸¹ This means that the history originally had an entirely different purpose to the one Ayscu attached to it at the time of publication. We must, therefore, read Ayscu's history as a contribution to the Elizabethan succession debates that was reworked in response to James's succession to the English throne.

Like the unofficial celebratory texts, Ayscu challenges the official narrative of James's succession by acknowledging that the English throne might have eluded him if not for the English Privy Council's speedy proclamation of his succession. In his address to the reader, Ayscu states that although James's 'right and title' to the English throne was 'pregnant enough', even those who favoured him 'forecast some perill in his Majesties accesse and passage unto it'. According to Ayscu, God worked 'in the heartes of our grave and most prudent Senate' to proclaim James's succession within a few hours of Elizabeth I's death. 'For, did they not by proclaiming his Majesty *in tempore oportuno* [at the opportune time], without delay prevent the malice' of the papacy, 'whose pestiferous breath might otherwise have poisoned and infected' malcontents and Catholics against James?⁸² Ayscu dwells on the potential opposition to James's succession, since many monarchs 'have bin fronted and foyled ... some thrust out of their Kingdomes' by Catholics.⁸³ This leaves the reader with the impression that James's hereditary claim was not enough by itself to secure the English throne, as Catholics might have prevented his succession if not for the divinely inspired actions of the English Privy Council.

Ayscu explains James's hereditary claim to the English throne in his account of Henry VII's reign, thereby incorporating a justification of James's succession into England's national history. Ayscu, however, also suggests that James's hereditary claim was strengthened by parliamentary entailment, a topic that the official explanations intentionally did not discuss. According to Ayscu, by Henry's

⁸¹ John Lesley, Bishop of Ross's history of Scotland, *De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum Libri Decem* (1578), is perhaps the only comparable work, as it also defended the Stuart claim to the English throne, but Lesley had been supporting the candidacy of James's mother, Mary, Queen of Scots.

⁸² Ayscu, *A Historie*, A5v.

⁸³ Ayscu, *A Historie*, A6r.

marriage to Elizabeth of York, ‘the eldest Daughter of king *Edward* the fourth’, ‘the two houses of *Lancaster* and *Yorke*, which had for many yeares before contended for the Sovereignty, were graciously united’ in their descendants. On top of that, ‘for the avoyding of all titles and claimes (peramount) in time to come the Crowne of *England* by generall consent in Parliament of the three estates, was limited and intayled’ to Henry and Elizabeth’s issue (though this is incorrect, as the act of entailment only mentioned Henry).⁸⁴ Ayscu therefore goes against the official narrative of James’s succession by presenting the English Parliament as unambiguously having authority over the succession, and asserting that Henry and Elizabeth’s marriage alone could not guarantee the end of the Wars of the Roses.

A few pages later, Ayscu gives an account of the marriage of Henry and Elizabeth’s daughter, Margaret Tudor, to James IV, King of Scots. Ayscu then explains that Margaret and James’s great-grandson ‘*James* the sixt now King is lineally descended in the third degree’ from Henry VII, ‘both by Father and Mother.’ This firmly links James VI & I to Henry VII, explaining where James’s hereditary claim to the English throne originated and how the claim had passed down to him.⁸⁵ Ayscu’s explanation of James’s hereditary claim largely concurs with the official Jacobean explanations—and the arguments in support of James’s claim put forward during the Elizabethan succession debates, which is likely when Ayscu wrote this part of his history. This is the first example of an explanation of James’s hereditary claim to the English throne being added to a published English historical narrative of Henry VII’s reign, which was an important development in asserting the historical legitimacy of James’s succession.

Ayscu concludes his history with an account of James’s succession to the English throne, though, like the unofficial celebratory texts, he goes against the official explanations by stressing the importance of the English Privy Council’s proclamation. Ayscu writes that, ‘not many houres after’ Elizabeth I’s death, James was proclaimed ‘the onely lawfull, lineall, and rightful King’ to the ‘great joy and

⁸⁴ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 242.

⁸⁵ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 251. It is notable that Ayscu refers to James as ‘*James* the sixt now King’, as the use of James’s Scottish regnal number alone shows that this section was written before James’s succession to the English throne.

generall applause of all estates'.⁸⁶ As in his address to the reader, Ayscu does not explain what James's claim to the English throne actually is at this point in the text, focusing again on the significance of the proclamation and public response. Despite this, the explanation Ayscu gives of James's hereditary claim in the main body of the text agrees with the official explanations.

John Speed, like Thomas Lyte, undermines the Tudor origin myth by challenging Henry VII's hereditary claim to the English throne, and therefore goes against the official explanations of James's succession. Speed was a cartographer and historian whose *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* was published in 1611.⁸⁷ Speed repeats the story of John Morton, Bishop of Ely, declaring that through Henry VII and Elizabeth of York's marriage 'both the houses of *Yorke* and *Lancaster* may be united in one' when their rivalry 'had long time disquieted the Land'.⁸⁸ Speed, however, also notes that Henry's Beaufort ancestors had been 'made incapable of succession in the Regalitie', and it was only Richard III's usurpation that caused the English to 'neglect (in a sort) so many naturall heires of the house of *Yorke*' in offering their support to Henry. According to Speed, Henry 'scarce had any thing of a legal title', and Elizabeth was 'the rightfull inheritrice'.⁸⁹ Speed's criticisms of Henry VII's hereditary claim may have come from Francis Bacon, as Bacon criticised Henry's hereditary claim in his own history (discussed later in this section) and wrote a manuscript account of Henry's reign that Speed used, though Speed does not cite Bacon here. Speed explains that the 'naturall solder and indissoluble cement, which must make this Kingdome stand,' was Henry's marriage to Elizabeth. Speed also notes that the 'whole house of Parliament, concurring finally in establishing by a solemne Act, the Crowne upon him, and his heires for ever' (not claiming that the act applied to both him and Elizabeth, as other writers incorrectly asserted).⁹⁰ Speed writes that Henry and Elizabeth's son, Henry VIII, succeeded 'as the only true heir

⁸⁶ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 396.

⁸⁷ Sarah Bendall, 'Speed, John (1551/2-1629)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26093>.

⁸⁸ John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045), pp. 716, 718. A manuscript draft version of this can be found in: John Speed, working notebook for his *History of Great Britaine*, c. 1611. BL Add MS 57336, fol. 40r.

⁸⁹ Speed, *History*, pp. 727-728.

⁹⁰ Speed, *History*, p. 729.

unto the Crowne, by both the houses of *Lancaster* and *Yorke*.⁹¹ By doing this, Speed retreats slightly to maintain the Tudor origin myth of the Union of the Houses.

Speed twice asserts that the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York was the source of James's hereditary claim to the English throne. In his list of Edward IV's children, Speed explains that Elizabeth was promised in marriage to the French Dauphin and then pursued by Richard III, 'but better destiny attending her, shee was reserved to joine the union and marriage with the onely heire of *Lancaster*, which was *Henrie of Richmond*, afterward King of *England*, from whom is branched the roiall stemme' that includes '*James* our dread Sovereigne, and great *Brittaines* Monarch.'⁹² At the start of his account of James's reign, Speed argues that James's 'Title was most just, no man can deny, being sprung from the united Roses of *Lancaster* and *Yorke*, King *Henry the seventh*, and *Queene Elizabeth his wife*', tracing James's descent from them.⁹³ Despite having previously dismissed Henry's hereditary claim, Speed (like Lyte) was unwilling to completely disavow the Union of the Houses and argue that the hereditary claim of all the Tudor monarchs, and James, came solely from Elizabeth.

Speed concludes his history with an account of James's joint reign, where he reminds his readers of the Elizabethan succession debates and undermines the official narrative that James's succession had been guaranteed and unchallengeable. Speed does this by referring to 'Doleman', the claimed writer of *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inghland*: 'Let *Doleman* therefore dote upon his own dreames, and other like Traitors fashion their barres upon the Popes forge; yet hath *God & his right* set him on the throne of his most lawfull inheritance'.⁹⁴ Speed asserts that James had succeeded by hereditary right and God's will, though he admits that there had been rival candidates. Immediately on

⁹¹ Speed, *History*, p. 753.

⁹² Speed, *History*, p. 691. This statement can be found in an identical form in a surviving draft version of Speed's chapter on Edward IV. BL Add MS 57336, fol. 32r. Woolf argues that this shows Speed was sincere in this belief that the marriage was 'the final stage of an intricate divine plan—there was no need to write an insincere panegyric in an unpublished manuscript.' Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 70. Woolf, however, seems to be unaware that this statement was also included in the published version.

⁹³ Speed, *History*, p. 884.

⁹⁴ Speed, *History*, p. 884.

Elizabeth's death, Speed explains, 'the Lords of the Land gave full satisfaction unto the people, in proclaiming' James as her successor. This was a great comfort to the English because not only did James have an 'unquestionable claime', but he also 'professed the same true Religion' and was known for 'his singular learning and experience' from having already ruled Scotland.⁹⁵ James had qualities other than his hereditary claim that made him a suitable monarch for England, and Speed admits that there had been support for other claimants—even if James's hereditary claim was the strongest.

Francis Bacon wrote the most in-depth analysis of Henry VII's claim(s) to the English throne of any work published in the Jacobean period. Bacon was a lawyer, philosopher, and politician who served James in numerous capacities.⁹⁶ Bacon's motivations for writing *The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1622) are discussed in more depth in Chapter 2, but the scholarly consensus is that it was intended to restore Bacon to royal favour after he was impeached and publicly disgraced in 1621.⁹⁷ According to Jonathan Marwil, Bacon believed that a historian's role was 'not merely to record events' or moralise as traditional chroniclers did, but to 'teach men about politics' by 'informing his readers of the reasons for events, the explanations in terms of power and character for why men had acted as they had, so that they (the readers) might use the information to conduct their own affairs more successfully.'⁹⁸ As such, Bacon's history was intended to

⁹⁵ Speed, *History*, p. 884.

⁹⁶ Markku Peltonen, 'Bacon, Francis, Viscount St Alban (1561-1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/990>. See also: Joel J. Epstein, *Francis Bacon: A Political Biography* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1977).

⁹⁷ Bacon had long shown an interest in Henry VII, having already begun a manuscript account of Henry's reign that was quoted in Speed's history. Speed, *History*, pp. 728, 731. Bacon initially planned to write a more extensive 'history of England', turning to the reign of Henry VIII (with Prince Charles's encouragement) after completing his history of Henry VII, but he made little progress. Francis Bacon to Tobie Matthew, c. June 1623. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, 7 vols (London, 1861-1874), VII (1874), p. 429. According to Woolf, Bacon 'wished to be restored to influence, if not office, and when the first part of the planned history, the *Henry VII*, failed to accomplish this, he abandoned the project'. Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 153.

⁹⁸ Jonathan Marwil, *The Trials of Counsel: Francis Bacon in 1621* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1976), p. 151. See also: Leonard F. Dean, 'Sir Francis Bacon's Theory of Civil History-Writing', *English Literary History*, 8.3 (1941), 161-183; F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), pp. 253-274; Andrew Hiscock, *Reading Memory in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 230-234; Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, pp. 252-258; George H. Nadel, 'History as Psychology in Francis Bacon's Theory of History', *History and Theory*, 5.3 (1966), 275-287; John F. Tinkler, 'Bacon and

provide examples of good and bad rule to contemporary readers, including James VI & I and the future king to whom it was dedicated, Prince Charles. The educational purpose of Bacon's history helps explain why he was so vehemently against the idea that Henry VII ruled by hereditary right.

On the surface, Bacon appears to support the Tudor origin myth of the Union of the Houses and the view that James's hereditary claim came from the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. In his dedicatory address to Prince Charles, Bacon explains that 'I have endeavoured to doe *Honour* to the *Memorie* of the last *King of England*, that was *Ancestour* to the *King* your *Father* and *Your selfe*', Henry VII, in whom the Union of the Houses was 'Consummate'.⁹⁹ Bacon, however, had already revealed himself as a critic of Henry's hereditary claim in his *Twoo Bookes* (1605), where he described Henry's succession as a 'mixt Adeption of a Crowne, by Armes and Tytle: An entry by Battaile, an Establishment by Mariage'.¹⁰⁰ Bacon developed this argument further in his history.

Immediately after defeating Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth, Bacon writes, Henry 'met with a Point of great difficultie, and knotty to solve'—deciding which title to depend on for his claim to the English throne.¹⁰¹ Bacon provides a detailed analysis of Henry's three possible titles: the 'ancient and long disputed' Lancastrian hereditary claim; his projected marriage to Elizabeth of York; and the right of conquest through his 'victorie of Battaile'.¹⁰² Henry did not want to depend on his title of conquest, as it would make his subjects fearful of him wielding absolute power.¹⁰³ Henry also knew that his Lancastrian claim, 'inherent in his Person', was

History', in *The Cambridge Companion to Bacon*, ed. by Markku Peltonen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 232-258; John F. Tinkler, 'The Rhetorical Method of Francis Bacon's *History of the Reign of King Henry VII*', *History and Theory*, 26.1 (February 1987), 32-52; B.H.G. Wormald, *Francis Bacon: History, Politics, and Science, 1561-1626* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 46-76, 214-260.

⁹⁹ Francis Bacon, *The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (London, 1622; *STC* 1159), A2r-A2v.

¹⁰⁰ Francis Bacon, *The Twoo Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the Proficiencie and Advancement of Learning, Divine and Humane* (London, 1605; *STC* 1164), p. 12v.

¹⁰¹ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 3. According to Judith H. Anderson, Bacon's representation of Henry's thoughts 'as an interior process is very much in the tradition of historical life-writing.' Judith H. Anderson, *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), p. 173.

¹⁰² Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰³ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 7.

‘condemned by *Parliament*, and generally prejudged in the common opinion of the Realme’. Promoting the Lancastrian claim was also inevitably to ‘the disinherison of the line of *Yorke*’.¹⁰⁴ Henry, however, held an ‘affection to his own Line and Bloud’ and preferred ‘that Title best which made him independent’, so he ‘resolved to rest upon the title of *Lancaster* as the *Maine*, and to use the other two,’ marriage and conquest, ‘as *Supporters*’.¹⁰⁵ Marriage to Elizabeth was the ‘fairest’ title and ‘most like to give contentment to the People’, Bacon claims, as they were ‘affectionate to that *Line*’ and the Yorkists were ‘held then the indubitate Heires of the Crowne.’ Henry, however, did not want his right to rule to depend on his wife, as he would have ‘a *Matrimoniall* rather than a *Regall* power: the right remayning in his *Queene*, upon whose decease ... he was to give place, and bee removed.’¹⁰⁶ Thus, Bacon writes, Henry chose to assume the title of king ‘in his owne name, without mention of the Lady ELIZABETH at all ... In which course hee ever after persisted, which did spin him a threed of many seditions and troubles.’¹⁰⁷ According to Bacon, Henry’s claim to the throne ‘was doubtful’ and Elizabeth provided him ‘with a *Crowne*’, though Henry ‘would not acknowledge it’.¹⁰⁸ As a result, the hereditary claim of the Tudors (and, after them, James) came exclusively from Elizabeth.

Bacon also discusses the parliamentary entailment of the crown to Henry VII’s descendants, raising the issue of the English Parliament’s authority over the succession—a topic that had been intentionally avoided in the official explanations of James’s succession. Henry ‘knew there was a very great difference betweene a King that holdeth his Crowne by a civill Act of *Estates*, and one that holdeth it originally by the law of *Nature*, and descent of Bloud.’¹⁰⁹ Therefore, he avoided having the act ‘penned by way of *Declaration* or *Recognition* of right’ or being a ‘new *Law* or *Ordinance*’, but rather ‘by way of *Establishment*, and that under covert and indifferent words’.¹¹⁰ Henry also did not want it to mention Elizabeth, so it only

¹⁰⁴ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 4.

¹⁰⁵ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 5.

¹⁰⁶ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 4. Bacon also claims that Henry delayed his marriage to Elizabeth so that he could have his own coronation, since a joint coronation might imply they were dual monarchs with equal claims to the throne. Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 8.

¹⁰⁷ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 6.

¹⁰⁸ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, pp. 12, 238.

¹⁰⁹ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 4.

¹¹⁰ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 11.

mentioned him and ‘the *Heires* of his body, not speaking of his *right Heires*’.¹¹¹ This contrasts with Ayscu and other Jacobean writers, such as Leonel Sharpe, who incorrectly claim that the act entailed the succession to the descendants of both Henry and Elizabeth.

Bacon’s dismissal of Henry’s hereditary claim may have been intended to make Henry’s achievements appear all the greater. Perez Zagorin explains that the history’s ‘master theme is how Henry Tudor—a monarch who came to the throne as the victor in a dynastic civil war, whose position was weak and whose title to the crown as the representative of the house of Lancaster was questionable and disputed ... nevertheless succeeded in overcoming all his enemies, building up his power, and mastering his kingdom.’¹¹² Marwil interprets it as an opportunity for Bacon to present Henry as a ‘problem-solver’ who carefully judged between the various titles he could claim to the throne.¹¹³ Scholars have also argued that Bacon intentionally represents Henry as making the wrong choice. According to Marwil, Bacon saw Henry’s greatest flaw as ‘his lack of foresight’, with Henry’s dismissals of Elizabeth’s hereditary claim being an (admittedly weak) explanation for why Henry faced so many Yorkist conspiracies.¹¹⁴ Henry’s character flaw leads him to make a mistake that has serious consequences, and the reader can learn from this.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, pp. 11-12. Baker explains that George Buck, another Jacobean historian whose history of Richard III remained in manuscript form during his lifetime, presented Henry as ‘a king who owed his title to Parliament rather than to any right of his ... Buck emphasized that Henry’s first Parliament had entailed the crown to him and his descendants. Significantly, Buck exhibited this parliamentary “gift of a new title” to Henry when rehearsing the “most noble and royal titles of our Sovereign Lord the King of Great Britain now reigning and flourishing.”’ Baker, ‘Jacobean Historiography and the Election of Richard III’, 317. Since Buck’s work is a history of Richard III rather than a history of Henry VII, and it was not published in James’s reign, it is beyond the focus of this section.

¹¹² Perez Zagorin, *Francis Bacon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), p. 215.

¹¹³ Marwil, *The Trials of Counsel*, pp. 158-159.

¹¹⁴ Marwil, *The Trials of Counsel*, pp. 192-193. Anderson concurs, writing that Henry’s short-sighted decision to deny his wife’s Yorkist right to the English throne ‘prepares for development of a major theme in the *Henry*, namely Yorkist dynastic identity and ambition.’ Anderson, *Biographical Truth*, p. 175. This also explains why Bacon presents Henry as a jealous and mistrustful husband (something that is not based on any historical evidence), as in Bacon’s narrative this leads to Yorkist discontent.

¹¹⁵ Tinkler suggests that Bacon discussed Henry’s various possible titles to teach James and Charles ‘that they should take equal advantage of all the titles to the crown that they could lay claim to’. This, however, would require James to overturn the official explanations of his succession—that he had come to the throne exclusively through hereditary right—set out almost twenty years earlier. Tinkler, ‘Bacon and History’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Bacon*, ed. by Peltonen, p. 238.

We might think that Bacon's denial of Henry VII's hereditary claim and the Tudor origin myth would be controversial, given that they were central features of the official explanations of James's succession. Some Jacobean historians did receive official censure for their criticisms of James's ancestors, as discussed in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. Bacon's history, however, was received favourably by James, who was given a copy prior to publication.¹¹⁶ Bacon did not criticise Henry's hereditary claim to deny James's, as a work like *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of England* had, but to show Henry making a bad decision. Bacon still presents James as the senior hereditary claimant through his descent from Elizabeth of York. This suggests that nuanced discussions of hereditary right were more acceptable in histories compared to other genres. Additionally, criticisms of Henry's hereditary claim might not have seemed as threatening in 1622 as they would have in 1603.

Sixteenth-century English historians had not overtly linked James VI & I or his ancestors, the Scottish Stuarts, to Henry VII and Elizabeth of York in their historical narratives, as they were not trying to explain and promote the Stuart hereditary claim to the English throne. After James's succession, however, English historians added explanations of James's descent from Henry and Elizabeth to their narratives. This gave James's succession historical legitimacy and established it as part of the narrative of England's national history. It also anglicised James, by linking him to his predecessors on the English throne and presenting him as another embodiment of the Union of the Houses.

However, Jacobean historians also suggested that other factors were involved in both James's own succession, and the operation of the English succession more generally. For example, Ayscu and Speed followed the example of the unofficial celebratory texts by stressing the importance of the English Privy Council's proclamation of James's succession for preventing rival candidates from emerging. Ayscu, Speed, and Bacon all discussed the parliamentary entailment of the crown to Henry VII's descendants. These inclusions can partially be explained by the genre of these works; as histories, they were providing narrative accounts of the

¹¹⁶ Thomas Meautys to Francis Bacon, 7 January 1622. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, VII, pp. 325-326.

reigns of England's monarchs, including key events such as these. However, both Ayscu and Bacon were intentionally commenting on the English succession—Ayscu to defend James's hereditary claim to the English throne (which he evidently felt was strengthened by the parliamentary entailment) and Bacon to analyse how Henry VII justified his right to rule. Therefore, it is important to consider the individual motivations of writers and not just the genre in which they were writing.

Jacobean historians also began to challenge the Tudor origin myth by judging between Henry VII and Elizabeth of York's hereditary claims, rather than simply celebrating their marriage. Speed concluded that Elizabeth's hereditary claim was senior, but still celebrated her marriage to Henry as the Union of the Houses and the source of James's own hereditary claim. Bacon wrote at length about Henry's claims, concluding that although Henry preferred to rely on his own Lancastrian hereditary claim to justify his right to rule, it was of little value—and Elizabeth's hereditary claim was superior. As such, the hereditary claims of their descendants, including James, came exclusively from Elizabeth and not Henry. Despite this, in his dedication to Prince Charles, Bacon still claims that the Union of the Houses was 'Consummate' in Henry's marriage to Elizabeth. Even the harshest Jacobean critic of the Tudor origin myth still repeated it at least once to explain James's own claim to the English throne. It could not be disposed of entirely, and so was perpetuated into the seventeenth century through its attachment to the Stuart monarchs.

Conclusion

The official explanations of James VI & I's succession to the English throne set out a clear narrative: it was the result of the hereditary claim he had inherited as the senior surviving descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, the heirs of the houses of Lancaster and York whose marriage united their rival claims and ended the Wars of the Roses. This was a continuation of the Tudor origin myth that had been attached to the English monarchs of the sixteenth century; now this myth was attached to James as well. James's new subjects heard this explanation in the proclamations made first in London and then throughout the country, and its repetition in unofficial celebratory texts, genealogies, and histories shows how influential the proclamation of James's succession was, and how successfully it was

received and repeated. This was likely because the same narrative had been used to defend the right to rule of James's Tudor predecessors, and so James was effectively presented as another English Tudor monarch, embodying the Union of the Houses as his predecessors had, rather than being the first monarch of a new, foreign dynasty.¹¹⁷ These works attempted to reassure James's new subjects by emphasising dynastic continuity and anglicising James.

The value of linking James to Henry and Elizabeth was not merely because Henry was the most recent English monarch James was descended from, but also because their marriage was uniquely celebrated as the Union of the Houses. This explains why Elizabeth was also important, even though she had only been a queen consort. The Tudor origin myth itself was an extension of the concept of hereditary right, as descent from Henry and Elizabeth was presented as not only providing a hereditary claim, but also guaranteeing that England would not fall into dynastic conflict again as it had during the Wars of the Roses—an advantage that built on, but was additional to, hereditary right. We might ask what relevance the Tudor origin myth had in 1603. Apart from the evident attachment the English had to the narrative, and its usefulness as a way of associating James with his Tudor predecessors, it also alleviated fears that Elizabeth I's death would result in a war over the succession. James's succession was presented as a guarantee of England's internal peace from dynastic conflict, something that was not merely in the past in the form of the Wars

¹¹⁷ This was despite Henry VII having been born in Wales and his Welsh ancestry—along with Elizabeth of York's—being valued by some Jacobean writers as a means of linking James VI & I to the ancient British kings. For example, see: Barnabe Barnes, *Four Bookes of Offices Enabling Privat Persons for the Speciall Service of all Good Princes and Policies* (London, 1606; STC 1468); Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos*; George Owen Harry, *The Genealogy of the High and Mighty Monarch, James, by the Grace of God, King of Great Brittain, &c.* (London, 1604; STC 12872); William Herbert, *A Prophetie of Cadwallader, last King of the Brittaines* (London, 1604; STC 12752); John Lewis, *The History of Great Britain, From the First Inhabitants Thereof, 'Till the Death of Cadwalader, Last King of the Britains; and of the Kings of Scotland to Eugene V* (London, 1729; ESTC T113293); John Lewis, 'Proposals to James I by John Lewis [of Llynwene] a barrister formerly practising in the Marches Court, for a history of Britain in ten books', c. 1604-1606. BL Royal MS 18 A XXXVII. For scholarly discussions, see: Hunt, Thornton, and Dagleish, 'A Jacobean Antiquary Reassessed', 169-184; Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, pp. 62-63; Philip Schwyzer, 'The Jacobean Union Controversy and *King Lear*', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 34-47; Sara Trevisan, 'Noah, Brutus of Troy, and King James VI and I: Biblical and Mythical Ancestry in an Anonymous Genealogical Role', in *Mythical Ancestry in World Cultures, 1400-1800*, ed. by Sara Trevisan (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), pp. 137-164; Sara Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2020), pp. 193-234; Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 62-63.

of the Roses, but which might resurface in the present. Emphasising James's descent from the Union of the Houses was also a means of denying the candidacy of anyone whose claim did not come from Henry and Elizabeth—such as the Infanta Isabella—as they could not guarantee the continuation of that peace. Finally, claiming that James's succession guaranteed England's continued peace was another means of anglicising him, as it explained how James's succession benefited the English people.

Although the official explanations did not acknowledge that the English Parliament had any role to play in James's own succession, they intentionally avoided the subject of whether parliament had any authority over the succession in general rather than explicitly denying it. Some unofficial works discussed the parliamentary entailment of the crown to Henry VII and Elizabeth of York's descendants (though in reality only Henry's descendants were mentioned), which was a parliamentary limitation on hereditary right. However, they did this to defend the exclusive hereditary right of Henry and Elizabeth's descendants—including James—to the English throne, so this still served as a defence of James's position. As a result, the question of parliament's role in the English succession was left open to debate rather than being conclusively resolved by James's own succession or the explanations that followed it. Leonel Sharpe defended James's right to the throne in both possible scenarios—if parliament had authority over the succession and if it did not—which, as this thesis demonstrates, was a more common strategy for dealing with possible objections to James's claim than explicitly attempting to define how the English succession operated.

Some unofficial celebratory texts also suggested that election or nomination had played a role in James's succession, unlike the official explanations. This implied that there was an element of choice to the English succession, even if these works also acknowledged that James was the senior hereditary claimant. Previous fears that Elizabeth I's death would result in open conflict over the throne explain why these writers were so jubilant about the speedy proclamation of James's succession by the English Privy Council and the peaceful response. By recalling their fears that rival claimants would contest James's succession, however, these works challenged the official narrative that James had succeeded automatically on Elizabeth's death

and had an unchallengeable hereditary claim. The official explanations had failed to convince these writers that James's hereditary claim to the throne and eventual succession had always been guaranteed and unopposable, and so they asserted that James had multiple possible claims to the English throne to strengthen his position. However, it was more common for unofficial works to assert that James's hereditary claim provided the *de jure* justification for his succession even if it was not the *de facto* reason for James successfully securing the throne.

Some unofficial works challenged the Tudor origin myth and the idea that James had succeeded to the English throne as the heir of the united Lancastrian and Yorkist hereditary claims. These were typically historical narratives that analysed the hereditary claims of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York in greater depth. Thomas Lyte, John Speed, and Francis Bacon all argued that Elizabeth had a superior hereditary claim to Henry. In a strictly hereditary system, it should have been not only possible to determine but obvious whether Henry or Elizabeth's hereditary claim was superior; however, the Tudor origin myth was built on denying this possibility, celebrating the union of their claims through their marriage rather than choosing between them. Arguing that Elizabeth's hereditary claim was senior to Henry's was still a defence of James's right to the English throne, however, which explains why these challenges to the Tudor origin myth were tolerated in the Jacobean period.

Jacobean officials clearly saw more value in attaching the Tudor origin myth of the Union of the Houses to James, rather than rejecting it. Lyte and Speed were not willing to take their argument to its logical conclusion by denying the Tudor origin myth; they still praised Henry and Elizabeth's marriage as a union of rival claims and traced James's own hereditary claim to the English throne from that marriage. Even Bacon still commended their marriage as a union of rival houses. So, despite the conflicting views held by James's subjects on the nature of the English succession and Henry VII's hereditary claim, it was still widely accepted that James had succeeded to the English throne by hereditary right as the senior surviving descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. How that hereditary claim had passed down to James, however, was a subject of disagreement, as discussed in Chapter 3.

2. Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, and Anglo-Scottish Union

James VI & I and his supporters sought to soothe concerns about Anglo-Scottish union by asserting that both the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union were historically legitimate and desirable. One way they did this was by invoking Henry VII, a king who was known for another union: the Union of the Houses, which was presented as a historic parallel and precedent for the Union of the Crowns. As Susan Doran explains, some of James's supporters argued 'that dynastic union would bring eternal peace to the two realms in much the same way as Henry VII's marriage to Elizabeth of York had ended the discord between the two warring houses of Lancaster and York.'¹ Henry was also invoked because his decision to marry his daughter, Margaret Tudor, to James IV, King of Scots, made James VI & I's eventual succession to the English throne by hereditary right possible.

The significance of Henry VII and the Union of the Houses to Jacobean discussions of Anglo-Scottish union has been recognised by scholars. According to Sydney Anglo, 'It was natural that this view of Henry Tudor, as pacifier of discord and bringer of union, should receive fresh impetus with the accession of James I who was a lineal descendant of the first Tudor and was, moreover, now enlarging that union of kingdoms.'² D.R. Woolf explains that Jacobean panegyrists and historians described James's 'projected union of the kingdoms as the logical, and inevitable, consequence of the union of the Roses.'³ Woolf also argues that the idea of the Union of the Crowns being 'the end result of a divine plan' and a fulfilment of the Union of the Houses 'would become a prominent theme of Jacobean historiography'.⁴ These examples have only been mentioned in passing by scholars, however, rather than analysed collectively as they are here.

¹ Susan Doran, 'Polemic and Prejudice: A Scottish King for an English Throne', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), p. 223. See also: Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986), p. 49.

² Sydney Anglo, 'Ill of the Dead: The Posthumous Reputation of Henry VII', *Renaissance Studies*, 1.1 (1987), 33.

³ D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), p. 32.

⁴ Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 55.

This chapter analyses how Henry VII and Elizabeth of York were invoked to promote the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union, exploring the Jacobean understanding of the relationship between hereditary right and Anglo-Scottish union. Firstly, it discusses how the Union of the Houses and the Union of the Crowns were paralleled to provide the latter with historic legitimacy. This is followed by an in-depth discussion of a story about Henry VII taken from Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia*, which was initially used in Elizabethan succession treatises to argue for the legality of a Scottish monarch succeeding to the English throne by hereditary right, then was adapted in Jacobean union treatises to argue for the legitimacy of permanent Anglo-Scottish union, and as an example of what permanent union could look like. This chapter ends by discussing how Vergil's story was incorporated into Jacobean histories and what purpose the story served after James abandoned his attempts to secure permanent union. Overall, this chapter demonstrates why Henry VII was invoked so regularly in relation to Anglo-Scottish union and what other factors besides his significance as the source of James's English hereditary claim were behind it.

Unions of Houses and Crowns

Efforts to connect Henry VII and Elizabeth of York's Union of the Houses with James VI & I's Union of the Crowns began almost immediately after James's succession to the English throne, although there has been very little scholarly analysis of why and how they were linked.⁵ This section demonstrates that James

⁵ Even when the connection is acknowledged, it is not usually the subject of much analysis. For example, see: Anglo, 'Ill of the Dead', 33-34; Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack, 'Introduction', in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, ed. by Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1985), p. xix; Christopher Ivic, *The Subject of Britain, 1603-25* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), pp. 33, 113; Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 60. The groundwork for this connection had already been laid in Elizabethan succession treatises. For example, John Harington argued that 'If the union of the howses of York and Lancaster were a thing that bredd so much joy and quiet to this Realme as the best writers do testify, and the best subjectes do acknowledge, how much more just cause of joy shall they have that shall live to see the uniting of two nations of England and Scotland so often desyred?' John Harington, *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown (A.D. 1602)*, ed. by Clements R. Markham (London, 1880), p. 18. Some Jacobean works connected the unions for different reasons; for example, John Gordon argues that God secured the Union of the Houses to bring peace to England, and God then secured the Union of the Crowns so that James could use his greater authority to unite the universal Christian Church under Protestantism, abolishing Catholicism. For Gordon, the unions were successive and connected due to James's descent from the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, but the Union of the Crowns was not an end in itself, being part of God's greater plan. John Gordon, *A Panegyrique of Congratulation for the Concord of the*

and his supporters not only celebrated James's descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York as the source of his hereditary claim to the English throne, but also to promote the legitimacy of the Union of the Crowns based on James's combined hereditary claims, and to present the Union of the Crowns as beneficial to James's subjects. This section also considers whether Jacobean challenges to the Tudor origin myth of the Union of the Houses undermined the Union of the Crowns as well.

Samuel Daniel's succession panegyric was one of the first Jacobean works to link the Union of the Houses and the Union of the Crowns to give the latter historical legitimacy. Daniel was a poet and historian who had previously discussed the Wars of the Roses in his poem *The Civil Wars*, though it does not reach the reign of Henry VII.⁶ Daniel presented a manuscript copy of his panegyric to James on 23 April 1603, while James was staying at Burghley House as he travelled from Edinburgh to London.⁷ Daniel then registered a longer version of the panegyric for publication on 30 May.⁸ Daniel praises the peaceful means by which the Union of the Crowns had come about, as in the past it had been unsuccessfully pursued by 'all the swords of powre, by blood, by fire'. Daniel then refers to the Union of the Houses: 'Our former blessed union hath begot / A greater union that is more intire, / And makes us more our selves, sets us at one / With Nature that ordain'd us to be one.'⁹ This shows how ubiquitous the Union of the Houses was to a contemporary audience, as

Realmes of Great Britaine in Unitie of Religion, and Under One King (London, 1603; STC 12061), pp. 4-7. Robert Fletcher uses the Union of the Houses as a historic precedent for ending conflict between England and Scotland: 'Like Lancaster and Yorke in love, / must England now and Scotland joyne: / Such unity God grant may proove'. Robert Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle Shewing His Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title To All His Kingdomes* (London, 1603; STC 11086), B2v.

⁶ John Pitcher, 'Daniel, Samuel (1562/3-1619)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/7120>.

⁷ *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Majestie, From the Time of His Departure from Edenbrough; Till His Receiving at London: With All or the Most Speciall Occurrences* (London, 1603; STC 17153), E3-E4. Samuel Daniel, 'A Panegyrick congratatorie to the Kinges most sacred maiestie', 1603. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fols 1r-9r.

⁸ *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London. 1554-1650 A.D.*, ed. by Edward Arber, 5 vols (London, 1875-1894), III (1876), p. 96r; Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, pp. 72-74; Richard A. McCabe, 'Panegyric and Its Discontents: The First Stuart Succession', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 22-25.

⁹ Samuel Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1603; STC 6258), A1r. The manuscript presentation copy is identical: 'all the swordes of power, by bloud, by fyre ... Our former blessed union hath begote / A greater union, that is more intire, / And makes us moe o' selves, setts us at one / W^t Nature, that ordayn'd us to be one.' BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fol. 2r.

Daniel does not explain what that ‘former blessed union’ was. Daniel also states that God had chosen ‘to worke / Still greater good out of the blessednesse / Of this conjoynd *Lancaster* and *Yorke*’ by uniting England and Scotland.¹⁰ By linking the two unions, Daniel attempts to give the Union of the Crowns historical legitimacy and precedence, rather than presenting it as new and unfamiliar. In addition, by claiming that the Union of the Houses ‘begot’ the Union of the Crowns, Daniel presents the Union of the Crowns as the result of the hereditary claim James inherited from Henry and Elizabeth, as James had succeeded by his ‘sacred birth-right’ which is the ‘onely right, and none hath else a right’.¹¹

James himself linked the Union of the Houses to the Union of the Crowns to defend the latter’s legitimacy. In his first speech to the English Parliament on 19 March 1604, James declared that his descent from Henry and Elizabeth meant that the Union of the Houses was ‘reunited and confirmed’ in him, guaranteeing England’s internal peace. ‘But the Union of these Two princely Houses’, he continued, ‘is nothing comparable to the Union of two ancient and famous Kingdoms, which is the other inward Peace annexed to my Person.’¹² James was encouraging his audience to accept and celebrate the Union of the Crowns (and a permanent union based on it) by associating it with the already-celebrated Union of the Houses. Both had been achieved by hereditary right, and as such both unions were embodied in him personally.

¹⁰ Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie*, B1r. The manuscript presentation copy is identical: ‘to worke / still greater good out of the blessednesse / of this conjoynd Lancaster & Yorke’. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fol. 8r.

¹¹ Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie*, A1v, A2v, A6v. The manuscript presentation copy is identical: ‘God makes thee king of o’ Estates’. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fol. 2v. ‘sacred birthright’. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fol. 3v. ‘onely right, and none hath els a right’. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fol. 7v.

¹² James VI & I, *The Kings Majesties Speech, as it was Delivered by him in the Upper House of the Parliament, to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, On Munday the 19. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of this Present Parliament, and the First Parliament of his Majesties Raigne* (London, 1604; STC 14390), Br; James VI & I, ‘A Speach, as it was Delivered in the Upper House of the Parliament to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, on Munday the XIX. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of the First Parliament’, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 134-135; *The Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2d 1628. In the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First* (London, 1742), p. 143.

The English Parliament mimicked these aspects of James's speech in their *Act of Recognition of the King's Title*, further defending the Union of the Crowns based on hereditary right. The act explains that God had 'blessed this kingdom and nation by the happy union and conjunction of the two noble houses of York and Lancaster', as England had suffered from 'bloody civil war; but more inestimable and unspeakable blessings are thereby poured upon us, because there is derived and grown from and out of that union of those two princely families, a more famous and greater union, or rather a reuniting, of two mighty, famous and ancient kingdoms (yet anciently but one) of England and Scotland, under one imperial crown, in your most royal person'.¹³ The Union of the Houses was so celebrated that James's Union of the Crowns should also be enthusiastically received, the act asserts, since it had 'grown from and out' of the earlier union and would have even greater results. This act, which was a recognition of James's right to the English throne, also celebrates the Union of the Crowns that resulted from James's succession, affirming that it was the legitimate outcome of James's combined hereditary claims.

James's coinage also affirms the connection between the unions, and between Henry and James themselves as unifiers, to assert that James's combined hereditary claims legitimised the Union of the Crowns. The Double Crown coin was commissioned in 1604 to be used in both England and Scotland, and it includes the legend 'Henricus Rosas Regna Jacobus' [Henry the Roses, James the Kingdoms].¹⁴ This legend implies that James's Union of the Crowns built on and succeeded Henry's Union of the Houses, and that given the success of Henry's union, James's

¹³ Act of Recognition of the King's Title, 1604. *Selected Documents of English Constitutional History*, ed. by G.B. Adams and H. Morse Stephens (London: Macmillan, 1901), pp. 326-327.

¹⁴ James VI & I Double Crown coin (1604-1605), gold. British Museum, inv. no. 1935,0401.6874. In a sermon preached before James in February 1606, Richard Meredeth said of James: 'as a still voice he hath done more than any of his noble progenitors, for although *Henricus rosas*, yet *Regna Iacobus* ... as a still voice hee laboureth to make us al to become one nation'. Richard Meredeth, *Two Sermons Preached before his Majestie, in his Chappell at Whitehall* (London, 1606; STC 17832), p. 9. Sir Roger Owen read this legend out in the House of Commons in 1607. Robert Bowyer, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606-1607*, ed. by David Harris Willson (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), p. 270. John Spottiswoode also notes the adoption of this legend. John Spottiswoode, *The History of the Church of Scotland*, 3 vols (Edinburgh: 1850), III, book 7, p. 156. See: Edward Burns, *The Coinage of Scotland*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1887), II, pp. 430-431; Ian Stewart, 'Coinage and Propaganda: An Interpretation of the Coin-Types of James VI', in *From the Stone Age to the 'Forty-Five: Studies Presented to R.B.K. Stevenson, Former Keeper National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland*, ed. by Anne O'Connor and D.V. Clarke (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1983), p. 460.

subjects should also embrace the Union of the Crowns and expect a similar positive outcome.

As discussed in Chapter 1, James adopted the Tudor rose after his succession to the English throne. James also altered the use of the Tudor rose to legitimise and promote the Union of the Crowns, by combining it with a thistle. The thistle was first adopted as a Scottish royal emblem by James III and the crowned thistle by James V.¹⁵ For example, James VI & I's new coinage, issued by both the English and Scottish mints, included the Thistle Crown. This coin features a crowned rose on one side and a crowned thistle on the other, and is inscribed 'tueatur unita deus' [may God guard these united kingdoms].¹⁶ Bruce Galloway describes James's coinage as broadcasting 'both the fact of unity and the theme of a divine mission working through history to fulfilment under James.'¹⁷ The combination of the thistle and the rose was used to decorate both the exteriors of James's residences and the objects within, promoting the Union of the Crowns as the legitimate outcome of James's combined hereditary claims by joining pre-existing dynastic emblems from each monarchy.¹⁸ This also transformed James's residences from

¹⁵ See: C.J. Burnett, 'The Thistle as a Symbol', in *Emblems of Scotland* (Dunfermline: The Heraldry Society of Scotland, 1997), pp. 45-47.

¹⁶ Examples include: James VI & I Thistle Crown coin (1604-1625), gold. British Museum, inv. no. GHB.537; James VI & I Thistle Crown coin (1604-1625), gold. National Museums Scotland, inv. no. A.1911.506.1189. See: Burns, *The Coinage of Scotland*, II, p. 432. The rose and thistle were also featured on objects such as James's coat-of-arms and seals, and James's funeral procession included a banner 'of the Rose and Thistle'. John Nichols (ed.), *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 4 vols (London, 1828), IV, p. 1044.

¹⁷ Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, p. 60.

¹⁸ For example, a pair of water pots that were made for James are chased with three bands of roses and thistles, with the two plants growing from the same stem; their permanent union reflects James's view that his combined hereditary claims justified both the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union. William Jeffries, silver-gilt water pots (1604-1605), 64cm (height). The Moscow Kremlin Museums, inv. no. Mz-642 and Mz643. See: Philippa Glanville, 'The Court Plate of James I', *Sotheby's: Art at Auction 1990-91*, ed. Sally Prideaux (New York: Sotheby's Publications, 1991), pp. 17-22; Charles Oman, *The English Silver in the Kremlin, 1557-1663* (London: Methuen & Co., 1961), p. 60. The royal palace in Edinburgh Castle was remodelled for James's return visit to Scotland in 1617 (the only time he returned to Scotland after succeeding to the English throne), and the window pediments were decorated with roses, thistles, Irish harps, French fleur-de-lis and Beaufort portcullises. Gordon Ewart and Dennis Gallagher, *Fortress of the Kingdom: Archaeology and Research at Edinburgh Castle* (Edinburgh: Historic Scotland, 2014), pp. 64-66. At Linlithgow Palace these same emblems were used to decorate the window pediments of the courtyard facade of the north range in c. 1618-1620. In some of the pediments, the Tudor rose is placed alongside James's Scottish regnal number and the thistle alongside James's English regnal number, conflating James's status as monarch of two separate kingdoms into one. One pediment contains the initials 'IR6' for James VI of Scotland, with three thistles to the left and a rose to the right, and the pediment surmounted by a thistle. Another pediment contains the initials 'IR1' for James I of England and Ireland, with multiple thistles to

separate English or Scottish spaces to Anglo-Scottish, or British, spaces, reflecting James's new status.

The examples discussed above all praise and celebrate the Union of the Houses, even if they argue that the Union of the Crowns was superior.¹⁹ A different approach was taken by Lord Chancellor Thomas Egerton, Baron Ellesmere, who praised the Union of the Crowns while questioning the success of the Union of the Houses. Egerton addressed MPs on the question of permanent Anglo-Scottish union before proroguing the English Parliament on 9 November 1605. According to a contemporary account, Egerton 'compared this tyme with ... former tymes when the cruelti of civill warres was extinguished by the union of the howses of Lancaster & York'. Yet, Egerton explained, 'that union was clouded with mist & doubt even in the middest of the raigne of H.8 [Henry VIII]'—a rare admittance that Henry and Elizabeth's marriage had not completely resolved the dynastic conflict at the heart of the Wars of the Roses. By contrast, Egerton explained, 'the union of the king's [James's] succession is perpetuall, by uniting in his person two kingdoms ... & this union is the act of god, not patched by absolutions of popes or parliament to dispense with doubtfull or illegitimate mariages.'²⁰ The 'doubtfull or illegitimate' marriages were those of Henry VIII, so Egerton was suggesting that although the hereditary claims of Henry VIII's descendants were questionable, James's hereditary claims were untainted by potential illegitimacy, making the Union of the Crowns unchallengeable and permanent, which justified parliament legislating permanent union. The influence of Francis Bacon on Egerton's speech is evident, as Bacon had written a letter to Egerton earlier that year making the same points.²¹

the left (the pediment has deteriorated so only one thistle remains, but it seems likely that originally there were two or three) and a rose to the right, with the pediment surmounted by three roses. The north range was reconstructed after the original range collapsed in 1607. Aonghus MacKechnie, 'James VI's Architects and their Architecture', in *The Reign of James VI*, ed. by Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000), pp. 167-168.

¹⁹ Another example is James Maxwell's union treatise; Maxwell writes that James's glory was 'to be next after God the author and (as we hope) the finisher thereof [i.e. the union of England and Scotland], even of this whyte-read-crossie Union of two ancient Kingdomes: a greater and a more memorable by many degrees, then that other whyte-read-rosie Union of two regall Houses.' James Maxwell, 'Britaines Union in Love'. BL Royal MS 18 A LI, fol. 3v.

²⁰ Roger Wilbraham, 'The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests for the Years 1593-1616, Together with Notes in Another Hand for the Years 1642-1649', *Camden Third Series*, 4 (1902), p. 72.

²¹ Francis Bacon to Thomas Egerton, Baron Ellesmere, 2 April 1605. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, 7 vols (London, 1861-1874), III (1868), pp. 249-252.

The Union of the Houses and the Union of the Crowns were both dynastic unions that were said to be embodied in James VI & I. James was presented as the embodiment of the Union of the Houses due to his senior descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, maintaining the Tudor origin myth and emphasising dynastic continuity between James and his predecessors on the English throne. The Union of the Crowns was presented as a continuation and extension of the Union of the Houses due to James's descent from Henry and Elizabeth, and the legitimate outcome of James's combined hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones. Even Thomas Egerton's speech criticising the success of the Union of the Houses still praised the Union of the Crowns as unquestionably legitimate due to James's combined hereditary claims.

By arguing that the Union of the Houses had made the Union of the Crowns possible, the newer union was not presented as a radical and possibly dangerous change to the status quo, but as a historically legitimate development that should be celebrated like, and alongside, the Union of the Houses. As such, the Union of the Crowns was incorporated into the narrative of England's national history and effectively anglicised by stressing the benefits it would bring to England. Just as the combination of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York's hereditary claims had resulted in the Union of the Houses, which brought additional benefits each hereditary claim did not have individually by securing England's internal peace, so James's combined hereditary claims to the thrones of England and Scotland had resulted in the Union of the Crowns, which also brought additional benefits each hereditary claim did not have individually by securing Anglo-Scottish peace.

Reviving Polydore Vergil: Before 1603

The rest of this chapter focuses on how one specific story about Henry VII, taken from Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia*, was used to promote both the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union as the legitimate outcome of James VI & I's combined hereditary claims. The story was used during the Elizabethan succession debates to support the Stuart claim to the English throne. After James's succession to the English throne, it was adapted by some writers to present Henry as an advocate for the Union of the Crowns. The story was also used

in union treatises to promote permanent union and to debate what form it should take. Finally, the story was incorporated into Jacobean histories to make James's succession part of the narrative of England's national history. This chain of events—with the story being passed from one genre to another, each with a different agenda—has received almost no scholarly attention, as scholars have mostly focused on how Vergil's *Anglica Historia* influenced sixteenth-century historians, rather than their Jacobean successors or writers of other genres. Therefore, this chapter provides a unique contribution to the study of the changing posthumous reputation of Henry VII, by exploring a significant shift that occurred in response to James's succession to the English throne. This section provides contextual information about the original story and its usage before 1603, while the rest of the chapter explores how it was adapted after James's succession.

Polydore Vergil (c. 1470-1555) was an Italian clergyman and scholar who came to England in 1502 to serve as deputy collector of Peter's Pence.²² Vergil had completed a draft manuscript of *Anglica Historia* by 1513; however, he rewrote it in the early 1520s and this version was published in 1534.²³ *Anglica Historia* was reprinted, with various changes, in 1546 and 1555.²⁴ The 1513 manuscript version narrates the history of England up to the Battle of Flodden Field in September 1513; the 1534 and 1546 published versions end with the death of Henry VII; and the 1555 published version includes an account of Henry VIII's reign to 1537.²⁵ Vergil's *Anglica Historia* was hugely controversial in England, as Vergil criticised the accuracy of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (c. 1136), including the existence of Brutus, Britain's legendary founder, and King Arthur.²⁶

²² Denys Hay, *Polydore Vergil: Renaissance Historian and Man of Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 3.

²³ Hay, *Polydore Vergil*, pp. 9, 17, 79-82.

²⁴ Hay, *Polydore Vergil*, p. 79.

²⁵ Hay, *Polydore Vergil*, pp. 17, 79, 82-84.

²⁶ Hay, *Polydore Vergil*, pp. 109-110, 157-158; Denys Hay (ed. and trans.), *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A.D. 1485-1537* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1950), pp. xxix; F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1967), pp. 58, 65-66; Laura Ashe, 'Holinshed and Mythical History', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 158.

Despite this, *Anglica Historia* had a huge influence over sixteenth-century English historians.²⁷

A story about Henry VII from Vergil's *Anglica Historia* was later incorporated into Elizabethan succession treatises, Jacobean union treatises, and Jacobean histories.²⁸ Vergil wrote about a Scottish delegation who came to England in 1498 to propose a marriage between Henry's daughter, Margaret Tudor, and James IV, King of Scots:

Henry gave them an audience, and then referred the matter to his Privy Council. Some suspected it might someday come to pass that Margaret would inherit the throne, and so thought she should not be bestowed on a foreigner. To this the king responded, "What then? Should anything of the kind happen (and God avert the omen), I foresee that our realm would suffer no harm, since England would not be absorbed by Scotland, but rather Scotland by England, being the noblest head of the entire island, since there is always less glory and honour in being joined to that which is far the greater, just as Normandy once came under the rule and power of our ancestors the English." And so the king's wisdom was praised and they unanimously approved the measure.²⁹

The first widespread use of the story by other writers was in Elizabethan succession treatises, which would influence how the story was used in Jacobean texts.³⁰ Vergil's story was initially used by Mary, Queen of Scots' supporters to refute the argument that those born outside of England—such as the Scottish-born

²⁷ Hay, *Polydore Vergil*, p. 157; Hay, *Anglica Historia*, p. xxxiii; Scott Lucas, 'Holinshed and Hall', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Heal, Archer, and Kewes, p. 205.

²⁸ This story was not included in the 1513 manuscript version of the *Anglica Historia*, nor in the first printed edition; it was only included in the second and third printed editions, which had been expanded and revised. Hay, *Polydore Vergil*, pp. 82-83; Hay, *Anglica Historia*, pp. xv-xvi, 114n.

²⁹ The original version, in Latin, can be found in Hay, *Anglica Historia*, p. 114n. This English translation is by Dana F. Sutton for the Philological Museum website, University of Birmingham. Polydore Vergil, *Anglica Historia* (1555 version), ed. and trans. by Dana F. Sutton, Book XXVI, section 41 <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/polverg/26eng.html> [accessed 17 July 2019]. I have made very slight changes to Sutton's translation to more closely follow the original Latin.

³⁰ The first recorded use of the story to defend the Stuart claim to the English throne appears to be in a letter from William Maitland (Mary, Queen of Scots' secretary) to Sir William Cecil (Elizabeth I's secretary), written in 1561. Maitland argued that Henry's 'meaning' in marrying his daughter to James IV, 'the world knoweth by that is conteynid in your Chronicles, written by Polidorus Virgilius'. William Maitland to Sir William Cecil, 5 January 1561. J. Payne Collier (ed.), *The Egerton Papers. A Collection of Public and Private Documents, Chiefly Illustrative of the Times of Elizabeth and James I, from the Original Manuscripts, the Property of the Right Hon. Lord Francis Egerton, M.P.* (London, 1840), p. 45. This letter is discussed in Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558-1568* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966), pp. 36-37.

descendants of Margaret Tudor—could not inherit the English throne.³¹ It was then repeated in succession treatises defending James VI's claim.³² These treatises made Henry a defender of the Stuart hereditary claim to the English throne, not just his own daughter's right to succeed. The story was also valued because it assured English readers that the succession of a Scottish monarch to the English throne would not be to England's detriment; given that England was the larger of the two kingdoms, Henry presumed that it would absorb or dominate Scotland.³³ These succession treatises did contemplate the nature of future Anglo-Scottish relations

³¹ The first succession treatise known to have used the story is Edmund Plowden's 1567 manuscript defence of Mary's claim. Edmund Plowden, 'A Treatise of Succession', presentation copy made for James VI & I by the writer's son, Francis Plowden. Bodleian Library, MS. Don. C.43, fols 67v-68v; Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), pp. 34-35. Marie Axton argues that Sir Anthony Browne simplified and adapted Plowden's legal arguments, which were then put into print for the first time by John Lesley, Bishop of Ross, in his 1569 succession treatise. Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, p. 19. Lesley also used the story, so he might have come across it in the work of Plowden (via Browne), though Lesley does give Vergil's *Anglica Historia* as his source and evidently studied the *Anglica Historia* for himself, referring to it elsewhere. John Lesley, *A Defence of the Honour of ... Marie Queene of Scotlande ... with a Declaration Aswell of Her Right, Title & Interesse to the Succession of the Crowne of Englande* ([Paris], 1569; STC 15504), Book 2, pp. 80v-81r. Lesley also includes the story in later editions of his succession treatise: John Lesley, *A Treatise Concerning the Defence of the Honour of ... Marie Queene of Scotland ... with a Declaration, As Well of Her Right, Title, and Interest, to the Succession of the Crowne of England* (Liège, 1571; STC 15506), Book 2, pp. 30r-30v; and John Lesley, *A Treatise Towching the Right, Title, and Interest of the Most Excellent Princesse Marie, Queene of Scotland, And of the Most Noble King James, Her Graces Sonne, to the Succession of the Crowne of England* (Rouen, 1584; STC 15507), pp. 36r-36v. Lesley also includes the story in his histories when discussing the marriage of James IV and Margaret Tudor: his manuscript Scots history, John Lesley, *The History of Scotland, from the death of King James I. in the Year M.CCC.XXXVI, to the Year M.D.LXI.*, ed. by T. Thomas (Edinburgh, 1830), p. 69; and his published Latin history, John Lesley, *De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum Libri Decem* (Rome, 1578), p. 338.

³² These include: *The Copie of a Leter, Wryten by a Master of Arte of Cambrige, to his Friend in London* [commonly known as *Leicester's Commonwealth*] ([Paris], 1584; STC 5742.9), p. 147; Peter Wentworth, *A Pithie Exhortation to Her Majestie for Establishing Her Successor to the Crowne* (Edinburgh, 1598; STC 25245), part 2, pp. 76-78; Irenicus Philodikaios, *A Treatise Declaring, and Confirming against all Objections the Just Title and Right of the Moste Excellent and Worthie Prince, James the Sixt* (Edinburgh, 1599; STC 19881.5), B2v; John Colville, *The Palinod of John Colvill wherein he doth Penitently Recant his Former Proud Offences, Specially that Treasonable Discourse Lately Made by him Against the Undoubted and Indeniable Title of his Dread Sovereigne Lord, King James the Sixt, Unto the Crowne of England, after Decease of her Maiesty Present* (Edinburgh, 1600; STC 5587), B3r-B3v; F.J. Fisher (ed.), 'The State of England Anno. Dom. 1600 by Thomas Wilson', *Camden Miscellany*, third series, 52 (London: Camden Society, 1936), 7-8; Harington, *A Tract on the Succession*, ed. by Markham, p. 60; Thomas Craig, *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England, in Two Books*, ed. and trans. by James Gadderar (London, 1703; ESTC T144321), pp. 290-291.

³³ Peter Wentworth in particular stresses England's superiority over Scotland, claiming that Henry VII said 'the Scottish king beeing (as all Princes are by their royall nature) enclined to Maiestie, to statelines, to eloquence, to policie & to civilitie, should frame and conform himselfe to the better countrie, & be taken with a liking of the more honorable discipline, fashions, and carriage of England, the rather for that hee hath so ample and large a reward proposed to him for the same.' He also claimed that Henry said 'the worthier kingdome would annexe and drawe to it the lesser and weaker', with annexation suggesting Scotland would be permanently absorbed into England. Wentworth, *A Pithie Exhortation*, pp. 76-78.

under a shared monarch, but their main goal was achieved once James had successfully secured the English throne. Vergil's story, however, would be adapted even further.

Reviving Polydore Vergil: Henry VII as Advocate for Anglo-Scottish Union

As S.B. Chrimes explains, the Union of the Crowns only occurred because Henry VII's male line died out, 'a catastrophe which he could have neither predicted nor contemplated without horror.'³⁴ Jacobean writers, however, did not share this view, as they made Henry a prophet and defender of James VI & I's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns based on hereditary right.³⁵ Howard Nenner claims that the Jacobean writers credited Henry 'with remarkable foresight in predicting the dynastic difficulties to which the Tudors would be subject and for providing a solution'—marrying his daughter to James IV, King of Scots, to provide additional heirs to the English throne.³⁶ The idea that Henry had predicted, and possibly even wanted, the Union of the Crowns originated during the Elizabethan succession debates.³⁷ This section analyses Jacobean works that present Henry as an advocate for the Union of the Crowns; however, it also considers why it was more common to present Henry as predicting or anticipating the Union of the Crowns rather than actively seeking it. It demonstrates that Vergil's story was used to reassure English readers that Anglo-Scottish union was the legitimate outcome of James's combined hereditary claims and would not harm England.

Sir John Hayward appears to have been the first Jacobean writer to claim that Henry VII actively wanted the Union of the Crowns, rather than simply accepting that it might be a possible outcome of Margaret Tudor's marriage to James IV. Hayward was a historian and civil lawyer known for writing a detailed account of Richard

³⁴ S.B. Chrimes, *Henry VII* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), p. 91.

³⁵ For example, see: Anthony Munday, *The Triumphes of Re-United Britania* (London, 1605; STC 18279), B1v-B3v.

³⁶ Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), p. 57.

³⁷ For example, Peter Wentworth claimed that the Union of the Crowns was 'wiselie foreseene' by Henry, and even suggested that Henry's statement about a possible Stuart succession to the English throne could be called a 'prophecie'. Peter Wentworth, *A Pithie Exhortation to Her Majestie for Establishing Her Successor to the Crowne* (Edinburgh, 1598; STC 25245), part 2, pp. 76-78.

II's downfall and deposition in *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie the IIII* (1599), which resulted in his imprisonment until after Elizabeth I's death.³⁸ Hayward then published two works intended to win James's favour: a succession treatise and a union treatise.³⁹ In his union treatise, Hayward argues that Henry 'aimed at this Union, when he married his eldest daughter *Margaret* into *Scotland*.'⁴⁰ Hayward thereby presents James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns as not merely a biological accident resulting from the failure of Henry VIII's line, but as Henry VII's intended goal. Hayward, however, does not elaborate on Henry VII's reasons, likely because it would require him to claim that Henry wanted his male line to fail, something contemporary readers would consider unlikely. Regardless, by claiming that Henry VII had aimed to secure the Union of the Crowns by marrying Margaret to James IV, Hayward presents the Union of the Crowns as the legitimate and desirable result of James VI & I's combined hereditary claims.

James himself also presented Henry as responsible for, or actively seeking, the Union of the Crowns. In his first speech to the English Parliament, James described Henry as 'the first ground-layer' of the union, as it was the marriage he arranged for his daughter that made James's eventual succession to the English throne possible.⁴¹ When giving a speech in Star Chamber in 1616, James claimed that he had never pressed for the alteration of the English common law during his permanent union campaign, but 'my desire was to conforme the Lawes of *Scotland* to the Law of *England*, and not the Law of *England* to the Law of *Scotland*; and so the prophesie to be trew of my wise Grandfather *Henry* the 7. who foretold that the lesse kingdome by marriage, would follow the greater, and not the greater the lesser: And therefore married his eldest daughter *Margaret* to *James* the fourth, my great

³⁸ John J. Manning, 'Hayward, Sir John (1564?-1627)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12794>. See also: Rebecca Lemon, *Treason by Words: Literature, Law, and Rebellion in Shakespeare's England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), pp. 23-51.

³⁹ John Hayward, *An Answer to the First Part of A Certain Conference, Concerning Succession, Published Not Long Since Under the Name of R. Dolman* (London, 1603; STC 12988); John Hayward, *A Treatise of Union of the Two Realmes of England and Scotland* (London, 1604; STC 13011).

⁴⁰ Hayward, *A Treatise of Union*, pp. 55-56.

⁴¹ James VI & I, *The Kings Majesties Speech ... On Munday the 19. day of March 1603*, A4v; James VI & I, 'A Speach ... on Munday the XIX. day of March 1603', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 134; *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 143.

Grandfather.’⁴² James presented Henry as a prophet who had married Margaret to James IV to secure both the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union—both thus being presented as legitimate and justified outcomes of James’s combined hereditary claims, but with special emphasis placed on how it would benefit England.

Some Jacobean union treatise writers also claim that Henry advocated the Union of the Crowns, as a defence of its legitimacy. According to John Russell, Henry, ‘forsieing uiell [well] that quhilk now is comit to pas’—the succession ‘be heritable richt and discent of blood’ of one of Margaret’s descendants to the thrones of both England and Scotland—believed that this union ‘sould be to the great uiell of Ingland’.⁴³ John Thornborough claims that Henry sought ‘to marie his eldest daughter Lady Margaret to king James the fourth of Scotland, hoping if his heire male failed, by that means to unite Scotland to England.’⁴⁴ Russell and Thornborough do not present Henry as actively wanting his male line to fail; rather, if his female line were to inherit, he wanted it to achieve the Union of the Crowns. Russell and Thornborough therefore defend the Union of the Crowns as the legitimate outcome of James VI & I’s combined hereditary claims.

The Jacobean work that most blatantly presents Henry VII as an active supporter of the Union of the Crowns is Thomas Gainsford’s *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittain* (1610).⁴⁵ Gainsford’s

⁴² James VI & I, *His Majesties Speech in the Starre-Chamber, the XX. of June. Anno 1616* (London, 1616; STC 14397), B4v; James VI & I, ‘A Speach in the Starre-Chamber, the XX. of June. Anno 1616’, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 208.

⁴³ John Russell, ‘A Treatise of the Happie and Blisshed Unioun’, in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 102.

⁴⁴ John Thornborough, *A Discourse Plainely Proving the Evident Utilitie and Urgent Necessitie of the Desired Happie Union of the Two Famous Kingdomes of England and Scotland by Way of Answer to Certaine Objections Against the Same* (London, 1604; STC 24035), p. 22.

Thornborough makes the same claim in another of his works: John Thornborough, *The Joiefull and Blessed Reuniting the Two Mighty & Famous Kingdomes, England & Scotland into their Ancient Name of Great Brittain* (Oxford, 1605; STC 24036), p. 10.

⁴⁵ Only the writer’s initials are given in the text, T.G., although the tract is generally attributed to Thomas Gainsford. Mark Eccles finds the attribution to Thomas Gainsford convincing. Mark Eccles, ‘Thomas Gainsford, “Captain Pamphlet”’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 45.4 (Autumn 1982), 262–263, 269n.16. S.A. Baron does not find the attribution to Thomas Gainsford convincing. S.A. Baron, ‘Gainsford, Thomas (bap. 1566, d. 1624)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10284>. Unfortunately, the writer was not listed when it was registered with the Stationers’ Company on 30 May 1610. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, ed. by Arber, III, p. 195v.

motivation was to promote British unity against the threat of Catholicism, rather than any specific form of permanent political or even religious union between James's kingdoms. Gainsford claims that there had never been 'a more happy projector of the Union, and Unitie of these kingdomes then *Henry* the seaventh, by giving his eldest daughter the Lady *Margaret* in marriage to *James* the 4. King of *Scotland*.' He cites Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia*, but this was not something Vergil had claimed; it is Gainsford's own invention.⁴⁶

Gainsford's main text, a poem, begins by explaining that he was planning to write verses on the subject of '*Britaines* concord' when he fell asleep. Dreaming, 'Me thought I saw the person of a King, / Whom winged Cherubins to th'earth did bring.' It was Henry, and beside him 'stood his lovely Queene', with a marginal note telling us this was '*Elizabeth* the daughter of *Edward* the 4.'⁴⁷ In their left hands, Henry and Elizabeth held 'the Roses white and red,' explained in a marginal note to be the 'arms of Yorke, and Lancaster.' Henry said that the Lancastrians and the Yorkists shed each other's blood 'Till these [roses] by marriage were made one of twaine: / And afterward such peace there did insue, / That never since *Mars* could those broyles renew.'⁴⁸ Henry also said that the two houses fought 'Till either house preserv'd but one poore sprout', Henry and Elizabeth, whose marriage 'did ingraft my *Yorke* and Me in one', a 'sacred knot' which would secure England's 'Long peace, good governement, riches, and renowne'.⁴⁹ Gainsford presents the Tudor origin myth in the conventional manner; Henry and Elizabeth's marriage had ended the Wars of the Roses and united the hereditary claims of Lancaster and York in their descendants.

Gainsford states that in their right hands, Henry and Elizabeth were holding 'a scutchin faire, / Wherein the picture of a King was drawne'—James, a marginal note explains. Henry addressed the image of James, describing him as 'My sonne,' and expressing his and Elizabeth's 'joy in heav'n that thou on earth doost raigne'.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Thomas Gainsford, *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittain* (London, 1610; STC 11526), A2r-A2v.

⁴⁷ Gainsford, *Vision and Discourse*, p. 1.

⁴⁸ Gainsford, *Vision and Discourse*, p. 2.

⁴⁹ Gainsford, *Vision and Discourse*, pp. 64-65.

⁵⁰ Gainsford, *Vision and Discourse*, p. 2.

Henry admitted that it ‘never grieves me that mine *Henries* line’—meaning his son, Henry VIII, and his descendants—‘Is quite expir’d, since I in thee doe live’.⁵¹ Gainsford, unlike Hayward, acknowledges that for Henry VII to actively support the Union of the Crowns meant that he wanted his own male line to fail. Since Gainsford uses the literary genre of a dream vision, Henry is only presented as accepting the failure of his male line when he looks down from heaven and sees that James, another of his descendants, has succeeded to the English throne; Gainsford does not claim that Henry wanted his male line to fail when he arranged Margaret’s marriage to James IV. In doing so, Gainsford encourages the reader not to regret the failure of Henry VII’s male line either as Henry lives on in James, thoroughly anglicising James and presenting the Union of the Crowns as desirable.

Jacobean works that presented Henry VII as actively desiring and pursuing the Union of the Crowns were not in the majority, and even those that did make this claim did not discuss it at length. Sir John Hayward asserted that Henry ‘aimed at this Union’ but did not acknowledge that this would mean Henry wanted his male line to fail to make a Stuart succession to the English throne possible. John Thornborough presented Henry as wanting the Union of the Crowns to take place if his male line failed, but not actively seeking this failure. Thomas Gainsford was the only writer who acknowledged that for Henry to advocate the Union of the Crowns meant accepting the failure of his own male line. Even Gainsford, however, only presented Henry as accepting this when it had already occurred, looking down from heaven. A Jacobean audience was unlikely to believe that any monarch would want their male line to fail, and Jacobean writers probably felt they should be cautious about appearing too eager to celebrate the failure of the Tudor line.

It was much more common for Jacobean writers to claim that Henry VII had considered the possibility of a Stuart succession to the English throne and accepted it in theory as the unavoidable outcome of their hereditary claim if his male line failed, rather than that he actively desired and pursued it to unite England and Scotland under one monarch. Those works that claimed Henry actively wanted the Union of the Crowns, however, did so to encourage an English audience to accept

⁵¹ Gainsford, *Vision and Discourse*, p. 3.

it as the legitimate outcome of James VI & I's combined hereditary claims, and not to worry that it would be damaging to England, since one of England's former monarchs, renowned for his wisdom, had supported it. As a result, this anglicised the Union of the Crowns by presenting it as Henry VII's intended outcome when he married his daughter to James IV.

Reviving Polydore Vergil: Union Treatises

James VI & I's first English Parliament began in March 1604 and the Scottish Parliament met in July 1604, both for the purpose of choosing Commissioners to negotiate a permanent Anglo-Scottish union. This went smoothly in the Scottish Parliament, despite their reservations; however, the English House of Commons was much less compliant.⁵² As a result of this ongoing parliamentary debate, a new literary format was created: the union treatise. Union treatises were written by both English and Scottish writers and explicitly commented on the topics being debated in the English Parliament, aiming to influence the form of permanent union that was adopted. The debates continued in the English Parliament until the prorogation of July 1607, when the parliamentary union project was abandoned.⁵³ Once the parliamentary debates were over, union treatises were no longer necessary.

An important feature of both the parliamentary union debates and the union treatises was the search for historical precedents. According to Brian P. Levack, this was because the situation was novel and it was unclear what form permanent union would take.⁵⁴ Previous international unions were studied to find appropriate models.⁵⁵ The past was also a source of example and legitimacy, providing precedents for changes so that they did not appear as radical. This explains why Henry VII was often invoked in the parliamentary union debates, with James

⁵² Thomas Murray (ed.), *The Laws and Acts of Parliament Made by King James the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Queen Mary, King James the Sixth, King Charles the First, King Charles the Second Who Now Presently Reigns, Kings and Queen of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1681; Wing S1265), pp. 378-379; Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 20-23.

⁵³ Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 127-8, 137; *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 391.

⁵⁴ Brian P. Levack, 'Toward a More Perfect Union: England, Scotland, and the Constitution', in *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J.H. Hexter*, ed. by Barbara C. Malament (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), p. 62.

⁵⁵ The main unions discussed were: France and the duchies of Normandy and Brittany; the kingdoms that made up Spain; Spain and Portugal; the Netherlands and the Habsburg territories; Poland and Lithuania. Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, p. 44.

himself starting this trend by discussing Henry in his opening speech.⁵⁶ The most common way of invoking Henry was to repeat Polydore Vergil's story, though scholars have largely overlooked or misinterpreted its use.⁵⁷ Richard A. McCabe claims that in England, 'pro-union commentators, such as Francis Bacon, frequently cited Henry VII's remark that in the event of a Scottish succession the greater kingdom would dominate the lesser'.⁵⁸ This, however, is only partially correct—although Bacon stated that 'the greater drawe the lesse', he did not attribute this claim to Henry or invoke Henry in support of his argument.⁵⁹ In addition, as Galloway and Levack point out, and as this section analyses in greater detail, it was primarily Scottish writers who used Vergil's story in defence of permanent Anglo-Scottish union, not English writers.⁶⁰

This section explores how Jacobean union treatises cited Vergil's story to promote the legitimacy of a Scottish monarch succeeding to the English throne by hereditary right, following the example of the Elizabethan succession treatises. In addition, it also analyses how union treatises used the story to debate the various forms a permanent Anglo-Scottish union might take. It demonstrates that, although James's combined hereditary claims might be acknowledged as an appropriate basis for permanent union, this did not clarify what form permanent union should take and so writers prioritised their own national concerns. This reveals the limitations of the usefulness of invoking hereditary right in the Anglo-Scottish union debates.

⁵⁶ *The Journals of the House of Commons*, pp. 142-143; *Journals of the House of Lords Beginning Anno Vicesimo Elizabethæ Reginae*, volume 2 (n.d.), p. 265.

⁵⁷ For example, John Bond, MP for Taunton, criticised the House of Commons for opposing that which 'the Prudence of our wisest king H : 7 fore-ordered' a century earlier. Bowyer, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer*, p. 195n.1.

⁵⁸ McCabe, 'Panegyric and Its Discontents', in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, p. 34.

⁵⁹ Francis Bacon, *A Briefe Discourse, Touching the Happie Union of the Kingdomes of England, and Scotland* (London, 1603; STC 1117), C4r. McCabe may have been misled by Galloway and Levack's summary of Bacon's union treatise, in which they write 'Bacon also defends England's primacy in the union, suggesting (with Henry VII) that 'the greater draw the less'. However, Galloway and Levack do not claim that Bacon actually cited Henry VII directly. Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack, 'Appendix', in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 246.

⁶⁰ 'This incident, recounted by Polydore Vergil, is favoured particularly by Scots writers about the union.' Galloway and Levack (eds.), *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, p. 27n.48.

Robert Pont, a minister of the Scottish kirk and judge, uses Vergil's story to promote a permanent union that prioritises England over Scotland.⁶¹ According to Galloway and Levack, Pont's union treatise 'points to the *de facto* advantage to England by the union, Scotland being essentially (as Henry VII had prophesied) an accessory dominion. Nevertheless, Pont clearly desires an equal union, like other Scots writers'.⁶² Alain Wijffels claims that Pont would only consider a legal union in the long-term, with distinct legal systems being preserved in the meantime, though Pont's use of Vergil's story does not give this impression.⁶³ Since Pont's treatise takes the form of a dialogue between three classical scholars, however, Pont did not necessarily share their views. One of the scholars, Hospes, claims it would 'ill becommeth' England to be governed by 'an inferior power'. In response, Alexander Polyhistor argues that England would rule Scotland because 'the stronger ever draweth to itself the weaker', and Scotland would become subject to England's laws, as shown by 'the renowned and wise prince, Henry the 7th', who 'did foresee' such a union resulting from his daughter's marriage to James IV. According to Polyhistor, citing Polydore Vergil, Henry told those who feared a potential union that it 'can be no praejudice to England, seeing that it (being the more honorable part of the iland) would draw Scotland unto it, as Normandy or ... other provinces were beyore joyned to the English empire.' Polyhistor claims that Scotland would be more successfully attached to England than those French territories because there was no sea to divide Scotland 'from the continent of England, so that it is almost against nature to have them dissevered.' Polyhistor concludes that if permanent union did cause any damage, it was more likely to fall upon Scotland than England,

⁶¹ For Pont, see: Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 31, 33, 40, 42, 52; Galloway and Levack, 'Introduction', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, pp. xliv-xlix; James Kirk, 'Pont, Robert (1524-1606)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22507>. Pont's union treatise was published in Latin as *De Unione Britanniae, Seu De Regnorum Angliæ et Scotiæ Omniumque Adjacentium Insularum Britanicarum in Unam Monarchiam Consolidatione* (Edinburgh, 1604; STC 20103); however, I have used the contemporary English translation published in Galloway and Levack (eds.), *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, pp. 1-38.

⁶² Galloway and Levack, 'Introduction', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. xlix. Pont's union treatise was originally published in Latin; the quotations here are taken from a contemporary English manuscript translation. Galloway and Levack, 'Introduction', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, pp. xlvi-xlvii.

⁶³ Alain Wijffels, 'A British *ius commune*? A Debate on the Union of the Laws of Scotland and England during the First Years of James VI/I's English Reign', *Edinburgh Law Review*, 6.3 (2002), 326.

since Scotland would lose ‘the presence of their kinge’.⁶⁴ Pont presents James’s combined hereditary claims as a suitable basis for permanent union but invokes Henry VII to support one that favoured England over Scotland.

John Russell uses Vergil’s story to argue both that James’s combined hereditary claims legitimised permanent union and that permanent union would benefit England. Russell, who was probably the Edinburgh lawyer of the same name, wrote a union treatise that survives in two manuscript versions; Galloway and Levack date the first version to between May and October 1604, then Russell presented an altered version to James.⁶⁵ In the first version, Russell states that he could not believe anyone in England would oppose permanent union, given that the English had wanted it for so long and now it had come about ‘be the providence of God, be richt of his hienes’ maist noble blood’. Russell describes Henry VII as having ‘na litle forsicht’ (in the first version), or states that the ‘first project of this unioun in the last aige began’ with Henry (in the second version), because when it came to deciding who Margaret should marry, ‘he preferrit the allyance uith Scotland to all utheris’, and declared ‘(as is now come to pas)’ that if ‘the ischew of that mariage any persoun sould succed to the croune of Ingland, as it is now establischt in his Hienes’ persoun, it sould redound to the profit of Ingland forever, and uald in end produce the unioun of baith the nationes’.⁶⁶

In Vergil’s original story, Henry’s aim was to reassure his councillors that Anglo-Scottish union would not damage *England*; Russell’s concern, however, was the impact on *Scotland*. According to Russell, Henry, ‘forsieing uiell that quhilk now is comit to pas’—the succession ‘be heritable richt and discent of blood’ of a descendant of Margaret to both the English and Scottish thrones—believed that this union ‘sould be to the great uiell of Ingland’. If any ‘incommoditie’ did result from it, Henry declared, ‘it uald rather fall on Scotland than Ingland’. This was because Scotland would lose the monarch’s presence, as he would go to live ‘in the maist

⁶⁴ Robert Pont, ‘Of the Union of Britayne’, in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, pp. 27-28.

⁶⁵ Galloway and Levack, ‘Introduction’, in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, pp. liv-lvi.

⁶⁶ Russell, ‘A Treatise of the Happie and Blissed Unioun’, in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, pp. 118, 118n.67.

fertill soill, quhilk to our regrait we now fiell'; Henry had been proven correct when James left Scotland for England.⁶⁷ Vergil's original account, however, does not address the issue of where a joint monarch would reside; Russell rewrote Vergil's story in response to the contemporary situation. Russell's proposals for permanent Anglo-Scottish union include the requirement that James 'mak his residence als ueill in Scotland as Ingland'.⁶⁸ While Pont uses Vergil's story as a positive example of what permanent union should look like, Russell interprets it as a prophecy of Scotland's inevitable decline under a permanent union if James did not prevent it.⁶⁹

Thomas Craig, another Edinburgh lawyer, uses Vergil's story to defend the legitimacy of James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Anglo-Scottish union based on hereditary right, since Henry VII accepted it as a possibility. James chose Craig as one of the Scottish Commissioners who met with their English counterparts to negotiate the specifics of a permanent union.⁷⁰ Scholars typically date Craig's manuscript union treatise to 1605, after he finished

⁶⁷ Russell, 'A Treatise of the Happie and Blissed Unioun', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 102.

⁶⁸ Russell, 'A Treatise of the Happie and Blissed Unioun', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 136.

⁶⁹ Before leaving for England in 1603, James promised his Scottish subjects that he would 'vissie you everie three yeere at the least, or ofter', so that he could dispense justice in person. David Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. by Thomas Thomson, 8 vols (Edinburgh, 1842-1849), VI (1845), p. 216. See also Robert Birrel, 'The Diarey of Robert Birrel, Burges of Edinburgh', in *Fragments of Scottish History* (Edinburgh, 1798), p. 58. James, however, later claimed that he governed Scotland 'with my Pen, I write and it is done', making his presence there unnecessary—he only returned to Scotland once more after his succession to the English throne, in 1617. James VI & I, *His Majesties Speech to both the Houses of Parliament, in his Highnesse Great Chamber at Whitehall, the day of the Adjournement of the Last Session, which was the Last Day of March 1607* (London, 1607; STC 14395), F2v; James VI & I, 'A Speach to Both the Houses of Parliament, Delivered in the Great Chamber at White-Hall, the Last Day of March 1607', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 173.

⁷⁰ James VI & I to the Scottish Parliament, 12 June 1604, Greenwich. *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, ed. by John Hill Burton and David Masson, 14 vols (Edinburgh, 1877-1898), VII (1885), p. 457. The Union Commission first met in London on 20 October 1604, and on 6 December 1604 they signed their Instrument of Union. James gave it his approval and the Commission was dispersed. Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 62-63, 73-74. The Instrument was then to be presented to both the English and Scottish Parliaments in early 1605, but both were delayed. Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, p. 79. In Wijffels's view, Craig's union treatise has 'a polemical purpose, as several passages seem to have been written in order to justify the works of the commission'. Wijffels, 'A British *ius commune*?', 332n.67. Levack describes Craig's recommendations as being 'in effect restatements of the plan for union embodied' in the Instrument of Union. Brian P. Levack, 'Law, Sovereignty and the Union', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 220.

his work on the Union Commission.⁷¹ There are, however, internal references to events that took place in the 1606-1607 session of the English Parliament, so at least parts of it (if not the entire work) must date from 1607 or later.⁷² In Craig's opinion, previous English kings who tried to unite England and Scotland by marriage so that 'an heir should be born to succeed naturally to both realms' were wiser than those who tried to subdue Scotland by force; the Union of the Crowns proved this.⁷³ Craig explains Henry VII's decision to make a marriage alliance with James IV as being 'either because as a neighbour his friendship was of greater moment, or because the eventual union of the two kingdoms was already in view.' According to Craig, Henry's councillors were especially concerned about Margaret's marriage because they did not think Henry's male line would survive, as 'Arthur was an invalid, while it was doubtful if Henry, afterwards Henry VIII, would have issue, and that in that event the crown of England would pass to Scotland in default'. Henry responded: 'What harm will England undergo in that event? She will not become a part of Scotland, but Scotland of England, the more considerable kingdom, as did Normandy in times gone by.' From this Craig concludes: 'May we not assert that the wise king hoped for and even foresaw the birth of a child from that marriage who would one day unite the two realms?'⁷⁴

Craig's addition to Vergil's story was Henry's councillors telling him they did not think his two sons would have children of their own. Craig inserts this statement with the hindsight knowledge that Henry VII's male line would die out, enabling the Stuart succession to the English throne. As he had done in his succession treatise, Craig uses Vergil's story to present Henry as a defender of the Stuart

⁷¹ For example: Brian P. Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 77; Roger A. Mason, 'Certain Matters Concerning the Realm of Scotland: George Buchanan and Scottish Self-Fashioning at the Union of the Crowns', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 92.1 (April 2013), 53 n.55; Roger A. Mason, '1603: Multiple Monarchy and Scottish Identity', *History*, 105.366 (2020), p. 17; Keith M. Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715* (London: Macmillan, 1992), p. 78, dates it to c. 1604. C. Sanford Terry, who translated the union treatise into English and published it, dates it to 1605. Thomas Craig, *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae Tractatus by Sir Thomas Craig*, ed. and trans. by C. Sanford Terry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1909), p. v.

⁷² In the treatise, Craig discusses Sir Christopher Piggott's outburst against Scotland and the Scots, which took place on 13 February 1607; and he discusses Edward Robinson attacking the Scots in a sermon given at Paul's Cross on 7 June 1607. Craig possibly began writing the treatise in 1604-1605 and continued to work on it over the following years. Craig, *De Unione*, p. 356.

⁷³ Craig, *De Unione*, p. 242.

⁷⁴ Craig, *De Unione*, p. 255.

succession by hereditary right. Craig also includes the story in his union treatise ‘to correct any disposition to suppose that our most gracious sovereign is attempting something new, or that has not been aimed at before’, with Vergil’s story showing that James’s attempt to secure permanent union had historical precedent, as Henry VII had considered it.⁷⁵ Unlike Pont, Craig does not elaborate on how Vergil’s story could be used to decide what form permanent union should take, most likely because he did not agree with Henry’s argument that Scotland should be absorbed by England—Craig asserts that previous attempts at union failed because England would not accept Scotland as equal and Scotland would not accept England as superior.⁷⁶ This shows that while Jacobean writers might accept that hereditary right justified and legitimised permanent union, it did not clarify what form permanent union should take, and so they prioritised their own national concerns (or, in Pont’s case, English national concerns).

The union treatise writers who use Polydore Vergil’s story about Henry VII were writing either to defend permanent Anglo-Scottish union on the grounds of James’s combined hereditary claims, or with the presumption that James’s combined hereditary claims had already made permanent union inevitable, and so they wanted to influence what form it took. No-one appears to have invoked Vergil’s story to argue that Henry was wrong to presume that permanent union would result from Margaret and James IV’s descendants succeeding to the thrones of both England and Scotland. While someone like Edwin Sandys might argue that there was no precedent for a dynastic union of multiple kingdoms under one monarch leading to their permanent union, neither he nor any other critic appears to have challenged or denied Vergil’s story about Henry VII specifically—perhaps because it had already been used to defend James’s succession to the English throne and was thus too risky.

What these examples show, however, is that although Vergil’s story was useful for union treatise writers wishing to defend the legitimacy of permanent union resulting from James’s combined hereditary claims, it did not clarify what form a permanent union would or should take. As a result, national concerns were prioritised. It

⁷⁵ Craig, *De Unione*, p. 258.

⁷⁶ Craig, *De Unione*, p. 462.

appears that only Scottish writers used Vergil's story in the surviving union treatises, which suggests that they did so because they believed that invoking Henry VII would be persuasive to their intended English audience, given that Henry had been England's monarch and had a positive reputation. As this thesis argues, national identity was a key reason for invoking some ancestors and overlooking others in the Jacobean period, which will become clearer in the following chapters.

Henry VII's judgement was treated as clear evidence that permanent union would result in England's dominance and Scotland's submission and decline. Henry's reputation for wisdom and the prior use of Vergil's story to defend the legitimacy of a Stuart succession to the English throne (which had since occurred, further proving the accuracy of Henry's judgements) made him a reliable figure to invoke in support of this argument, whether the writer agreed with his vision of Anglo-Scottish union or not. When James's permanent union project failed, however, Vergil's story continued to be utilised in another genre—histories.

Reviving Polydore Vergil: Histories

The sixteenth-century English historians Edward Hall and the writers of Holinshed's *Chronicles* did not incorporate Polydore Vergil's story about Henry VII into their narratives of his reign, even when they used Vergil as a source elsewhere.⁷⁷ After James VI & I succeeded to the English throne, however, Vergil's story became a common feature in English histories of Henry's reign. This served a double purpose, providing historical legitimacy to both James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns based on hereditary right. Scholars have not analysed the significance of the absence of Vergil's story in

⁷⁷ Edward Hall used the first printed edition of Vergil's *Anglica Historia*, which does not feature the story; even if Hall had been aware of the story, however, it is highly unlikely that he would have included it. The central argument of Hall's work was that the Wars of the Roses were brought to an end by the Union of the Houses, uniting the Lancastrian and Yorkist hereditary claims in Henry VIII; to suggest that Henry VIII's own bloodline might fail and result in a Stuart succession to the English throne would have undermined it. Henry A. Kelly, *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), p. 160. The writers of Holinshed's *Chronicles* (two editions, 1577 and 1588) used Vergil's *Anglica Historia* as a source, so unless they were also using the first edition they would have come across the story about Henry VII. Lucas, 'Holinshed and Hall', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Heal, Archer, and Kewes, pp. 205-206. By the time Holinshed's *Chronicles* was published, however, Vergil's story was already being used by pro-Stuart succession treatises. This might explain why the Holinshed writers did not include the story, as it had become too overtly associated with the Elizabethan succession debates.

sixteenth-century histories and its widespread insertion into Jacobean histories, which is the focus of this section.

Jacobean historians used Vergil's story differently to union treatises writers, as they focused primarily on the ongoing relationship between England and Scotland under the Union of the Crowns, rather than reflecting on what form permanent Anglo-Scottish union could or should take. A superficial glance at the dates of publication for these histories (1607, 1611, 1615, and 1622) would suggest that this was because most of them were released after the parliamentary union project was abandoned. While this is true to an extent, this section demonstrates that other factors—such as the contemporary purpose of histories and the individual motivations of each historian—were also significant. This section analyses how the story was used to defend the legitimacy of both James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns through hereditary right, and how the pre-existing historical narrative of Henry VII's reign was altered in response to these contemporary events.

Edward Ayscu's *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (1607) was the first history published in the Jacobean period to incorporate Vergil's story about Henry VII. As discussed in Chapter 1, Ayscu had to reinterpret the purpose of his history at the time of publication because he had written it as a defence of James's hereditary claim to the English throne during the Elizabethan succession debates. Ayscu dedicates the history to Prince Henry, and claims that it is intended to bring

to fresh memorie, the many leagues and happy mariages between the two kingdomes of this Iland ... for the more easie & harty receiving (in the fulnesse of time) of your excellent house, the common bloud of both nations, to raigne over us: but that we might readily and joyfully imbrace that, which many ages had sought, none found, and now was *gratis* offered unto us.⁷⁸

Ayscu claims to want to educate the English and Scots of their former alliances and dynastic marriages, to show the historical precedents for the Union of the Crowns

⁷⁸ Edward Ayscu, *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (London, 1607; STC 1014), A3r-A3v.

and defend its legitimacy based on James's combined hereditary claims, as well as smoothing over ongoing hostilities.⁷⁹ Sarah Waurechen, however, points out that Ayscu 'unapologetically rehearsed the instances in which Scottish monarchs paid homage to their acknowledged superior in England', undermining the notion that the Scots 'were equal and sovereign partners'. Instead, Ayscu 'tried to anglicize the Scots' by citing the nine Anglo-Scottish royal marriages, 'to stress that the union was really just the formal possession of an already colonized society.'⁸⁰ Given that Ayscu's history was mostly written before 1603 as a succession treatise, anglicising James and the Scots was a means of encouraging English readers to accept James's candidacy, challenging arguments that he was an alien and ineligible to succeed, or that the Union of the Crowns that resulted from his succession would be damaging to England.

Ayscu quotes Vergil's story not from *Anglica Historia*, but from the succession treatise *Leicester's Commonwealth* (1584), reflecting his intention to defend James VI & I's hereditary claim to the English throne.⁸¹ According to Ayscu, Henry VII 'thought nothing could happen more gracious to both nations' than 'the intitling of king *James* [James IV] and his posteritie to the Crowne of *England*'.⁸² Neither Vergil nor *Leicester's Commonwealth* made this claim; Ayscu invented it to reassure his original intended audience—English readers in Elizabeth I's reign—that the succession of a Scottish monarch to the English throne would benefit them, and so they should support James VI's candidacy. Ayscu also writes that when Prince Arthur died in 1503, 'Prince *Henry* his brother remained onely a barre betweene her [Margaret] and the Crown', so, if he had wanted to, Henry VII could have persuaded the pope to annul Margaret's engagement.⁸³ That he did not was, Ayscu claims, further evidence of Henry's approval of a Scottish monarch succeeding to the English throne by hereditary right.

⁷⁹ Now that the English and the Scots share the same monarch, Ayscu explains, 'let us devide the true honour and glorie attayned on both sides indifferently betweene us.'. Ayscu, *A Historie*, A6r.

⁸⁰ Sarah Waurechen, 'Imagined Politics, Failed Dreams, and the Beginnings of an Unacknowledged Britain: English Responses to James VI and I's Vision of Perfect Union', *Journal of British Studies*, 52 (2013), 593.

⁸¹ *Leicester's Commonwealth* was published anonymously, but it was rumoured to have been written by Thomas Morgan, an agent of Mary, Queen of Scots', so Ayscu attributes it to Morgan. Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 249.

⁸² Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 250.

⁸³ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 249.

Ayscu included Vergil's story because he, like the writers of other pro-Stuart succession treatises, believed it was evidence that a foreigner could succeed to the English throne—otherwise Henry would not have contemplated it. Ayscu then expanded this argument by having Henry declare that 'nothing could happen more gracious to both nations' than to be united under one monarch. Ayscu was encouraging his intended English audience to see James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns as not only legally possible, but also desirable. After James had secured the English throne, Ayscu's account of Henry VII's words was unintentionally transformed from a reassurance about a potential future change into something prophetic and legitimising about a change that had already occurred. It is possible that Ayscu added to his retelling of Vergil's story in response to James's permanent union project; Ayscu claims that Henry said England and Scotland 'should be united and made one Monarchie', a claim that is not in Vergil's original story or *Leicester's Commonwealth*, but does resemble James's own statements on Anglo-Scottish union.⁸⁴

John Speed's *The History of Great Britaine* (1611) was the first history both written and published in the Jacobean period to incorporate Vergil's story into a narrative account of Henry VII's reign. Like Ayscu, Speed uses the story to defend James's succession to the English throne by hereditary right. Speed's decision to include 'Great Britain' in the history's title is the most obvious reflection of how circumstances had changed since Ayscu wrote his history, as from 1604 James assumed the style 'King of Great Britain'.⁸⁵ Despite the all-encompassing name, however, Speed's work is overwhelmingly a history of England.⁸⁶ Speed lists two

⁸⁴ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 250. Examples of James's similar statements include: James VI & I, *By the King Whereas Wee Have Ever Since It Pleas'd God To Establish Us In the Imperiall Crowne of Great Britaine, Equally Regarded the Good of Both the Late Kingdomes of Scotland and England...* (London, 1605; STC 8377); James VI & I, 'Speech to the English Parliament, 31 March 1607, Whitehall', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 162.

⁸⁵ James VI & I, 'Proclamation concerning the Kings Majesties Stile, of King of Great Britaine, 20 October 1604, Westminster Palace,' in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625*, ed. by James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 94-98.

⁸⁶ Like previous English histories, Speed's history is divided into chapters covering the reigns of each English monarch; information concerning Scotland is placed within the account of the contemporary English monarch's reign, with the Scots only being discussed when Speed considers their history to be impinging on that of England. Speed begins with the Anglo-Saxon 'monarchy of Great Britaine, whereof Hengist the first king of Kent became the first monarch of the

sources for Vergil's story: John Lesley, Bishop of Ross, and Vergil himself.⁸⁷ This demonstrates that Speed's reason for including the story was to defend the legitimacy of James's succession to the English throne, as Lesley had used it as a defence of the Stuart hereditary claim in both his histories and his succession treatises.

Speed uses Vergil's story to defend the legitimacy of James's succession to the English throne by hereditary right, and to promote the idea that England should dominate in the resulting Union of the Crowns. Speed, unlike Ayscu, does not claim that Henry viewed a Stuart succession to the English throne favourably, but merely that he recognised the possibility and legality of it—which was still a useful means of defending James's succession.⁸⁸ Speed copies in full Vergil's comments about England's superiority over Scotland, which Lesley had cut down (likely due to his own sense of Scottish national pride). Speed also adds something new in his retelling: Henry's council receiving his statement 'as an Oracle'.⁸⁹ Speed claims that Henry's councillors interpreted his acceptance of the legality of a Scottish monarch succeeding to the English throne as a prophetic sign that it was God's will and would happen. Some Elizabethan succession treatises and Jacobean texts,

Englishmen.' Following these legendary figures, he eventually reaches more reliable ground. John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045), p. 324. In a letter to Robert Cotton, Speed gave his motivation for writing the history as 'love of that Kingdom which your self seeks still to adorne.' John Speed to Robert Cotton, 30 August 1611. Henry Ellis (ed.), *Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1843), p. 110. Although Speed does not specify if he means Great Britain or only England, Edmund Bolton, a contemporary of Speed's, claimed that he knew 'by sure Information' that Speed's reason for writing the history was to educate readers 'for the common Service of England's Glory.' Thomas H. Blackburn, 'Edmund Bolton, Critic, Antiquary, and Historian: A Biographical and Critical Study with an Edition of *Hypercritica*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1962), p. 257.

⁸⁷ Speed uses Vergil's *Anglica Historia* as a source throughout his history; however, his decision to also cite Lesley as a source for this story suggests either that he first came across the story in Lesley's work or was following Lesley's interpretation of Vergil's original story.

⁸⁸ For example, Speed's Henry declares about the prospect of a Stuart succession: 'which Omen God forbid'. Speed, *History*, p. 747. This follows Vergil's original account, and although Lesley omitted this statement from his succession treatise, he included it in his manuscript history as 'quhilk chance God forbid'. Hay, *Anglica Historia*, p. 114n; Lesley, *History of Scotland*, p. 69. Lesley also includes it in his published Latin history, quoting Vergil exactly: Lesley, *De Origine*, p. 338. Ayscu, following *Leicester's Commonwealth*, does not include this statement at all.

⁸⁹ Speed, *History*, p. 747. Neither Vergil nor Lesley claimed that Henry's Council received his statement as an oracle. An oracle was a religious figure in ancient Greece who was granted prophetic knowledge by a deity and interpreted it for their fellow humans. The term was also used to mean 'prophecy' in the early modern period. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, third revised edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 1071-1072.

discussed above, present Henry as foreseeing or prophesising James's eventual succession to the English throne; Speed tempers this interpretation by claiming that Henry's councillors received it as a prophetic statement, but not that it was one (while Henry himself called it an 'Omen' which 'God forbid'). Speed likely added this statement to suggest that James's succession to the English throne by hereditary right and the resulting Union of the Crowns had historical legitimacy and divine sanction. He does not, however, go as far as to claim that Henry wanted his male line to die out to make these events possible.

William Martyn, unlike Ayscu and Speed, uses Vergil's story primarily to demonstrate what England and Scotland's future relationship should be under the Union of the Crowns, prioritising England's welfare. Martyn, a lawyer, wrote *The Historie, and Lives, of the Kings of England from William the Conqueror, Unto the End of the Raigne of King Henrie the Eight* (1615).⁹⁰ According to Martyn, Henry VII chose to marry Margaret Tudor to James IV so that if a Scottish monarch descended from her did succeed to the English throne, they would be drawn 'into *England*, as unto an estate of greater power, magnificence, honour, and riches'. Martyn then makes an addition to Vergil's story that reflects his English national pride and hostility towards Scotland. Martyn claims that Henry could have married Margaret to 'the greatest and most honorable Kings or Potentates in the Christian world' but, if he had, England might have ended up being governed by a deputy, 'which would bee derogatorie from the majestie of such a Monarchie and Commonweale.'⁹¹ Henry is presented as protecting England's interests by ensuring a future union would be with a (supposedly) lesser kingdom, as England would maintain its superior status and their shared monarch would prioritise living in England over Scotland—the latter having since been proven true.

Martyn's use of Vergil's story can also be interpreted as evidence of what he thought the relationship between England and Scotland should be after the failure

⁹⁰ Martyn's motivations for writing his history are discussed in Chapter 4, including a particular reason for his anti-Scottish attitude. Woolf claims that Martyn's history 'is suffused by moral rather than political judgements', unlike the works of many of Martyn's contemporaries. D.R. Woolf, 'Martyn, William (bap. 1562, d. 1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18240>.

⁹¹ William Martyn, *The Historie, and Lives, of the Kings of England from William the Conqueror, Unto the End of the Raigne of King Henrie the Eight* (London, 1615; STC 17526), pp. 350-351.

to secure permanent union. As England and Scotland remained separate kingdoms, it was necessary for one kingdom to be governed in the monarch's absence. It would have been dishonourable for England to be governed by a deputy while the monarch remained in Scotland, Martyn claims; however, Martyn has no objections to Scotland being ruled from a distance. In Martyn's retelling of Vergil's story, Henry was not only anticipating the eventual Union of the Crowns but planning how it would operate without being detrimental to England. As such, Martyn incorporates Vergil's story into his history not only to defend James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns based on hereditary right, but also to suggest how England and Scotland should be governed in future and which kingdom should be prioritised.

Francis Bacon uses Vergil's story to promote his own political career as a royal councillor, attaching a meaning to the story that no previous historian had done. After Bacon was impeached and publicly disgraced in 1621, he proposed writing two works for James in an effort to be restored to favour: 'a good history of England, and a better digest of your laws'.⁹² Scholars have long recognised that Bacon's history of Henry VII was intended to teach James and Prince Charles about the nature of good rule.⁹³ Scholars have also proposed numerous viable explanations for why Bacon chose Henry as his subject.⁹⁴ These scholars, however,

⁹² Francis Bacon to James VI & I, 21 April 1621. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, VII (1874), p. 242.

⁹³ See: F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1967), p. 257; Jonathan Marwil, *The Trials of Counsel: Francis Bacon in 1621* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1976), pp. 157-158; D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), p. 154; B.H.G. Wormald, *Francis Bacon: History, Politics, and Science, 1561-1626* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 245, 248, 254-258.

⁹⁴ For example, Leonard F. Dean argues that Henry VII's reign was 'the last reign for which documentary evidence was readily available, all later reigns depending on State Papers which were closely guarded.' I do not think this is true; Bacon could have written a history of later monarchs using existing histories and chronicles, since Bacon's history of Henry VII did not use many manuscript sources. Leonard F. Dean, 'Sir Francis Bacon's Theory of Civil History-Writing', *English Literary History*, 8.3 (1941), 171. Jonathan Marwil claims that Bacon chose Henry VII 'if only by a process of exclusion', because, out of the monarchs who would have been included in Bacon's planned history of England from 1485 onwards, 'Henry VIII was beneath admiration, Edward and Mary beneath respect, and Elizabeth already ably done by Camden.' What 'probably clinched the decision' was 'that there was so little to be done', since Bacon had already studied Henry's reign and chose not to use much manuscript material. Marwil points out James's known admiration for Henry but does not mention James's Star Chamber speech. Marwil, *The Trials of Counsel*, p. 153. While Anderson acknowledges that Bacon probably hoped to regain favour by 'writing a fair sample of the history of England in which James I had once expressed interest,' she

have missed an important piece of evidence: James appears to have directly inspired Bacon's choice. On 20 June 1616, in his first Star Chamber speech—which Bacon may have heard in person or read later in print—James explained why he had not spoken there before, despite many of his subjects requesting ‘to heare me speake in this place, where my Predecessors have often sitten, and especially King *Henry* the seventh; from whom ... I am lineally descended, and that doubly to this Crown [i.e. through both of his parents]; and as I am neerest descended of him, so doe I desire to follow him in his best actions.’⁹⁵ In a letter telling James that he was writing a history of Henry VII, Bacon claims that Henry ‘was in sort your forerunner, and whose spirit, as well as his blood, is doubled upon your Majesty’, mimicking James's speech.⁹⁶ James expressed a desire to learn from Henry's example, and Bacon's history served that purpose.⁹⁷

emphasises that the personal and biographical motivations for Bacon's choice of Henry VII, ‘a man with special relevance to himself’. Judith H. Anderson, *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), p. 202. Woolf explains that Henry VII was ‘the logical candidate’ because Bacon wanted ‘to confine himself to the Tudor dynasty’, Camden had ‘already done Elizabeth’ and ‘Bacon admired none of the middle three Tudors’ who had ‘been dealt with’ by Francis Godwin. Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 155. Bacon often looked to the reigns of former monarchs to find precedents for how James could or should act, and he claimed that Henry VII was an appropriate monarch for James to emulate. In 1612, a speech attributed to Bacon claimed that Henry was ‘a prince not unfit to be paralleled with his Majesty’, since both were concerned about individuals with royal blood fleeing abroad. As Henry VII had secured the return to England of Edmund de la Pole, 6th Earl of Suffolk, James kept his cousin, Lady Arbella Stuart, imprisoned in England after she attempted to escape to France. Francis Bacon (att.), ‘Charge Against the Countess of Shrewsbury’, 30 June 1612. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, IV (1868), pp. 298-299. In 1615, during the trial of Oliver St. John, Bacon refuted St. John's comparison of James to Richard II, a monarch Elizabeth I had also been compared to, and entreated him to ‘compare them to King Henry VII. or King Edward I. or some other parallels to which they are like.’ Francis Bacon, ‘The Charge Given by Francis Bacon, His Majesty's Attorney General, Agaist Mr. I.S.’, 28 April 1615. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, V (1869), pp. 144-145.

⁹⁵ James VI & I, *His Majesties Speach in the Starre-Chamber*, B2r; James VI & I, ‘A Speech in the Starre-Chamber’, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 206.

⁹⁶ Francis Bacon to James VI & I, 8 October 1621. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, VII, p. 303.

⁹⁷ In addition, James claimed that he had not spoken in the Star Chamber sooner because he wanted to understand English law first. James VI & I, *His Majesties Speach in the Starre-Chamber, the XX. of June. Anno 1616*, B2v; James VI & I, ‘A Speech in the Starre-Chamber’, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 206. Bacon wanted to write both ‘a good history of England, and a better digest of your laws’ for James, meeting both of the needs expressed in James's speech. Francis Bacon to James VI & I, 21 April 1621. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, VII, p. 242. Bacon reapplied his offer to James to write a ‘digest of your laws’ in a letter of 20 March 1622, when his history of Henry VII was being published. Francis Bacon to James VI & I, 20 March 1622. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, VII, p. 357. James Spedding suggests that Bacon's ‘Proposition to his Majesty... Touching the Compiling and Amending of the Laws of England’ was written between June 1616 and March 1617—after James expressed his interest in understanding English law. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, VI (1872), p. 57.

Bacon makes a noticeable addition to the story that reflects his own concerns: he emphasises the right of Henry VII's councillors to question royal decisions and ensure the king's policies were in the best interests of the realm. After expressing their concern that if Henry's male line died out 'the Kingdome of *England* would fall to the King of *Scotland*, which might prejudice the *Monarchie of England*', Henry replied that '*Scotland* would bee but an *Accession to England*, and not *England to Scotland*, for that the *Greater* would draw the lesse', and 'it was a safer *Union for England*' than one with France. Once Henry had justified the marriage, his councillors received his declaration 'as an *Oracle*' (this claim being taken from Speed) and were 'silenced' by Henry's wisdom.⁹⁸ This story demonstrates the value of good counsel as, without the prodding of his councillors, Henry would not have publicly defended the legitimacy of a Stuart succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns through hereditary right—a story that had proven so useful to James and his supporters.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ Francis Bacon, *The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (London, 1622; *STC* 1159), p. 208. Bacon's claim that Henry's councillors received his declaration 'as an Oracle' is evidence that he took the story from Speed's history, discussed above, rather than Vergil's *Anglica Historia* or any other source. Bacon, *Henry the Seventh*, p. 208. Wilhelm Busch has shown that Bacon was heavily dependent on Edward Hall's account of Henry VII's reign, and Hall's account was largely based on Vergil. Wilhelm Busch, *England under the Tudors, Volume 1: King Henry VII*, trans. by Alice M. Todd (London, 1895), p. 417. Hall, however, did not include this story, so Hall was not Bacon's source. It is possible that Bacon studied Vergil's *Anglica Historia*, as in the speech attributed to him, discussed above, there is a reference to 'the Italian story' as a source for the discussion of Henry VII capturing the Earl of Suffolk. Bacon (att.), 'Charge Against the Countess of Shrewsbury'. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by Spedding, IV, p. 298. Perhaps Bacon no longer had access to Vergil's *Anglica Historia* by the time he wrote his history of Henry VII, or he did not have an edition that included the story. Whatever the reason, the internal evidence suggests Bacon took the story from Speed, as scholars have also noted Bacon's dependence on Speed's work. Discussions of Bacon using Speed as a source can be found in: Marwil, *The Trials of Counsel*, pp. 154-155; Anderson, *Biographical Truth*, pp. 177-179. D.R. Woolf has pointed out that Bacon also used manuscript material with the help of research assistants, and 'was not as content with Speed and Hall, or even André, as has been thought.' Daniel R. Woolf, 'John Seldon, John Borough and Francis Bacon's *History of Henry VII, 1621*', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 47.1 (Winter 1984), 50. Since it was Speed who first called Henry an 'oracle' in his retelling of this story, however, Bacon must have taken it from Speed.

⁹⁹ Bacon also discusses Henry's attitude towards receiving council in his *Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall* (1625), pointing out that Henry 'in his greatest Businesse, imparted himselfe to none, except it were to *Morton*, and *Fox*'—emphasising how important it was that '*Inward Counsellours*, had need also, be *Wise Men*, and especially true and trusty to the Kings Ends'. Francis Bacon, *The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall* (London, 1625; *STC* 1147), p. 119. James's council was compared unfavourably to Henry VII's and Henry VIII's in an undated libel: 'Seventh Henryes Counsayle was of great renowne / That joynd the white & red rose in the crowne / And th'eight Henryes Counsayle weare no babies / That suppress popery & put downe the Abbeyes / But King James his counsayle wins the prise / For they make wise men mad, & mad men wise.' Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae (eds.), 'B21 Seventh Henryes Counsayle was of

Early modern histories were written for a variety of purposes; this is evident when we compare the use of Vergil's story about Henry VII in histories published in James VI & I's reign. Edward Ayscu's history was mostly written prior to James's succession to promote his candidacy, and so it used Vergil's story to assert the legality of a Scottish monarch succeeding to the English throne by hereditary right, as Elizabethan succession treatises did. John Speed used the story to show that James's succession and the resulting Union of the Crowns were historically legitimate, as he claimed that Henry's councillors received his statement as an oracle revealing God's will. William Martyn used the story to explicitly comment on how the Union of the Crowns should operate, arguing that Scotland must be ruled by a deputy so as not to damage England's honour. Finally, Francis Bacon used Vergil's story to stress the importance of royal counsel, since Henry had only defended the legality of a future Stuart succession and the resulting Union of the Crowns when questioned by his councillors.

These histories did have something in common, however: they all used Vergil's story to give historical legitimacy to James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns through hereditary right. James's succession had changed how Henry VII was written about, as Vergil's story became a standard part of narrative histories of Henry's reign for the first time. As discussed in Chapter 1, Jacobean historians explicitly linked Henry and James together to explain and justify James's succession to the English throne. Jacobean historians also adopted Vergil's story for the same reason; Ayscu and Speed even took the story from succession treatises. These Jacobean historians all presented Henry as having considered the possibility of a Stuart succession and Union of the Crowns resulting from the marriage of Margaret to James IV and concluding that not only was it legally possible (as Elizabethan succession treatise writers claimed) but also something he either wanted (as Ayscu claimed), prophesied would eventually happen (as Speed and Bacon had Henry's councillors interpret his declaration), or favoured over a union with another kingdom so that England's superiority would be guaranteed (as Martyn claimed).

great renowne', *Early Stuart Libels*
http://www.earlystuartlibels.net/htdocs/early_jacobean_section/B21.html [accessed 12 July 2021].

James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns became established features of narratives of England's national history, with Vergil's story giving them historical legitimacy through Henry VII's support. Despite the continued hostility towards Vergil's *Anglica Historia* for its denouncement of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, no Jacobean historians appear to have questioned the validity of this specific story, which proved so useful for justifying and legitimising their contemporary situation.¹⁰⁰ As with the Jacobean efforts to link the Union of the Houses to the Union of the Crowns, the widespread adoption of Vergil's story about Henry VII in Jacobean histories was an example of the Union of the Crowns being anglicised to make it acceptable to an English audience, adding it to pre-existing narratives of Henry VII's reign in works that, for the most part, were still only histories of England.

Conclusion

James VI & I's inheritance of a hereditary claim from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York was used not only to justify his succession to the English throne, but also the resulting Union of the Crowns and a proposed permanent Anglo-Scottish union. While previously Henry and Elizabeth's marriage was presented as an end in itself for resolving the dynastic conflict of the Wars of the Roses, in the Jacobean period their marriage became an origin point for Anglo-Scottish union. Given how established and celebrated the Union of the Houses already was in England, it is understandable that James's supporters would want to associate it with the Union of the Crowns, to give the latter historical precedence and present it as a natural extension of England's existing national history, thereby anglicising it. This explains why the Union of the Houses and the Union of the Crowns were paralleled with one another so often, as they were both dynastic unions that combined hereditary claims—Lancaster and York, England and Scotland—but were presented as having additional benefits that were extensions of those hereditary

¹⁰⁰ For example, in a work written c. 1618-1621, Edmund Bolton criticised Vergil and others for their attacks on Geoffrey of Monmouth's history, since it left a large gap in the national narrative. Bolton also pointed out that many of these critics were foreigners. Blackburn, 'Edmund Bolton, Critic, Antiquary, and Historian', pp. 204-205.

claims, as the Union of the Houses was said to guarantee England's internal peace and prevent civil war, while the Union of the Crowns was said to guarantee peace between England and Scotland and, if James got his way, their permanent union as Great Britain. Linking the two unions together was a means of reassuring James's English subjects that the Union of the Crowns would be equally as beneficial as the Union of the Houses, and hopefully more so.

Polydore Vergil's story about Henry VII was of central importance to Henry's legacy in the Jacobean period, and its usage represented a shift in how Henry was remembered and invoked. Prior to James's succession, the story's use was limited to succession treatises arguing in favour of the Stuart hereditary claim to the English throne. After James's succession, the story (often copied from Elizabethan succession treatises) was used in a variety of genres to legitimise his new position, the resulting Union of the Crowns, and a potential permanent union, all based on hereditary right. James's subjects took the initiative in turning to Vergil's story, as official works did not use it. These unofficial works, in turn, likely influenced James himself by bringing the story to his attention, as he used it in both his 1614 speech to the English Parliament and his 1616 speech to Star Chamber.¹⁰¹ Some Jacobean writers claimed that Henry VII had actively wanted Anglo-Scottish union to result from the marriage of his daughter, Margaret Tudor, to James IV, King of Scots. This, however, required them to argue that Henry had wanted his male line to fail (or to avoid mentioning this awkward implication), which likely explains why it was more common to present Henry as a prophet foreseeing the eventual succession of Margaret's Scottish descendants to the English throne; Henry might not have sought or wanted it, but he acknowledged that their hereditary claim made it legally possible, as well as asserting that it would not be to England's disadvantage to share a monarch with Scotland, which offered reassurance to English readers.

¹⁰¹ William Cobbett (ed.), *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, from the Norman Conquest, in 1066, to the year, 1803*, 36 vols (London, 1806-1820), I (1806), p. 1151; Maija Jansson (ed.), *Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988), pp. 8, 16; James VI & I, *His Majesties Speach in the Starre-Chamber*, B2r; James VI & I, 'A Speech in the Starre-Chamber', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 206.

The widespread use of Vergil's story in various media indicates that this aspect of Henry VII's legacy was largely agreed upon in the Jacobean period, among both the English and the Scots; Henry accepted the legality of both James's succession to the English throne and Anglo-Scottish union based on hereditary right, and provided guidance about future Anglo-Scottish relations. In addition, Henry does not appear to have been invoked to oppose Anglo-Scottish union, and Vergil's story does not appear to have been directly challenged by those who argued that hereditary right was not an appropriate basis for permanent union. Even the Scottish union treatise writers who disliked Henry's conception of Anglo-Scottish union still considered him a valuable historical figure to invoke, as they used Vergil's story as proof that James's combined hereditary claims justified and legitimised permanent union. There was less consensus over what form permanent union should take, with some supporting and some opposing Henry's Anglo-centric approach. This demonstrates that, even if hereditary right was accepted as an appropriate basis for permanent union, it did not clarify what form it should take, and national concerns therefore took priority.

The Jacobean uses of Vergil's story to defend Anglo-Scottish union focused exclusively on James's maternal descent from Henry VII (through Margaret Tudor and James IV), rather than James's paternal descent from Henry VII (through Margaret Tudor and Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus). This was because Henry had arranged Margaret's marriage to James IV but not her later marriage to Angus (which took place after Henry's death), and because only James's maternal line could be celebrated for combining hereditary claims that led to his succession to the thrones of both England and Scotland, and thus resulted in the Union of the Crowns, while his paternal line could only be celebrated for providing him with a hereditary claim to the English throne. As Chapter 3 shows, however, many Jacobean English writers preferred to emphasise James's paternal descent rather than his maternal descent when explaining his hereditary claim to the English throne. As a result, Vergil's story was only useful to those who wanted to argue that James had succeeded to the English throne through his maternal hereditary claim, and to celebrate and defend the Union of the Crowns. This, as Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 discuss, was not the case for all of James's English subjects.

Not only was James himself anglicised through his descent from the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, as discussed in Chapter 1, but so too were the Union of the Crowns and the proposed permanent Anglo-Scottish union. Some writers asserted that Henry VII had actively sought the Union of the Crowns when he married his daughter to James IV, though it was more common to claim that Henry had accepted the legality of a Stuart succession to the English throne and offered reassurance that England would dominate over Scotland in the resulting Union of the Crowns. Scottish union treatise writers invoked Henry VII to persuade their English audience that hereditary right was a legitimate basis for permanent union and to show them that Scotland would be worse off under a permanent union than England (even if they hoped this could be prevented). The Union of the Crowns was incorporated into the narrative of England's national history by presenting it as an extension of the Union of the Houses, and by adding Vergil's story about Henry VII into Jacobean histories of Henry's reign to inform English readers that James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns was the legitimate outcome of hereditary right. These works not only defended Anglo-Scottish union as the legitimate result of James's status as hereditary monarch of both kingdoms, but also presented it in a way that would be palatable to an English audience and would not threaten their sense of national identity.

3. James VI & I's Descent from Margaret Tudor and Hereditary Right

James VI & I's succession to the English throne was officially explained to be the result of the hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York through their eldest daughter, Margaret Tudor. As discussed in Chapter 1, this was a widespread and popular explanation because it anglicised James as another English Tudor monarch, rather than the first monarch of a new, foreign dynasty. In the generations following Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, however, James's descent diverged from that of his Tudor predecessors and thus he could not simply co-opt the explanation of their hereditary claim to the English throne; the passage of a hereditary claim through successive generations to James had to be explained separately. Scholars have analysed the objections against the hereditary claims of James's ancestors in the Elizabethan succession debates, but less has been written about how those objections were resolved or nullified after James's succession.¹ This chapter addresses this gap in the scholarship.

¹ For example, see: Marie Axton, 'The Influence of Edmund Plowden's Succession Treatise', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 37.3 (1974), 209-226; Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977); David Colclough, "'I Have Brought Thee Up to a Kingdome': Sermons on the Accessions of James I and Charles I", in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 205-213; Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, 'The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 20-38; Susan Doran, 'Polemic and Prejudice: A Scottish King for an English Throne,' in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, pp. 215-230; Susan Doran, '1603: A Jagged Succession', *Historical Research*, 93.61 (August 2020), 1-23; Victor Houlston, 'The Hare and the Drum: Robert Persons's Writings on the English Succession, 1593-6', *Renaissance Studies*, 14.2 (2000), 235-250; Rei Kanemura, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, 52.2 (April 2013), 317-342; Lazar, 'Literary Responses to the Accession of James I'; Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558-1568* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966); Jean-Christophe Mayer, 'Introduction: Breaking the Silence', in *Breaking the Silence on the Succession: A Sourcebook of Manuscripts and Rare Elizabethan Texts (c.1587-1603)*, ed. by Jean-Christophe Mayer (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2003), pp. 1-28; McCabe, 'Panegyric and Its Discontents', in *Stuart Succession Literature*, ed. by Kewes and McRae, pp. 19-36; Andrew McRae, 'Welcoming the King: The Politics of Stuart Succession Panegyric', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 186-193; *Literature of the Stuart Successions: An Anthology*, ed. by Andrew McRae and John West (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), pp. 1-73; Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), pp. 13-17, 55-65; Judith M. Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England', *The English Historical Review*, 117.472 (2002), 513-535; Kristen Post Walton, *Catholic Queen, Protestant*

This chapter analyses the Jacobean representation of James VI & I's descent from Margaret Tudor in relation to his hereditary claim to the English throne. It discusses why the official explanations of James's succession to the English throne did not explain how he was descended from Margaret Tudor and argues that this can be interpreted as a response to the challenges to the hereditary claims of James's ancestors in the Elizabethan succession debates. It then analyses how unofficial works represented James's descent from Margaret Tudor without official guidance, demonstrating that Jacobean artists and writers prioritised their desire to anglicise James over strict hereditary seniority. This chapter explores what the widespread emphasis on James's double descent from Margaret Tudor reveals about Jacobean understandings of the concept of hereditary right and the operation of the English succession.

Before 1603

This section briefly explains how James VI & I was descended from Margaret Tudor before summarising the objections made against the hereditary claims to the English throne of these ancestors during the Elizabethan succession debates. Margaret Tudor (1489-1541) was the eldest daughter of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. In 1503 she married James IV, King of Scots (1473-1513). In 1512, she gave birth to her husband's eventual successor, James V, at Linlithgow Palace, Scotland. James IV died fighting against the English at the Battle of Flodden Field in 1513, and in 1514 Margaret married Archibald Douglas, 6th Earl of Angus. In 1515, she gave birth to their only child, Lady Margaret Douglas, at Harbottle Castle, Northumberland, England. Dissatisfied with her marriage to Angus, however, Margaret sought a papal annulment. The potential bastardy of Lady Margaret Douglas was given by Henry VIII and Cardinal Wolsey as a reason for Margaret not to pursue the annulment, but to no avail.² The pope granted the annulment in 1528 on the grounds that the marriage had never been valid, but with no explanation

Patriarchy: Mary, Queen of Scots, and the Politics of Gender and Religion (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 49-88.

² Cardinal Wolsey to Margaret Tudor, 1528. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, ed. by J.S. Brewer, R.H. Brodie, and James Gairdner, 21 vols (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, and HMSO, 1862-1910), IV.2 (1872), p. 1826.

of why or whether the legitimacy of Lady Margaret Douglas was affected.³ Margaret Tudor married her third husband, Henry Stewart, later Lord Methven, in 1528, but she had no further children.⁴

James V, King of Scots (1512-1542), married Madeleine of Valois, daughter of François I of France, in 1537, but she died, childless, just over six months later. James V then married Marie of Guise, a French noblewoman, in 1538. James and Marie had two sons, but they both died in 1541. James and Marie's final child, Mary, was born in 1542 at Linlithgow Palace, Scotland. James V died six days later, and their daughter succeeded to the Scottish throne.⁵

Lady Margaret Douglas (1515-1578) spent the first year of her life in England, while her mother resided at the court of Henry VIII. They then returned to Scotland. Douglas's father, Angus, took her into England in 1528, where she remained close to the Anglo-Scottish border until 1530, when she went to live at the English court. Margaret married Matthew Stewart, 4th Earl of Lennox, in 1544. Their surviving children were Henry, Lord Darnley (c. 1546-1567), and Charles (1557-1576), both

³ 'Attested copy of the sentence of divorce between Margaret Queen of Scotland and the Earl of Angus, pronounced by Peter, Cardinal of Ancona, at Rome, on 11 March 1527[1528].' 2 April 1528, Ancona. TNA SP 49/3, fol. 84. Translated into English in D.L. D'Avray, *Dissolving Royal Marriages: A Documentary History, 860-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 223-226. For a contemporary discussion of the annulment, see: John Duncan to John Stewart, Duke of Albany, 29 March 1528, Rome. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, ed. by Brewer, Brodie, and Gairdner, IV.2, p. 1817. Printed in *Papiers D'État, Pièces et Document Inédits ou Peu Connus Relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Écosse au XVI^e Siècle, tirés des Bibliothèques et des Archives de France*, ed. by Alexandre Teulet, 3 vols (Paris, 1851), I, pp. 71-73. Modern scholars have rarely returned to the primary source evidence to properly understand the annulment of Margaret Tudor and Angus's marriage—both the grounds on which it was granted, and the potential impact on Lady Margaret Douglas's legitimacy. Scholars claim that Margaret and Angus's marriage was annulled on the grounds that Angus was married/pre-contracted to Jane Stewart of Traquair, and that a special dispensation was granted to protect the legitimacy of Lady Margaret Douglas. The source of these claims is the nineteenth-century historian Agnes Strickland, who took it from the work of eighteenth-century historian George Mackenzie, who took it from John Lesley's 1578 history and expanded it in his own words, based on other late sixteenth century sources that are also discussed in this chapter. Lesley had his own agenda for what he wrote, discussed below, and thus is not a reliable source for the claims made by Mackenzie, Strickland, and the modern scholars influenced by them. Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses Connected with the Regal Succession of Great Britain*, 8 vols (Edinburgh and London, 1850-1859), I (1850), p. 230; George Mackenzie, *Lives and Characters of the Most Eminent Writers of the Scots Nation*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1708-1722), II (1711), p. 572; John Lesley, *De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum Libri Decem* (Rome: 1578), p. 419.

⁴ See: Richard Glen Eaves, 'Margaret [Margaret Tudor] (1489-1541)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18052>.

⁵ See: Andrea Thomas, 'James V (1512-1542)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14591>.

born and raised in England.⁶ Charles married Elizabeth Cavendish, daughter of Elizabeth Hardwick, Countess of Shrewsbury, in 1574, and they had one child, Lady Arbella Stuart (1575-1615), who was born and raised in England.⁷

Mary, Queen of Scots (1542-1587), was sent to France in 1548, where she married the heir to the French throne, François, in 1558. François became king of France, as François II, in 1559, but died in 1560. Mary and François' marriage was childless. Mary returned to Scotland in 1561 and married her half-cousin, Henry, Lord Darnley, in 1565. They had one child, the future James VI & I, who was born in 1566. James was thus the great-grandson of Margaret Tudor through both his mother and his father.⁸

Prior to James's succession to the English throne in 1603, it was possible to learn about his descent from Margaret Tudor through histories and succession treatises, and these texts would influence how James's descent was represented afterwards. Paulina Kewes argues that the 1587 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, 'which chronicled events right up to December 1586, positively impelled one to think about the succession,' ending as it does with Mary, Queen of Scots' condemnation; her execution had taken place by the time this edition was published.⁹ Although contemporary events might have caused people to read histories as commentaries on the English succession, however, most histories did not explicitly state whether or not James VI had inherited a hereditary claim to the English throne from Margaret Tudor, or discuss the possibility of his hereditary claim being nullified by illegitimacy or other potential conditions applied to the English succession.¹⁰ The

⁶ Henry, Lord Darnley's exact date of birth is debated. See: Elaine Finnie Greig, 'Stewart, Henry, duke of Albany [known as Lord Darnley] (1545/6-1567)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26473>; Alison Weir, *The Lost Tudor Princess: A Life of Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2015), p. 130.

⁷ See: Rosalind K. Marshall, 'Douglas, Lady Margaret, countess of Lennox (1515-1578)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/7911>.

⁸ See: Julian Goodare, 'Mary [Mary Stewart] (1542-1587)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18248>.

⁹ Paulina Kewes, 'History Plays and the Royal Succession', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 495.

¹⁰ For example, Holinshed recorded that Margaret Tudor 'clerely forsooke' her second husband, Angus, 'and so used the matter that she was married to Henry Stewarde'. However, Holinshed did not make a judgement on the legitimacy of their daughter, Lady Margaret Douglas, and the implications this might have for the English succession. Raphael Holinshed, *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande and Ireland* (London, 1577; STC 13568.5), p. 438.

exception was John Lesley's *De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum Libri Decem* (1578), which intentionally acted as a succession treatise by arguing that Mary, Queen of Scots, was the rightful heir to the English throne.¹¹ James's descent from Margaret Tudor, and the hereditary claim to the English throne he might have inherited from her, was discussed more explicitly in Elizabethan succession treatises.

A possible bar to the seniority of the hereditary claim of Margaret Tudor's descendants was Henry VIII's will, which was authorised by the English Parliament in the *Third Succession Act* of 1544. As Susan Doran explains, pro-Stuart succession treatises denied the validity of Henry VIII's will on various grounds, claiming that 'no law or prerogative could permit the king to make a donation of the Crown to any but the rightful successor' and 'explaining that there was no authentic copy, that the earl of Pembroke had asserted that he was with the king throughout his sickness and protested that the will was false, and that Lord Chief Justice Sir Edward Montague, who had put the dry stamp on the document, had confessed during Mary I's reign that the whole matter was false and begged for pardon.'¹² Pro-Stuart succession treatises typically defended the principle of absolute hereditary right, whereby no conditions or institutions (such as the English Parliament) could prevent them from succeeding to the English throne, as they were the senior hereditary claimants.¹³

Another objection against Margaret Tudor's descendants was that they were foreigners and thus incapable of succeeding to the English throne, as the common law prevented aliens from inheriting English property. A statute from Edward III's

Buchanan also made no mention of Margaret and Angus's marriage being annulled and Margaret's remarriage, so the reader is not led to question the legitimacy of Lady Margaret Douglas.

¹¹ Lesley, *De Origine*, pp. 339-340.

¹² Susan Doran, 'James VI and the English Succession', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 36. For example, see: John Colville, *The Palinod of John Colvill wherein he doth Penitently Recant his Former Proud Offences, Specially that Treasonable Discourse Lately Made by him Against the Undoubted and Indeniable Title of his Dread Sovereigne Lord, King James the Sixth, Unto the Crowne of England, after Decease of her Maiesty Present* (Edinburgh, 1600; STC 5587), B3r; Thomas Craig, *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England, in Two Books*, ed. and trans. by James Gadderar (London, 1703; ESTC T144321), pp. 131, 343-345.

¹³ For example, see: Peter Wentworth, *A Pithie Exhortation to Her Majestie for Establishing Her Successor to the Crowne* (Edinburgh, 1598; STC 25245), p. 7.

reign, *De Natis Ultra Mare*, also excluded anyone born outside the monarch's allegiance from inheriting property, with the exception of the 'enfants du roi'—though who this exception applied to was debated.¹⁴ James attempted to claim the English lands that had belonged to his paternal grandparents, the Lennoxes, to demonstrate that he could inherit property in England, but was unsuccessful.¹⁵ Marie Axton explains that the theory of the king's two bodies was used to argue that any laws excluding foreigners from inheriting English property did not apply to the crown.¹⁶ It was also argued that James's ancestry—including his descent from Margaret Tudor, among other English royals—made him suitably English, and thus he was not truly a foreigner, despite his foreign birth.¹⁷ Thomas Craig asserted that James was an Englishman because his father was, and that James inherited his father's legal privileges.¹⁸ This explains why James's paternal descent was valued both during the Elizabeth succession debates and after his succession to the English throne, as it gave him more immediate English ancestry than his maternal descent.¹⁹

The Stuarts were also objected to on the grounds that, although they might not be legally barred from the succession, their foreignness made them unsuitable; therefore, another reason to present James as partly or wholly English was in

¹⁴ Doran and Kewes, 'The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited', in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, p. 21; Nenner, *The Right to be King*, pp. 57-58. Robert Lane explains: 'The act barring aliens contained an exception for children of the king, the scope of which became a disputed issue in the succession controversy, namely, did it extend to more remote descendants?' Robert Lane, "'The Sequence of Posterity': Shakespeare's *King John* and the Succession Controversy', *Studies in Philology*, 92.4 (Autumn 1995), 469 n. 39. This same issue would be raised in 1614, when James VI & I asked the English Parliament to naturalise his son-in-law, Frederick, Elector Palatine, as an Englishman. One MP, Nicholas Fuller, expressed concern that a descendant of Frederick and James's daughter, Elizabeth, from five or six generations down the line would be 'A mere Stranger' to England, so Fuller wanted to limit how many generations the bill applied to. *The Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2d 1628. In the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First* (London, 1742), p. 459.

¹⁵ See: Alexander Courtney, 'The Scottish King and the English Court: The Secret Correspondence of James VI, 1601-3', in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, pp. 140-141; Julian Goodare, 'James VI's English Subsidy', in *The Reign of James VI*, ed. Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000), p. 114.

¹⁶ Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, pp. 12, 15-21, 27-28.

¹⁷ For example, see: John Harington, *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown (A.D. 1602)*, ed. by Clements R. Markham (London, 1880), pp. 60-61; Wentworth, *Pithie Exhortation*, p. 76. This is discussed in Susan Doran, 'Polemic and Prejudice: A Scottish King for an English Throne', in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. Doran and Kewes, p. 221.

¹⁸ Craig, *The Right of Succession*, pp. 292-295, 353, 427. This argument is discussed in Anne McLaren, 'Challenging the Monarchical Republic: James I's Articulation of Kingship', in *The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England: Essays in Response to Patrick Collinson*, ed. by John F. McDiarmid (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 177.

¹⁹ See: Walton, *Catholic Queen, Protestant Patriarchy*, pp. 49-88.

response to English hostility towards the Scots.²⁰ *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inghland* argued that the Anglo-Scottish union that would result from James's succession to the English throne would lead to 'slaughter, bloodshed, and infinyt losses and charges of Inghland', to discourage the English from supporting James's candidacy.²¹

The potential bastardy of Lady Margaret Douglas was also used to challenge her hereditary claim and that of her descendants. An official investigation was conducted in 1563 that found evidence that her father, Angus, had already been married at the time of his supposed marriage to Margaret Tudor, thus making their marriage invalid and Douglas illegitimate.²² Douglas's potential illegitimacy was also debated in succession treatises.²³ There was flexibility around legitimacy and succession in the early modern period, however; for example, Elizabeth I succeeded to the English throne despite being illegitimate according to the law.²⁴

Thus, by the time of James's succession to the English throne, there were arguments both for and against the hereditary claims he inherited from Margaret Tudor through both his mother and his father. While his maternal descent from Margaret was typically accepted as being senior and acknowledged to be legitimate, it might be

²⁰ This was the focus of Sir Ralph Sadler's attack on the claim of Mary, Queen of Scots, when speaking to the English Parliament in 1563. Sir Ralph Sadler, 'Sir Ralph Sadler's Speech on the Succession', in *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I, Volume 1 1558-1581*, ed. T.E. Hartley (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1981), pp. 87-89. According to Susan Doran, 'deeply rooted anti-Scottish sentiment' in England was exploited by *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inghland*. Doran, 'Polemic and Prejudice', in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. Doran and Kewes, p. 220.

²¹ Robert Persons (att.), *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inghland* (Antwerp, 1595; STC 19398), part 2, pp. 118-119.

²² Declaration by William Barlow, Bishop of Chichester, 21 March 1563. SP 52/8, fols 37r-37v. Declaration by William Howard, Baron Howard of Effingham, 21 March 1563. SP 12/28, fols 41r-41v. Barlow and Howard are both listed as English ambassadors to Scotland in 1535 and 1536, in Gary M. Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives, 1590-1688* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1990), pp. 236-237. Examination of Alexander Pryngell [Alexander Pringle], concerning the legitimacy of Lady Margaret Douglas. 2 April 1563. MS CP 153/97, fol. 97r.

²³ For example, see: John Hales, 'A Declaration of the Succession of the Crown Imperiall of Inghland', in George Harbin, *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted; the History of the Succession since the Conquest clear'd* (London, 1713), pp. xxxvii-xxxviii; Persons (att.), *Conference*, Part 2, pp. 126-127; Wentworth, *Pithie Exhortation*, pp. 11-15; Craig, *The Right of Succession*, p. 360; F.J. Fisher (ed.), 'The State of England Anno. Dom. 1600 by Thomas Wilson', *Camden Miscellany*, third series, 52 (London: Camden Society, 1936), 2, 6.

²⁴ See: Mary Hill Cole, 'The Half-Blood Princes: Mary I, Elizabeth I, and Their Strategies of Legitimation', in *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*, ed. by Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 71-88.

denied on the grounds that it was a line of foreigners or due to his mother's legal exclusion from the succession (which is discussed in Chapter 5).²⁵ While his paternal descent from Margaret was typically accepted as being junior and was potentially illegitimate, it was an English-born line (even though some denied that this was sufficient to make them English subjects and thus eligible to succeed).²⁶ Both lines of descent had strengths and weaknesses, which explains why succession treatises began to assert that James had inherited hereditary claims to the English throne from both his mother and his father, as if to show that even if one claim was faulty he could always rely on the other, that the two claims resolved one another's faults, or that his candidacy was strengthened by having more than one hereditary claim.²⁷

Official Uncertainty Over Its Representation

After the death of Elizabeth I, James VI & I and his supporters finally had the opportunity to resolve the issues raised in the Elizabethan succession debates. Official works could clearly explain James's descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, and assert whether he was claiming the English throne through the hereditary claim he inherited from his maternal line, paternal line, or both. They could also counter the arguments made against James's claim based on his ancestors being either foreign or illegitimate. For the most part, however, official works did not take this opportunity, which scholars have not yet explained. This section demonstrates how this silence can be interpreted as an intentional response to the Elizabethan succession debates.

²⁵ Philodikaïos points out that, even if James did not have a hereditary claim from his mother due to the *Act of Association*, 'hee may like wise justlie claime the same by his father'. Irenicus Philodikaïos, *A Treatise Declaring, and Confirming against all Objections the Just Title and Right of the Moste Excellent and Worthie Prince, James the Sixt* (Edinburgh, 1599; STC 19881.5), C2r.

²⁶ For example, John Hales claimed that all of Margaret Tudor's descendants—including Lady Margaret Douglas, despite having been born in England—were foreigners, and thus could not inherit the English crown according to English law. Hales, 'Declaration of the Succession', pp. xxx-xxxv. Thomas Bishop, a Lennox servant, claimed that although Lady Margaret Douglas was born in England, she could not 'claim the benefit of hir byrth' as an English subject, because she was raised in Scotland and came to England again 'as a stranger.' Articles against Lady Margaret Douglas by Thomas Bishop, 7 May 1562. SP 12/23, fols 13v-14r. The debate over whether foreigners could succeed is discussed in Levine, *Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, pp. 99-125. For the debate over whether Douglas was a foreigner, see: Walton, *Catholic Queen, Protestant Patriarchy*, pp. 67-73.

²⁷ For example, see: Philodikaïos, *A Treatise*, C2r, p. 9; Wentworth, *Pithie Exhortation*, p. 7.

The official proclamation of James's succession to the English throne states that James was 'lineally and lawfully descended from the body of Margaret,' daughter of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, and that Margaret was 'also the eldest sister of Henry the eight'.²⁸ Although the proclamation asserts that James inherited his hereditary claim from Margaret Tudor, it does not explain how he was descended from her, which would have clearly demonstrated the route by which he inherited the hereditary claim that was being used to justify his succession. Instead, the proclamation focuses on associating James with previous English monarchs and, as Henry VIII was the father of Elizabeth I, establishing a familial connection between James and his immediate predecessor. Christopher Ivic persuasively argues that this was done to present James as English and obscure his Scottishness, making 'a non-native monarch familiar to his English subjects by rendering him more Tudor than Stewart'.²⁹ In his contemporary account, John Stow expands the proclamation's explanation of James's descent by writing that Margaret was 'married to James the fourth King of Scotland, in the yeare 1503, (one hundred yeare since) who had issue James the fift, father to Mary the first, mother to James the sixt, now King of this whole Iland'.³⁰ This shows that there was a demand to understand the route by which James had inherited his hereditary claim to the English throne from Margaret Tudor, but it went unfulfilled by the official proclamation.

The proclamation of James's succession would have been the ideal opportunity to explain how James's hereditary claim had passed down through each generation, untainted by any of the objections previously raised in the Elizabethan succession debates. Given that James was doubly descended from Margaret Tudor, it also would have been an opportunity to clarify whether he was claiming the English throne based on the hereditary claim he inherited from his mother, his father, or both. The proclamation had a great deal of influence over how James's new English subjects explained his claim to the English throne (as discussed in Chapter 1). As such, the English had no clear official explanation of how James had inherited his

²⁸ *Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to call to his mercy out of this transitory life our sovereigne lady, the high and mighty prince, Elizabeth late Queene of England, France, and Ireland, by whose death and dissolution, the imperiall crowne of these realmes aforesaid are now absolutely, wholly, and solely come to the high and mighty prince, James the Sixt, King of Scotland...* (London, 1603; STC 8298).

²⁹ Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 21.

³⁰ John Stow, *The Annales of England* (London, 1605; STC 23337), p. 1425.

hereditary claim, and later official explanations—such as James’s first speech to the English Parliament and the *Act of Recognition of the King’s Title* (1604)—offered no further clarification, demonstrating that it was an intentional omission.

The official explanations of James VI & I’s succession to the English throne asserted that his hereditary claim came from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York through their daughter, Margaret Tudor. They did not, however, explain how James was descended from Margaret. Given that James could trace his descent from Margaret through both his maternal and paternal lines, he could justify his succession based on the hereditary claims he inherited from either parent. Jacobean officials evidently decided it was preferable to remain silent rather than conclusively assert which line of descent James was depending on, as this might have revived former debates over the legitimacy of James’s maternal and paternal hereditary claims. By being intentionally ambiguous, James could continue to rely on either, or both, hereditary claims if his right to the English throne continued to be disputed. This, however, meant choosing not to acknowledge which line of descent was senior, which should have been obvious and indisputable in a strictly hereditary system.

As demonstrated in Chapter 1, the official explanations of James’s succession also attempted to anglicise James by emphasising dynastic continuity between him and his predecessors on the English throne. Perhaps a detailed explanation of James’s ancestry would have undermined these efforts by drawing attention to his foreign ancestry and his own foreign birth, even if it would have clarified the route by which he inherited his hereditary claim. As Radford Mavericke wrote at the time of James’s succession, James was ‘a moste sure and certaine successour, and right inheritor, to the Imperial Crowne of this Realme; no forreiner, but of the royall bloud, his owne Grandmother [Margaret Tudor] being borne and bred in this lande; and the eldest daughter of our late Soveraignes grandfather, king *Henrie* the seventh of famous memorie’.³¹ This demonstrates the importance of nationality to Jacobean representations of James’s hereditary claim to the English throne; it was not enough

³¹ Radford Mavericke, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled, And Named According to the Severall Subject of Each Treatise: The Mourning Weede. The Mornings Joy. The Kings Rejoycing.* (London, 1603; STC 17148.7 and 17683a.5), p. 13v.

for James to be the senior hereditary claimant, but he was also expected to embody the national identity of his new subjects and thus could not be represented as a foreigner. While the official explanations achieved this by overlooking the generations between Margaret and James, James's English subjects had their own strategy for giving James a suitably English line of descent from Margaret.

Celebrating James VI & I's Double Descent from Margaret Tudor

Although the official explanations of James VI & I's succession to the English throne did not describe how he had inherited a hereditary claim from Margaret Tudor, many unofficial Jacobean works did. Some focused exclusively on James's maternal descent from Margaret through the monarchs of Scotland; however, they typically did this to celebrate not only James's succession but also the resulting Union of the Crowns. As such, these works are discussed in Chapter 4. It was more common for works that were only concerned with James's succession to the English throne to emphasise James's double descent from Margaret, rather than focusing on just one line of descent. Scholars have not explained why they did this; this section demonstrates that it can be interpreted as a response to both the Elizabethan succession debates and the lack of official guidance after James's succession.³²

What scholars have shown is that, when the route by which James had inherited his hereditary claim was discussed after his succession, the English wanted to make their new monarch share their own national identity. According to Christopher Ivic, unofficial works not only presented James as 'the eldest of King Henry VII's living descendants, not simply as king of England but as an English king to boot.'³³ Kevin Sharpe claims that 'in 1603, perhaps not least because the alternatives had been foreign, it was the British, even the English, descent of the new monarch that panegyrists highlighted.'³⁴ The works discussed here were also discussed in

³² For example, D.R. Woolf points out that 'Early Stuart panegyrists and historians would make much of James's double descent from Henry VII,' but does not explain why. D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), p. 32. Ivic notes that both Drayton and Bacon mention James's double descent, but does not offer an explanation as to why. Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 60.

³³ Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 21.

³⁴ Sharpe, however, does not note the importance of James's paternal lineage in the panegyrics. Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), p. 14.

Chapter 1, except for Sir George Buck's *Daphnis Polystephanos* (1605). Buck, who is best known for his revisionist history of Richard III, was made a knight, a gentleman of the Privy Chamber, and Master of the Revels by James.³⁵

One reason for invoking James's double descent from Margaret Tudor was to argue that if one of the hereditary claims he inherited from Margaret was invalid, James could still rely on the other, or that the two hereditary claims together were stronger.³⁶ In his sermon, Leonel Sharpe explains that succession treatises had denied the hereditary claim of James's mother 'by a false interpretation' of the words '*Infants De Roy*' in the statute from Edward III's reign, which had 'unwittingly laboured to hurt' James's own claim, 'which comes both by father and mother'.³⁷ Sharpe argues that the French word '*Infants*' means not only the monarch's children, but also the descendants of those children, and so 'it was ill restrained by some, to prejudice the mother, whome they did not love, to hurt the title of the sonne, whome all the world had cause to love.'³⁸ Although he does not make this clear, Sharpe's reason for mentioning James's inheritance of hereditary claims from both parents may have been to assert that, even if Mary, Queen of Scots' claim was denied, James could rely on Henry, Lord Darnley's—though Sharpe does not explain how Darnley's English birth would prevent the statute from applying to the Scottish-born James; perhaps, like Thomas Craig, he believed that James inherited his father's legal privileges.³⁹ The anonymous writer of *Northerne Poems Congratulating the Kings Majesties Most Happy and Peaceable Entrance*

³⁵ Arthur Kincaid, 'Buck [Buc], Sir George (bap. 1560, d. 1622)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3821>.

³⁶ It is not clear why Leonel Sharpe mentions James's double descent when he first does so; however, since Sharpe compiles numerous arguments to support James's succession, he might simply have considered this to be another. Leonel Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge before the Universitie, the Knights, and Chiefe Gentlemen of the Shiere, the Maior and Townesmen, the 28. of March* (Cambridge, 1603; STC 22376), p. 18.

³⁷ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 24. Sharpe also argues that the English Parliament could not limit the succession, though he still decides to argue that James's hereditary claim was unaffected even if parliamentary legislation was admitted.

³⁸ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 25.

³⁹ Craig, *The Right of Succession*, pp. 292-295, 353, 427. Edward Ayscu also emphasises James's double descent from Margaret, likely for the same reason as Sharpe; if one line of descent was objected to, James could rely on the other, and together they were even stronger. For example, Ayscu points out that James VI & I was descended from Margaret Tudor by both his father and his mother (when recording the marriage of Margaret and James IV) and that James VI & I was the grandson of both James V and Lady Margaret Douglas (when recording Douglas's birth). Edward Ayscu, *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (London, 1607; STC 1014), pp. 251, 266.

to the Crowne of England (1604) claims that James had a ‘double right’ from his ‘double title’, and thereby asserts that James’s combined hereditary claims strengthened his position.⁴⁰ This was preferable to defending James’s succession based on only one hereditary claim and risking renewed debate over its validity.

Another reason for unofficial works to mention James’s double descent from Margaret was to anglicise him through his English paternal ancestry. Robert Fletcher explains that while James VI & I was James V’s grandson (not mentioning Mary, Queen of Scots), he was also the son of Darnley, ‘a most Godly, goodly, and noble young gentleman, borne heare in *England* amongst us’.⁴¹ Fletcher, like James’s defenders in the Elizabethan succession debates, points out that James’s father was English to present James as English (or at least partly English) as well.⁴² Sir George Buck claims that he can call James ‘an English man, as well for being descended from so many *English* Princes, as also for that your Majesties Father was an English man, and your mother Princesse, and heire of *England*’.⁴³ Buck asserts that James’s mother was the source of his senior hereditary claim to the English throne, but also celebrates the fact that James’s father was English, as this allows him to claim that James is English as well.⁴⁴ In his history, Edward Ayscu claims that James had received an annual pension from Elizabeth I ‘in regard of his just title and claime’ to the Lennox family’s English lands, which can be interpreted as an assertion that James was not excluded from inheriting property in England according to the common law, thereby demonstrating that he was suitably English

⁴⁰ *Northerne Poems Congratulating the Kings Majesties Most Happy and Peaceable Entrance to the Crowne of England* (London, 1604; STC 14427), p. 5. Rosamund Oates suggests that the writer was John Favour, ‘a godly cleric based at Halifax’, who became a chaplain and close friend to Tobie Matthew, Bishop of Durham and later Archbishop of York. Rosamund Oates, *Moderate Radical: Tobie Matthew and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 136.

⁴¹ Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar*, A4r. See: Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, pp. 21-22.

⁴² Anthony Nixon argues that James had secured from his ‘princely *Ancestors*, / Linall discent and rightfull claime: / Of English blood were his progenitors’, and though Nixon does not explicitly refer to James’s paternal ancestry as was English, the reader could interpret it this way. Anthony Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall. King James His Arrivall. And Romes Downefall* (London, 1603; STC 18586), C3v.

⁴³ George Buck, *Δαφνις Πολυστεφανος [Daphnis Polystephanos] An Eclog Treating of Crownes, and of Garlandes, and to Whom of Right they Appertaine. Addressed, and Consecrated to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1605; STC 3996), A3v.

⁴⁴ Buck later calls Mary ‘heyr apparent of *England*, and mother of our Soverain Lord King *James*’, further emphasising that James’s hereditary claim did not come from his father—James’s English parentage was pleasing but not essential to his succession. Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos*, F2v.

and could legally inherit the English throne as well—even though, in reality, James’s pension had not been compensation for the Lennox lands.⁴⁵

Some unofficial works also suggest that James’s strongest hereditary claim to the English throne came from his father rather than his mother, though they still list both.⁴⁶ For example, Robert Fletcher concludes that James is ‘our lawfull, and true undoubted King of *Scotland* by mother and father: of *England* by father and mother’.⁴⁷ This is not merely a rhetorical flourish: Fletcher presents James’s hereditary claim to the Scottish throne as coming first from his mother (since Darnley had his own hereditary claim to the Scottish throne), and he presents James’s hereditary claim to the English throne as coming first from his father. Michael Drayton explains that James had succeeded to the English throne because he was ‘Of *Henries* line by Father, and by Mother.’⁴⁸ Drayton gives more personal praise to Darnley than Mary and, like Fletcher, lists Darnley’s hereditary claim to the English throne ahead of Mary’s. Neither writer explains why they have prioritised Darnley’s hereditary claim over Mary’s, though it was likely due to the perceived Englishness of James’s paternal ancestry, and it may also have been a silent response to former challenges to Mary’s hereditary claim. Neither writer sets aside Mary’s hereditary claim to depend solely on Darnley’s, however, as they still choose to list both in defence of James’s succession. No Jacobean writers appear to discuss the annulment of Margaret Tudor’s marriage to Angus or her following marriage, intentionally avoiding any implication that Lady Margaret Douglas was illegitimate and thus incapable of passing a hereditary claim down to James through his paternal line—after all, the proclamation of James’s succession asserts that he was ‘lawfully descended’ from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York.

⁴⁵ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 302.

⁴⁶ For example, Anthony Nixon clearly explains Darnley’s descent from Margaret Tudor, but does not make clear that Mary was the daughter of James V and thus also Margaret’s descendant. As such, Mary is not explicitly presented as Margaret’s senior descendant, with Nixon appearing to give more weight to James’s paternal lineage. Nixon, *Elizaes Memoriall*, C3r.

⁴⁷ Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar*, A4r. See: Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, pp. 21-22.

⁴⁸ Michael Drayton, *To the Majestie of King James. A Gratulatorie Poem* (London, 1603; *STC* 7231), B1v. Ivic notes that Drayton ‘renders England’s Scottish monarch as one of their own, for James is [o]f Henries line by Father, and by Mother.’ However, Ivic does not analyse why Drayton mentions James’s double descent from Henry VII. Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 60. *An Excellent New Ballad* copies this information from Drayton, explaining that James was ‘next of Henries line, / bove other, / Comming both by father and mother.’ *An Excellent New Ballad, Shewing the Petigree of our Royall King James the First of that Name in England. To the Tune of, Gallants All Come Mourne with Mee* (London, 1603; *STC* 14423).

Another reason James's double descent from Margaret was considered significant was due to patriarchal prioritisation of paternal ancestry over maternal ancestry. In 1606, Richard Humphrey, schoolmaster of Dedham, Essex, accused Gervase Smith, parson of Polested, Suffolk, of saying that James 'was illegitimate, nor more a Tiddar or of that bloud than he himself was' while they were travelling together in Suffolk.⁴⁹ Smith denied saying that James was illegitimate, but confessed that he had said that James 'came from Tydor not in recta linea but collaterally' and acknowledged his error.⁵⁰ Humphrey stated that he 'gave the lesse eare unto' Smith because 'I found him ignorant of the kings majestie now being his discent from the Tiddar both by father & mother.'⁵¹ Smith's point appears to have been that James's descent from the Tudors was inferior because it only came through his mother, but Humphrey responded that James was also descended from the Tudors through his father. If paternal ancestry was more important than maternal ancestry, this was another reason to emphasise James's paternal descent from Margaret Tudor. If James could not be considered a Tudor through his maternal line, he apparently could be through his paternal line (even though his paternal descent from Henry VII still passed through two women, Margaret Tudor and Lady Margaret Douglas), and he had a greater accumulation of Tudor blood through the combination of the two.⁵² This helps us to understand the value attached to James's paternal ancestry by other writers as well, because they were also likely making patriarchal assumptions about the relative value of maternal and paternal descent.

⁴⁹ Summary of a discourse between Gervase Smith and Richard Humphrey, 11 September 1606. MS CP 192/131, fol. 225r.

⁵⁰ Testimony of Gervase Smith, 1 October 1606. MS CP 117/149, fol. 148r.

⁵¹ Testimony of Richard Humphrey, 8 October 1606. MS CP 192/137, fol. 168r.

⁵² English MPs made a similar point when discussing the line of succession if England and Scotland were permanently united. They claimed that, if James died without issue, 'the Law of Nations' required that 'if it be a new-erected Kingdom, it must go, in the nature of a purchase, to the next heir of his Majesty's father's side.' *The Journals of the House of Commons*, pp. 187-188. These complaints are recorded among 'Fragments at Large' in a manuscript union treatise, 'Whereupon There Are Sundry Objections Framed (Disputatively Only) Against Every Severall Matter and Circumstance (Any Way Subject to Excepcon)'. BL Harley MS 1314, fols 133-134. John Hayward argues that this was not how hereditary succession operated in his union treatise. Hayward, *Treatise of Union*, p. 45. An anonymous union treatise discusses 'the feare of the Alienacon of the English crowne, in case his Ma^{ties} lyne should determine &c.', responding that James was blessed with 'plentifull issue' and their fear was overblown. 'A Brief Replication to the Aunswere of the Objections Against the Union', c. 1604. BL Stowe MS 158, fol. 38r.

One previous objection that affected both lines of descent, however, was Henry VIII's will. Jacobean official explanations intentionally do not address the question of whether the English Parliament had any authority over the succession; therefore, although they do not openly discuss Henry VIII's will—which would risk renewed debate over James's right to the English throne—it is not acknowledged to have prevented James's succession by hereditary right. Most unofficial celebratory texts also do not discuss Henry VIII's will, silently accepting that it had no impact without debating its legality.⁵³ Similarly, Jacobean historians either do not mention Henry VIII's will or do not acknowledge that it had any impact on James's claim to the throne.⁵⁴ Leonel Sharpe's sermon is unique among these unofficial works, therefore, as Sharpe refutes the 'pretended testament of Henrie the 8.'⁵⁵ Sharpe argues that, even if Henry's will was authentic, the Act of Parliament it depended on did not allow him to 'make them heyres of the crowne that were not', and a monarch could not give the crown to anyone but to the person who was 'by the right of blood and lineall descent next heire unto it', since 'it is heaven not the earth that must destribute crownes: it is God not man that must dispose them at his pleasure.'⁵⁶ Royal succession operated according to divinely ordained hereditary right—and if

⁵³ One anonymous union treatise writer argues that using parliamentary legislation to make the Scottish line of succession follow the English line of succession (in case James's line failed and the succession diverged, thereby ending Anglo-Scottish union) would be unsuccessful. Their evidence for this was that parliamentary legislation was used during the Wars of the Roses to ensure the crown remained with the houses of Lancaster or York, but it never prevented someone from the opposite house succeeding, nor had Henry VIII's will prevented James's 'rightfull inheritance'. 'A Brief Replication to the Aunswere of the Objections Against the Union', c. 1604. BL Stowe MS 158, fols 38r-38v. It is interesting to note that, when Robert Cecil's papers were given to the State Papers Office after his death in 1612, they included 'Henry the 8th will under the greate seale'. Thomas Wilson, 'A Register of the later Bookes and Papers of English business as they are digested under their severall titles delivered into the Office of the Papers at Whitehall, at the death of the Earle of Salisbury, late Lord Treasurer.' 1612. TNA SP 45/20, fol. 29v.

⁵⁴ Edward Ayscu and William Martyn do not mention Henry VIII's will. Francis Godwin and John Speed do not question the authority or authenticity of Henry VIII's will, but they also do not say who Henry chose to succeed after his own children, so they do not discuss its displacement of Margaret Tudor's descendants in the line of succession. Francis Godwin, *Rerum Anglicarum Henrico VIII. Edwardo VI. et Maria Regnantibus, Annales* ([London], 1616; STC 11945), p. 84; John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045), p. 783. William Camden explains that Henry VIII asked for an Act of Parliament authorising him to name who would succeed to the throne if his own line failed, and although Camden does not claim that Henry's will was inauthentic or denounce the authority of the parliamentary legislation or the will to dictate the succession, he also does not say who Henry chose or bring up the will when discussing Mary, Queen of Scots' or James VI's hereditary claims. William Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha, Ad Annum Salutis M.D. LXXXIX*. (London, 1615; STC 4496), p. 7. In addition, Camden inserts uncertainty about the authority of parliamentary legislation over the succession elsewhere in his history, as discussed in Chapter 5.

⁵⁵ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 18.

⁵⁶ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, pp. 26-27.

man's wishes were given any weight, why should Henry VII's parliamentary entailment not prevail over Henry VIII's 'pretended and uncertaine' will?⁵⁷ Sharpe defends James's right to the English throne from various angles—while claiming that parliamentary legislation could not dictate royal succession, he also argues that, if it could, James still had the senior claim to the throne. Therefore, Sharpe defends James's status as England's monarch in both possible scenarios, rather than simply denying the English Parliament's authority over the succession.

Jacobean genealogists also had to decide how to explain the route by which James inherited his hereditary claim to the English throne, without the example of the official explanations to follow. Renold Elstrack made an engraved genealogy to celebrate the various Anglo-Scottish royal marital alliances. Although the genealogy itself has received some scholarly attention, the accompanying text has not been used to interpret it.⁵⁸ The text (possibly written by John Speed, who published the genealogy) explains that the two kingdoms had historically tried to secure peace 'by matching in matrimonye the princly blood royall of both the realmes: whereby the issue procreated from either, might indifferently challenge a love, and loyalty from bothe.'⁵⁹ The text lists the various Anglo-Scottish royal marriages since the Norman Conquest, the sixth being the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, 'Whose royall issue hath obyeined of god both the blessing of the first borne, and the imperiall Diademes of both theise Realmes.' Thus, the text asserts that it was James VI & I's maternal descent from Margaret that provided him with his senior hereditary right to the English throne (which is discussed further in Chapter 4). The text explains that the last Anglo-Scottish royal marriage was that of Mary and Darnley 'of England'.⁶⁰ Darnley's descent from Margaret is not traced

⁵⁷ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 27.

⁵⁸ For example, see: Arthur M. Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Descriptive Catalogue with Introductions, Part II: The Reign of James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), pp. 209-210; Antony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689* (London: British Museum Press, 1998), p. 45; Catherine MacLeod, *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2012), p. 48.

⁵⁹ This was certainly what James VI & I expected after his succession to the English throne. When he addressed the English Parliament on 20 April 1604, James explained that he wanted an Act of Union so that his subjects would properly understand that England and Scotland were united in 'One Allegiance, and loyal Subjection, in Me and My Person, to My Person and My Posterity for ever.' *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 180.

⁶⁰ Renold Elstrack (engraver) and John Speed (publisher), *The Most Happy Unions Contracted Betwixt the Princes of the Blood Royall of Theis Towe Famous Kingdomes of England & Scotland* (1603), engraving on paper, 46.4 x 39.3 cm. STC 23039g.3. British Museum, inv. no.

in the text, making clear that it was not significant for providing James with a hereditary claim, but because it gave James additional English royal blood.

On the genealogy itself, however, Elstrack traces James's double descent from Margaret Tudor and gives them equal weight, revealing a divide between how the genealogy and its accompanying text explain the source of James's hereditary claim to the English throne. Scholars have not sufficiently explained why the genealogy depicts James's double descent; Catherine MacLeod simply points out that 'there was a need to rehabilitate the Stuart monarchy and to stress its links with England, as well as to elucidate James's position in the succession', showing that he was 'descended directly from Henry VII on both his father's and his mother's side.'⁶¹ Sara Trevisan has provided the most thorough analysis of Jacobean genealogies, asserting that they aimed to 'fashion the Scottish king as an English one.'⁶² However, Trevisan does not explain why James's double descent was significant or analyse Elstrack's genealogy specifically.⁶³ James's maternal descent is not emphasised to show its seniority, leaving the viewer with the impression that both lines of descent are of equal significance; both are decorated with Tudor roses, emphasising that James's Tudor descent came from both his mother and his father.⁶⁴ Mary is shown at the centre of her row in the genealogy, with Darnley to her right, which could be interpreted as a sign that Mary was more important. However, this was likely done to achieve visual symmetry with the row containing Margaret and her first two husbands, as Mary is shown not only with Darnley but also with her first husband, François II, even though all other childless marriages are excluded from the genealogy. Angus is described as Margaret's second husband on the

1856,0614.149. Elstrack and Speed also produced another genealogy of James VI & I's double descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York via Margaret Tudor: Renold Elstrack (engraver) and John Speed (publisher), *James I and Anne of Denmark*, undated, c. 1603, engraving on paper, 28.3 x 37.8cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. no. 28.7.13.

⁶¹ MacLeod, *The Lost Prince*, p. 48. Arthur M. Hind and Antony Griffiths also do not provide any explanation or analysis of James's double descent: Hind, *Engraving in England... Part II: The Reign of James I*, pp. 209-210; Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain*, p. 45.

⁶² Sara Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2020), p. 174.

⁶³ Discussing *An Excellent New Ballad*, Trevisan writes: 'Like contemporary visual representations of the royal pedigree, the versified genealogy illustrates James's paternal and maternal legitimacy from the Tudor line.' Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy*, p. 191.

⁶⁴ Although James's maternal line is placed on the proper right, all of James's Scottish ancestors are shown on that side, so it does not appear to have been an attempt to present James's maternal descent from Margaret as senior to his paternal descent.

genealogy, so an alert viewer could deduce that James's maternal descent from Margaret was senior, though this is not signified visually. Elstrack's genealogy does not include Margaret's third husband, not only because the marriage was childless and irrelevant to James VI & I's descent, but also likely to avoid the question of whether Lady Margaret Douglas, the offspring of Margaret Tudor's second marriage, was legitimate. Elstrack's genealogy carries a different message to its accompanying text: both lines of descent from Margaret are given equal weight on the genealogy, demonstrating that James's double descent strengthened his hereditary claim to the English throne, while the accompanying text does not explain Darnley's descent from Margaret and only mentions him because he was English.

Benjamin Wright's genealogy represents James's descent from Margaret in an almost identical way to Elstrack's; however, Wright's genealogy is more Anglo-centric, as it only traces James's descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York while Elstrack's genealogy traces James's descent from Robert II, King of Scots, and John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster.⁶⁵ Without the accompanying text of Elstrack's genealogy to say otherwise, Wright's genealogy suggests that James's maternal and paternal descent from Margaret is equally important to his hereditary claim to the English throne. James IV is described as Margaret's first husband and Angus as her second, allowing the viewer to interpret James's maternal line as senior; however, this is not made textually or visually explicit, leaving the viewer with the impression that James had succeeded to the English throne because of his combined maternal and paternal hereditary claims.

Since the official explanations of James VI & I's succession to the English throne had intentionally avoided choosing between James's maternal and paternal hereditary claims as the justification for his succession, unofficial works did not have an example to follow for their own explanations.⁶⁶ Some asserted that James's

⁶⁵ Benjamin Wright, *The Roiall Progenei of our Most Sacred King James*, 1603, engraving on paper, 37.2 x 27 cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1882,0812.540.

⁶⁶ In his first Star Chamber speech on 20 June 1616, James himself pointed out that he was 'lineally descended' from Henry VII 'and that doubly to this Crown', a reference to the hereditary claims to the English throne he inherited from both of his parents. This was a different approach to the official explanations at the start of his joint reign, suggesting he may have been influenced by the unofficial works that celebrated his double descent and combined hereditary claims. James VI

maternal descent was senior and thus the main source of his hereditary claim to the English throne, though they did not always make this explicit. Others presented James's maternal and paternal hereditary claims as equal, or at least did not judge between them, which was likely a response to the criticisms each line had faced during the Elizabethan succession debates. Finally, some prioritised James's paternal descent as the source of his hereditary claim, primarily due to its perceived Englishness which allowed James to be fashioned as English. This can also be interpreted as a response to the Elizabethan succession debates, when James's foreignness was used to argue that he was ineligible to succeed to the English throne. If James's maternal line was excluded due to its foreignness (or due to his mother's legal exclusion, as discussed in Chapter 5), then James could rely on his paternal line instead. As a result, these works were divided over whether James's maternal or paternal line was the senior source of his hereditary claim, preferring to combine the two with the presumption that this strengthened James's claim further rather than relying on only one.

The Jacobean focus on James's English paternal descent can also be interpreted as an expression of nationalistic desire among the English for their new monarch to share their national identity, rather than being a Scot. There are numerous surviving examples of English people expressing dissatisfaction with the succession of a foreigner and a Scot to the English throne, and James's Scottishness had been used to argue that he was not a desirable candidate during the Elizabethan succession debates, regardless of his hereditary claim.⁶⁷ Attempts to anglicise James through his paternal descent were a response to such criticisms and fears. This reveals that nationality was an important justification for James's succession, alongside hereditary right—if James did not have 'enough' English blood or immediate

& I, *His Majesties Speech in the Starre-Chamber*, B2r; James VI & I, 'A Speech in the Starre-Chamber', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 206.

⁶⁷ One man was tried for publicly stating that the English 'ought not to rejoyce for that any forraine prynce should raigne over us ... and that if any forraine Prince did inherit the Crowne the nobles were perjured.' J.S. Cockburn (ed.), *Calendar of Assize Records: Sussex Indictments, James I* (London: HMSO, 1975), p. 1. Another man was tried for publicly stating that 'it weer pyttie that a forreyne kinge shold be kinge excepte yt were his right ... and that there were as wise men in England to have bene kinge as the Kinge of Scotts'. J.S. Cockburn, *Calendar of Assize Records: Essex Indictments, James I* (London: HMSO, 1982), p. 3. Considering that these statements have only been recorded because they resulted in trials, we can assume that many more criticisms of James as a foreigner and a Scot were being made that went unrecorded.

English ancestry, would his hereditary claim be sufficient to secure him the English throne? While some might assert that James's maternal descent provided him with his senior hereditary claim, his paternal descent was celebrated more profusely for giving him more recent English ancestry, and the two lines were often represented as being of equal value. Thus, the question of whether foreigners could succeed to the English throne was not resolved by James's own succession, as he was presented as suitably English and his hereditary claim was not presented as coming exclusively through his Scottish maternal ancestry.

It was rare for unofficial Jacobean works to openly respond to the objections made against the hereditary claims of James's ancestors in the Elizabethan succession debates. The exception to this was Leonel Sharpe's sermon, which has more in common with Elizabethan succession treatises than Jacobean panegyrics due to its thorough analysis of, and response to, such objections. The preferred strategy among Jacobean works was to ignore former objections, implicitly asserting that they had not been valid in the first place and so could not prevent James's succession to the English throne. For example, the potential illegitimacy of Lady Margaret Douglas was not discussed and so she was assumed to be legitimate and capable of passing down a hereditary claim to James—and, even if she could not, James could alternatively rely on his maternal hereditary claim. Henry VIII's will was rarely discussed and silently assumed to be of no consequence, but few openly debated the authority of the English Parliament over the succession—even Sharpe made arguments that defended James's right to the throne in both possible scenarios, rather than simply denying parliament's authority. Rather than asserting that foreigners could succeed to the English throne and pass down hereditary claims to their descendants, James's subjects preferred to anglicise him through his paternal descent and celebrate his combined maternal and paternal hereditary claims in case either was objectionable. This strategy of silence meant that these works did not make conclusive statements about how the English succession operated, and so it remained unclear; their concern was to defend James's position, so they did not want to renew debates over the nature of the succession and the validity of James's hereditary claim.

Protestant Paternal Ancestry

The continued uncertainty over the nature of James VI & I's hereditary claim to the English throne, and the operation of the English succession more generally, is clearly demonstrated by a dispute in the 1610s over whether James's hereditary claim came exclusively from Catholics. This dispute has only received limited scholarly attention and has not been analysed in terms of what it reveals about Jacobean understandings of the concept of hereditary right.⁶⁸ The dispute demonstrates that the Jacobean representation of James's hereditary claim to the English throne was influenced not only by the nationality of James's ancestors but also by their confessional identity, as certain lines of descent were prioritised based on whether they were (or were perceived to be) Catholic or Protestant. The importance of religion to the representation of James's hereditary claim is discussed further in Chapter 5.

The dispute revolved around Benjamin Carier, who argued that James's hereditary claim to the English throne depended entirely on Catholics and that, as a result, James should restore Catholicism in England. Carier was a Church of England clergyman who served as chaplain to Prince Henry and chaplain-in-ordinary to James. In 1613, however, Carier travelled to Cologne and publicly converted to Catholicism. Carier wrote an open letter to James, which served as the basis for a treatise published in 1614, though the treatise may have been published posthumously as Carier had died by mid-1614.⁶⁹ Carier makes numerous arguments

⁶⁸ For example, Howard Nenner does not include it in his discussion of challenges to the nature of James's claim to the English throne made later in his joint reign. For discussions of this incident, see: James Doelman, *King James I and the Religious Culture of England* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2000), pp. 116, 118-120; Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24.2 (April 1985), 204; Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 183n.50, 197-198; Andreas Pečar, 'Printed and Censored at the Same Time for One and the Same Statement?: The Fate of George Hakewill's Writings in the Context of the Spanish Match', in *Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Book*, ed. by Pete Langman (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 75-77; Michael Questier, 'Crypto-Catholicism, Anti-Calvinism and Conversion at the Jacobean Court: The Enigma of Benjamin Carier', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 47.1 (1996), 45-64; Constantin Rieske, 'Doing the Paperwork: Early Modern Converts, Their Narratives and the (Re)Writing of Religious Lives', *The Medieval History Journal*, 18.2 (2015), 409-410, 418-420; Deborah Shuger (ed.), *Religion in Early Stuart England, 1603-1638: An Anthology of Primary Sources* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), pp. 160-177; Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 5-7.

⁶⁹ Antony Charles Ryan, 'Carier, Benjamin (bap. 1565, d. 1614)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/4663>.

encouraging James to convert to Catholicism, one of which is that although Elizabeth I was forced to maintain Protestantism because her right to the English throne depended on an acceptance of Henry VIII's break from the Catholic Church, James was 'by the consent of all sides come to the Crowne, and your undoubted Title settled with long possession ... for your Majestie hath no need of dispensations'. James's hereditary claim to the English throne was not based on parliamentary legislation, and thus he had no reason to maintain the schism between the Church of England and the Catholic Church as Elizabeth had. Carier concludes that James should restore Catholicism 'as your most wise, and Catholike Progenitor, King Henry the sevent did leave it.'⁷⁰ James's Protestant subjects overlook the Catholicism of Henry VII, a pre-Reformation monarch, in their discussions of James's hereditary claim; the Catholic Carier, however, makes a point of it.

George Hakewill, a Church of England clergyman who served as chaplain to Prince Charles, was commissioned by James to refute Carier's treatise. Hakewill's response was published in 1616.⁷¹ Hakewill discusses James's double descent from Margaret Tudor to deny Carier's statement that James's 'right to the Crowne came only by Catholikes'.⁷² Hakewill based his argument on what James himself had written about his family's religious views in the second edition of *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* (1609). As well as arguing that Mary, Queen of Scots, although a Catholic, disliked the Jesuits and some of the Catholic Church's 'superstitious Ceremonies' (directly quoting James), Hakewill claims that James's '*right to the Crowne is double*', as his 'second right above any other pretendor was from his father'.⁷³ Hakewill claims that as Henry, Lord Darnley, was 'brought up

⁷⁰ Benjamin Carier, *A Treatise, Written by M. Doctor Carier, Wherein Hee Layeth Downe Sundry Learned and Pithy Considerations, By Which He Was Moved, To Forsake the Protestant Congregation, and to Betake Himselfe to the Catholicke Apostolike Roman Church* (Brussels, 1614; STC 4623), p. 33.

⁷¹ P.E. McCullough, 'Hakewill, George (bap. 1578, d. 1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/11885>. A copy of Hakewill's response is recorded in an inventory of Somerset House/Denmark House, Anna of Denmark's residence, taken after her death in 1619: 'An aunswere to a treatise written by Doctor Carrier'. M.T.W. Payne, 'An Inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark's "ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcellis" at Denmark House, 1619', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 13.1 (2001), 42.

⁷² Carier, *A Treatise*, p. 6. Carier declares not only that James's claim came exclusively through Catholics, but also that it 'was ancients then the Schisme, which would very faine have utterly extinguished it'. This may have been a reference to Henry VIII's will and/or attacks on Mary, Queen of Scots' hereditary claim based to her Catholicism.

⁷³ George Hakewill, *An Answer to a Treatise Written by Dr. Carier, By Way of a Letter to his Majestie Wherein he Layeth Downe Sundry Politike Considerations; by which hee Pretendeth*

in Q. *Elizabeths Court*,’ and Darnley’s father, Matthew Stewart, Earl of Lennox, was a Protestant, so ‘in all likelihood his *Majesties* father himselfe should be that way affected’.⁷⁴ In reality, the confessional identities of both men were ambiguous, while Lady Margaret Douglas—Darnley’s mother and the source of his hereditary claim to the English throne—had been a well-known Catholic who received the support of English Catholics during the Elizabethan succession debates.⁷⁵ In addition, support for Darnley’s candidacy had not been based on his supposed Protestantism.⁷⁶ However, it suited James and Hakewill to assert that Darnley and Lennox were Protestants, with Hakewill using it to argue that James’s hereditary claim to the English throne did not come exclusively through Catholics.

George Hakewill’s intention was to show that not only did James VI & I have the senior hereditary claim to the English throne through his maternal descent from Margaret Tudor, but also that James’s paternal line, which provided him with a second, junior hereditary claim, was Protestant. Although Hakewill used James’s own words as the basis for this argument, their motivations were different. James was countering Cardinal Bellarmine’s claim that he was an ‘apostate’ who was of Catholic ancestry and had been raised Catholic but had abandoned Catholicism for Protestantism.⁷⁷ Hakewill, however, adapted James’s words to serve as a response

Himselfe was Moved, and Endevoureth to Move Others to be Reconiled to the Church of Rome, and Imbrace that Religion, Which he Calleth Catholike (London, 1616; *STC* 12610), pp. 20-21. Hakewill argues that although James’s mother ‘imbraced that Religion in which shee was brought up, being never acquainted with any other,’ James himself had stated in the preamble to the second edition of *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* (1609) that Mary ‘disliked some of the superstitious Ceremonies, and abhorred those new opinions, which the Jesuits call Catholike’ (though this is not a direct quote from James, as Hakewill makes the anti-Catholic sentiment more extreme). Hakewill, *An Answere*, p. 20. James’s original quote reads: ‘And as for the *Queene* my Mother of worthie memorie, although she continued in that Religion wherein she was nourished, yet was shee so farre from being superstitious or *Jesuited* therein, that at my *Baptisme* (although I was baptized by a Popish *Archbishop*) she sent him word to forbear to use the spettle in my *Baptisme*; which was obeyed, being indeede a filthy and an apish trick, rather in scorne then imitation of *Christ*. And her owne very words were, *That shee would not have a pockie Priest to spet in her childes mouth.*’ James VI & I, *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1609; *STC* 14401.5), p. 33.

⁷⁴ Hakewill, *An Answere*, p. 21.

⁷⁵ For discussions of Lennox and Darnley’s religious beliefs, see: Marcus Merriman, ‘Stewart, Matthew, thirteenth or fourth earl of Lennox (1516-1571)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26497>; Greig, ‘Stewart, Henry, duke of Albany’. Catholic support for Lady Margaret Douglas’s claim to the English throne is discussed in Levine, *Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, pp. 9, 46.

⁷⁶ Levine, *Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, pp. 166-167.

⁷⁷ James responded to this by claiming that his mother, while Catholic, was ‘farre from being superstitious or *Jesuited* therein,’ and that his father and paternal grandfather were both Protestants. James VI & I, *An Apologie*, p. 33.

to Benjamin Carrier's argument that James's hereditary claim to the English throne came exclusively through Catholics, and thus James should convert to Catholicism.

As a result, James's paternal lineage was presented as significant by the Jacobeans not only because it was (apparently) English, but also because it was (apparently) Protestant. Hakewill did not argue that it was essential for James's hereditary claim to come from Protestants to justify his succession to the English throne; he clearly stated that James's senior hereditary claim came from his Catholic maternal ancestry, even if he also downplayed the extent of Mary, Queen of Scots' Catholicism. However, Hakewill still asserted that James's inheritance of a second hereditary claim through his Protestant paternal ancestry was a cause for celebration and evidence that James's status as England's monarch did not depend entirely on Catholics, as he still would have succeeded to the English throne without his maternal hereditary claim. Therefore, James was under no obligation to convert to Catholicism.

Ultimately, however, this dispute suggested that religion was an important factor in justifying James's succession, as Hakewill did not judge James's hereditary claims purely according to their seniority but also according to whether they could be categorised as Catholic or Protestant, depending on the confessional identities of James's ancestors. Hakewill wanted James to have a 'Protestant' hereditary claim from his father so that he was not entirely reliant on his mother's 'Catholic' hereditary claim, even if the latter was senior. As will be discussed in Chapter 5, Mary, Queen of Scots' Catholicism was a cause for concern in the Jacobean period, so it is understandable that Hakewill wanted to emphasise Henry, Lord Darnley's supposed Protestantism (and downplay the zeal of Mary's own Catholicism) as a countermeasure, making James's ancestry (and hereditary claim) appear less Catholic to reassure James's Protestant subjects.

Conclusion

While the official explanations of James VI & I's succession to the English throne asserted that he had succeeded by hereditary right as the senior surviving descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York through their daughter, Margaret Tudor, they offered no explanation of how that hereditary claim had passed down

to James through the following generations, as James was descended from Margaret through both his mother and his father. Jacobean officials preferred to leave it ambiguous, so that James could rely on the hereditary claims that came from either or both lines of descent, rather than firmly choosing one. This ambiguity was a response to the Elizabethan succession debates when the hereditary claims of both lines of descent had been disputed. James's maternal ancestors had been objected to as foreign, either making them legally ineligible to succeed or undesirable as candidates (and it was argued that the hereditary claim of James's mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, had been nullified by parliamentary legislation, which will be discussed in Chapter 5). James's paternal ancestors, meanwhile, had been objected to as illegitimate and thereby incapable of passing down a hereditary claim, or as not sufficiently English to bypass the exclusion of foreigners. Therefore, rather than relying on only one line of descent to justify James's succession or openly responding to those former objections, thereby risking the possibility of renewed debate over the validity of James's claim to the English throne, the official explanations remained intentionally silent.

Without official guidance to follow, most of James's English subjects chose to emphasise his double descent from Margaret Tudor rather than deciding between his maternal and paternal hereditary claims. James's subjects were divided over which hereditary claim was senior, if they chose to address this question at all, but most celebrated the union of the two in James's person, just as they celebrated the union of the Lancastrian and Yorkist hereditary claims in the descendants of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. This suggested that James's position was strengthened by having multiple hereditary claims, or that the objections made against each individual claim during the Elizabethan succession debates—which were not openly addressed by most Jacobean works—did not undermine James's claim to the English throne as he could simply turn to the other, thereby ensuring that he was England's rightful monarch in all possible scenarios. In a strictly hereditary system, it should have been obvious whether James's maternal or paternal hereditary claim was senior; however, this was not considered to be the case, and so James's subjects judged the value of these hereditary claims based on other considerations, the most important being the nationalities and confessional identities of James's ancestors.

The significance of nationality to justifications of James's succession, previously discussed in Chapter 1, is further demonstrated by the widespread emphasis placed by James's English subjects on his paternal descent from Margaret Tudor, due to its supposed 'Englishness'. One of the reasons they did this was to present James as sufficiently English himself to be a suitable monarch for England, reflecting their desire for James to share their national identity. It can also be interpreted as a response to the Elizabethan succession debates. If James's maternal hereditary claim was invalid because it passed through a line of foreigners, his paternal hereditary claim was an acceptable alternative due to the English births of James's paternal ancestors going back to Margaret Tudor. Jacobean works implicitly rejected John Hales's claim that James's paternal ancestors were not truly English and thus could not inherit the throne according to English law, as that would have completely undermined their purpose. Jacobean works also ignored James's own foreign birth, both explicitly and implicitly asserting that his paternal ancestry was sufficient to make him English regardless of where he was born.

In addition, George Hakewill valued James's paternal ancestry for (apparently) being Protestant because it allowed him to argue that James had a hereditary claim to the English throne that did not come exclusively from Catholics. This further demonstrates that hereditary claims were not judged purely based on their seniority. Although other Jacobean works did not openly state that they preferred James's paternal ancestry because they considered it to be Protestant, given the previous English hostility towards Mary, Queen of Scots, based on her Catholicism and involvement in Catholic plots against Elizabeth I (as discussed in Chapter 5), it is possible that Jacobean Protestants looked to James's paternal ancestry as less objectionable on religious grounds. This introduces the question of how religion was perceived to affect the value of a hereditary claim, which will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

Few Jacobean works openly discussed the objections previously made against the hereditary claims of James's ancestors in the Elizabethan succession debates, revealing that their intention was not to clarify how the English succession operated but simply to defend James's suitability as England's monarch. The idea that Henry VIII's will negated the seniority of the Stuart hereditary claim was silently

dismissed, but the English Parliament's authority over the succession was left largely undiscussed. Had James been accepted as a foreigner succeeding to the English throne through his maternal hereditary claim, this would have dismissed the argument that foreigners were legally excluded from the line of succession. Instead, James's English subjects anglicised him based on his paternal ancestry. This explains James's fear in 1614 that his daughter Elizabeth's foreign-born descendants would be prevented from inheriting the English throne if his male line failed, as his own succession had not been acknowledged as a resolution to the question of whether foreigners could succeed to the English throne.⁷⁸

⁷⁸ See: William Cobbett (ed.), *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, from the Norman Conquest, in 1066, to the year, 1803*, 36 vols (London, 1806-1820), I (1806), pp. 1151-1152; Maija Jansson (ed.), *Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988), pp. 8, 15-16, 54; *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 459; *Journals of the House of Lords Beginning Anno Vicesimo Elizabethæ Reginae*, volume 2 (n.d.), p. 693; Nenner, *The Right to be King*, pp. 64-65; Conrad Russell, *King James VI and I and his English Parliaments*, ed. by Richard Cust and Andrew Thrush (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 122.

4. James VI & I's Descent from Margaret Tudor and Anglo-Scottish Union

Many English Jacobean works celebrated James VI & I's paternal descent from Margaret Tudor to anglicise him and make him appear less foreign, as shown in Chapter 3. This should be understood not only as a response to the Elizabethan succession debates, but also the Union of the Crowns. As Jenny Wormald explains, 'the flattering and soothing extolling of union by English and Scottish poets ... was rivalled, if not drowned out, by a flood of anti-Scottish writing ... all portraying the Scots as beggarly, grasping, thieving, filthy and lice-ridden.'¹ This hostility helps to explain why English works preferred not to focus on James's Scottish maternal descent from Margaret Tudor. Sarah Waurechen cautions against overstating English hostility and xenophobia towards the Scots in response to the Union of the Crowns, as 'English commentators used the idea of Scotland in myriad ways' and 'an extremely careful negotiation of the new Anglo-Scottish dynamic was also occurring.'² However, Waurechen acknowledges that English writers tended to create 'Anglocentric narratives'.³ This chapter therefore analyses the Jacobean representation of James's Scottish maternal ancestors (excepting Mary, Queen of Scots, who is discussed separately in the following chapters) to determine if and how their reputations were affected by the Union of the Crowns. Scholars tend to only discuss the Jacobean representation of these individuals anecdotally, with most analysis of their posthumous reputations focusing on sixteenth-century histories or modern works.⁴

¹ Jenny Wormald, "'A Union of Hearts and Minds?': The Making of the Union between Scotland and England, 1603", *Revista Internacional de los Estudios Vascos*, 5 (2009), 122.

² Sarah Waurechen, 'Imagined Politics, Failed Dreams, and the Beginnings of an Unacknowledged Britain: English Responses to James VI and I's Vision of Perfect Union', *Journal of British Studies*, 52 (2013), 576.

³ Waurechen, 'Imagined Politics, Failed Dreams', 575.

⁴ For example, see: Jamie Cameron, *James V: The Personal Rule, 1528-1542* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2011), pp. 1-6, 328-335, 344-349; Dermot Cavanagh, 'Uncivil Monarchy: Scotland, England and the Reputation of James IV', in *Early Modern Civil Discourses*, ed. Jennifer Richards (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 146-161; Ken Emond, *The Minority of James V: Scotland in Europe, 1513-1528* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2019), pp. 267-281; Louise Olga Fradenburg, *City, Marriage, Tournament: Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), pp. 153-171; Louise Olga Fradenburg, 'Troubled Times: Margaret Tudor and the Historians', in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), pp. 38-53; Norman MacDougall, *James IV* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1997), pp. 282-303; Pamela E. Ritchie, *Mary of Guise in Scotland, 1548-1560: A*

Some Jacobean works also invoked James's descent from Margaret Tudor to claim that his succession to the English throne had united 'Britain'. Christopher Ivic explains that 'many English authors of succession texts presented James as a (re)unifier of a British polity. Accompanying this discourse of (re)unification is less an Anglicisation of James than a Briticisation ... of the Scottish monarch.'⁵ As such, these attempts to present James as British could conflict with attempts to anglicise him—except when, as Wormald explains, English writers used the term 'Britain' interchangeably with 'England', thereby anglicising the concept of Britain as a whole.⁶ James adopted the title 'King of Great Britain' on 20 October 1604, dropping the separate names of England and Scotland, and unsuccessfully tried to have the two kingdoms permanently united as the single kingdom of Great Britain.⁷ Jacobean representations of James's descent from the mythical British kings, which were intended to defend the legitimacy of the contemporary 'reunification' of Britain, have been analysed by scholars.⁸ Less attention, however, has been paid to how James's descent from Margaret Tudor was used to defend the concept of Britain, which is analysed in this chapter.

Political Career (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2002), pp. 1-9; Katie Stevenson and Gordon Pentland, 'The Battle of Flodden and its Commemoration, 1513-2013', in *England and Scotland at War, c.1296-c.1513*, ed. by Andy King and David Simpkin (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 355-380; Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 49, 60, 74-75.

⁵ Christopher Ivic, *The Subject of Britain, 1603-25* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), p. 27.

⁶ Wormald, "'A Union of Hearts and Minds?'" , 112. As Alan MacColl explains, this was also done before the Union of the Crowns. Alan MacColl, 'The Meaning of "Britain" in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45.2 (April 2006), 269.

⁷ James VI & I, 'Proclamation concerning the Kings Majesties Stile, of King of Great Britaine, 20 October 1604, Westminster Palace,' in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625*, ed. by James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 94-98.

⁸ For example, see: Arnold Hunt, Dora Thornton, and George Dalgleish, 'A Jacobean Antiquary Reassessed: Thomas Lyte, the Lyte Genealogy and the Lyte Jewel', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 96 (2016), 169-184; Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, pp. 62-63; Philip Schwyzer, 'The Jacobean Union Controversy and *King Lear*', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 34-47; Sara Trevisan, 'Noah, Brutus of Troy, and King James VI and I: Biblical and Mythical Ancestry in an Anonymous Genealogical Role', in *Mythical Ancestry in World Cultures, 1400-1800*, ed. by Sara Trevisan (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), pp. 137-164; Sara Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2020), pp. 193-234; D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), pp. 62-63.

This chapter begins by analysing how the combined English and Scottish hereditary claims James VI & I inherited from the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots, were celebrated for making the union of ‘Britain’ possible. This reveals what some of James’s subjects thought the impact of his status as hereditary monarch of both kingdoms had (or might have had) on Anglo-Scottish relations. This chapter then discusses the Jacobean representation of James IV and James V, since James VI & I relied on them both for his hereditary claim to the Scottish throne and on the latter for his maternal hereditary claim to the English throne. It considers whether their reputations were affected by, or revised in support of, the Union of the Crowns and permanent union, as they had both been England’s enemies. This demonstrates that nationality continued to influence the representation of James VI & I’s Scottish ancestors in the Jacobean period and that James’s dependence on them for his hereditary claims was not enough to overcome this or lead to a properly integrated history of ‘Great Britain’.

The Marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots

As discussed in Chapter 3, many English Jacobean works celebrated James VI & I’s double descent from Margaret Tudor for combining two hereditary claims to the English throne, while placing special emphasis on James’s English paternal ancestry to anglicise him due to their focus on James’s status as England’s monarch. By contrast, Jacobean works that celebrated the Union of the Crowns focused primarily on James’s maternal descent from the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots, which combined both English and Scottish hereditary claims and could therefore be presented as solely responsible for James’s succession to both thrones. This divide in how James’s hereditary claim to the English throne was represented in the Jacobean period—either coming from both of his parents or only his mother—can be explained by the artist or writer’s national concerns. While many of those who justified James’s succession to the English throne through his combined maternal and paternal hereditary claims did so to anglicise James and focus on his status as England’s monarch, those who justified James’s succession to the thrones of both England and Scotland through his maternal line’s combined hereditary claims did so to celebrate the Union of the Crowns as the creation of ‘Britain’.

This section analyses Jacobean representations of James VI & I's descent from Margaret and James IV as a lens through which to understand what political impact James's subjects thought his succession to the thrones of both England and Scotland by hereditary right had on Anglo-Scottish relations. It demonstrates that these Jacobean works presented James's succession to the thrones of both England and Scotland as the result of the combined hereditary claims he inherited from the marriage of Margaret and James IV to celebrate the Union of the Crowns as the creation of 'Britain', dissolving the separate English and Scottish states and national identities. This has been the subject of almost no scholarly analysis.⁹

The marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots, was represented as a significant national event in both English and Scottish histories written prior to James VI & I's succession to the English throne.¹⁰ However, it was only in John Lesley, Bishop of Ross's *De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum Libri Decem* (1578) that the marriage was explicitly linked to the English succession, as Lesley's history was also a succession treatise.¹¹ The marriage was also discussed in Elizabethan succession treatises as the source of the Stuart hereditary claim to the English throne (as discussed in Chapter 3). After James VI & I's succession to the English throne, the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV was celebrated as the event that had made the Union of the Crowns possible. According to Brian P. Levack, 'both James and his literary supporters recognized that the union of 1603 was a strictly dynastic and regal union'.¹² This, however, is not true of all Jacobean works. The works discussed here all celebrate James's succession to the thrones of both England and Scotland as achieving the union (or reunion) of 'Britain' and

⁹ For example, see: R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Royal Mothers, Sacred History, and Political Polemic', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 288.

¹⁰ For example, see: Robert Lindsay, *The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland*, ed. by Æ.J.G. Mackay, 3 vols (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1899-1911), I (1899), pp. 238-240; George Buchanan, *The History of Scotland*, trans. by James Aikman, 4 vols (Glasgow, 1827), II, pp. 239-240; Edward Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke* (London, 1548; STC 12721), 44r, 52v, 53v-54r, 56r-56v [of account of Henry VII's reign]; Raphael Holinshed, *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande and Ireland* (London, 1577; STC 13568.5), pp. 1452, 1456.

¹¹ Lesley explained how Mary, Queen of Scots, was descended from the marriage to argue that she and her descendants were the rightful heirs to the English throne after Elizabeth I, which was followed by a full-page genealogy of Henry VII's descendants to support Mary's claim. John Lesley, *De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum Libri Decem* (Rome, 1578), pp. 339-340.

¹² Brian P. Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 4.

discuss the implications this has for Anglo-Scottish relations. This suggests uncertainty over the immediate impact of James's succession to the English throne on the relationship between England and Scotland, and what his status as hereditary monarch of both kingdoms made possible. Some of the writers discussed in this section have already been covered in earlier chapters; a brief introduction is provided for those who were not.

Samuel Daniel tries to anglicise both the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV and the Union of the Crowns he claims resulted from it to reassure an English audience. Christopher Ivic explains that 'Daniel's poem eases fears of James's accession by figuring it not as the arrival of a foreign king but as a homecoming.'¹³ In both the manuscript presentation copy and published version of his poem, Daniel justifies James's succession to the English throne based on the hereditary claim he inherited from the 'precious' Margaret Tudor (though not, at this point, mentioning whether it came from James's maternal or paternal line of descent, or both), and describes James's succession as the 'fresh returning of our blood', anglicising England's new monarch.¹⁴ Daniel also made a significant addition to the published version to encourage the English to celebrate both James's succession and the Union of the Crowns. In the published version, Daniel explains that 'the hundreth yeare brought backe againe / The sacred bloud lent to adorne the North, / And here return'd it with a greater gaine, / And greater glory than we sent it forth'.¹⁵ Daniel celebrates the marriage of Margaret and James IV for preserving England's 'sacred' royal blood in their descendants, which had now returned to England through James VI & I's succession to the English throne (thereby asserting that James's succession was based on his maternal hereditary claim, with no mention of James's paternal descent in the poem). England's royal blood was now more glorious for having been combined with Scotland's royal blood, which together secured the Union of the Crowns. Daniel anglicises James VI & I based on his maternal descent from Margaret Tudor, as well as anglicising the Union of the Crowns as the natural

¹³ Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 68.

¹⁴ Samuel Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1603; *STC* 6258), A3r, B1r. Samuel Daniel, 'A Panegyrick congratulatorie to the Kinges most sacred maiestie', 1603. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fols 4r, 8r.

¹⁵ Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie*, B1r. This stanza would have gone at the top of fol. 8r if it had been in the manuscript presentation copy. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII.

outcome of England's royal blood being 'brought backe againe' from its temporary abode in Scotland.

Daniel likely attempted to appease English readers with the above addition because his poem also claims that the English state and national identity had been subsumed into Great Britain. James VI & I's official union proclamation, issued on 19 May 1603, commanded James's subjects 'to repute, hold, and esteeme both the two Realmes as presently united, and as one Realme and Kingdome, and the Subjects of both the Realmes as one people, brethren and members of one body'.¹⁶ This proclamation appears to have influenced the changes Daniel made between the manuscript and published version of his poem, including his claims concerning Great Britain.¹⁷ In both the manuscript and published version, Daniel declares that, with James's succession to the English throne, there was 'No Scot, no English now, nor no debate: / No Borders but the Ocean, and the Shore'.¹⁸ In the manuscript version, Daniel declares 'o thou mightie Ile / Now thou art all great Brytaine', while in the published version this is changed to 'O thou mightie State, / Now thou art all great *Brittaine*'.¹⁹ This change clarifies that not only is the island of Great Britain united under a shared monarch, but it has also become a single state. In his poem, Daniel awkwardly combines an anglicised interpretation of James VI & I's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns with a celebration of the latter as the creation of Great Britain. Daniel claims that England and Scotland are no longer separate states, and their inhabitants no longer have separate national identities. Daniel justifies this as the legitimate and immediate

¹⁶ James VI & I, 'Proclamation for the Uniting of England and Scotland, 19 May 1603, Greenwich,' in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1*, ed. by Larkin and Hughes, pp. 18-19; James VI & I, *By the King. Forasmuch as the Kings Majestie, in his Princely Disposition to Justice...* (London, 1603; STC 8314).

¹⁷ Daniel presented the manuscript copy of his poem to James VI & I on 23 April 1603; the union proclamation was issued on 19 May 1603; and Daniel registered the published version of his poem with the Stationers' Company on 30 May 1603. Therefore, it was possible for Daniel to make changes to the published version of his poem in response to the union proclamation. *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Majestie, From the Time of His Departure from Edenbrough; Till His Receiving at London: With All or the Most Speciall Occurrences* (London, 1603; STC 17153), E3-E4; BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fols 1r-9r; *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London. 1554-1650 A.D.*, ed. by Edward Arber, 5 vols (London, 1875-1894), III (1876), p. 96r.

¹⁸ Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie*, A1r. Manuscript presentation copy: 'No Scott, no English now, no sevrall stile / No Borders but the Ocean, or the shore'. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fol. 2r.

¹⁹ Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie*, A1r; BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fol. 2r.

result of James VI & I's succession to the thrones of both England and Scotland by hereditary right, asserting that James's subjects are all united in their 'obedience ... to one imperiall Prince.'²⁰

Edward Wilkinson presents the Union of the Crowns as the reunion of 'Britain' and stresses the benefits it will bring James's subjects based on the precedent of (mythical) history. Wilkinson was a poet of whom we know very little, but Catherine Loomis interprets the 'advocacy of a united kingdom' found in poems such as his to be an indication that 'at least some of the poets were confident that their literary works could be used to encourage political action.'²¹ Wilkinson presents the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV as the source of James VI & I's combined hereditary claims, explaining that Henry VII's 'issue female must continue / Our happinesse begunne: *Margaret* a gemme / Of peerelesse price, who past with her retinue to Edenbrough, to a glorious stemme / King *James* the fourth ... From whose faire Princely loynes we fetch discent / Of *James* our king'.²² By mentioning Margaret's journey to Edinburgh, Wilkinson effectively presents James's succession to the English throne as the corresponding return trip (in a similar manner to Daniel), which serves to anglicise James. Wilkinson claims that Britain had flourished when it was united in the past (focusing on Brutus, Britain's founder according to English legend), but when it was divided it suffered from 'invasions ... civill discord, mutinies, and jarres ... forraine as domesticke warres'.²³ Therefore, Wilkinson asserts that with James's succession, '*England, and Scotland, Cornwall, Wales* and all / Stands joyntly now a *Britaine*', and he describes Britain as a single monarchy.²⁴

The text on one of Renold Elstrack's genealogies (possibly written by its publisher, John Speed) celebrates James VI & I's descent from Margaret Tudor and James IV not only for providing him with the senior hereditary claims that justified his successions to the English and Scottish thrones, but also for securing peace between

²⁰ Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie*, A1r.

²¹ Catherine Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 63.

²² Edward Wilkinson, *Isahacs Inheritance; Dew to Our High and Mightie Prince, James the Sixt of Scotland, of England, France and Ireland the First* (London, 1603; STC 25643), B4r.

²³ Wilkinson, *Isahacs Inheritance*, B1v.

²⁴ Wilkinson, *Isahacs Inheritance*, B2r, B4r.

the two kingdoms and making them one British monarchy. The writer of this text also appears to have been influenced by the official union proclamation. The marriage of Margaret and James IV, the text explains, ‘attained farre greater blessings’ than any other Anglo-Scottish royal marriage because it ‘not only raised up a most princly Imperialle seede to sitt a sole Monarche upon these their thrownes, but hath united a peace betwixt two fierce nations in warre’. This was the hoped-for result of previous Anglo-Scottish royal marriages because, the text claims, a shared hereditary monarch ‘might indifferently challenge a love, and loyalty’ from the subjects of both kingdoms, thereby ensuring Anglo-Scottish peace. The permanency of this was guaranteed because ‘in his most Royall persone is confirmed the successive inheritance and just tittle of both their Realmes; and the whole land of Britanie (so long devided in goverment, and infested with troubles) brought into a most quiet peace, and one intire Monarchie.’²⁵ By contrast, the genealogy itself depicts James’s double descent from Margaret Tudor and gives both lines of descent equal weight (as discussed in Chapter 3), unlike its accompanying text, which focuses exclusively on James’s maternal descent as the source of his hereditary claim to the English throne to celebrate the union of ‘Britain’.

The parliamentary union debates revealed that James’s succession had not automatically resulted in England and Scotland being permanently united as the single kingdom of ‘Britain’, as the works discussed above had claimed, which explains why Margaret Tudor and James IV’s marriage was no longer celebrated for this reason. John Speed uses his account of Margaret and James IV’s marriage in *The History of Great Britaine* (1611) to reflect on the ongoing relationship between England and Scotland under the Union of the Crowns. Speed took his information on the marriage from John Lesley, Bishop of Ross’s 1570 manuscript Scots history.²⁶ According to Lesley, the marriage alliance secured ‘perfyte peace and syncere amity’ between England and Scotland for a ‘lange tyme eftir’, as Henry

²⁵ Renold Elstrack (engraver) and John Speed (publisher), *The Most Happy Unions Contracted Betwixt the Princes of the Blood Royall of Theis Towe Famous Kingdomes of England & Scotland*, 1603, engraving on paper, 46.4 x 39.3cm. STC 23039g.3. British Museum, inv. no. 1856,0614.149.

²⁶ Numerous contemporary copies of the manuscript history have survived, suggesting that it circulated among interested readers. This evidently included John Speed. Margaret J. Beckett, ‘The Political Works of John Lesley, Bishop of Ross (1527-96)’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2002), pp. 194n4, 195-198.

VII and James IV ‘contynewit in gryt luf and frindship and mutuall societie,’ while their subjects married and traded with one another as if ‘thay had bene all under the obedience of ane prince, quhairthroch justice, polycie and richesse did flowrishe and abound through the hole Yle of Albowne [Albion].’²⁷

Speed turns Lesley’s words into a prophecy of James VI & I’s eventual succession to both thrones, capitalising words for emphasis: ‘And of this marriage is *James* the sixt descended, being that ONE PRINCE under whose obedience AL are now governed, as under the sole and lawfull lineall *Monarch of great Britaine*’.²⁸ Margaret and James IV’s marriage had temporarily secured peaceful and prosperous Anglo-Scottish relations as if the two kingdoms shared a monarch, but their descendant’s succession to both thrones made it permanent. James had adopted the title ‘King of Great Britain’ in 1604, so Speed could assert that the English and Scots were the common subjects of ‘ONE PRINCE’, the ‘*Monarch of great Britaine*’, without claiming that the two kingdoms were united as a single state as the works discussed above did. Speed encourages James’s subjects to embrace the Union of the Crowns not only as the legitimate outcome of James’s combined hereditary claims, but also because its advantages had already been proven through the precedent of Margaret and James IV’s marriage.

Shortly after James VI & I’s succession to the English throne, some of his English subjects began to celebrate the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots, as the source of the combined English and Scottish hereditary claims that had resulted in his succession to the thrones of both kingdoms and consequently, they claimed, united (or reunited) ‘Britain’. Some works attempted to anglicise this line

²⁷ John Lesley, *The History of Scotland, from the death of King James I. in the Year M.CCC.XXXVI, to the Year M.D.LXI.*, ed. by T. Thomas (Edinburgh, 1830), p. 72. This is in sharp contrast to Lesley’s published Latin history of 1578, which states that although peace continued in Henry VII’s lifetime, after his death, England and Scotland’s traditional rivalry re-emerged and was even worse than before. Lesley, *De Origine*, pp. 342-343; John Lesley, *The Historie of Scotland*, trans. by James Dalrymple, ed. by E.G. Cody and William Murison, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1888-1895) II (1895), p. 121. In the years between the completion of his manuscript history and his published history, Lesley had decided to present a much less optimistic vision of Anglo-Scottish relations in the aftermath of Margaret and James IV’s marriage. Whether or not Speed had access to both the 1570 and 1578 versions of Lesley’s history, to choose between Lesley’s optimistic and pessimistic assessments, Speed quoted from the 1570 version.

²⁸ John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045), p. 748.

of descent to make it more palatable to an English audience; however, they were ultimately asserting that England had been subsumed into Britain, and the English and Scots had all become British, because of it. This offers another possible explanation for why many of James's English subjects preferred to explain his succession to the English throne as the result of the combined hereditary claims he inherited from his maternal and paternal lines of descent from Margaret Tudor, with special emphasis placed on the latter, rather than relying on James's maternal line of descent alone. Not only was James's maternal ancestry Scottish, but it also carried connotations of Britishness and the loss of English nationhood and identity. James's paternal line of descent therefore offered a suitable alternative, as that hereditary claim could be represented as purely English, rather than British or Scottish. This allowed them to celebrate James's status as England's monarch without also celebrating the Union of the Crowns or the creation of 'Britain'. This further demonstrates the importance of nationality to Jacobean representations of James's hereditary claims.

The works discussed in this section all claimed that James's succession to the English throne had resulted not only in England and Scotland sharing a monarch in a dynastic union (what we now call the Union of the Crowns), but also the creation of a single, indivisible monarchy of Great Britain that ended Anglo-Scottish conflict because James's subjects all became British. Many of these writers were influenced by the official proclamation of the union of England and Scotland, which James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes describe as 'James's first formal statement in England on the Union'.²⁹ The proclamation asserted that England and Scotland were now to be regarded as 'one Realme and Kingdome, and the Subjects of both the Realmes as one people', although it did not include the word Britain.³⁰ This demonstrates that these writers intended to win James's approval, though they stopped making these assertions (or, like John Speed, tempered them) once it became clear that James's succession had not actually secured the union of 'Britain' and automatically made James's subjects British. As a result, James's descent from the

²⁹ Larkin and Hughes (eds.), *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1*, p. 18 n. 1.

³⁰ James VI & I, 'Proclamation for the Uniting of England and Scotland, 19 May 1603, Greenwich,' in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1*, ed. by Larkin and Hughes, pp. 18-19; James VI & I, *By the King. Forasmuch as the Kings Majestie, in his Princely Disposition to Justice...*

marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV was not considered to be as significant in his later reign as it was in those first few months when the impact of James's status as hereditary monarch of both England and Scotland was still unclear.

The Divided Representations of James IV and James V

When discussing James VI & I's double descent from Margaret Tudor, some Jacobean works emphasised his English paternal ancestry while remaining neutral about his Scottish maternal ancestry, despite recognising that the latter also provided him with a(n arguably senior) hereditary claim to the English throne. Even some of the works that celebrated James's Scottish maternal ancestors for their role in the eventual Union of the Crowns, discussed above, attempted to anglicise them. Levack explains that 'One of the main sources of animosity between Englishmen and Scots was the memory of previous armed conflict between them.'³¹ Ivic points out how challenging it would be 'for English and Scots to become "*Britaines*" in the face of emergent English and Scottish national consciousnesses underpinned by bitter memories of past Anglo-Scottish broils'.³² Therefore, it is not surprising that some Jacobean English writers continued to be hostile towards James's Scottish ancestors.

Despite this, there has been very little scholarly analysis of Jacobean representations of James IV and James V—Scottish monarchs who had been at war with England—and whether their reputations were affected by James VI & I's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns.³³ This section begins with an overview of their reputations and representation in histories and succession treatises before 1603. It then considers broader Jacobean opinions about whether former Anglo-Scottish conflict should be discussed after the Union of the Crowns, before analysing Jacobean English and Scottish representations of James IV and James V. This section demonstrates that English writers often prioritised their own national concerns when discussing these Scottish monarchs,

³¹ Levack, *The Formation of the British State*, p. 193.

³² Ivic, *The Subject of Britain*, p. 34.

³³ D.R. Woolf mentions some examples, but only anecdotally to illuminate broader points. For example, Woolf compares Edward Ayscu's positive representation of James IV with William Martyn's negative one, and suggests that Martyn's criticism was the reason he was arrested. Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 96-97.

criticising them as England's former enemies rather than rewriting the history of Anglo-Scottish relations in defence of James VI & I's succession to the English throne and the Union of the Crowns. Scottish writers, by contrast, downplayed former Anglo-Scottish conflict and emphasised the dynastic significance of James IV and James V for James VI & I's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones. This reveals the continued influence of national identity over the representation of James VI & I's ancestors.

Prior to 1603, James IV and James V's reputations were decidedly mixed. Norman MacDougall concludes that by the end of the sixteenth century, 'the estimate of James IV broadly agreed upon by the [Scottish] chroniclers was that of an able ruler, much loved by his people, who at the end would not accept wise counsel; and disaster was the result' when he died at the Battle of Flodden Field.³⁴ According to Dermot Cavanagh, James IV's failure was used by sixteenth-century English histories 'to illustrate the consequences awaiting the Scots crown if it exceeded its ordained status as a feudal vassal of its Southern neighbour.'³⁵ Roger A. Mason claims that the most celebrated of the previous eight Scottish monarchs in the 1577 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* was James IV; even James's invasion of England and death at Flodden 'did little to dampen enthusiasm for a Stewart king ... "[who] deserved to be numbred amongst the best Princes that ever raigned ouer the Scottish nation".³⁶

According to Jamie Cameron, sixteenth-century Scottish historians offered both criticism and praise in their discussions of James V.³⁷ Discussing Holinshed's depiction of James V, Mason writes: 'In recounting the events that resulted in the outbreak of war between Henry VIII and James V in 1541, Holinshed is moved to include the entire text of the printed pamphlet in which Henry set out his reasons for taking up arms against his nephew and then restated in still more elaborate terms the case for England's feudal superiority over Scotland'.³⁸ Compared to

³⁴ MacDougall, *James IV*, p. 303.

³⁵ Cavanagh, 'Uncivil Monarchy', in *Early Modern Civil Discourses*, ed. by Richards, p. 152.

³⁶ Roger A. Mason, 'Scotland', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 661.

³⁷ Cameron, *James V*, pp. 345-348.

³⁸ Mason, 'Scotland', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Heal, Archer, and Kewes, p. 656.

Holinshed's more favourable representation of James IV, this demonstrates hostile English attitudes towards Scotland and the Scottish monarchs.

Some Elizabethan succession treatises cited England and Scotland's turbulent historic relationship as a reason to exclude the Stuarts from the English succession. For example, John Hales defended the legitimacy of Henry VIII's will, arguing that Henry 'had no cause to love' the descendants of his sister Margaret, because James V had refused to meet him at York and later 'made Warre agaynst him.'³⁹ Hales also pointed out that the Stuarts could not be considered English, even though Scotland's monarchs (supposedly) owed allegiance to England's monarchs, because 'they have longe time forsaken their Faithe and Alleigaunce of *Inglad*' and many had been England's enemies, including James V.⁴⁰

James VI & I's succession to the English throne, the resulting Union of the Crowns, and attempts to secure permanent Anglo-Scottish union stimulated further discussion of historic Anglo-Scottish conflict, which reveals conflicting attitudes towards it. In his first speech to the English Parliament, James himself argued that one of the benefits of Anglo-Scottish union was that foreign powers would no longer be able to encourage the Scots 'by untimely incursions' to distract England from their warfare abroad, forcing the English to defend 'their Backdoore ... which was the greatest hinderance and let that ever my Predecessors of this Nation gate in disturbing them from their many famous and glorious Conquests abroad.'⁴¹ Edward

³⁹ Hales, 'Declaration of the Succession', p. xxiv.

⁴⁰ Hales, 'Declaration of the Succession', p. xxxi.

⁴¹ James VI & I, *The Kings Majesties Speech, as it was Delivered by him in the Upper House of the Parliament, to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, On Munday the 19. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of this Present Parliament, and the First Parliament of his Majesties Raigne* (London, 1604; STC 14390), B2r; James VI & I, 'A Speech, as it was Delivered in the Upper House of the Parliament to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, on Munday the XIX. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of the First Parliament', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 136; *The Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2d 1628. In the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First* (London, 1742), p. 143. Union treatise writers, such as John Hayward and Thomas Craig, followed James VI & I's example by arguing that England would now be stronger in the face of foreign attacks, as Scotland's former alliance with France had weakened England—Craig specifically giving the example of James IV's invasion of England hindering Henry VIII's campaign in France. John Hayward, *A Treatise of Union of the Two Realmes of England and Scotland* (London, 1604; STC 13011), p. 4; Thomas Craig, *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae Tractatus* by Sir Thomas Craig, ed. and trans. by C. Sanford Terry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh

Ayscu claims that it is ‘vanitie’ to boast about the English having ‘beene victorious in more battailes’ against the Scots, as the Union of the Crowns resulting from ‘the successe of marriage’—James VI & I’s descent from Margaret Tudor and James IV—meant that ‘the memory of all fore-passed displeasures and unkindnesse is buried in perpetual oblivion.’⁴² Francis Bacon suggests that England and Scotland’s former conflict be studied to celebrate their present peace: ‘And if any man think it may refresh the memory of former discords, he may satisfy himself with the verse, *olim hæc meminisse juvabit*: for the case being now altered, it is matter of comfort and gratulation to remember former troubles.’⁴³ Thus, when Jacobean writers discussed James IV and James V’s conflict with England, it was not necessarily an attack on the Union of the Crowns.

Jacobean catalogues of Scottish monarchs, written by or copied from Scottish writers, typically describe James IV and James V in a similar, non-controversial way that emphasises their dynastic importance and downplays historic Anglo-Scottish conflict. John Johnston’s *Inscriptiones Historicae Regum Scotorum*, first published in 1602, lists Scotland’s monarchs from the mythical Fergus I to James VI with accompanying Latin verses. Overall, according to Mason, it ‘was intended as a celebration of the Scottish royal line in general and the Stewart dynasty in particular—and as a reminder to James’s prospective English subjects of the Stewart king’s unrivalled princely pedigree.’⁴⁴ English versions were published in 1602 and 1603 with James’s permission, the latter after his succession to the English throne with the title *A Trew Description of the Nobill Race of the Stewards*

University Press, 1909), p. 225; ‘A Brief Replication to the Aunswere of the Objections Against the Union’, c. 1604. BL Stowe MS 158, fol. 39v.

⁴² Edward Ayscu, *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (London, 1607; STC 1014), A6v.

⁴³ The Latin text, from Vergil’s *Aeneid*, means that it will be pleasing to remember these things one day. However, Vergil’s quote is preceded by ‘forsan’, meaning ‘perhaps’—Bacon removed that uncertainty. Francis Bacon to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, 2 April 1605. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, 7 vols (London, 1861-1874), III (1868), p. 250. Similarly, the Scottish poet Sir William Mure of Rowallan celebrates the Union of the Crowns by reflecting on their former conflict in a poem addressed to James during his visit to Scotland in 1617: ‘O heavenlie union! O thryse happie change! / From bloodie broyles, from battells and debait, / From mischeifs, cruelties and sad revenge / To love and peace thou hes transformed our stait, / Which now confirmed, by thee before begunne, / Shall last till earth is circuit with the Sunne.’ William Mure, *The Works of Sir William Mure of Rowallan*, ed. by William Tough, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1898), I, p. 42.

⁴⁴ Roger A. Mason, ‘Certain Matters Concerning the Realme of Scotland: George Buchanan and Scottish Self-Fashioning at the Union of the Crowns’, *The Scottish Historical Review*, 92.1 (April 2013), 50.

Succedinge Lineallie to the Crown of Scotland unto this Day: and Now this Yeir 1603. unto the Crown of England. Johnston emphasises James’s hereditary claims to the thrones of both England and Scotland, while downplaying historic Anglo-Scottish conflict. For example, Johnston describes James IV as a ‘noble and courageous Prince’ who married ‘*Margaret*, Eldest daughter to *Henry* the 7. Erle of *Richemond*, King of *England* and *Elizabeth* daughter to *Edward* the 4. In whose twa persones the twa houses of *Lancaster* and *Yorke* were united, and the bludie civill wares of *England* pacified.’ This tells us more about Henry VII and England than it does about James IV and Scotland, but by co-opting Henry’s legacy and attaching it to James IV through his marriage to Margaret Tudor, the work encourages English readers to view James IV as part of their own national history and focus on the hereditary claims he and his wife passed down to James VI & I. Johnston concludes by stating that James IV was ‘slaine at *Flowden*,’ but does not explain that it was a conflict between England and Scotland.⁴⁵ Johnston describes James V as ‘a just prince and severe,’ emphasising his reputation for justice, but focuses primarily on his marriages and thus his role in perpetuating the Stuart dynasty. Johnston also does not explain that England and Scotland were at war at the time of James V’s death.⁴⁶ Overall, Johnston encourages his readers to celebrate these kings as the sources of James VI & I’s combined hereditary claims, while downplaying historic Anglo-Scottish conflict.

Other Jacobean works—most of them written by Scots—also emphasise James IV and James V’s dynastic importance for both kingdoms and neutralise their former reputations as England’s enemies.⁴⁷ For example, *Certeine Matters Concerning the*

⁴⁵ John Johnston, *A Trewe Description of the Nobill Race of the Stewards Succedinge Lineallie to the Crown of Scotland unto this Day: and Now this Yeir 1603. unto the Crown of England* (Amsterdam, 1603; STC 14787.4), p. 7r [unpaginated]. The text below a Jacobean engraving of James IV (both the text and engraving are copied from Johnston’s work) describes him as ‘a worthy Prince’ who was ‘Slaine at Floydon field’ (with no further explanation), and concludes that he ‘married Margaret eldest daughter to Henry 7.’ Thus, just like Johnston, this text downplays historic Anglo-Scottish conflict and emphasises James IV’s dynastic importance. Compton Holland (publisher), *James the fourth: King of Scotland*, c. 1616-1621, engraving on paper, 17.1 x 11.7cm. British Museum, inv. no. O,7.67. See: Arthur M. Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Descriptive Catalogue with Introductions, Part II: The Reign of James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), pp. 375-376.

⁴⁶ Johnston, *A Trewe Description*, p. 8r [unpaginated].

⁴⁷ For example: Thomas Trevilian, ‘The Trevelyon Miscellany’, 1608. Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.b.232, fols 124r, 124v, which directly copies the text and images from Johnston, *A Trewe Description*; John Monipennie, *The Abridgement or Summarie of the Scots Chronicles* (London, 1612; STC 18014), pp. 70-71; James Maxwell, *Queene Elizabeths Looking-Glasse of*

Realme of Scotland, Composed Together, a work originally published in Edinburgh in 1594, was republished in London in 1603 with almost the exact same text as *A Trewe Description of the Nobill Race of the Stewards*. Mason explains that this republication was intended to ‘provide the king’s new English subjects with a handy introduction to their alien monarch’s distinguished royal ancestry as well as his remote and unfamiliar Scottish kingdom.’⁴⁸ The 1594 edition did not emphasise the Stuart hereditary claim to the English throne. James IV was described as having ‘made confederacie with *England*, and to the effect, it should the longer endure: He married *Margaret*, daughter to king *Henrie* the 7. of *England*’; however, the Union of the Houses was not explained and linked to James IV as it is in the 1603 edition.⁴⁹ The 1594 edition also justified James IV and James V’s decisions to go to war against England, and celebrated one of the latter’s victories, while the 1603 edition downplays Anglo-Scottish conflict.⁵⁰ It is clear, therefore, that after James VI & I’s succession to the English throne, Scottish writers chose to downplay historic Anglo-Scottish conflict and focus on how the Stuarts had passed down combined English and Scottish hereditary claims to James VI & I. This defended his hereditary successions to both thrones and the resulting Union of the Crowns. These shorter works also asserted the hereditary nature of the Scottish crown by focusing on the familial relationships between Scotland’s monarchs and avoiding controversial subjects such as Mary, Queen of Scots’ abdication (which is discussed in Chapter 5).

While the Scottish writers of short catalogue entries and inscriptions, such as those discussed above, largely avoid discussing England and Scotland’s former conflict, the English writers of longer histories adopted more varied approaches. For

Grace and Glory (London, 1612; *STC* 17705), A3v; *A Briefe Chronicle, of All the Kings of Scotland, Since it was First Inhabited, Untill this Present Yeare 1623* (Aberdeen, 1625; *STC* 22007), pp. 42-43.

⁴⁸ Mason, ‘*Certeine Matters Concerning the Realme of Scotland*’, 38.

⁴⁹ *Certaine Matters Composed Together* (Edinburgh, 1594; *STC* 18016), E1r.

⁵⁰ For example, James IV was described as declaring war against Henry VIII ‘for not making satisfaction of the slaughter of the warden of the *Marches*, called *Ker*, and other reasons.’ James V was described as winning a battle ‘against king *Henrie* the 8. of *England*, at *Haddan-ryg* [Hadden Rig], by his Lieutenant, the Erle of *Huntlie*. Anno 1542,’ making this a focus for Scottish national pride. He also, however, ‘lost a great battell against *England* in his time,’ because he made Oliver Sinclair, ‘a man of base degree,’ the lieutenant of the Scottish army and the Scottish nobles ‘disdaining that, suffered themselves to be taken prisoners, to the greate turpitude of their Fames, and their Nation, and to the great hart-break of their Native Prince, and shortning of his daies, with extreame grief of mind.’ *Certaine Matters Composed Together*, E1r.

example, Edward Ayscu's *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (1607) does discuss Anglo-Scottish conflict in the reigns of James IV and James V, but places the blame for it on outside agents who did not have either kingdom's interests at heart, demonstrating the benefits of closer Anglo-Scottish relations. The conflict between Henry VIII and James IV was neither king's fault, Ayscu explains, 'but it seemeth the same wholly proceeded from the subtile practise of *France* our ancient enemy'.⁵¹ The Scottish clergy—all Catholic at this time, and a common focal point for blame in post-Reformation histories—and Louis XII of France encouraged James IV to ally with France and make war against England, so James's 'former affection towards *England*' was wholly alienated.⁵² James IV is ultimately presented as responsible for his own demise, and as unnecessarily pursuing war against England, but Ayscu also blames the French and the Catholic clergy for encouraging him.⁵³

Ayscu inserts an invented story into his account of the relationship between James V and Henry VIII to promote the historical legitimacy of a Stuart succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns. Ayscu claims that although Henry VIII had proposed his only daughter, Mary (the future Mary I), as a potential bride for both Charles V and François I, this was only for the sake of diplomacy, Henry 'thinking her a fitter matche for his Nephew of *Scotland* [James V], then for eyther of them.' According to Ayscu, Henry planned to make James 'the Monarch over the whole Island, if hee dyed with-out issue male. And to the end hee should give the more trust and credit to these his promises, hee said more-over, that hee would forth-with intitle him Duke of *Yorke*, and his Vicar Generall over the whole realme of *England*.'⁵⁴ This story is Ayscu's own invention; a marriage between Mary and James V was suggested but was never seriously pursued by Henry VIII and certainly not so that James could succeed to the English throne. The story does, however, create a historic precedent for the Union of the Crowns by making it

⁵¹ Ayscu, *A Historie*, pp. 251-252. Thomas Milles also blamed Louis XII of France for encouraging James to invade England, a war that was 'taken in hand against all faith, and league sworne,' so God punished the Scots. Thomas Milles, *A Catalogue of the Kings of Scotland. Together with their Severall Armes, Wives, and Issue* (London, 1610; STC 22008), p. 30.

⁵² Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 253.

⁵³ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 262.

⁵⁴ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 279.

appear that Henry VIII had supported it. It also acts as a counter to John Hales's argument that Henry VIII was opposed to a Stuart succession to the English throne. Unfortunately, the 'subtile practise of the Priests' who 'buzzed in their kings eares,' led James to cancel the meeting.⁵⁵ Ayscu does not blame James V for the poor state of Anglo-Scottish relations at this time, but—once again—the interfering and corrupt Catholic clergy.

Ayscu goes to great lengths to present Henry VIII as the wronged party who was innocent of aggravating behaviour in James V's reign, although Ayscu attributes all blame to Scotland's Catholic clergy so as not to be too critical of James V.⁵⁶ Despite claiming in the address to the reader that he would not take sides when discussing historic Anglo-Scottish conflict, Ayscu still celebrates English victories against Scotland and adopts an Anglo-centric viewpoint.⁵⁷ Ayscu's *Historie* offended James VI & I and resulted in William Ayscu, the writer's son, being arrested. The specific cause of offence cited was Ayscu's account of Mary, Queen of Scots (which is discussed in Chapter 5), but James VI & I declared that he 'found no good pairt in it'.⁵⁸ Ayscu does, however, divest James IV and James V of any personal blame in the Anglo-Scottish conflict of their reigns, extolling the benefits of closer Anglo-Scottish relations and making clear that they had passed hereditary claims to the thrones of England and Scotland down to James VI & I, thereby justifying his succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns.

Another English historian who offended the Jacobean regime by expressing too much hostility towards former Scottish monarchs was William Martyn, a lawyer

⁵⁵ Ayscu, *A Historie*, pp. 279-280. This narrative of the interfering Catholic clergy preventing James and Henry's meeting comes from the histories of Buchanan and Pitscottie. Ayscu, *A Historie*, pp. 282-283.

⁵⁶ Ayscu, *A Historie*, pp. 282-283, 287-288.

⁵⁷ In the address to the reader, Ayscu declares: 'whereas the Chronicles of both Nations containe matter of reproach and disgrace one against the other: I have had an especiall care to carry my selfe so indifferently betweene them as I hope neither of both shall have iust cause to take offence therat.' Ayscu, *A Historie*, A6r. An example of Ayscu celebrating an English victory over the Scots is the Battle of Solway Moss, which he claims was 'the most admirable victory that ever was had over them, to bee wholly referred to the immediat hand of God, howsoever they would excuse it.' Ayscu saw the battle as evidence 'that the King of Heaven and Earth can, and will daunt, the courage of man, when it seemeth good unto him, to the end we should acknowledge him to be the only giver of all victory.' Ayscu, *A Historie*, pp. 287-288.

⁵⁸ Thomas Erskine, Viscount Fentoun, to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, 22 October 1607, Royston. MS CP 122/149.

from Exeter.⁵⁹ The Martyn family were heavily involved in Exeter's local government; in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the offices they held at various times included town chamberlain, mayor, sheriff, and MP.⁶⁰ William Martyn was granted the office of Recorder of Exeter in 1606.⁶¹ Unlike other Jacobean historians, Martyn did not claim that his work, *The Historie, and Lives, of the Kings of England from William the Conqueror, Unto the End of the Raigne of King Henrie the Eight* (1615), was anything more than a history of England. In his dedication, Martyn claims that he wrote his *Historie* so that English gentlemen preparing to learn about foreign countries 'may first be furnished with a convenient knowledge of their owne.' He had kept it short to engage readers, focusing on 'the Raignes, Deeds, and Actions, of twentie of our English Kings; which I will neither praise ... nor dispraise'.⁶² Martyn's stated aim—to be objective in his assessment of England's monarchs—did not extend to his discussion of Scotland's monarchs.

Martyn is much harsher in his criticisms of the Scottish monarchs and people than other Jacobean historians, and expresses his hostility towards them most fervently when discussing historic Anglo-Scottish conflict. For example, Martyn recounts how James IV welcomed Perkin Warbeck, a pretender to Henry VII's throne, even though the Scots 'knew that *Perkin* was a counterfet'. James IV and his forces entered England and 'exercised all kinde of rigour, violence, and wrong, burning, robbing, rifling, stealing, and spoiling in all places, and destroying with the sword both young and old, strong and feeble, healthie and infirme, rich and poore, with such barbarous inhumanitie, and strange crueltie, as never was committed before by that Nation.'⁶³ Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey (later 2nd Duke of Norfolk),

⁵⁹ D. R. Woolf, 'Martyn, William (bap. 1562, d. 1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18240>.

⁶⁰ J.H. Wylie (ed.), *Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report on the Records of the City of Exeter* (London: Hereford Times, 1916), pp. 90, 114, 138, 311, 402.

⁶¹ Wylie, *Exeter*, p. 55.

⁶² William Martyn, *The Historie, and Lives, of the Kings of England from William the Conqueror, Unto the End of the Raigne of King Henrie the Eight* (London, 1615; STC 17527), ¶2r-¶3r. Also published under the title *The Historie, and Lives, of Twentie Kings of England With the Successions of the Dukes, and Earles, of this Realme; From the Conquest, Untill the Twelfth Yeare of the Famous Raigne of the Most Admired Prince King James the First. Together with the Times of the Creations of the Barons, and Baronets, of this Kingdome* (London, 1615; STC 17526). The contents are largely the same. Martyn's *Historie* may have been registered with the Stationers' Company on 20 August 1614 as the following, with his first name recorded incorrectly: 'a booke called *The historye of the Normans and Kings of England* by HENRY MARTIN'. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, ed. by Arber, III, p. 253v.

⁶³ Martyn, *Historie*, p. 343.

assembled forces and James IV, ‘upon good occasion being timerous and feareful ... fled into his owne Countrie. But the *English* forces with brave courage and manly resolution entred into his Kingdome, and battered, assaulted, wonne, and razed to the ground many of his strongest Townes, Castles, and Holds, and were not resisted’. While Martyn criticises the Scots for their violent attack on England, he praises the English for their violent retaliation. The English pursued the Scots for a week, but ‘so barren was that Countrie, and so poore and destitute of all good things, and so unseasonable was the weather there,’ that Surrey returned to England.⁶⁴ Although Martyn records the marriage of James IV and Margaret Tudor, he uses it as an occasion to emphasise England’s superiority over Scotland (as discussed in Chapter 2) and does not explain James VI & I’s descent from the marriage to demonstrate the source of his hereditary claim to the English throne, as other Jacobean historians did.⁶⁵

Unlike other Jacobean writers, Martyn does not stress the dynastic ties between the English and Scottish monarchs to promote good relations between the people of the two countries—in fact, on one occasion he mentions the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV to encourage English hostility towards the Scots. Martyn writes that, when Henry VIII left for war with France, James IV, ‘although he had married with the Ladie *Margaret*, the eldest sister of king *Henrie* ... made open warre, and wilfull breach of his Promise, and of the Peace, which had been confirmed by his solemne Oath; and beganne unjustly to pick quarrels against the King.’⁶⁶ James IV invaded England, but the ‘valiant and renowned Earle of *Surrey*’ and his son went to face the Scots.⁶⁷ James IV’s death is described as an honourable one, as he was ‘fighting couragiously among his people as a common souldier’ when he was slain. Martyn, however, still celebrates the English victory at Flodden as the result of God’s blessing and ‘the victorious courage and true manhood of the Earle of *Surrey*, and of his sonne’.⁶⁸ Following this, Martyn does not record Margaret Tudor’s second marriage and the birth of Lady Margaret Douglas, nor the birth of Douglas’s son, Henry, Lord Darnley, both of which would have been occasions for explaining

⁶⁴ Martyn, *Historie*, p. 346.

⁶⁵ Martyn, *Historie*, pp. 350-351.

⁶⁶ Martyn, *Historie*, pp. 361-362.

⁶⁷ Martyn, *Historie*, p. 362.

⁶⁸ Martyn, *Historie*, p. 363.

James VI & I's paternal descent from Margaret Tudor and the hereditary claim to the English throne that came from it. As such, Martyn did not promote James VI & I's maternal *or* paternal hereditary claims to the English throne, as other Jacobean writers did.

Martyn also encourages his English readers to view James V with hostility. Unsurprisingly, Martyn does not claim that Henry VIII wanted James V to be his successor, as Ayscu does. Henry asked to meet with James at York so they could reconcile, but as English and Scottish commissioners were meeting to negotiate peace 'the *Scots* invaded the Westerne marches of this Realme, burnt, slue, spoiled, and riffled, beyond charitie and reason'.⁶⁹ James V, like his father, is presented as the sole initiator of Anglo-Scottish conflict. As a result of these 'notorious injuries and wrongs,' Henry VIII was forced to send an army north, whose defeat of the Scots at the Battle of Solway Moss 'so much disturbed the patient disposition of the *Scottish* King, that (with melancholy, and inward grieffe) he dyed within few weekes after.'⁷⁰ Martyn records the succession of James V's infant daughter, Mary, Queen of Scots, but, as usual, does not use this as an occasion to mention that James VI & I was descended from her. As such, Martyn overlooks another opportunity to defend James VI & I's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones.

It is perhaps unsurprising that Martyn's *Historie* caused him to be officially reprimanded. On 25 February 1615—just over a month after the dedication date in the *Historie*—a messenger was given a warrant to bring Martyn before the English Privy Council.⁷¹ Martyn was charged with having 'lately written a history of England, wherin were many passages so unaptly inserted, as might justly have drawne some heavy and seveare sensure upon him for the same.' Martyn repented and acknowledged he was at fault, so the Privy Council agreed to mediate for him

⁶⁹ Martyn, *Historie*, p. 411.

⁷⁰ Martyn, *Historie*, p. 413.

⁷¹ E.G. Atkinson (ed.), *Acts of the Privy Council of England. 1615-1616* (London: HMSO, 1925), p. 62. Transcription taken from the Privy Council Registers, TNA PC 2/27, fol. 274v.

with the king; James pardoned Martyn, and he was dismissed.⁷² Martyn died in 1617 and his *Historie* was not reprinted during James's lifetime.⁷³

The reason for Martyn's arrest has been a subject of scholarly speculation.⁷⁴ Woolf argues that the offending passages were Martyn's 'anti-tyrannical tirades or his observations on the Scottish kings,' who are presented as 'blatant liars and political cynics.'⁷⁵ Cyndia Susan Clegg claims that the 'only passage that conceivably could have offended James told of Scottish border raids during the reign of Henry VIII,' as Martyn describes their destruction as typical Scottish behaviour.⁷⁶ Clegg argues that official concern about histories was heightened at this time due to Edmund Peacham's treasonous predictions that James would die a violent death; Peacham had been inspired by Walter Raleigh's *History of the World* (1615), which argued that the death of kings was divine retribution. In Clegg's view, Martyn's criticism of the Scots 'is so trivial that had Peacham not implicated chronicles, James might have ignored Martyn altogether.'⁷⁷

Given that Martyn's criticisms touched on issues of major importance to James, Clegg's latter assertion seems unfounded. James's Scottish ancestors were essential to his hereditary claims to the thrones of both England and Scotland and, therefore, the resulting Union of the Crowns. James wanted to promote good relations between the English and the Scots, arguing that a permanent Anglo-Scottish union was justified on the grounds that 'God, by his Providence, in apparent Sight of all the World,' had already caused the English and Scots to begin to develop a 'Uniformity of Manners and Customs.'⁷⁸ While James emphasised the similarities

⁷² Atkinson, *Acts of the Privy Council of England. 1615-1616.*, p. 100. Privy Council Registers, TNA PC 2/27, fol. 289v.

⁷³ It was first reprinted in 1628. William Martyn, *The Historie and Lives, of the Kings of England: From William the Conqueror, Unto the End of the Raigne of King Henry the Eighth* (London, 1628; STC 17528). Two largely identical issues of Martyn's *Historie* were published in 1615, though it is not recorded whether one was released after Martyn's appearance before the Privy Council, which seems unlikely.

⁷⁴ Later in the seventeenth century, Thomas Fuller wrote that he had been 'credibly informed, that King James took some exceptions at a Passage therein, sounding either to the derogation of his own Family, or of the Scotch Nation'. Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England* (London, 1662; Wing F2440), p. 275.

⁷⁵ Woolf, *The Idea of History*, pp. 74-75.

⁷⁶ Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 102-103.

⁷⁷ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, pp. 101-103.

⁷⁸ *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 180.

between the English and the Scots, Martyn emphasised their differences. Martyn's *Historie* was an example of the English xenophobia towards the Scots that was on prominent display in the Jacobean period.⁷⁹ By reminding his readers of former Anglo-Scottish conflict, celebrating English victories, and denigrating both the Scottish monarchs and people for being cruel, cowardly, and untrustworthy, Martyn undermined James's efforts to bring his subjects closer together as the natural and unavoidable outcome of his joint rule over both England and Scotland.

Scholars have overlooked Martyn's wish to defend the historic reputation of the Howard family, who had led the English campaigns against James IV and James V, as a motivation for his criticisms of the Scottish monarchs and people.⁸⁰ The Howards were important landowners and officeholders in south-west England, bringing them into contact with officials in Exeter, including Martyn and his family.⁸¹ Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, was elected High Steward of Exeter in March 1614, though he died only three months later. In July 1615, Richard Martyn (a relative of William Martyn) presented the letter and patent of High Steward of Exeter to Thomas Howard, Earl of Suffolk, 'to succeed his noble Uncle

⁷⁹ Theodore K. Rabb, 'Sir Edwin Sandys and the Parliament of 1604', *The American Historical Review*, 69.3 (1964), 650-653, 699-670; Joel J. Epstein, 'Francis Bacon and the Issue of Union, 1603-1608', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 33.2 (1970), 124, 127, 130; Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 21-22, 104-105, 113, 127-128; Levack, *The Formation of the British State*, pp. 193-197, 200-201.

⁸⁰ To do this, Martyn praises the English forces under Howard command and demonised the Scots. Martyn's support even extended to rehabilitating John Howard, 1st Duke of Norfolk, who had fought at the battle of Bosworth on the side of Richard III against the future Henry VII. According to Martyn, this Duke 'was both valiant in the field, and wise in counsell,' a 'true friend' to Richard who 'remained firme and faithfull' until Richard's death. Martyn's positive assessments of the Duke contrasts with his very critical (and thus conventional) description of Richard III himself. Martyn, *Historie*, pp. 312, 324. Another revealing incident is Martyn's sympathetic account of the disgrace of Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk, and his son Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. According to Martyn, the joy of Henry VIII's 1546 peace agreement with France 'was quickly checked with an other sorrow: for the most victorious, faithfull, and ever to be honored Captaine, the Duke of *Northfolke*, and his sonne, the most illustrious Earle of *Surrey* (both which, in this Kings raigne, performed many memorable, and brave services, in *Scotland*, *England*, and in *France*) were sodainely apprehended, and sent unto the Tower; For none other thing, but because they quartered, and bare in their Escoucheon certaine Armes, which were pretended, properly, and only to belong unto the King and Prince (which Armes notwithstanding, they and their Auncestors time out of minde had so borne without controlment, reproofe, or check.' Surrey was executed, 'to the great grieve and sorrow of many thousands, who lamented the causelesse death of such a worthy man, as had so well deserved of the King, and of the common weale.' By Henry VIII's death, the Duke of Norfolk was 'preserved by God from that danger, for better fortunes.' Martyn, *Historie*, pp. 419-420.

⁸¹ Wylie, *Exeter*, p. 55.

for a patron and protector of your Citty.⁸² William Martyn was thus almost certainly flattering the Howards in the hope of securing Howard patronage in Exeter. It backfired on him, however, as his flattery of the Howards came at the expense of the Scottish monarchs and people, angering James VI & I.

As these texts attest, James IV and James V acquired a new political relevance in the Jacobean period, as they were associated with James VI & I's efforts to promote the legitimacy of his succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns based on hereditary right. However, their reputations remained the subject of debate and disagreement, which can largely be explained by the national identities of those discussing them. Scottish writers decided to alter their representation of James IV and James V in response to these events, by focusing on their dynastic significance as the sources of James VI & I's hereditary claims to the thrones of both England and Scotland and downplaying historic Anglo-Scottish conflict. They also intertwined the histories of England and Scotland by associating James IV with the Union of the Houses through his marriage to Margaret Tudor, anglicising James IV to present him more favourably to an English audience. These Scottish writers were willing to set aside their national pride by no longer expressing open hostility towards the English; for example, by no longer celebrating Scottish victories against England.

English writers, however, were divided over the representation of James IV and James V. The Union of the Crowns was regularly celebrated for ending Anglo-Scottish conflict and establishing peaceful relations between the people of the two kingdoms, but it is evident that many English writers still felt attached to their own sense of English national identity and a corresponding hostility towards the Scots—they certainly were not promoting a shared British identity. Edward Ayscu and William Martyn both celebrated English victories over the Scots and identified themselves with those English forces through a shared nationality. Ayscu was an English historian addressing an English readership about the English succession,

⁸² Wylie, *Exeter*, p. 76; see also p. 99. William Martyn dates the dedication of his *Historie* to 20 January 1615, after Northampton's death and before Suffolk's appointment as High Steward. Perhaps Martyn would have dedicated his *Historie* to the member of the Howard family who was High Steward at the time, if there had been one.

and his support for James's candidacy was not incompatible with anti-Scottish prejudice. However, Ayscu did not express hostility towards James IV and James V individually, placing blame for their decisions to attack England on the French and Catholic clergy. Ayscu also promoted the legitimacy of James VI & I's succession to the thrones of both England and Scotland by the hereditary claims he inherited from his Scottish ancestors, as well as stressing the benefits of closer Anglo-Scottish relations.

Martyn's treatment of historic Anglo-Scottish conflict was hardly conducive to encouraging good relations between the English and the Scots under the Union of the Crowns—his *Historie* was more likely to revive and encourage former antagonism, reinforcing the divide between the people of the two countries and their separate senses of national identity, rather than encouraging them to embrace one another as the common subjects of a shared monarch. There is certainly no suggestion that they were now all British: Martyn's *Historie* is explicitly a history of England, with an Anglo-centric approach to the past that is highly critical of the Scots. This is partially the result of his attempts to flatter the Howards, who had historically led English forces against the Scots, but it also shows that James's succession had not resulted in English writers unanimously deciding to downplay former Anglo-Scottish conflict to defend the Union of the Crowns. Additionally, Martyn did not defend James VI & I's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones by inserting clear explanations of his descent from Margaret Tudor, as other Jacobean histories did. As a result, these parts of Martyn's *Historie* did not promote the legitimacy of James VI & I's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns through hereditary right, which he still could have done while preserving his sense of English national identity, as Ayscu did.

Conclusion

James VI & I's maternal descent was essential to the justification of the Union of the Crowns, as it was the source of his hereditary claim to the Scottish throne and his maternal hereditary claim to the English throne. As a result, the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots, became a focus for celebration in the Jacobean period for having made James VI & I's eventual succession to both thrones possible. As discussed in Chapter 3, however, it was common for English

works to celebrate James's double descent from Margaret as the justification for his succession to the English throne, rather than just his maternal descent. When James's subjects wished to celebrate the Union of the Crowns, by contrast, James's paternal descent was of less interest as, although some argued it provided him with his senior hereditary claim to the English throne, it was not also responsible for his succession to the Scottish throne. As a result, works that only celebrated James's succession to the English throne and works that also celebrated the Union of the Crowns often differed in how they explained James's hereditary claim to the English throne.

This divide can be explained by looking at the national identities that these works promoted. Works that celebrated the Union of the Crowns as the result of James VI & I's descent from the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, thereby presenting James's maternal descent as the source of his combined hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, also claimed that James's succession to both thrones had resulted in the union (or reunion) of 'Britain'. Following the example of the official union proclamation of 19 May 1603, they claimed that James's English and Scottish subjects no longer had separate national identities, as they had all become British under the single monarchy and state of 'Britain'.

By contrast, those works that presented James's combined maternal and paternal hereditary claims as the justification for his succession to the English throne largely avoided discussing the Union of the Crowns or using terms such as Britain, as their focus was only James's status as England's monarch. These works often anglicised James by emphasising his paternal ancestry, which demonstrates that they did not want James to depend exclusively on his Scottish maternal descent to justify his succession to the English throne. As a result, they were not going to embrace a Union of the Crowns that subsumed the English state and national identity by replacing it with 'Britain'. This was another reason for them to avoid relying exclusively on James's maternal descent as the source of his hereditary claim to the English throne, as not only was it Scottish, but it now also carried connotations of Britishness and the loss of English national identity. This further demonstrates the importance of nationality to justifications of James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Union of the Crowns.

Among the Jacobean works that celebrated the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV for making the Union of the Crowns possible, there was uncertainty over what impact James's status as hereditary monarch of both kingdoms had on Anglo-Scottish relations. Initially writers overstated its impact, claiming that it had united (or reunited) 'Britain', making James's subjects one people with a shared national identity under a single monarchy and state—following the example of the official union proclamation. It soon became clear, however, that this was not the case, as James pursued permanent union through parliamentary legislation. Some of James's subjects turned his reliance on hereditary right to legitimise his successions to both the English and Scottish thrones against him, by claiming that this disallowed permanent union. For example, one anonymous union treatise writer argued that the personal union of England and Scotland under a shared hereditary monarch was 'deryved from and by the mariadge of Margaret of England, to James y^c fourth kinge of Scotland, the Royall progenytors of our Sacred Sovereaigne, the trewe and undoubted heire unto them both.'⁸³ After listing marriages supposed to have brought about permanent unions, however, the writer concluded: 'I do not fynde that ther was any other union then in the persons of the Prynces onely'.⁸⁴ Consequently, the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV was not celebrated as regularly or credited with such an extensive impact on Anglo-Scottish relations in James's later reign.

It is notable that, compared to Henry VII, the succeeding generations of James's ancestors were not invoked as regularly to defend Anglo-Scottish union, as Jacobean writers wanted to appeal to English audiences by claiming that previous English monarchs—not previous Scottish monarchs—had supported union. For example, it was common to celebrate Henry VII's decision to arrange the marriage of Margaret Tudor to James IV because it offered an Anglo-centric justification of the Anglo-Scottish union that resulted from James VI & I's succession to the English throne (as discussed in Chapter 2). It was less common, however, to simply

⁸³ *A Discourse against the Union*, 1604. TNA SP 14/7, fol. 166r. This treatise was given the name *A Discourse against the Union* by a different hand and dated 26 April 1604 by yet another hand. The treatise bears similarities to Sir Edwin Sandy's speech given on the same date, but differs enough not to be labelled a copy of it.

⁸⁴ TNA SP 14/7, fol. 169r.

celebrate the marriage for making Anglo-Scottish union possible without invoking Henry VII. When Edward Ayscu mentioned Henry VIII's (supposed) wish to marry his daughter to James V to allow the latter to succeed to the English throne, the value of this example was Henry VIII's support for Anglo-Scottish union. These works were targeting an English rather than a Scottish audience and, thus, invoking previous English monarchs was considered more persuasive than invoking previous Scottish monarchs, even if James VI & I's hereditary claim to the Scottish throne from the latter group was also necessary to make union possible. This further demonstrates that Jacobean writers were attempting to make Anglo-Scottish union palatable to an English audience by anglicising it, as they did not believe that it was enough to simply assert that James's status as hereditary monarch of both kingdoms legitimised and justified union without stressing that it would also benefit the English people.

While there was a broad consensus about the historical reputations of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York in the Jacobean period, as shown in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, there was much less consensus about the following generations of James's ancestors. Margaret Tudor was recognised and celebrated as the source of James's hereditary claim(s) to the English throne, whether James inherited it from his mother, his father, or both. There was a noticeable divide in the representation of James IV and James V, however, as Scottish writers focused on their dynastic significance for providing James VI & I with his combined English and Scottish hereditary claims and downplayed their conflict with England, while even English writers who recognised their dynastic significance to James VI & I (and, as William Martyn showed, even that was not universal) could still be hostile towards them as England's former enemies. This divide demonstrates the continued significance of nationality to Jacobean representations of past Anglo-Scottish relations, even when it came to the ancestors on whom James VI & I depended for the hereditary claims that justified his status as monarch of England and Scotland and the resulting Union of the Crowns.

5. Mary, Queen of Scots, and Hereditary Right

Among the historical figures who are discussed in this thesis, Mary, Queen of Scots' posthumous reputation has received the most scholarly attention.¹ Concerning the Jacobean period, however, scholars have focused primarily on her funerary monument in Westminster Abbey and her depiction in the first volume of William Camden's *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha* (1615). Our understanding of Mary's posthumous reputation would be improved by contextualising these two works as part of Mary's broader representation in the Jacobean period. In addition, scholars have primarily focused on how Mary was portrayed as an individual; for example, whether later writers believed that she had been involved in the murder of her husband Henry, Lord Darnley, or they depicted her as a Catholic martyr. This chapter focuses on the Jacobean representation of Mary's status as hereditary monarch of Scotland and her hereditary claim to the English throne, examining what this demonstrates about Jacobean attitudes towards the concept of hereditary right and the hereditary nature of the English and Scottish monarchies.

¹ For example, see: Jennifer M. DeSilva and Emily K. McGuire, 'Revising Mary Queen of Scots: From Protestant Persecution to Patriarchal Struggle', *Journal of Religion and Film*, 25.1 (April 2021), <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/jrf/vol25/iss1/59>; Alejandro García-Reidy, 'Political Rhetoric in Lope de Vega's Representation of Elizabeth I', in *The Image of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Spain*, ed. by Eduardo Olid Guerrero and Esther Fernández (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), pp. 230-231, 235-239; Kelsey J. Ihinger, 'The Mirror in Albion: Spanish Theatrical Reimaginings of Queen Elizabeth I and Mary Stuart', *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, 70.1 (2018), 33-57; Jayne Elizabeth Lewis, *Mary Queen of Scots: Romance and Nation* (London: Routledge, 1998); David Nolan, 'The First Play on Mary Queen of Scots', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 57.226 (Summer 1968), 174-179; James Emerson Phillips, *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth-Century Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964); John D. Staines, *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560-1690* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009); Marguerite A. Tassi, 'Martyrdom and Memory: Elizabeth Curle's Portrait of Mary, Queen of Scots', in *The Emblematic Queen: Extra-Literary Representations of Early Modern Queenship*, ed. by Debra Barrett-Graves (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 101-132; Michael T.R.B. Turnbull, 'L'Église d'Écosse et le martyre controversé de Marie Stuart', in *Le sang de princes: Cultes et mémoires des souverains suppliciés, XVIe-XXIe siècles*, ed. by Paul Chopelin and Sylvène Édouard (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2014), pp. 257-266; Peter Sherlock, 'The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory', *Journal of British Studies*, 46.2 (2007), 263-289; Jesús M. Usunáriz, 'The Political Discourse on Elizabeth I in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Spain', in *The Image of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Spain*, ed. by Guerrero and Fernández, pp. 83, 87, 92-95, 97-100; Jos E. Verduyssen, 'A Scottish Jesuit from Antwerp: Hippolytus Curle', *The Innes Review*, 61.2 (2010), 137-149; Stefano Villi, 'From Mary Queen of Scots to the Scottish Capuchins: Scotland as a Symbol of Protestant Persecution in Seventeenth-Century Italian Literature', *The Innes Review*, 64.2 (2013), 100-119.

In the 1960s, James Emerson Phillips was the first scholar to comprehensively chart Mary's sixteenth century textual representation, though Phillips only discusses the Jacobean period in a short epilogue.² Phillips claims that, once James succeeded to the English throne, he was 'anxious to achieve some kind of public settlement of the debate about his mother's life and death, one that would mollify Catholics at home and abroad and at the same time not offend or alarm his newly acquired Protestant subjects in England.' James did this by encouraging works that 'emphasized Mary's dynastic rights and personal charms, but minimized or actually ignored the religious and political activities that led her to the block.'³ Jayne Elizabeth Lewis discusses Mary's enduring appeal from her lifetime until the nineteenth century, focusing primarily on Mary's funerary monument when covering the Jacobean period.⁴ John D. Staines analyses Mary's legacy in print, from George Buchanan's attacks to John Banks's late seventeenth century plays. In his chapter on the Jacobean period, Staines focuses primarily on James VI & I's involvement in Camden's *Annales*. According to Staines, the threat of competing histories of Mary explains why James 'took an active interest in assuring that his version of his mother's tragedy would be printed in Scotland, England, and Europe.'⁵ As this overview demonstrates, scholars have focused on a very limited number of Jacobean works, and so this chapter incorporates a broader variety.

Despite James VI & I's efforts to revise his mother's reputation in both England and Scotland by celebrating her significance as the source of his hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, this chapter demonstrates that James's Protestant subjects in both kingdoms were incredibly unwilling to publicly discuss Mary, preferring to remain silent and consign Mary to oblivion, rather than accepting and repeating James's version of his mother's life and legacy.

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the major objections to Mary, Queen of Scots' status as a hereditary monarch in Scotland and her hereditary claim to the English throne. This is followed by an analysis of why Mary was absent from

² Phillips, *Images of a Queen*.

³ Phillips, *Images of a Queen*, p. 225.

⁴ Lewis, *Romance and Nation*, pp. 65-74.

⁵ Staines, *The Tragic Histories*, p. 9.

official explanations of James VI & I's succession to the English throne, challenging previous assumptions that it was because Mary's hereditary claim to the English throne had been legally 'extinguished' and thus James could not depend on it. It then considers how English Catholics and Protestants continued to be divided over Mary's legacy in the Jacobean period, demonstrating the continued significance of confessional identity to discussions of the English succession. Mary's Westminster Abbey funerary monument is then analysed from the perspective of how it represents her hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, demonstrating that James used his mother's reburial as an opportunity to defend his own status as hereditary monarch of both kingdoms. James's return visit to Scotland in 1617 is discussed to show the divide between official and unofficial attitudes towards publicly commemorating Mary in Scotland. This is followed by an analysis of William Camden's *Annales*, further revealing how James wished his mother to be remembered and represented. Unofficial histories are then analysed to determine whether James's subjects adopted his interpretation of Mary's life and legacy.

Before 1603

The following overview of the life of Mary, Queen of Scots, focuses on the aspects that proved significant to discussions of hereditary right in the Jacobean period. Mary succeeded to the Scottish throne on the death of her father, James V, when she was only six days old. Mary's hereditary right to the Scottish throne was accepted without question, and the person generally considered to be next in line, James Hamilton, 2nd Earl of Arran (later Duke of Châtellerauld), served as her first regent.⁶ On 24 July 1567, while imprisoned at Lochleven Castle, Mary was pressured into signing an instrument of abdication (though the instrument presented it as her own decision), resigning the throne to her infant son, James VI.⁷ The

⁶ For Arran's position as Mary's heir and his appointment as regent, see: Amy Blakeway, *Regency in Sixteenth-Century Scotland* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2015), pp. 31-32; Marcus Merriman, *The Rough Wooings: Mary Queen of Scots, 1542-1551* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000), pp. 87-92, 123; Marcus Merriman, 'Hamilton, James, second earl of Arran, and duke of Châtellerauld in the French nobility (c. 1519-1575)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12081>.

⁷ The reason given was that Mary's 'body, spreit and sences' were 'sa vexit, brokin and unquietit' that she was no longer capable of governing and wished her son to succeed her now as would have been his right after her death, so 'be thir our lettres, frelie of our awin motive,' she resigned the crown to him. 'Procedure: demission of the crown by Mary queen of Scots', 25 July 1567. Keith M. Brown et. al. (ed.), *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707* (St Andrews, 2007-

Scottish Parliament passed an act on 6 December that recognised the legality of Mary's instrument of abdication and James's succession and coronation.⁸ On the surface, these events maintained the principle of hereditary succession, with Mary simply abdicating the throne to the next in line; however, Mary's abdication was quickly interpreted as a deposition by contemporaries (such as Elizabeth I), and was both acknowledged and justified as such by Mary's opponents in Scotland.⁹ The works of George Buchanan were central to this justification, and they are discussed in the thesis introduction alongside an overview of James's response to Buchanan's works prior to 1603.

Mary's legacy was also contentious in England prior to James's succession to the English throne. In her lifetime, Mary and her supporters had argued that she was Elizabeth I's rightful heir, pressuring Elizabeth to recognise her as such—a recognition Elizabeth never granted.¹⁰ Some even argued that Mary was already

2021), 1567/7/25/1 <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1567/7/25/1> [accessed 15 June 2021]. The instrument of abdication was read before a convention in Edinburgh on 25 July and in Stirling on 29 July, the latter taking place immediately before James's coronation. 'Procedure: demission of the crown by Mary queen of Scots', 25 July 1567. Brown, *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, 1567/7/25/1 <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1567/7/25/1> [accessed 15 June 2021]; 'Procedure: letters of demission from Mary queen of Scots; commission of regency to the Earl of Moray', 29 July 1567. Brown, *Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, 1567/7/29/2 <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1567/7/29/2> [accessed 15 June 2021]. See also: Antonia Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969; reprinted 2015), pp. 429-430; John Guy, *'My Heart is My Own': The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Harper Perennial, 2004), pp. 364-365; Retha M. Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), p. 164.

⁸ 'Procedure: letters of demission from Mary queen of Scots', 6 December 1567. Brown, *Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, 1567/12/104 <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1567/12/104> [accessed 15 June 2021].

⁹ Elizabeth I immediately interpreted it as a deposition and rebuked the Scottish lords on the grounds that they had no authority to depose a divinely-ordained monarch. Elizabeth I to Nicholas Throckmorton, 27 July 1567. TNA SP 52/14, fols 71r-73v. For further discussion of Mary's abdication, see: J.H. Burns, *The True Law of Kingship: Concepts of Monarchy in Early-Modern Scotland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 185-208; Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 409-433; Guy, *'My Heart is My Own'*, pp. 341-352, 362-366; Roger A. Mason, *Kingship and the Commonwealth: Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), pp. 190-194; Kristen Post Walton, *Catholic Queen, Protestant Patriarchy: Mary, Queen of Scots, and the Politics of Gender and Religion* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 137-164; Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 161-165, 173-185; Jenny Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991), pp. 165-177.

¹⁰ See: Jane E.A. Dawson, 'Mary Queen of Scots, Lord Darnley, and Anglo-Scottish Relations in 1565', *The International History Review*, 8.1 (February 1986), 1-24; Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, 'The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 20-44; Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 105-108, 199-210, 259-260, 269-272, 280, 332-333; Guy, *'My Heart is My Own'*, pp. 55-55, 83, 95-96, 113, 115, 129-130, 146-147, 157-159, 167, 169-176, 181-185, 188-191, 200-204, 243, 265, 278-279, 284, 287, 292, 475; Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558-1568* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966), pp. 2, 6, 30-59, 92-97, 165-170, 198-202;

England's rightful ruler and Elizabeth merely a usurper, including Mary herself at the start of Elizabeth's reign.¹¹ Mary's claim—and that of the Stuarts in general—was opposed on various grounds, such as her foreignness and the displacement of Margaret Tudor's descendants in the line of succession by Henry VIII's will, as discussed in Chapter 3. There were also other arguments made against Mary individually, as discussed below.

A common objection was Mary's Catholicism. According to Mortimer Levine, depriving a claimant on religious grounds in the 1560s 'was an idea that few men were yet prepared to consider openly, though most men were undoubtedly swayed in their succession choices by their religious preferences.'¹² Attitudes changed during Mary's English imprisonment; attacks on her claim quickly shifted from its legality to her Catholicism.¹³ By 1572, according to Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, 'no Protestant worth his salt would ever again venture to stand up for Mary's title; and few if any Catholics would consider supporting anyone else.'¹⁴ After Mary's execution, Catholics were divided over the English succession; some supported James, especially in the hope that he would convert to Catholicism or

Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 52, 56, 64, 75-76, 97-98, 102-109, 134, 190-195, 198-199, 207, 221, 232, 234, 243-244, 256-257; Walton, *Catholic Queen, Protestant Patriarchy*, pp. 49-88.

¹¹ See: Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 106-108, 122, 147-148, 555; Guy, 'My Heart is My Own', pp. 96, 105, 112-114, 122, 124, 129-131, 146-147, 243, 464, 509; Levine, *Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, pp. 6, 30-34, 57-58, 191; Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 52, 56, 64, 75, 193, 243.

¹² Levine, *Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, p. 92. Kriston Post Walton concurs. Walton, *Catholic Queen, Protestant Patriarchy*, p. 53.

¹³ Doran and Kewes, 'The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited', in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, pp. 28-29. For example, the English bishops put forward arguments in the 1572 parliament, encouraging Elizabeth to execute Mary to prevent her from attempting to restore Catholicism in England: 'if the late Scotishe Queen with her alies by the pretensed title and other develishe and traiterous devises and workinges is like to bringe confusion to this noble realme of Englande, as evedentley appereth to all faithfull and good subjectes, therefore the prince offendethe grevouslie before God yf for the saftie of hir people she do not cutt hir of.' 'Arguments Against Mary Queen of Scots Presented to Elizabeth by Some of Both Houses, 26 May (?) [1572]', in *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I, Volume I 1558-1581*, ed. T.E. Hartley (London: Leicester University Press, 1981), p. 278.

¹⁴ Doran and Kewes, 'The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited', in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, p. 30. Anne McLaren argues that 'anti-Catholicism became central to English national and political life' in response to the threat posed by Mary's claim to the English throne. Anne McLaren, 'Gender, Religion, and Early Modern Nationalism: Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Genesis of English Anti-Catholicism', *The American Historical Review*, 107.3 (June 2002), 740.

offer toleration, while others turned to Catholic candidates, such as the Infanta Isabella.¹⁵

Attempts were made to legally bar Mary from the English throne which, according to Kewes, necessarily included ‘the argument that parliament, even one summoned after Elizabeth’s death without statutory warrant, could determine the identity of her rightful successor or even choose the next ruler.’¹⁶ The English Privy Council created the Bond of Association in 1584, binding those who swore an oath to ‘withstande, offende, and pursue ... all maner of persons of what estate soever they shalbe and their abettors, that shall attempte by any acte, counsell or consent to any thinge’ to harm Elizabeth, and they would ‘never desist from all maner of forcible pursuete against such persons to the uttermoost extermination of them, their comforters, ayders and abettors.’ The oath-takers would never ‘allowe, accepte or favoure any such pretended successor, by whom or for whom any such detestable act shalbe attempted or commyted, or any that may any way clayme by or from such person or pretended successor as is aforesaid, by whom or for whom such ane acte shalbe attempted or commytted’.¹⁷ If Elizabeth was killed by one of Mary’s supporters, this would apply to both Mary and her son James, whether or not either of them was personally involved.¹⁸

¹⁵ See: Victor Houlston, ‘Filling in the Blanks: Catholic Hopes for the English Succession’, *SEDERI*, 25 (2015), 77-104; Paulina Kewes, ‘The Puritan, the Jesuit and the Jacobean Succession’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. Doran and Kewes, pp. 47-70; Thomas M. McCoog, ‘Harmony Disrupted: Robert Parsons, S.J., William Crichton, S.J., and the Question of Queen Elizabeth’s Successor, 1581-1603’, *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 73.145 (2004), 149-220.

¹⁶ Paulina Kewes, ‘Parliament and the Principle of Elective Succession in Elizabethan England’, in *Writing the History of Parliament in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, ed. by Paul Cavill and Alexandra Gajda (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), p. 107. See also: Patrick Collinson, ‘The Elizabethan Exclusion Crisis and the Elizabethan Polity’, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 84 (1994), 51-92, reprinted in Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 61-88.

¹⁷ ‘Associations for Defence of the Queen’, 1584, Lincoln’s Inn. J. Payne Collier (ed.), *The Egerton Papers. A Collection of Public and Private Documents, Chiefly Illustrative of the Times of Elizabeth and James I, from the Original Manuscripts, the Property of the Right Hon. Lord Francis Egerton, M.P.* (London: 1840), pp. 109-110.

¹⁸ For more on the Bond of Association, see: Collinson, *This England*, pp. 61-88; David Cressy, ‘Binding the Nation: The Bonds of Association, 1584 and 1696’, in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, ed. by DeLloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 217-226, 233-234; Doran and Kewes, ‘The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited’, in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. by Doran and Kewes, p. 35.

The Bond of Association was then developed into an act of parliament.¹⁹ The 1585 *Act for the Queen's Surety* (commonly known as the *Act of Association*) stated that if Elizabeth was attacked, or any invasion or rebellion was attempted, 'by or for any person that shall or may pretende any Title to the Crowne of this Realme after her Majesties decease', or 'if any thing shall be compassed or imagined' to the hurt of Elizabeth 'by any person, or with the privitie of any person that shall or may pretende Title to the Crowne of this Realme', then a commission of at least 24 Privy Councillors, MPs, and judges would be authorised to proclaim that the culprits 'shall bee excluded and disabled for ever to have or claime, or to pretende to have or claime the Crowne of this Realme'. If Elizabeth was killed, then 'every such person, by or for whome any such Acte shall bee executed, and their issues being any wise assenting or privie to the same, shall by vertue of this Acte be excluded and dishabled for ever to have or claime, or to protende to have or claime the saide Crowne'.²⁰ Mary was not mentioned, but she was the intended target.²¹ The act could be interpreted as meaning that even if Mary was found guilty and made ineligible to succeed, James's claim would not be threatened if he had not been 'assenting or privie to the same'. After Mary's execution, however, James continued to worry that the *Act of Association* nullified his own hereditary claim.²²

Elizabeth's commission for Mary's trial stated that Mary had plotted to harm Elizabeth, 'pretending Title to the Crown of this Realm of *England*', and so the conditions of the *Act of Association* should be carried out and a judgement passed.²³

¹⁹ 'Thomas Cromwell's Journal, 1 December 1584-29 March 1585', in *Proceedings in the Parliament of Elizabeth I, Volume II 1584-1589*, ed. T.E. Hartley (London: Leicester University Press, 1995), p. 92.

²⁰ 'An Acte for Provision to be Made for the Suertie of the Queenes Majesties Most Royall Person, and the Continuance of the Realme in Peace', in *Anno xxvii. Reginæ Elizabethæ. At the Parliament Begunne and Holden at Westminster, the xxiii. Day of November, in the xxvii. Yeere of the Reigne of Our Most Gracious Sovereigne Lady Elizabeth ... and There Continued, Untill the xxix, of March Following* (London, 1585; STC 9485.7), A2r-A3r.

²¹ This is made clear in 'Sir William Fitzwilliam's Journal, 23 November 1584-29 March 1585', in *Proceedings in the Parliament of Elizabeth I, Volume II*, pp. 141-142.

²² Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), p. 15; Kewes, 'Parliament and the Principle of Elective Succession', in *Writing the History of Parliament*, ed. by Cavill and Gajda, pp. 120-122; Elizabeth Tunstall, 'The Paradox of the Valentine Thomas Affair: English Diplomacy, Royal Correspondence and the Elizabethan Succession', *Parergon*, 38.1 (2021), 65-87.

²³ Thomas Salmon (ed.), *A Compleat Collection of State-Tryals, and Proceedings Upon Impeachments for High Treason, and Other Crimes and Misdemeanours*, 4 vols (London, 1719), I, p. 125.

In accordance with the *Act of Association*, a commission tried Mary at Fotheringhay Castle in mid-October 1586. The commission then met on their own in the Star Chamber on 25 October, where Mary's secretaries (Gilbert Curle and Claude Nau) appeared to confirm the validity of their testimonies; the commission then pronounced Mary's sentence of guilt for plotting to kill Elizabeth.²⁴ The Commons and Lords sent a petition to Elizabeth requesting she order Mary's execution, which they justified on the grounds of treason, Catholic plotting, and the *Act of Association*.²⁵ Elizabeth hesitated, and hoped that the Bond of Association would be sufficient legal grounds rather than a royal warrant.²⁶ Ultimately, however, Elizabeth signed a warrant for Mary's execution.²⁷ The public proclamation of Mary's condemnation explained that she had been tried 'according to a late Acte of Parliament made the xxiii. day of November, in the xxvii. yeere of our Reigne' (the *Act of Association*) and found guilty of having 'compassed and imagined within the same Realme, divers thing tending to the hurt, death and destruction of our royall person' while 'pretending title to the same Crowne'.²⁸

Elizabeth's warrant for Mary's execution did not mention the implications it had for James's hereditary claim to the English throne.²⁹ Nevertheless, Richard A. McCabe explains that opponents of James's claim to the English throne 'had long argued that Mary's condemnation for treason disqualified her son from succeeding under the terms of the popular Bond of Association of 1584, even though the official Act for the Queen's Surety [*Act of Association*] of 1585 excluded only those complicit in the crime.'³⁰ For example, *A Conference about the Next Succession to*

²⁴ Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 625-644; Guy, 'My Heart is My Own', pp. 489-494; Salmon, *A Compleat Collection of State-Tryals*, I, pp. 126-131; A. Francis Steaurt (ed.), *Trial of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: William Hodge and Company, 1923; republished 1951), pp. 83-104, 132-135; Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 240-245.

²⁵ 'Petition of Lords and Commons for the Execution of Mary Queen of Scots, Presented 12 November 1586', in *Proceedings in the Parliament of Elizabeth I, Volume II*, pp. 246-247.

²⁶ Guy, 'My Heart is My Own', pp. 494-496.

²⁷ Contemporary copy of the warrant for the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, with annotations and underlining in the hand of Robert Beale, 1 February 1587. Lambeth Palace Library, MS 4769 <https://archives.lambethpalacelibrary.org.uk/CalmView/Record.aspx?src=CalmView.Catalog&id=MSS%2F4769> [accessed 22 December 2020].

²⁸ *By the Queene. A true Copie of the Proclamation lately published by the Queenes Maiestie vnder the great Seale of England, for the declaring of the Sentence, lately giuen against the Queene of Scottes, in fourme as followeth* (London, 1586; STC 8160).

²⁹ Lambeth Palace Library, MS 4769.

³⁰ Richard A. McCabe, 'The Poetics of Succession, 1587-1605: The Stuart Claim', in *Doubtful and Dangerous*, ed. Doran and Kewes, p. 196.

the Crowne of England pointed to the *Act of Association* (intentionally confusing it with the Bond of Association, according to David Cressy) as evidence that ‘this king who pretendeth al his right to the crowne of England by his said mother, can have none at al.’³¹ Succession treatises defending James’s claim argued that the *Act of Association* did not apply to him, or that the English Parliament could not overturn hereditary right.³²

Mary’s Absence from Official Explanations of James VI & I’s Succession

As discussed in Chapter 3, the official proclamation of James VI & I’s succession to the English throne explains that James had succeeded to the English throne based on the hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York through their daughter, Margaret Tudor, but the generations between Margaret and James are not listed—including his mother, Mary, Queen of Scots.³³ Some scholars have assumed this was an intentional omission because the *Act of Association* had ‘extinguished’ Mary’s hereditary claim to the English throne, and by extension James’s; however, these scholars do not recognise that it continued to be debated whether the *Act of Association* had stripped James of his maternal hereditary claim even if Mary’s had been affected, as discussed above, or whether parliamentary legislation could subvert hereditary right in general.³⁴ Thus, the reason for Mary’s absence from the proclamation is not as straightforward as these scholars assume. This section argues that Mary’s absence from the official explanations of James’s

³¹ Robert Persons (att.), *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of England* (Antwerp, 1595; STC 19398), part 2, p. 117; Cressy, ‘Binding the Nation’, p. 226.

³² For example, see: Peter Wentworth, *A Pithie Exhortation to Her Majestie for Establishing Her Successor to the Crowne* (Edinburgh, 1598; STC 25245), part 2, pp. 16-33; Irenicus Philodikaos, *A Treatise Declaring, and Confirming against all Objections the Just Title and Right of the Moste Excellent and Worthie Prince, James the Sixt* (Edinburgh, 1599; STC 19881.5), C1v-D2r; John Colville, *The Palinod of John Colvill wherein he doth Penitently Recant his Former Proud Offences, Specially that Treasonable Discourse Lately Made by him Against the Undoubted and Indeniable Title of his Dread Sovereigne Lord, King James the Sixt, Unto the Crowne of England, after Decease of her Maiesty Present* (Edinburgh, 1600; STC 5587), B6r-C1r; Thomas Craig, *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England, in Two Books*, ed. and trans. by James Gadderar (London, 1703; ESTC T144321), pp. 345-346.

³³ *Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to call to his mercy out of this transitory life our sovereigne lady, the high and mighty prince, Elizabeth late Queene of England, France, and Ireland, by whose death and dissolution, the imperiall crowne of these realmes aforesaid are now absolutely, wholly, and solely come to the high and mighty prince, James the Sixt, King of Scotland...* (London, 1603; STC 8298).

³⁴ For example, see: James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (eds.), *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), p. 1n1; Erin Murphy, *Familial Forms: Politics and Genealogy in Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011), p. 51.

succession was an intentional strategy to avoid reviving debates about the validity of James's maternal hereditary claim.

Leonel Sharpe, previously discussed in Chapter 1 and Chapter 3, was one of few Jacobeans to directly address the issue of whether James could inherit a hereditary claim to the English throne from his mother. Sharpe's work demonstrates the arguments that official explanations of James's succession to the English throne could have adopted in defence of the validity of his maternal hereditary claim. For example, Sharpe asserts that, if the Bond of Association was created by 'some that were enemies unto the Kings title', would anyone now fulfil that which 'with fraud and craftines was exacted?'³⁵ Sharpe questions the motives behind the Bond of Association to argue that, even if it was legally valid, it should not be implemented. Additionally, the English now owed an oath of allegiance to James, so they could not oppose their rightful monarch on the grounds of the 'extinguisht' Bond of Association.³⁶

Sharpe also argues that the *Act of Association* itself, 'by which this oth was limited' (meaning the Bond of Association could not be invoked separately), did not deny James's hereditary claim. Sharpe states that he would 'not now dispute whether any thing were attempted' by Mary against Elizabeth (although he does not mention Mary by name), but still points out that 'nothing was executed'—suggesting that, since the plots Mary was involved in had not gone ahead, the provisions of the *Act of Association* were not implemented.³⁷ Regardless, 'heaven and earth doth witness that the kings Majestie was free not only from evil thought, but from all suspition of evill'.³⁸ Even if Mary was guilty of plotting against Elizabeth, James himself was not, and thus his hereditary claim was unaffected. While Sharpe rebukes the idea that the Bond and *Act of Association* nullified James's hereditary

³⁵ Leonel Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge before the Universitie, the Knights, and Chiefe Gentlemen of the Shiere, the Maior and Townesmen, the 28. of March* (Cambridge, 1603; STC 22376), pp. 27-28. Sharpe's sermon is discussed in David Colclough, "I Have Brought Thee Up to a Kingdome": Sermons on the Accessions of James I and Charles I', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 209-213.

³⁶ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 29.

³⁷ As discussed in the next section, it was very rare for Jacobean works to discuss Mary's involvement in plots against Elizabeth, so Sharpe's sermon stands out in this regard.

³⁸ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 29.

claim to the English throne, he accepts that Mary was guilty of plotting against Elizabeth and therefore may have lost her own claim.

Sharpe denies the argument that Mary ‘beeing guiltie of treason doth barre the sonne’, as ‘the blood Royall, as the Law doth hold it, cannot be tainted: for though such a fact may taint a royall person, yet it cannot taint the blood; no nor the person’.³⁹ Sharpe follows the example of Elizabethan succession treatises by using the theory of the king’s two bodies to argue that royal blood and any hereditary claim it carries passed down from individual to individual, is unaffected by attainders or legal convictions.⁴⁰ Thus, Sharpe proposes numerous possible defences of the validity of James’s maternal hereditary claim to the English throne: the Bond of Association being automatically nullified by his succession; the *Act of Association* not applying to James, even if it applied to his mother; Mary’s actions not justifying the implementation of the *Act of Association*; and hereditary claims being unaffected by legal convictions. However, Sharpe does not resolve the debate by conclusively denying that the English Parliament or popular oaths had authority over the succession—rather than trying to define how the English succession operates, he instead offers multiple defences of James’s maternal hereditary claim that would suit various interpretations of the nature of the English succession.

A list of ‘Acts to be considered of against next Parliament’ by an unknown writer, made in anticipation of James’s first English Parliament, reveals that officials did consider taking action to defend the legality of Mary’s hereditary claim to the English throne. The first proposed act on the list is ‘An acte of recognition of his Ma^{ty} title to the Imperiall Crownes of England, Fraunce, & Ireland’ and the second is ‘An acte for the disannulling of a sentence given against y^e late Prince of famous memory Marie Queene of Scotland and the defacing of all records and memories

³⁹ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 28.

⁴⁰ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 28. Sharpe claims that acts of parliament could not be applied to the inheritance of the crown, as the monarch was ‘incorporate to the crowne, the right whereof doeth not onely descend according to the course of private inheritances, but goes by succession as other corporations’. Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, pp. 23-24. Sharpe also argues that although a subject found guilty of treason could not pass their land down to their heirs, ‘yet doth it not reach to the succession of the Crowne, though the persons were attainted by Act of Parliament’, as shown by the example of Edward IV, who was attainted along with his father and never restored, ‘and yet the two last were not disabled thereby to receive the Crowne by lawfull succession.’ Sharpe, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge*, p. 28.

thereof'.⁴¹ This is a reference to the sentence of guilt passed against Mary in 1586; as the sentence was based on the *Act of Association* and consequently nullified Mary's hereditary claim, the 'disannulling' of the sentence would reaffirm the legitimacy of her hereditary claim. The first proposed act on the list came to fruition as the *Act of Recognition of the King's Title*, but the second proposed act did not, nor does it appear to have been raised or discussed. However, its prominent inclusion in this list shows that it was, at least briefly, considered to be an important issue.⁴² In the end, it was evidently deemed unnecessary—or inadvisable—to put this proposed act before the English Parliament. Rather than pursuing an active policy of censorship by destroying records of Mary's sentence, the Jacobean government instead chose not to revive discussions of this controversial subject.

The absence of Mary, Queen of Scots, in the proclamation of James VI & I's succession to the English throne was not necessarily an acknowledgment by Jacobean officials that the *Act of Association* had nullified Mary's hereditary claim, as scholars have assumed. As discussed in Chapter 1, the proclamation of James's succession and the subsequent *Act of Recognition of the King's Title* (1604) were assertions of the hereditary principle that did not acknowledge the English Parliament's authority over the succession.⁴³ As such, this can be interpreted as a rejection of the idea that the *Act of Association* could nullify Mary's hereditary claim or its passage to James. Additionally, it had historically been argued that a monarch's succession automatically overrode any parliamentary attainder or legal conviction applied to them or their ancestors.⁴⁴ It is possible, therefore, that the same was held to be true for the *Act of Association* and Mary's execution—James's succession overrode any effect they might have had on his hereditary claim. Leonel Sharpe's multiple defences of Mary's hereditary claim and its passage to James

⁴¹ 'Acts to be considered of against next Parliament', March 1604? TNA SP 14/6, fol. 181r.

⁴² Notestein suggests that this proposed act 'may have been inserted at the request of Scots in the royal entourage, possibly with the approval of the new sovereign.' Mary's execution, however, was of concern to the English as well as the Scots. It is not included in another surviving copy of the list, at Alnwick Castle. Wallace Notestein, *The House of Commons, 1604-1610* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), p. 49.

⁴³ *Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God...: Journals of the House of Lords Beginning Anno Vicesimo Elizabethæ Reginae*, volume 2 (n.d.), p. 267.

⁴⁴ This was the case with Henry VII. S.B. Chrimes, *Henry VII* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 27, 60-61. This legal argument being used in the Elizabethan succession debates is discussed in Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), pp. 30-31.

demonstrate some of the arguments that the official explanations could have adopted.

It is only possible to speculate, however, because official explanations preferred to remain silent rather than overtly address former objections to James's hereditary claim and risk renewing those debates. The list of 'Acts to be considered of against next Parliament' shows that Jacobean officials did consider taking further action to deny the legality of Mary's execution; however, they did not go ahead with it, maintaining their strategy of silence. Unofficial works, with the notable exception of Sharpe's sermon, followed suit by presuming that James could inherit a hereditary claim from his mother and not debating its validity—even if their preference for combining it with James's paternal hereditary claim might be interpreted as an indication that they did not think James could or should rely solely on his maternal hereditary claim.

Jacobean officials had other reasons not to discuss Mary in their explanations of James's succession to the English throne. As discussed in the previous chapters, official explanations intentionally avoided describing how James was descended from Margaret Tudor. This allowed James to rely on the hereditary claims he inherited from either his mother, his father, or both, rather than conclusively asserting on which line of descent he was depending. Additionally, the official explanations anglicised James by associating him with his Tudor predecessors rather than his Scottish ancestors—mentioning Mary would have undermined this effort, and so she was overlooked just like the other ancestors in the generations between Margaret and James. There was, however, a reason to avoid mentioning Mary in particular: Mary had been, and remained, a hugely controversial figure in England. This ongoing controversy, which is discussed in the following sections of this chapter, also likely contributed to her absence from the official explanations of James's succession.

The Continuing Confessional Divide

Mary, Queen of Scots, unlike many of the historical figures who were discussed in the previous chapters, had been alive at the same time as many of James VI & I's subjects. As discussed in the thesis introduction, scholars have shown that remembering and forgetting specific aspects of the past could be public and collective processes within early modern communities. Phillips claims that James's joint reign was 'a period of truce in the propaganda warfare that had raged for almost half a century' between Catholics and Protestants over Mary and her legacy.⁴⁵ As this chapter will demonstrate, however, Mary's legacy continued to be a subject of disagreement for English Catholics and Protestants in the Jacobean period. While Catholics continued to emphasise Mary's Catholicism and present her as a martyr, many Protestants were uncomfortable publicly discussing her at all. This ongoing division in Mary's legacy in the Jacobean period has received little scholarly attention, and this section demonstrates that Mary's hereditary claim to the English throne continued to be a subject of debate among Catholics and Protestants even after James's succession to the English throne.

The Protestant writers of Jacobean succession panegyrics typically praise Mary in a conventional manner and avoid the controversial aspects of her life, such as her Catholicism and execution. For example, the anonymous writer of *An Excellent New Ballad* describes Mary as a 'very faire and princely Dame' by whose 'most sweete and happy bed, / Our sorrowes now are quight stroke dead' because she had given birth to James.⁴⁶ It was enough that Mary had provided her son with a hereditary claim to the English throne; anything else was irrelevant. Some writers mention Mary's imprisonment and execution—though they intentionally avoid explaining why they had occurred. For example, Michael Drayton states that Mary had been 'long in *England* seene', but does not provide further details.⁴⁷ Samuel

⁴⁵ Phillips, *Images of a Queen*, p. 224.

⁴⁶ *An Excellent New Ballad, Shewing the Petigree of our Royall King James the First of that Name in England. To the Tune of, Gallants All Come Mourne with Mee* (London, 1603; STC 14423). The balladeer demonstrates that they are Protestant by declaring that the English throne will remain in the possession of James's descendants 'In spight of Pope and cruell Spaine'. See also: John Johnston, *A Trewe Description of the Nobill Race of the Stewards Succedinge Lineallie to the Croun of Scotland unto this Day: and Now this Yeir 1603. unto the Croun of England* (Amsterdam, 1603; STC 14787.4), p. 9r [unpaginated]; *Certeine Matters Concerning the Realme of Scotland, Composed Together*, D2r-D2v. These Scottish texts describe Mary in a similar manner.

⁴⁷ Michael Drayton, *To the Majestie of King James. A Gratulatorie Poem* (London, 1603; STC 7231), B1v.

Daniel claims that James would look with grief upon the ‘annoyned blood that staine most shamefully / This ill seduced state’—a reference to Mary’s execution that does not mention her by name—but ‘not wraith t’avenge the same, / Since th’Authors are extinct that caus’d that shame.’⁴⁸ It is unclear who Daniel was referring to, as not everyone involved in Mary’s execution had died; for example, Tobie Matthew, Bishop of Durham, had campaigned for Mary’s execution from 1572 onwards and he apologised to James for this when he met him in Berwick in 1603.⁴⁹ These examples suggest that Protestant writers chose to publicly forget Mary’s Catholicism and plotting in response to James’s succession to the English throne, focusing on her importance as the source of James’s hereditary claim instead.

Some Protestant writers celebrate James’s succession as a triumph for the Protestant faith, though this also results in them avoiding Mary and suggesting that it was necessary for James to be Protestant to succeed to the English throne. These works typically discuss the many Catholic plots against Elizabeth I and Catholic displeasure at the succession of the Protestant James.⁵⁰ However, nowhere in their discussions of Catholic plots is Mary mentioned. Some celebrate James’s succession to the English throne as God’s plan to protect England’s Protestant church; according to Robert Pricket, a former soldier who wrote anti-Catholic poems, it was due to James’s distance from ‘the Romane Antichristian leprosie’ that God had ‘raisde your highnesse up unto the throne of royall dignitie, that by the happines of your godly government, you may encrease & beautifie the glorious kingdom of his blessed Son.’⁵¹ These writers prefer to link James to his Protestant

⁴⁸ Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie*, A4v. The manuscript presentation copy version is almost identical. Samuel Daniel, ‘A Panegyrick congratulatorie to the Kinges most sacred maiestie’, 1603. BL Royal MS 18 A LXXII, fol. 5r.

⁴⁹ Rosamund Oates, *Moderate Radical: Tobie Matthew and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 32-33, 39-45, 53-55, 57, 136-138.

⁵⁰ For example, see: *Englands Wedding Garment. Or a Preparation to King James his Royall Coronation* (London, 1603; STC 14421); *Northerne Poems Congratulating the Kings Majesties Most Happy and Peaceable Entrance to the Crowne of England* (London, 1604; STC 14427), pp. 6-9, 11-13, 19; Robert Pricket, *Unto the Most High and Mightie Prince, his Sovereigne Lord King James. A Poore Subject Sendeth, a Souldiors Resolution* (London, 1603; STC 20343); *The Poores Lamentation for the Death of our Late Dread Sovereigne the High and Mightie Princesse Elizabeth, late Queene of England, France and Ireland With their Prayers to God for the High and Mightie Prince James by the Grace of God King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith* (London, 1603; STC 7594).

⁵¹ Pricket, *A Souldiors Resolution*, A3r-A3v.

predecessor rather than his Catholic mother, so they focus on the similarities between Elizabeth and James rather than James's ancestry and hereditary claim.⁵² This challenged the official narrative that James had succeeded exclusively by hereditary right, as it presents his Protestantism as another necessary quality—one which his mother did not have.

Mary had an entirely different reputation among Jacobean Catholics who, unlike their Protestant contemporaries, did not remain silent about the relationship between Mary's Catholicism and her claim to the English throne. After her execution, Mary had immediately been presented as a martyr by writers such as Adam Blackwood and Richard Verstegan.⁵³ James's new Catholic subjects hoped that he would grant them religious toleration, and individual Catholics handed him petitions to this end as he progressed south through England.⁵⁴ A group of Catholics also presented a petition to James after his arrival in London.⁵⁵ The petition asks how many Catholic noble- and gentlemen had lost their lands and livings, been exiled, imprisoned, and executed, 'for the advancement of yo^r blessed Mothers right to the Cepter [of] Albion? Nay whose finger did ever ake but the Catholikes, for yo^r Ma^{ties} present title & dominion?' The petitioners ask to be able to practice the Catholic religion 'w^{ch} all yo^r happy pr[e]decessours p[ro]fessed from Donaldus first

⁵² Christopher Muriell and Robert Pricket also claim that Elizabeth had nominated James as her successor. Christopher Muriell, *An Answer unto the Catholiques Supplication, Presented Unto the Kings Majestie, for a Tolleration of Popish Religion in England. Wherein is Contained a Confutation of their Unreasonable Petitions* (London, 1603; STC 18292), B2; Pricket, *A Souldiors Resolution*, 3r.

⁵³ See: Anne Dillon, *The Construction of Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1535-1603* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2002; reprinted 2016), pp. 273-274; Thomas M. McCoog, 'Construing Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1582-1602', in *Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, ed. by Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), pp. 105-106; Phillips, *Images of a Queen*, pp. 171-197; Staines, *The Tragic Histories*, pp. 90-99; Vercruyse, 'A Scottish Jesuit from Antwerp: Hippolytus Curle'; Alexander S. Wilkinson, *Mary Queen of Scots and French Public Opinion, 1542-1600* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 103-149.

⁵⁴ Albert J. Loomie, 'Toleration and Diplomacy: The Religious Issue in Anglo-Spanish Relations, 1603-1605', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 54.6 (1963), 14; Thomas M. McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1598-1606: "Lest Our Lamp Be Entirely Extinguished"* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), p. 410.

⁵⁵ As John J. LaRocca explains, the petitions appeal for toleration was based on 'the loyalty of the Catholics to his mother' but 'was also tinged by the memory of all the treasonous plots which revolved around her, and the idea of treason did not render him benevolent.' John J. LaRocca, "'Who Can't Pray with Me, Can't Love Me': Toleration and the Early Jacobean Recusancy Policy', *Journal of British Studies*, 23.2 (Spring 1984), 27.

Converted unto yo^r ma^ties peerles mother last martired.’⁵⁶ According to the Venetian Ambassador in France, however, this mention of Mary’s death alarmed some members of the English Privy Council, so the petitioners were ordered to leave the kingdom.⁵⁷ English Catholics ultimately failed to secure official toleration from James.⁵⁸

In his response to the Catholic petition, Gabriel Powell reminded Jacobean readers that support for candidates in the Elizabethan succession debates had been based on confessional identity rather than strict hereditary seniority. Powell was a Welsh Church of England priest who published a number of anti-Catholic works.⁵⁹ In his response, Powell points out that Catholics had judged Elizabeth ‘justly deposed’ by papal excommunication ‘and so traiterously gave away her right unto another. Otherwise how could any pretend RIGHT *unto the scepter of Albion*, Queene *Elizabeth* being yet living? and there is great difference betweene RIGHT AND TITLE.’⁶⁰ This was a direct acknowledgment that some Catholics had argued not

⁵⁶ ‘The Catholikes of England’ to James VI and I, c. April 1604. TNA SP 14/1, fols 110r-110v. The 1603 Catholic petition survives in numerous manuscript copies, suggesting it became more widely known through circulation. A transcription of another manuscript version of the petition, as well as a list of the known manuscript versions, is provided on *Manuscript Pamphleteering in Early Stuart England* <https://mpese.ac.uk/t/CatholicsLetterJamesI1603v2.html> [accessed 21 June 2021].

⁵⁷ Marin Cavalli, Venetian Ambassador in France, to the Doge and Senate, 25 May 1603. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. by Horatio F. Brown, Rawdon Brown, G. Cavendish Bentinck, and Allen B. Hinds, 38 vols (London: HMSO, 1864-1947), X (1900), p. 38.

⁵⁸ See: John Bossy, ‘The English Catholic Community 1603-1625’, in *The Reign of James VI and I*, ed. by Alan G.R. Smith (London: Macmillan, 1973), pp. 91-105; Caroline M. Hibbard, ‘Early Stuart Catholicism: Revisions and Re-Revisions’, *The Journal of Modern History*, 52.1 (March 1980), 1-34; LaRocca, “‘Who Can’t Pray with Me, Can’t Love Me’”, 22-36; McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England*, pp. 405-519; Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978), pp. 72-136; Diana Newton, *The Making of the Jacobean Regime: James VI and I and the Government of England, 1603-1605* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), pp. 17-18, 62-66; Michael Questier, *Dynastic Politics and the British Reformations, 1558-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 272-276, 287; Stefania Tutino, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570-1625* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 81-116; Stefania Tutino, “‘Makyng Recusancy Deathe Outrighte’?: Thomas Pounce, Andrew Willet and the Catholic Question in Early Jacobean England’, *Recusant History*, 27.1 (2004), 31-50; Jenny Wormald, ‘Gunpowder, Treason, and Scots’, *Journal of British Studies*, 24.2 (April 1985), 145-158, 167.

⁵⁹ Gabriel Powell, *The Catholikes Supplication Unto the Kings Majestie; for Toleration of Catholike Religion in England: With Short Notes or Animadversions in the Margine. Whereunto is annexed Parallel-wise, a Supplicatorie Counterpoise of the Protestants, unto the Same Most Excellent Majestie*. (London, 1603; STC 20141). See: Margo Todd, ‘Powell, Gabriel (bap. 1576, d. 1611)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22646>. Another published response was Muriell, *An Answer unto the Catholiques Supplication*.

⁶⁰ Powell, *Catholikes Supplication*, p. 8.

only that Mary was the next heir to the English throne in Elizabeth's reign, but also that Mary was already England's rightful monarch. Powell, however, avoids attacking Mary herself, only discussing her Catholic supporters.

Powell also points out that Catholics had advanced the 'pretended title' of the Infanta Isabella, 'yet now they acknowledge Gods right and their owne madnes.'⁶¹ Powell denies the petition's claim that Catholics had immediately gone from supporting Mary's claim to the English throne to supporting James's, arguing instead that they had prioritised the confessional identity of the claimant rather than the seniority of their hereditary claim. Powell's work undermined the official narrative that James's succession to the English throne had been inevitable and unchallengeable due to his senior hereditary claim, as it reminded readers that support for candidates in the Elizabethan succession debates had often been divided along confessional lines and James's claim had not been universally recognised.

John Colleton, an English Catholic priest, puts forward identical arguments to the anonymous petition in his 1604 pamphlet appealing to James for toleration. Colleton's petition was provoked by a royal proclamation commanding all 'Jesuites, Seminaries, and other [Catholic] Priests' to leave England.⁶² Colleton stresses 'our manifolde dangers under-gone, our severall losses and indignities sustained, and the store of catholike blood that hath beene shedde, for affecting your mothers Rightes and Title'. The addition of the word 'Title' appears to be a response to Powell. Colleton claims that the Catholics' 'true love, zeale and tribute of service' did not extend to Mary alone, 'but in and through her' to James, 'so since the time of her happie Crowne of Martyrdome, our wishes, indevours and actions, have ever levelled, as much as lay in our power, to the most advancing of your Majesties Title.'⁶³ As well as being another reminder of the importance of confessional identity in the Elizabethan succession debates, Colleton also suggests

⁶¹ Powell, *Catholikes Supplication*, p. 8.

⁶² 'A Proclamation Commanding All Jesuits, Seminaries, and Other Priests, to Depart the Realme by a Day Appointed', 22 February 1604, Westminster, in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1*, ed. by Larkin and Hughes, pp. 70-73. See: Questier, *Dynastic Politics*, p. 287.

⁶³ John Colleton, *A Supplication to the Kings Most Excellent Majestie* (London, 1604; STC 14432), pp. 45-46. For Colleton, see: Theodor Harmsen, 'Colleton, John (1548-1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5909>; Loomie, 'Toleration and Diplomacy', 28; McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England*, pp. 468-469.

that Catholics had only defended James's claim to the English throne because his mother had been a Catholic and a martyr.

Powell also responded to Colleton's appeal for Catholic toleration, arguing that Catholic support for James's candidacy as an extension of their support for Mary was 'Sore against the Papists will', and asking Colleton to prove that Catholics had done all in their power to support James's claim, since 'Parsons [Robert Persons, believed to be the writer of *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of England*] denyeth it.'⁶⁴ Once again, Powell reminds his readers that Catholics had opposed James's claim to the English throne on religious grounds, and stresses that hereditary right had not been the main consideration when Catholics chose which candidate to support.

The discovery of the Gunpowder Plot inspired the creation of numerous works on the history of Catholic plots against Elizabeth I. Like the succession panegyrics that reflected on these plots, discussed above, none of these later works mention Mary's involvement.⁶⁵ Rather than denying or defending Mary's involvement in these plots, most English Protestant writers do not discuss her at all—she was removed from the Protestant public memory and consigned to oblivion (a concept discussed in the thesis introduction). While this might appear to be in James's interest, this refusal to discuss Mary also meant that these writers were not adopting James's interpretation of his mother's life and legacy, or defending Mary's hereditary claim

⁶⁴ Gabriel Powell, *A Consideration of the Papists Reasons of State and Religion, for Toleration of Poperie in England, intimated in their Supplication unto the Kings Majestie, & the States of the Present Parliament* (Oxford, 1604; STC 20144), p. 123.

⁶⁵ For example, see: Thomas Morton, *An Exact Discoverie of Romish Doctrine in the Case of Conspiracie and Rebellion by Pregnant Observations: Collected (Not Without Direction from our Superiours) Out of the Expreste Dogmaticall Principles of Popish Priests and Doctors* (London, 1605; STC 18184); Thomas Dekker, *The Double PP* (London, 1606; STC 6498); William Leigh, *Great Britaines, Great Deliverance, from the Great Danger of Popish Powder* (London, 1606; STC 15425); Thomas Morton, *A Full Satisfaction Concerning a Double Romish Iniquitie* (London, 1606; STC 18185). The exception was the 1606 and 1612 editions of William Warner's versified history, *Albions England*. Although first published in 1586, *Albions England* did not mention Mary by name until the revised edition of 1596, when she was introduced during a violent diatribe against England's Catholic enemies. Phillips, *Images of a Queen*, pp. 211-212. Surprisingly, Warner's criticisms of Mary were not removed when the work was republished in James's joint reign. James Maxwell commented that the 'olde, shamelesse, uncharitable and unreasonable stile' of discussing Mary was 'of later tyme approved and applauded by that raiging and rayling Rymerist who in his 20 Booke of Albions England spueth out most spitefully against her, even longe after her deathe, the whole poyson of his hart'. James Maxwell, 'Britaines Union in Love'. BL Royal MS 18 A LI, fol. 5r.

to the English throne from arguments that it had been invalidated by her Catholicism, parliamentary exclusion, or execution.

Catholic writers also reminded their readers that Protestants had challenged Mary's status as Scotland's hereditary monarch and her hereditary claim to the English throne on religious grounds. In 1606, Richard Broughton, another English Catholic priest, published a response to a 1605 work by Thomas Morton, future Bishop of Durham.⁶⁶ Morton had argued that Catholic doctrine legitimised both rebellions against legitimate rulers and their assassination, as well as the overthrow of hereditary succession in favour of a Catholic candidate 'by pretended prerogative of Pope and people.'⁶⁷ Broughton responds that Protestants had deposed more rulers than the papacy had, including Marie of Guise and 'his Majesties mother'.⁶⁸ This was a reminder that Scotland's hereditary monarchy had been threatened by Protestant ideologues. Broughton then states that 'his Highnesse title was expresly contradicted, and written against' by the 'English Protestant' John Hales in his 1563 succession treatise, 'to which, no Protestant (to my knowledge) did ever give answer, or deniall. But many Catholikes confuted it, as the Catholike Bishop of *Rosse*, in *Scotland*, and three Catholikes of distinct professions in *England*'—Sir Anthony Browne, 'Doctor *Morgan*, a Divine, and Doctor *Mytch*, (or like name) a civill Lawyer.'⁶⁹ This was another unwelcome reminder that Mary's hereditary claim to the English throne—and, by extension, James's—had been disputed on religious grounds and that confessional identity had been a central consideration in the Elizabethan succession debates.

While the official explanations of James's succession to the English throne asserted that it was the result of his senior hereditary claim, some of James's new Protestant

⁶⁶ For Morton, see: Brian Quintrell, 'Morton, Thomas (bap. 1564, d. 1659)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/19373>.

⁶⁷ Morton, *An Exact Discoverie*, p. 11. Although Morton discusses Catholic plots and rebellions against Elizabeth I in this work, he does not mention Mary, Queen of Scots. This was common among Jacobean works, as discussed above.

⁶⁸ Richard Broughton, *A Just and Moderate Answer to a Most Injurious, and Slaunderous Pamphlet, Intituled, An Exact Discovery of Romish Doctrine in Case of Conspiracie and Rebellion. Wherein the Innocency of Catholike Religion is Proved, and Every Objection Returned Upon the Protestant Accuser, and his Owne Profession* (England, 1606; STC 18188), Dv. For Broughton, see: Peter Holmes, 'Broughton [alias Rouse], Richard (c. 1561-1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3587>.

⁶⁹ Broughton, *A Just and Moderate Answer*, F2r.

subjects preferred to stress the importance of his Protestantism. As a result, they were silent on his Catholic mother, thereby undermining the idea that James's succession was due to the hereditary claim he had inherited from her. If James had been Catholic, or if his mother had still been alive at the time of Elizabeth I's death, the implication of these works was that they would not have succeeded to the English throne, as hereditary right alone was not enough—they would also have to be Protestant. Jacobean Catholic writers made this point explicit by reminding their readers that Protestants had opposed Mary's hereditary claim because of her Catholicism.

One outspoken Protestant, Gabriel Powell, counter-argued that Catholic support for Mary's claim to the English throne was due to her Catholicism, not her senior hereditary claim, and that Catholics were exaggerating the support they had given to the Protestant James now that he had successfully secured the throne. Consequently, these religious debates undermined the official narrative that James's succession to the English throne had been inevitable and unchallengeable due to his senior hereditary claim. They reminded readers that James's candidacy had not been universally acknowledged, and that support for candidates in the Elizabethan succession debates had been divided along confessional lines. This highlighted the importance of religion to the English succession, rather than just hereditary right.

Both sides of the confessional divide undermined James's efforts to downplay his mother's Catholicism in favour of emphasising her dynastic significance, instead reinforcing the divide between the two confessional groups and how they remembered Mary. Catholics continued to present Mary as a martyr, while Protestants preferred not to publicly discuss her at all, rather than adopting James's interpretation of her life and legacy. Although the decision by most Protestant writers not to mention Mary when discussing Catholic plots against Elizabeth I was likely done so as not to offend James, it also meant that they did not defend Mary from claims that her involvement had nullified her hereditary claim to the English throne and its passage to James.

Mary's Reburial in Westminster Abbey

A major occasion for asserting James VI & I's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, and the hereditary nature of both monarchies, was the reburial of Mary, Queen of Scots, in Westminster Abbey. After her execution at Fotheringhay Castle on 8 February 1587, Mary had been buried in Peterborough Cathedral.⁷⁰ The earliest known reference to James's intention to have a funerary monument made for Mary in Westminster Abbey dates from April 1605.⁷¹ On 19 May 1606, a writ was issued to pay Cornelius Cure, James's master mason, 'for the framing, making, erecting, and finishing of a tomb for Queen Mary, late Queen of Scotland'.⁷² Thomas Sackville, Earl of Dorset, Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, and Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, were responsible for the design and features of Mary's monument.⁷³ After Cure's death in 1607, the monument was completed by his son, William Cure.⁷⁴ Mary's body was removed from Peterborough Cathedral on 7 October 1612 and transported to London, where it was reburied in the south aisle of Westminster Abbey's Lady Chapel on 8 October 1612.

Mary's reburial and funerary monument have inspired significant scholarly interest. Jennifer Woodward explains that Mary's burials in both Peterborough Cathedral and Westminster Abbey did not reflect her own wishes but rather 'the particular political ends of its organisers'.⁷⁵ Thus, James's decision to have a funerary monument made for Mary was for 'the enhancement of his own image'.⁷⁶ According to Nigel Llewellyn, James's motivation 'was to "absolve" the taint of treason against Mary Stuart which had been the legal justification for her

⁷⁰ Jennifer Woodward, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997), pp. 77-78.

⁷¹ Sherlock, 'Manipulation of Memory', p. 270.

⁷² Frederick Devon (ed.), *Issues of the Exchequer; Being Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue During the Reign of King James I* (London, 1836), p. 35. Additional payments to Cornelius Cure can be found on pp. 50, 75.

⁷³ One of Cornelius Cure's payments states that he was to construct Mary's monument 'according to a plot thereof drawn, and articles indented, between the Right Honourable the Earl of Dorset, the Lord Treasurer, the Earls of Northampton and Salisbury, and the said Cornelius Cure.' Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 75. By contrast, only Dorset and Salisbury were responsible for Elizabeth I's monument; this shows that Northampton had a personal interest in Mary's reburial. Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 50.

⁷⁴ Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, pp. 100, 168-169. On 14 May 1616, a writ was issued to pay James Mauncy for 'painting and gilding' the monument, and so it was completed. Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 190.

⁷⁵ Woodward, *The Theatre of Death*, p. 68.

⁷⁶ Woodward, *The Theatre of Death*, p. 135.

execution.⁷⁷ Peter Sherlock claims that the impact of Mary's monument 'upon popular and official conceptions of British history is no accident but rather the result of a careful strategy dreamed up by James VI and I and his councillors.'⁷⁸ The ultimate purpose of Mary's new monument was 'to resolve the historical, dynastic, and political problems posed by her execution.'⁷⁹ This section demonstrates that the location of Mary's reburial and the funerary monument created for her were used to defend the hereditary natures of the English and Scottish monarchies, promote James's hereditary claims to both thrones, and downplay the controversial aspects of Mary's legacy that undermined those two previous points.

According to Anthony D. Smith, nations 'provide individuals with "sacred centres", objects of spiritual and historical pilgrimage, that reveal the uniqueness of their nation's "moral geography".'⁸⁰ Westminster Abbey served this purpose in early modern England. J.F. Merritt argues that, prior to the Wars of the Three Kingdoms, Westminster Abbey was 'the principal centre for religious and secular ceremonial in the kingdom ... The presence of royal tombs within ... coupled with the abbey's role in royal coronations and funerals, provided an important link with royal ceremony ... the abbey took it upon itself to serve as representative of the national Church in its full glory.'⁸¹ As David Cressy explains, in early modern England,

⁷⁷ Nigel Llewellyn, 'The Royal Body: Monuments to the Dead, For the Living', in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540-1660*, ed. by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), p. 227.

⁷⁸ Sherlock, 'Manipulation of Memory', p. 263.

⁷⁹ Sherlock, 'Manipulation of Memory', p. 278.

⁸⁰ Antony D. Smith, *National Identity* (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 16.

⁸¹ J.F. Merritt, 'The Cradle of Laudianism? Westminster Abbey, 1558-1630', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 52.4 (October 2001), 626. Merritt argues that it was only during the Commonwealth period that Westminster Abbey first became 'a state Church, and indeed perhaps the first example of a "national" Church that was linked to the state rather than to the monarch.' However, this does not negate that Westminster Abbey was already an important national site in the Jacobean period, especially in relation to England's monarchy and royal history. J.F. Merritt, 'Reinventing Westminster Abbey, 1642-1660: A House of Kings from Revolution to Restoration', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 67.1 (January 2016), 126. Merritt explains that 'The Abbey's role as effectively the national Church in these years was in itself part of a broader process whereby the area of central Westminster came to have a more exclusively 'national' meaning in this period ... Just as Westminster now acted as the host of national government in a more intensive and continuous fashion, so Westminster Abbey played a more continuous national role, in contrast to its episodic deployment under the early Stuart monarchs.' Merritt, 'Reinventing Westminster Abbey', 134-135. See also: J.F. Merritt, *Westminster, 1640-60: A Royal City in a Time of Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 95-115; Peter Sherlock, 'The Revolution of Memory: The Monuments of Westminster Abbey', in *Revolutionary England, c.1630-c.1660: Essays for Clive Holmes*, ed. by George Southcombe and Grant Tapsell (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), pp. 201-217.

‘governments made calculated use of national memory for dynastic, political, religious and cultural purposes’, deliberately cultivating a vision of the past that was ‘given physical form by memorials and monuments.’⁸² Mary’s funerary monument can be interpreted in this light.

James’s decision to bury Mary in Westminster Abbey clearly defends his hereditary claim to the English throne, as it associates him with his English predecessors. Westminster Abbey was the burial place of many of England’s former monarchs, going back to the tenth century.⁸³ In a letter to the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough Cathedral on 28 September 1612, asking them to exhume Mary’s body in preparation for its reburial, James explained that ‘it appertains to the duty we owe to our dearest mother that like honour should be done to her body and like monument be extant of her as to others her and our progenitors have been used to be done.’⁸⁴ Since James had Mary buried in the Lady Chapel constructed on the orders of Henry VII and in which Henry himself was buried, it is likely that Henry was one of the progenitors James had in mind. The Lady Chapel was associated with the entire Tudor dynasty, as it was already the burial place of Lady Margaret Beaufort, Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, Edward VI, Mary I, Lady Margaret Douglas, and Elizabeth I.

Since James’s hereditary claim was based on his descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, burying his mother so close to them emphasises that familial connection. Jennifer Woodward argues that ‘by having Mary reinterred in the Henry VII Chapel of Westminster Abbey, the royal sepulchre established by the Tudor dynasty, he was underlining the legitimacy of the Stuart succession.’⁸⁵ Peter Sherlock also notes the importance of the precise location of Mary’s monument,

⁸² David Cressy, ‘National Memory in Early Modern England’, in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. by John R. Gillis (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 61.

⁸³ As mentioned in one of the payments for Mary’s monument, it was ‘to be erected and set up amongst the rest of his Majesty’s most honourable progenitors’. Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 190. An anonymous Jacobean Catholic also interprets it in this manner when transcribing Mary’s epitaph ‘as it is at Westminster on her Toombe unto which place her body was translated, and layed amongst the auncient Kinges and Queenes of this Realme her auncesters’. *A Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, undated, post-1616. BL Harley MS 371, fol. 122r.

⁸⁴ James VI & I to the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough Cathedral, 28 September 1612. G.P.V. Akrigg (ed.), *Letters of King James VI & I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), p. 326. The original letter is in the Peterborough Cathedral Archives, MS 11a.

⁸⁵ Woodward, *The Theatre of Death*, p. 140.

behind that of Lady Margaret Beaufort (Henry VII's mother) in the south aisle: 'James identified himself with his great-great-grandfather, also the founder of a new dynasty, and mapped the Stuart family over the geography established by the Tudors.'⁸⁶ Mary's reburial in Westminster Abbey emphasises continuity between James and his predecessors on the English throne, presenting Mary—and through her, James—as an extension of England's royal family, and the Tudor dynasty more specifically. It also downplays Mary's 'foreignness' (which had previously been used to deny her claim to the English throne) by asserting that it was appropriate for her to be buried alongside her English royal ancestors.

Mary's funerary monument also defends James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, and the hereditary nature of both monarchies. Its key literary feature is the Latin epitaph that was written by Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton.⁸⁷ The first paragraph explains that Mary was 'daughter of James V of Scotland, sole heir and great granddaughter of Henry VII, King of England, through his elder daughter Margaret (who was joined in marriage to James IV of Scotland): great-great-granddaughter of Edward IV, King of England through his eldest daughter Elizabeth', making Mary 'sure and certain heiress to the crown of England while she lived: mother of James, most powerful sovereign of Great Britain.'⁸⁸ This explanation of Mary's hereditary claim to the English throne is almost identical to that used in the official proclamation of James's succession. While Mary is not mentioned in that proclamation, this epitaph makes clear that she was the source of James's hereditary claim to the English throne and asserts that

⁸⁶ Sherlock, 'Manipulation of Memory', 271. Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, asserts that it 'mighte seeme an effecte of providence' that in the south aisle of the Lady Chapel 'wherein the countesse of Richmonde' (Lady Margaret Beaufort) was buried, 'no more rowme was left' except the space for Mary's reburial, proving that 'this place was preservid and kept for hir.'

Northampton directly links Mary to her ancestor, Lady Margaret Beaufort, which was particularly apt as the latter had also provided her son with a hereditary claim to the English throne. Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, to Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester, 10 October 1612. TNA SP 14/71, fols 24r-24v.

⁸⁷ The transcription of the original Latin epitaph is taken from Jodocus Crull, *The Antiquities of St. Peters, or the Abbey Church of Westminster, Containing All the Inscriptions, Epitaphs, &c. upon the Tombs and Grave-Stones* (London, 1711; ESTC T72143), pp. 89-91. I thank Paloma Perez Galvan for her assistance in translating this epitaph into English.

⁸⁸ 'Jacobi V. Scotorum Regis filia, et hæredis unica Henrici VII. Angliæ Regis ex Margareta, maiori natu filia (Jacobi IV. Regis Scotorum matrimonio copulata) proneptis Edwardi IV. Angliæ Regis ex Elisabetha filiarum natu maxima abneptis. ... Coronæ Angliæ dum vixit, certæ, & indubitatæ Hæredis, et Jacobi Magnæ Britannia Monarchæ potentissimi, matris.' Crull, *Antiquities*, p. 89.

the English succession operated according to hereditary right. It also anglicises Mary—and by extension James—by emphasising her English royal descent.

According to Sherlock, the description of Mary as Henry VII's 'sole heir' (hæredis unicæ) 'virtually denied Elizabeth's legitimacy' by implying that Mary had been England's rightful monarch in Elizabeth's lifetime. Sherlock suggests this may have been added at James's request, as Northampton's drafts do not make such an overt claim, with one describing Mary as 'nearest heir by the law of succession to the English crown'.⁸⁹ The meaning was vague enough, however, not to have caused any evident controversy.⁹⁰ The epitaph also states that Mary was 'blest, by a three-fold right, with a three-fold crown', made up of 'Scotland by right, France by marriage, England by expectation'.⁹¹ While this can also be interpreted as a challenge to Elizabeth's status, it does state that her right to the English crown was only 'by expectation', not that she possessed it during her lifetime. This line presents Mary's hereditary right to rule in Scotland and status as heir to the English throne by hereditary right as legitimate and unchallengeable. This, by extension, also defends James's status as hereditary monarch of both kingdoms.

The events of Mary's personal reign in Scotland, including Mary's abdication, are intentionally not discussed. Therefore, the epitaph avoids reviving the debate over whether it was a legitimate deposition and does not bring into question the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy. It is also notable that the epitaph makes no mention of James's father, Henry, Lord Darnley—perhaps out of fear that this would remind the reader of the controversy of his murder and its aftermath. As a result, the epitaph presents James's hereditary claim to the English throne as coming exclusively from his mother, unlike the unofficial works discussed in Chapter 3.

⁸⁹ Sherlock, 'Manipulation of Memory', 280 and n. 60. The draft Sherlock refers to is: Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, *In Obitum potentissimæ principis D Mariæ Stuartæ Scotorum Reginae*. BL Cotton MS Titus C VI, fol. 208r, with a slightly different wording also included on fol. 209r.

⁹⁰ A Catholic contemporary translated it as 'The certaine and undoubted heire (whiles shee lived) of the croune of England', not appearing to interpret it as meaning that Mary had been England's rightful monarch in Elizabeth's lifetime. *A Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*, undated, post-1616. BL Harley MS 371, fol. 122v.

⁹¹ 'Jure Scotos, Thalamo Francos, spe possidet Anglos / Triplice sic triplex jure corona beat.' Crull, *Antiquities*, p. 90.

The epitaph states that after Mary had been imprisoned in England for around twenty years ‘and had courageously and vigorously (but vainly), fought against the obloquies of her foes, the mistrust of the faint-hearted, and the crafty devices of her mortal enemies, she was at last struck down by the axe’. Mary is not presented as responsible for her own downfall, but as the victim of unnamed enemies. The epitaph condemns Mary’s execution as ‘an unheard-of precedent, outrageous to royalty’, thereby denying its legitimacy and, implicitly, the argument that it had any impact on James VI & I’s hereditary claim to the English throne.⁹²

The epitaph presents James’s own succession to the English throne as a triumphant posthumous conclusion to the tragedy of Mary’s life. It states that Mary commended her soul to Christ—no specific details of her confessional identity are mentioned—and ‘to James, her son, the hope of a kingdom’.⁹³ The epitaph ends by explaining Mary’s greatest achievement: ‘She gave birth, fate being propitious, to the excellent James ... Great in marriage, greater still in lineage, greatest of all in her progeny’.⁹⁴ The epitaph encourages the reader to remember Mary primarily as a mother who passed down a prestigious lineage and unchallengeable hereditary claims to her son. James’s hereditary claims to the thrones of England and Scotland are presented as absolute and unchallengeable; Mary’s Catholicism, abdication, and execution did not affect them, and these issues are downplayed or ignored to avoid any suggestion that they had.⁹⁵

⁹² ‘... postquam annos plus minus viginti in custodia detenta, fortiter et Strenue (sed frustra[m]) cum malevolorum obtreactionibus, timidorum suspicionibus, et inimicorum capitalium insidiis conflictata esset tandem inaudito, et infesto Regibus exemplo securi percutitur.’ Crull, *Antiquities*, pp. 89-90. A Catholic contemporary translated it as ‘After shee had bene detayned in prison little lesse then twenty yeeres, and had striven and contended couragiously and valiantly, but in vayne, with the slaunders of evill persons willers, the suspicions of fearefull people, and the crafty traps laid for her, by her mortall enemyes, at length by an example incredible and strange to heare, hatefull and dangerous unto kings, is beheaded’. BL Harley MS 371, fol. 122v.

⁹³ ‘*Jacobo* filio spem regni’. Crull, *Antiquities*, p. 90. The epitaph also explains that Mary’s end might appear unfortunate, but ‘she perished that she might possess the land: now she triumphs by death, / that her stock might thereafter burgeon with fresh fruits.’ ‘Sed cadit ut terram teneat, nunc morte triumphat, / Fructibus ut sua stirps, pullulet inde novis.’ Crull, *Antiquities*, p. 90.

⁹⁴ ‘Edidit eximium fato properante *Jacobum* ... Magna viro, major, natu, sed maxima partu, / Conditur hic Regum filia, sponsa, parens.’ Crull, *Antiquities*, p. 91.

⁹⁵ Mary’s epitaph was published in the 1614 edition of William Camden’s *Remaines* and the editions that followed, allowing it to be read more widely. William Camden, *Remaines, Concerning Britaine: But Especially England, and the Inhabitants Thereof* (London, 1614; STC 4522), pp. 379-381.

The draft versions of Mary's epitaph demonstrate that it was decided not to focus on controversial aspects of Mary's life in the final epitaph but to emphasise Mary's dynastic significance as the source of James's hereditary claims. For example, Mary's confessional identity is downplayed in the final version compared to Northampton's drafts, which present her as a pious martyr; James's ecumenical intention was to overcome the confessional divide in how Mary was remembered by focusing on Mary's dynastic significance.⁹⁶ While the final epitaph does not discuss Mary's downfall in Scotland and says very little about her downfall in England, there is a draft that explains both.⁹⁷ It blames Mary's illegitimate half-

⁹⁶ Two of Northampton's drafts state that she is 'an example of one destroyed by being cut down, like the wounded Christ, / Plunge the authors and actors of that act into disgrace'. 'Exemplu[m] p[er]eat c[ae]s[ar]e cu[m] vulnere R [Christ symbol, Christae] / In dedecus p[rae]cept[us] author et actor ent'. Comparing Mary to Christ gives the impression that she is a martyr, a claim commonly made by her Catholic supporters. Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, *In Obitum potentissimae principis D Mariae Stuartae Scotorum Reginae*. BL Cotton MS Titus C VI, fol. 208v. 'Exemplum p[er]eat c[ae]s[ar]e cum vulnere Christae, / inque malum p[rae]cept[us] Author et Actor eat.' Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, *In Obitum potentissimae principis D Mariae Stuartae Scotorum Reginae*. BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 627r. Translations of the draft manuscripts are my own. Hilton Kelliher claims that James was personally responsible for rejecting this version of the epitaph for its provocative allusion to Elizabeth I's treatment of his mother, but this claim is not supported with any evidence. Hilton Kelliher, 'British Post-Medieval Verse in the Cotton Collection: A Survey and Handlist', in *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy*, ed. by C.J. Wright (London: British Library, 1997), p. 313. The Westminster Abbey website mistakenly claims that this quote is included in the final epitaph, but this is incorrect. This error may have originated in Thomas Allen, *The History and Antiquities of London, Westminster, Southwark, and Parts Adjacent*, 4 vols (London, 1827-1829), IV (1829), p. 105, where Allen presumably copied one of the draft epitaphs rather than the final epitaph in Westminster Abbey, and this has been copied onto the website. The website also mistranslates the quote: <https://www.westminster-abbey.org/abbey-commemorations/royals/mary-queen-of-scots> [accessed 17 March 2021]. One of Northampton's drafts also states that 'when piety was banished from the kingdom it has now returned', which suggested that England at large had fallen into impiety because of Mary's mistreatment and execution. 'Pulsa domo pietas ad sua regna redit'. BL Cotton MS Titus C VI, fol. 209r. Another of Northampton's drafts discusses Mary's personal piety: 'A woman who was constant in her religion, / Extraordinary in her piety towards God'. This was likely removed because it drew attention to Mary's Catholicism. 'Fæmina in sua religione constantissima, / eximia in Deum pietate'. William Camden, *Maria Scotor[um] Regina, et Galliae Dotaria*. BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 630r. 'ffæmina in Sua Religione constantissima, exi= / mia in Deum Pietate'. Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, *Maria Scotorum Regina et Galliae Dotaria*. BL Sloane MS 3199, fol. 336v. This draft survives in the hands of both William Camden and Northampton's secretary, though it is likely the work of Northampton, with Camden only copying it out.

⁹⁷ It survives in two versions: one in the hand of William Camden; another in the hand of a secretary in Northampton's service. This leaves it open to debate who was the original writer, as they are unnamed, though many aspects of it closely resemble Camden's *Annales* (discussed in a later section). Northampton is sometimes named in his drafts, while Camden puts his initial at the end of another draft epitaph in the same volume. This leaves it unclear who was the writer of this draft, since neither claim authorship. Given the similarities to Camden's *Annales* and the inclusion of the argument that Moray was responsible for Mary's downfall in Scotland, it is possible that James VI & I himself was responsible for the content of this draft, as James was heavily involved in Camden's *Annales* (as discussed in a later section) and had made this claim about Moray in *Basilikon Doron*. Camden version: William Camden, *Maria Scotor[um] Regina, et Galliae Dotaria*. BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 630r. Camden's signature, a 'C', is on an earlier

brother, James Stewart, Earl of Moray, for Mary's troubles in Scotland, leading her to abdicate (as James VI & I had argued in *Basilikon Doron*).⁹⁸ This makes clear that Mary had not been deposed due to her immorality and misrule, as George Buchanan argued; however, it also does not question the legitimacy of James VI's position as Scotland's monarch in his mother's lifetime. Mary was then 'enticed to England / by promises, to craftily get her detained in that place, / and oppressed by suspicion'.⁹⁹ Afterwards, 'insidious people repeatedly attacked her, causing undeserved injuries to her, and / ongoing tedious captivity afflicted her: then factions / eager to help as long as it benefited them, led her to her destruction'.¹⁰⁰ Mary is not personally blamed for any of her troubles and, without mentioning it explicitly, Mary's decision to involve herself in plots against Elizabeth I is justified on the grounds of her cruel treatment and long captivity. Even 'those of her own / religion slyly persuaded her through pernicious practices'.¹⁰¹ Finally, this draft explains that 'in an unheard of example the Queen's Majesty was tricked, / and

leaf in this volume that is written in the same hand as this draft epitaph (fol. 628r), further proof that Camden wrote this version. Northampton version: Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, *Maria Scotorum Regina et Galliae Dotaria*. BL Sloane MS 3199, fol. 336v. Both versions include multiple options for certain words/phrases. The Northampton version was evidently written with the pre-existing knowledge that multiple options would be included, as it is formatted to incorporate the multiple options. The Camden version has the second options added above the regular line of text, making it appear less premeditated but not conclusively so. Phillips assumes it was written by Northampton, but he does not consider the draft in Camden's hand. Phillips, *Images of a Queen*, p. 227. Hilton Kelliher does not discuss BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 630r. Kelliher, 'Survey and Handlist', p. 313.

⁹⁸ 'To / Scotland returned the perfidious Moray, her illegitimate brother, / whose ambition drove him to cause trouble, so she abdicated the throne'. Camden version: 'In Scotiam / reversa perfida Moravy fratris nothi ambitione / exagitata, regno abdicata'. BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 630r. Northampton version: 'In / Scotiam reversa Perfidia Moravii ffratris nothi / Ambitione exagitata, Regno abdicata'. BL Sloane MS 3199, fol. 336v. This closely resembles the explanations offered in Camden's *Annales*, which might suggest that Camden was the writer. However, Northampton could have taken this interpretation of events from James VI & I himself (who influenced what Camden wrote about Mary in the *Annales*) or James's *Basilikon Doron*.

⁹⁹ Camden version: 'in Angliam promissis evo= / cata, eius dem artibus ibidem detenta, & suspicionibus / onerata'. BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 630r. Northampton version: 'in Angli= / am Promissis evocata, ejus dem artibus ibidem / detenta, et suspicionibus onerata'. BL Sloane MS 3199, fol. 336v.

¹⁰⁰ Camden version: 'postea insidijs subinde petita, iniurijs / indignè affecta, & diuturnæ captiuitatis tædio / afflicta : Demu[m] factionu[m] studijs dum alij saluti'. BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 630r. Northampton version: 'Postea In= / sidiis subinde petita, Injuriis indigne affecta, et / diuturnæ Captivitatis tædio afflicta : Demum ffacti= / onum Studijs, dum alij Saluti'. BL Sloane MS 3199, fol. 336v. This also resembles the explanation offered in Camden's *Annales*.

¹⁰¹ Camden version: 'alij exitio pro sua religione subdolè incumberent, / in perniciem præcipitata'. BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 630r. Northampton version: 'alij Exitio pro Sua / Religione subdolè incumberent, in perniciem Præcipi= / tata'. BL Sloane MS 3199, fol. 336v. This also resembles the explanation offered in Camden's *Annales*.

robbed of her life'.¹⁰² This is a reference to the Elizabethan government's trap to implicate Mary in the Babington Plot.

Mary's effigy also demonstrates how James wished his mother to be remembered, as it downplays her Catholicism. The effigy follows the 'Sheffield' portrait type, created in 1578, which features religious iconography that clearly identifies the subject as Catholic.¹⁰³ Mary's effigy, by contrast, is stripped of all Catholic symbolism.¹⁰⁴ Mary's Catholicism had been used to justify both her exclusion from the English line of succession and her execution, so her funerary monument intentionally downplays her faith. While Elizabeth's effigy (like those of other English monarchs in Westminster Abbey) includes regalia—crown, sceptre, and orb—Mary's has none, with the only signifier of her royal status being the ermine lining of her mantle. This can be interpreted as an acknowledgment that Mary had not been England's monarch, despite her presence in an English royal burial site.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Camden version: 'inauditoq[ue] exemplo Regiæ / Maiestatis fraudi, vita spoliata'. BL Cotton MS Caligula C IX, pt. ii, fol. 630r. Northampton version: 'inauditoque exemplo Regiæ Majestatis fraudi, / vita spoliata'. BL Sloane MS 3199, fol. 336v.

¹⁰³ It shows Mary wearing a crucifix hanging from a ribbon around her neck, and a cross (featuring an image of Susanna and the Elders to assert Mary's innocence from claims that she had an adulterous affair with Bothwell, as Susanna also had to defend herself from claims of adultery) and a rosary hanging from a chain around her waist. Roy Strong misidentified the surviving 'Sheffield' portraits as Jacobean, 'when the accession of James I led to a hasty resurrection of his mother', on the grounds that they used 'a formula of *circa* 1610, the full-length, hand on table, silk curtain in the background, standing on a turkey carpet.' Roy Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits, Volume I: Text* (London: HMSO, 1969), p. 221. Strong's judgement was treated as established fact until recently; for example, see Helen Smailes and Duncan Thomson, *The Queen's Image* (Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland, 1987), p. 53. Jeremy L. Smith persuasively argues, however, that the stylistic features Strong identified as Jacobean were not unusual in 1578, so there is no reason to doubt that the portrait likeness originated in Mary's own lifetime, even if all the surviving copies did not. Jeremy L. Smith, 'Revisiting the Origins of the Sheffield Series of Portraits of Mary Queen of Scots', *The Burlington Magazine*, 152.1285 (April 2010), 212-218. For more on Mary's use of the Susanna and the Elders iconography, see: Jeremy L. Smith, 'Mary Queen of Scots as Susanna in Catholic Propaganda', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 73 (2010), 209-220.

¹⁰⁴ Jeremy L. Smith puts down to caution: 'her religion is by no means clear ... Her piety is expressed in her generalised, if poignant, recumbent pose with hands clasped in prayer.' Jeremy L. Smith, 'The Sheffield Portrait Types, their Catholic Purpose, and Mary Queen of Scots's Tomb', *British Catholic History*, 33.1 (2016), 87-88. Smith also theorises that a gap in the clasp of Mary's mantle 'almost surely would have held a symbolic element of some kind', such as a cross, an Agnus Dei or a depiction of Susanna and the Elders. This, however, is not supported by any evidence, and would have gone against the broader purpose of the funerary monument to downplay Mary's Catholicism.

¹⁰⁵ Mary is depicted wearing regalia in other Jacobean English visual representations, suggesting it was due to the planned location of her effigy that the decision was made not to depict her wearing regalia. For example, see: Renold Elstrack (engraver) and Compton Holland (publisher), *The most excellent Princesse Mary queene of Scotland*, c. 1618, engraving on paper, 19.2 x 11.4 cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1848,0911.264.

Mary's monument also uses heraldry and symbols to promote James's hereditary claims to the thrones of England and Scotland, and the hereditary nature of both monarchies. The friezes of the two pavilions that support the canopy are decorated with the marshalled arms of Scotland's former monarchs and their spouses from William I onwards, as well as Walter Stewart and Marjorie Bruce (whose marriage gave the Stewart family their claim to the Scottish throne).¹⁰⁶ The frieze culminates with James's coat of arms. These shields assert that Scotland's monarchy is hereditary. The monument is also heavily decorated with the heraldic emblems of the Scottish monarchy.¹⁰⁷ The monument asserts that Mary had been Scotland's legitimate hereditary monarch and James's right to the Scottish throne had come from his mother, ignoring Mary's abdication.

Heraldry and symbols are also used to promote James's hereditary claim to the English throne. For example, a large shield above the southern frieze of the east pavilion features the marshalled arms of England and Scotland, likely representing the marriage of James IV and Margaret Tudor, which provided Mary and James with their hereditary claims to the English throne. There are also Tudor roses on two of the four shields held by unicorns on the canopy's top corners; the two

¹⁰⁶ The frieze also contains the arms of Marie of Guise's parents, Claude of Lorraine, Duke of Guise and Antoinette of Bourbon, though the reason for this is unclear. It may have been because there was an extra space in the frieze's decorative scheme that needed to be filled. It may have been to associate Mary and James with the Lorraine claims to the crowns of Jerusalem and Naples and descent from Charlemagne. See: Robert S. Sturges, 'The Guise and the Two Jerusalems: Joinville's *Vie de saint Louis* and an Early Modern Family's Medievalism', in *Aspirations, Representation and Memory: The Guise in Europe, 1506-1688*, ed. by Jessica Munns, Penny Richards, and Jonathan Spangler (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 25-46.

¹⁰⁷ On top of the canopy, facing outwards from both the north and south sides, are the Scottish royal arms surrounded by the Order of the Thistle and supported by two Scottish unicorns, surmounted by a helm and the Scottish crest (a red lion displaying the Honours of Scotland). Also, on top of the canopy, facing outward from both the east and west sides, are panels depicting St Andrew and his cross. Another Scottish crest sits on a crown at Mary's feet. The underside of the canopy is decorated with Scottish thistles. For discussions of these Scottish heraldic emblems, see: Charles J. Burnett, 'The Development of the Royal Arms to 1603', *Journal of the Heraldry Society of Scotland*, 1 (1977-1978), 9-19; Charles J. Burnett, 'The Thistle as a Symbol', in *Emblems of Scotland* (Dunfermline: The Heraldry Society of Scotland, 1997), pp. 45-52; Charles J. Burnett and Christopher J. Tabraham, *The Honours of Scotland: The Story of the Scottish Crown Jewels* (Edinburgh: Historic Scotland, 1993); Mark Dennis, 'The Unicorn', in *Emblems of Scotland*, pp. 20-31; Christopher Green, 'The Lion of Scotland', in *Emblems of Scotland*, pp. 7-12; John Malden, 'The Double Tressure', in *Emblems of Scotland*, pp. 13-19; Romilly Squire, 'The Saltire', in *Emblems of Scotland*, pp. 32-44.

remaining shields are decorated with a French fleur-de-lis and a Scottish thistle, respectively.

The funerary monuments James commissioned for both his mother and his English predecessor, Elizabeth I, reveal a more conflicted official attitude towards the significance of James's father, Henry, Lord Darnley, as a source of James's hereditary claim to the English throne. Mary's monument does not acknowledge—but also does not deny—that Darnley was the source of any hereditary claim to the English throne for James.¹⁰⁸ However, Darnley's lineage *is* represented on Elizabeth I's monument. On the southern frieze of the western canopy, three shields represent the marriages of Margaret Tudor and Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus, Lady Margaret Douglas and Matthew Stewart, Earl of Lennox, and Darnley and Mary.¹⁰⁹ This demonstrates the route by which James inherited his paternal hereditary claim to the English throne. As this line of descent was English born, it might have been considered appropriate to depict it on the monument of James's English predecessor. Overall, however, official commissions show much less interest in James's father compared to his mother, and rarely emphasise his paternal

¹⁰⁸ While Darnley is not mentioned in Mary's epitaph, Mary and Darnley's marriage is represented on her monument by two shields containing their marshalled coats of arms. One of these shields is on the southern frieze of the east pavilion as part of the series of arms representing Scotland's previous monarchs and their spouses. The only other shield on the southern frieze of the east pavilion shows the arms of James VI & I, the product of Mary and Darnley's marriage. A larger version of Mary and Darnley's marshalled arms is also displayed on a shield above the southern frieze of the west pavilion, highlighting the significance of the marriage. Darnley's arms (which combine the arms of his father, mother, the earldom of Ross and the duchy of Albany, the latter two titles being granted to him by Mary before their marriage) are placed on the superior dexter side, while Mary's arms are placed on the inferior sinister side. Unsurprisingly, Mary's third marriage, to Bothwell, is not mentioned or represented at all, since it would recall the controversial circumstances of Darnley's murder and claims that Mary and Bothwell had orchestrated it together—as well as being irrelevant to James's ancestry, which is the focus of Mary's funerary monument. Mary's first marriage, to François II of France, is represented on her funerary monument by two shields with their marshalled coats of arms (one on the eastern frieze of the east pavilion as part of the series of arms representing Scotland's previous monarchs and their spouses, the other a larger version above the northern frieze of the east pavilion) despite its irrelevance to James VI & I's ancestry; however, it was a prestigious marriage that had made her queen consort of France, as mentioned in the epitaph. Likely for the same reasons, coats-of-arms representing Mary's first two marriages (but not her third) are included on Renold Elstrack's 1618 engraving of Mary. Elstrack, *The most excellent Princesse Mary*.

¹⁰⁹ Joseph Hunter, 'Heraldry of the Monument of Queen Elizabeth, at Westminster', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 1.3 (July 1850), 198-199. According to Sherlock, these 'have no legitimate place on Elizabeth's tomb, for they illustrate not her lineage, but that of her successor. James used them to demonstrate that, just as he had an undoubted claim on the Scottish throne through his mother, so too he could claim the English throne through his English-born father.' Sherlock, 'Manipulation of Memory', 282.

hereditary claim—an example of how official and unofficial works differed in their representation of James's ancestry.

James's decision to rebury his mother in Westminster Abbey, and the features of Mary's new funerary monument, convey a clear message about how James and his supporters wished Mary to be remembered—and how they did not. They wanted to focus on Mary's dynastic significance as the source of James's senior hereditary claims to the thrones of both England and Scotland. As such, Mary's status as Scotland's hereditary monarch and senior hereditary claimant to the English throne was clearly explained through her epitaph and the imagery on her monument. Mary's abdication in Scotland was not discussed, to avoid renewed debate about the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy. Mary's execution, however, was openly denounced as illegitimate, to make clear that it had no impact on James's hereditary claim to the English throne. Ultimately, the English and Scottish successions were presented as operating according to hereditary right, and Mary was celebrated for providing James with his combined senior hereditary claims. The decision to represent Henry, Lord Darnley's descent from Margaret Tudor on Elizabeth I's monument reveals that Jacobean officials did not want to entirely ignore James's paternal hereditary claim, even if Mary's monument was exclusively devoted to promoting the seniority of James's maternal hereditary claim.

However, the location of Mary's reburial and the features of her funerary monument also downplayed those aspects of Mary's identity that had been used to challenge her hereditary claim to the English throne in the Elizabethan succession debates. Westminster Abbey was already established as a significant site for the English monarchy, so by choosing to bury Mary there, James anglicised his mother—and, by extension, himself. Mary's Catholicism was not mentioned, and her effigy was intentionally stripped of Catholic iconography. Rather than conclusively asserting that foreigners and Catholics could succeed to the English throne if they had the senior hereditary claim, Mary was presented in a way that would make her less objectionable to an English, Protestant audience. As such, this implicitly acknowledged that nationality and religion were still significant factors to the

English succession, as James wanted to demonstrate that the source of his hereditary claim to the English throne was not overly foreign or Catholic.

Contemporary responses to Mary's reburial reveal that some, especially Catholics, still interpreted Mary's legacy from a religious perspective.¹¹⁰ It also appears to have been met with silence by many of James's Protestant subjects. Luisa de Carvajal y Mendoza, a Spanish Catholic living in London, claimed that 'not a soul among the heretics mentions it, and few Catholics, I believe, even know about it ... the Protestants keep quiet and pretend not to know.'¹¹¹ Despite James's efforts to set aside Mary's controversial religious legacy and to focus on her dynastic importance, his Protestant subjects still appear to have felt unsure about her, and sought safety in silence rather than adopting the official interpretation of Mary's life and legacy.

James VI & I's Visit to Scotland in 1617

Mary, Queen of Scots' posthumous legacies in England and Scotland were not identical, with Mary's hereditary claim to the English throne being of greater concern in the former country and Mary's abdication from the Scottish throne being of greater concern in the latter country. As discussed in the thesis introduction, Mary's abdication from the Scottish throne, and especially the subsequent justifications of it as a deposition, threatened James VI & I's conception of the status of the Scottish monarchy and the hereditary nature of the Scottish succession. As such, James and his supporters wished to control how Mary's abdication was understood and condemn the idea that it was a legitimate deposition. This section focuses on James's return visit to Scotland in 1617, which offered various

¹¹⁰ For examples of contemporary responses to Mary's reburial, see: Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton to Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester, 8 October 1612. TNA SP 14/71, fols 7r-8v; Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton to Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester, 10 October 1612. TNA SP 14/71, fols 23r-24v; Edmund Bolton, *Carmen Personatum*, 1612. BL Cotton MS Titus A XIII, fols 178r-184r; Luisa de Carvajal y Mendoza, *The Letters of Luisa de Carvajal y Mendoza*, ed. by Glyn Redworth, trans. by David McGrath and Glyn Redworth, 2 vols (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), II, pp. 265, 272-3; John Stow and Edmund Howes, *The Annales, or Generall Chronicle of England, Begun First by Maister John Stow, and After Him Continued and Augmented with Matters Forreyne, and Domestique, Auncient and Moderne, Unto the Ende of This Present Yeere 1614. By Edmond Howes, Gentleman* (London, 1615; STC 23338), p. 913; Maija Jansson (ed.), *Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988), p. 6; David Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. by Thomas Thomson, 8 vols (Edinburgh, 1842-1849), VII (1845), p. 174.

¹¹¹ De Carvajal y Mendoza, *Letters*, II, p. 273.

opportunities to both Scottish officials and subjects to reflect on Mary's legacy—though, as this section reveals, these were not necessarily taken up by the latter group. Scholars have not analysed how Mary was represented—or avoided—during James's return visit. This section demonstrates that discussions of James's hereditary claim to the Scottish throne and the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy were revived at this key moment, and that the decision of James's subjects not to publicly discuss Mary during his visit undermined his attempts to revise her legacy.

In 1617, James made his only return visit to Scotland after his departure for England in 1603. James explained his motivations for going in a letter to the Scottish Privy Council: 'wee have had these manie yeares a greate and naturall longing to see our native soyle and place of our birthe and breeding,' which he described as 'the maine and principall motive of our intendit jorney.'¹¹² It was suspected, however, that James's real reason for returning was to enforce changes in the Scottish kirk and promote Anglo-Scottish union.¹¹³ While in Scotland, James pressured the Scots to accept Church of England forms of worship.¹¹⁴ This culminated in the 1618 General Assembly passing the Five Articles of Perth, which were confirmed by the Scottish Parliament in 1621.¹¹⁵ While in Scotland, James celebrated both his fifty-first

¹¹² James VI & I to the Scottish Privy Council, 15 December 1616, Newmarket. James Maidment (ed.), *Letters and State Papers during the Reign of King James the Sixth. Chiefly from the Manuscript Collections of Sir James Balfour of Denmyln* (Edinburgh, 1838), pp. 302-303, where it is misdated as June 1617. Also published in *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, ed. by John Hill Burton and David Masson, 14 vols (Edinburgh, 1877-1898), X (1891), pp. 685-686, where the correct date is given.

¹¹³ For example, see: Giovanni Battista Lionello, Venetian Secretary in England, to the Doge and Senate, 30 March 1617, London. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, in the Archives and Collections of Venice*, ed. by Brown, Brown, Bentinck, and Hinds, XIV (1908), p. 477.

¹¹⁴ See: Calderwood, *History*, VII, pp. 245-276; Alan R. MacDonald, 'James VI and I, the Church of Scotland, and British Ecclesiastical Convergence', *The Historical Journal*, 48.4 (2005), 885-903; Jenny Wormald, 'The Headaches of Monarchy: Kingship and the Kirk in the Early Seventeenth Century', in *Sixteenth Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, ed. by Julian Goodare and Alasdair A. MacDonald (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 365-393.

¹¹⁵ See: George Yule, 'James VI and I: Furnishing the Churches in His Two Kingdoms', in *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, ed. by Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 182-208; John Morrill, 'A British Patriarchy? Ecclesiastical Imperialism under the Early Stuarts', in *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Fletcher and Roberts, pp. 209-237; Alan R. MacDonald, *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625: Sovereignty, Polity and Liturgy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998); Laura Stewart, "'Brothers in Truth': Propaganda, Public Opinion and the Perth Articles Debate in Scotland', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 151-168; Laura Stewart, 'The Political Repercussions

birthday and the fiftieth anniversary of his succession to the Scottish throne, both potential occasions for reflecting on his mother's life and legacy. Ultimately, however, only Jacobean officials were willing to do so, with James's subjects remaining publicly silent.

In anticipation of James's return, the Scottish Privy Council asked George Gordon, Marquess of Huntly, to send the painter John Anderson to work at Falkland Palace.¹¹⁶ Anderson also agreed to paint 'some chalmeris in the Castell of Edinburgh'.¹¹⁷ On 16 June 1617, Anderson was paid £100 Scots 'for painting the rowme quhair his Majestie wes borne and for furneisching gold cullouris and workmanship'.¹¹⁸ James was born in the palace inside Edinburgh Castle and Anderson's paintings survive today in a small cabinet on the ground floor.¹¹⁹ The surviving paintings are a clear example of how Jacobean officials in Scotland wished Mary to be remembered. On the west wall of the cabinet are the Scottish royal arms, surrounded by Scottish royal emblems, mottos, and symbols.¹²⁰ James's date of birth is recorded across two painted cartouches on the north and south walls. The four ceiling panels have thistles growing from each corner; the top left and bottom right panels feature James's crowned cypher, 'IR', while the top right and

of the Five Articles of Perth: A Reassessment of James VI and I's Religious Policies in Scotland', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 38.4 (2007), 1013-1036.

¹¹⁶ Scottish Privy Council to George Gordon, Marquess of Huntly, 25 March 1617, Edinburgh. *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, ed. by John Hill Burton and David Masson, 14 vols (Edinburgh, 1877-1898), XI (1894), p. 75.

¹¹⁷ Scottish Privy Council charge against John Anderson, 3 June 1617, Edinburgh. *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, XI, p. 143.

¹¹⁸ John Imrie and John G. Dunbar (eds.), *Accounts of the Masters of Works for Building and Repairing Royal Palaces and Castles, Volume 2: 1616-1649* (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1982), p. 81.

¹¹⁹ Anderson may have painted the entire bedchamber, not only the cabinet, but the cabinet is the only part of his work that survives. The actual room in which Mary gave birth to James does not appear to have been recorded by contemporaries, and the only cited evidence that Mary gave birth to James in the cabinet rather than the main bedchamber is Anderson's surviving paintings, alongside the assumption that the cabinet was more private. For example, see: James Grant, *Memorials of the Castle of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1850), p. 99; Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 331; Iain MacIvor, *Edinburgh Castle* (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1993, reprinted in 1997), pp. 62, 74; John G. Dunbar, *Scottish Royal Palaces: The Architecture of the Royal Residences during the Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Periods* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1999), C.14; Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: A Life of James VI and I* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2003), p. 13.

¹²⁰ The Scottish royal arms are supported by crowned unicorns. The arms are surrounded by the collar of the Order of the Thistle, with a badge depicting St Andrew. A large thistle is shown on either side of the arms, below the unicorns. The royal arms are crowned, and atop the crown sits the Scottish crest. Scrolls on either side of the crest read 'IN DEFENCE' and 'NEMO ME IMPUNE LACESSET' (no-one shall hurt me with impunity), both Scottish royal mottos. J.H. Stevenson, *Heraldry in Scotland*, 2 vols (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1914), II, pp. 390-394, 396-397.

bottom left panels feature Mary's crowned cypher, 'MR'. The text in the cartouche below the arms reads: 'Lord Jesu Chryst that Crounit was with Thornse / Preserve the Birth quhais Badgie heir is borne. / And send Hir Sonce Successione to Reigne still / Lang in this Realme, if that it be Thy will / Als Grant O lord quhat ever of Hir proseed / Be to Thy Glorie Honer and Prais sobeid.' The text refers to Mary in the present tense as if she were still alive; thus, the text either dates from Mary's lifetime or was made to appear as if did as a literary technique.¹²¹ The motto 'nemo me impune lacesset' was first adopted in James's reign, and the 'IR' cyphers must also date from his reign.¹²² These paintings assert that familial descent and political authority are inevitably connected, as James had succeeded to the Scottish throne through the divinely ordained hereditary right he inherited from his mother, and the text expresses hope that their descendants will continue to reign. The paintings present the succession from Mary to James as natural, ignoring the true circumstances of Mary's abdication and James's succession during Mary's lifetime. This implicitly asserts that, although Mary had been pressured to abdicate, it was not a legitimate deposition and James had still succeeded by hereditary right. The paintings are only concerned with James's position in Scotland; Mary's life in England is irrelevant here because it did not affect James's status as King of Scots. Ultimately, the paintings assert the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy and celebrate Mary as the source of James's hereditary claim to the Scottish throne.

As James travelled through Scotland, he was presented with numerous speeches and poems that were published together as *TA TΩN MOYΣΩN EΙΣΟΔΙΑ: The Muses Welcome to the High and Mightie Prince James* (1618).¹²³ Scholars have not noted Mary's total absence from these works, despite their reflections on James's

¹²¹ Accounts for work done at the royal palace in Edinburgh Castle during Mary's reign have not survived, and it is therefore impossible to know whether any of the cabinet paintings date from the time of James's birth or if they were all made in 1617. See: Henry M. Paton, 'Introduction', in *Accounts of the Masters of Works for Building and Repairing Royal Palaces and Castles, Volume 1, 1529-1615*, ed. by Henry M. Paton (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1957), pp. viii-ix.

¹²² Edward Burns, *The Coinage of Scotland*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1887), II, pp. 358-360. See also: Ian Stewart, 'Coinage and Propaganda: An Interpretation of the Coin-Types of James VI', in *From the Stone Age to the 'Forty-Five: Studies Presented to R.B.K. Stevenson, Former Keeper National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland*, ed. by Anne O'Connor and D.V. Clarke (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1983), pp. 450-462.

¹²³ John Adamson (ed.), *TA TΩN MOYΣΩN EΙΣΟΔΙΑ: The Muses Welcome to the High and Mightie Prince James ... At His Majesties Happie Returne to His Old and Native Kingdome of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1618; STC 140). I looked for references to Mary, Queen of Scots, in all the speeches and poems, but there did not appear to be any in the Hebrew and Latin works.

life and reign, and Scotland's history more generally.¹²⁴ For example, when James entered Edinburgh on 16 May, John Hay, Deputy Clerk, delivered a speech in which he claimed that James excelled his 'most noble progenitours ... nature having placed in your sacred person alone, what in everie one of them was excellent, the senate-house of the Planets being, as it wold seeme, convened at your M. birth, for decreeing of all perfections in your Royall person.'¹²⁵ Despite referring to James's birth, Mary was not mentioned. Hay also reminded his audience of 'the tumultuous dayes of your M. most tender yeeres' and the 'fire of civile discorde,' which James had quenched.¹²⁶ What Hay did not openly state, however, was that the tumult and division of James's early reign were caused by Mary's abdication, which was followed by the Marian civil war between Mary's supporters and James's regency governments.

The other speeches and poems also avoided any direct discussion of Mary. When James entered Edinburgh Castle on his birthday, a Hebrew speech and Latin poems were presented to him—none of which mentioned the parents who were responsible for his birth.¹²⁷ When James entered Stirling on 30 June, Robert Murray, Commisar of Stirling, delivered a speech in which he described James as 'matchles in birth and Royall discent'—a reference to his parents without naming or discussing them. Murray also discussed James's past relationship with Stirling itself, as 'these sacred brows, which now beare the weghtie Diademes of three invincible Nations, wer empalled with their first heere.'¹²⁸ This was a reference to James's coronation in Stirling's Church of the Holy Rude, an event that was only made possible by Mary's abdication five days earlier, though Murray did not discuss that.¹²⁹

¹²⁴ For example, see: Jane Barbara Stevenson, 'Adulation and Admonition in *The Muses' Welcome*', in *James VI and I, Literature and Scotland: Tides of Change 1567-1625*, ed. by David J. Parkinson (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), pp. 267-281; and Roger P.H. Green, 'The King Returns: *The Muses' Welcome* (1618)', in *Neo-Latin Literature and Literary Culture in Early Modern Scotland*, ed. by Stephen J. Reid and David McOmish (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 126-162.

¹²⁵ Adamson, *The Muses Welcome*, pp. 40-41.

¹²⁶ Adamson, *The Muses Welcome*, p. 41. William Cowper, Bishop of Galloway, made the same point when preaching before James: William Cowper, *Tvvo sermons preached in Scotland before the Kings Maiesty the one, in his chappell royall of Holy-Roode-house at his Highnesse comming in: the other, in the church of Drumfreis at his Highnesse going out* (London, 1618; STC 5944), pp. 42-43.

¹²⁷ Adamson, *The Muses Welcome*, pp. 116-121.

¹²⁸ Adamson, *The Muses Welcome*, pp. 123-125.

¹²⁹ There was another speech that discussed James's birth, though it is not relevant to a discussion of his hereditary claim to the Scottish throne. When James entered Perth on 5 July, John Stewart, merchant burgess, delivered a speech. Stewart explained that God had caused the Scottish

It is clear from these examples that many of James VI & I's Scottish subjects did not want to discuss his mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, during his return visit to Scotland, even when they were celebrating his birth.¹³⁰ Speeches and pageants also avoided discussing the specifics of James's succession, making no mention of his predecessor. Only a work commissioned by the Scottish Privy Council—John Anderson's paintings—openly represented Mary, and that was accessible to an extremely limited audience, so much so that it appears to have left no impression on contemporaries.¹³¹ Anderson's paintings asserted that James had succeeded to the Scottish throne by the hereditary right he inherited from his mother, while intentionally avoiding the subject of Mary's abdication. James's subjects adopted an even more extreme strategy for their poems and speeches, choosing not to mention Mary at all. Thus, silence was a useful and widely adopted strategy when it came to the controversial subject of Mary, Queen of Scots.

James's return visit could have been an occasion for renewed discussion of Mary's abdication, its implications for the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy, and James's own hereditary claim. Instead, however, James's subjects—excepting the Scottish Privy Council—all publicly avoided the subject of Mary rather than risk renewing debates over these topics. This could be interpreted as beneficial to James, as his subjects did not openly challenge his interpretation of his mother's life and

Reformation fifty years ago, and at the same time 'of his gracious goodnes Hee ordained your M. our gracious Sovereaine to be borne. And the heavens, appointing for your most happie birth that remarkable poynt of tyme, seme to have poynted out unto the world to what end yee was borne, even to be that which in no small measure your M. hes proved alreadie: to wit a sheild of the trew word preached; a defender of the trew faith professed'. Once again, James's birth was discussed without any mention of Mary, whose Catholicism would have made her inclusion uncomfortable. Adamson, *The Muses Welcome*, p. 138.

¹³⁰ Mary is also not mentioned in Robert Wilkinson, *Barwick Bridge: or England and Scotland Coupled in a Sermon Tending to Peace and Unitie. Preached before the King at Saint Andrewes* (London, 1617; *STC* 25652) and John Adamson (ed.), *TA ΤΩΝ ΜΟΥΣΩΝ ΕΖΟΔΙΑ: Planctus, & Vota Musarum in Augustissimi Monarchæ Jacobi, Magnæ Britanniae, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ Regis, &c.* (Edinburgh, 1618; *STC* 142), a different publication to *The Muses Welcome* that contains six additional poems.

¹³¹ According to David Calderwood, on 19 June 1617 (James's birthday), 'he made a feast to the Englishe and Scottishe nobilitie, in the Castle of Edinburgh, betuixt foure efertnoone and nyne at night; and thereafter came down to the Palace of Halyrudhous'. Unfortunately, however, there is no record of James and his guests visiting Anderson's painted cabinet. Calderwood, *History*, VII, pp. 256-257. Robert Henderson had previously reported that James would 'kiep his birth day in ye Castel of Edinb, ye 19 of yis month', where 'he sal be staitlie servid, and money healths drukin, and so pieces of canon schot at everie health.' Robert Henderson to Dudley Carleton, 9 June 1617, Edinburgh. TNA SP 14/92, fol. 164r.

legacy. However, it also demonstrates that they were not willing to publicly adopt and repeat James's interpretation, but preferred to remain silent and keep their own opinions private—the same approach adopted by English Protestants.

William Camden's *Annales*

The most significant official Jacobean commission relating to Mary, Queen of Scots, was the first volume of William Camden's *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha* (1615), as it extensively revises Mary's legacy and does not simply avoid the controversial aspects, as Mary's funerary monument does. Hugh Trevor-Roper was one of the first scholars to chart James VI & I's involvement in the creation of Camden's *Annales*, demonstrating that James wanted to create a more positive account of Mary's life than could be found in the histories of George Buchanan and Jacques-August de Thou.¹³² Trevor-Roper incorrectly claims, however, that Camden 'was strong enough to ignore the outward pressure that was put upon him' and thus James's coercion 'is reflected not at all.'¹³³ Trevor-Roper may have been misled by Camden's subtle techniques that lead readers to certain conclusions without outright declaring them, as discussed below. Patrick Collinson considers the central focus of the *Annales* to be 'the tragedy of Elizabeth and Mary Stuart', which reaches its 'climax' with Mary's execution.¹³⁴ According to John D. Staines, Camden 'portrays Mary as the tragic victim of historical circumstances', not guilty of Buchanan's worst criticisms but also not as zealously religious as Catholics had claimed.¹³⁵ Staines argues that 'James's primary concern about Camden's history was that it exonerate Mary of the charges of committing adultery with Bothwell and murdering her husband since those mattered most for the legitimacy of his birth. The problems raised by Mary's execution, by contrast, became largely moot once James had succeeded to the English throne'.¹³⁶ This latter claim, however, is not supported by the text itself, as will be shown below.

¹³² Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Queen Elizabeth's First Historian: William Camden and the Beginnings of English 'Civil History'* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1971), pp. 10-18.

¹³³ Trevor-Roper, *Queen Elizabeth's First Historian*, pp. 10, 20.

¹³⁴ Patrick Collinson, 'William Camden and the Anti-Myth of Elizabeth: Setting the Mould?', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 86, reprinted in Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), p. 276.

¹³⁵ Staines, *The Tragic Histories*, p. 165.

¹³⁶ Staines, *The Tragic Histories*, p. 171.

The focus of this section is how Camden's *Annales* represents Mary's abdication from the Scottish throne and her hereditary claim to the English throne, which have not yet been the focus of in-depth scholarly analysis. There are many primary sources relating to Camden's *Annales*, particularly the surviving manuscript drafts, that have yet to be fully utilised by scholars.¹³⁷ By analysing these sources, we gain a fuller understanding of why Camden wrote his *Annales*, how he responded to James's requirements and concerns, and the writing process itself. They also reveal that although Camden's *Annales* was always intended to present Mary in a more favourable light and defend James's hereditary claim to the English throne, Camden's defence of the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy was expanded through later additions to the manuscript drafts, and his argument that Mary's condemnation did not meet English legal requirements was not only an entirely later addition to the manuscript, but also an original argument that first appeared in his work.

William Camden's *Annales* was written in response to a critical French account of Mary's life that repeated George Buchanan's accusations against her. Jacques-Auguste de Thou's multi-volume *Historia Sui Temporis (History of His Own Time)* recorded the history of Europe from 1545 onwards. The first volume, covering the period up to 1560, was published in 1604. In early 1605, De Thou told Camden that he was going to use Buchanan's history as his source for Mary's personal reign in Scotland, but asked Camden to send him additional information.¹³⁸ Camden

¹³⁷ The most extensive discussion of the manuscript drafts thus far can be found in two pieces by Patrick Collinson. In one, Collinson considers some differences between the manuscript drafts and final version relating to Camden's representation of Elizabeth I. Patrick Collinson, 'One of Us? William Camden and the Making of History: The Camden Society Centenary Lecture', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 8 (December 1998), 139-163, reprinted in Collinson, *This England*, pp. 245-269. In the other, Collinson focuses on the evidence the manuscript drafts provide for Cotton's involvement and uses Elizabeth I's response to Mary, Queen of Scots' execution as a case study for considering differences between the manuscript drafts and the final version. Collinson, 'William Camden and the Anti-Myth of Elizabeth', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Doran and Freeman, pp. 79-98, reprinted in Collinson, *This England*, pp. 270-286, Beyond this, however, the manuscript drafts have been neglected by scholars.

¹³⁸ Jacques-Auguste de Thou to William Camden, 10 February 1604, Paris. *Sylloge Scriptorum Varii Generis et Argumenti: in qua Plurima de Vita, Moribus, Gestis, Fortuna, Scriptis, Familia, Amicis, et Inimicis Thuani*, 7 vols (London, 1733), VII, part 5, pp. 2-3. Also published in Thomas Smith (ed.), *V. CL. Gulielmi Camdeni, et Illustrium Virorum Ad G. Camdenum Epistolae* (London, 1691), pp. 68-69. Translated into English in John Collinson, *The Life of Thuanus* (London, 1807), pp. 137-141.

responded that Buchanan could not be trusted, and provided De Thou with a brief account of the year 1566 (which, in the Old Style, included Henry, Lord Darnley's murder in February 1567). Following James's argument in *Basilikon Doron*, Camden blamed Mary's illegitimate half-brother James Stewart, Earl of Moray, for forcing Mary to abdicate and go into exile. Camden also blamed Buchanan for exciting rebellion against Mary, and denounced his books as being full of errors.¹³⁹

The second volume of De Thou's *Historia Sui Temporis* was published in 1606, covering the period 1560 to 1572. George Carew, James's ambassador in France, reported that, 'touching the matters of Scotland,' De Thou 'wholly followith Buchanan'. Carew recommended that 'the truth now [be] sett foorth, by some good penne', suggesting Sir Henry Savile, Camden, or a knowledgeable Scot.¹⁴⁰ James explained that he did not want De Thou to transmit Buchanan's works to posterity, since he had rebelled against his sovereign prince and justified regicide. Thus, James proposed the creation of a new history of his mother's life.¹⁴¹ Patrick Young,

¹³⁹ William Camden to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 16 May 1605, London. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Dupuy 632, fols 101r-102v. Published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, pp. 3-4. Translated into English in Collinson, *Thuanus*, pp. 142-145. Camden later told De Thou that James was hostile to Buchanan's account and laid chief blame for Mary's downfall on Moray. William Camden to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 22 November 1607, London. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Dupuy 836, fols 145r-145v. Published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, pp. 8-9. Translated into English in Collinson, *Thuanus*, pp. 149-151. A year later, De Thou asked Camden to send him a fuller account of the period. De Thou informed Camden that he could not find evidence to support the latter's claim that Moray had wanted to seize the throne for himself. De Thou also asked Camden for evidence of who had been involved in Darnley's murder. He could not understand how Moray and Bothwell, who were the deadliest of enemies, could have conspired together and kept one another's involvement secret—proof in De Thou's mind of Moray's innocence, since Bothwell was undoubtedly guilty. De Thou also asked why Mary judged Bothwell innocent when everyone else knew otherwise, and why she had married Bothwell—he did not believe that Bothwell had abducted her. Jacques-Auguste de Thou to William Camden, 31 May 1606, Paris. *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, pp. 5-6; *Camdenum Epistolæ*, ed. by Smith, pp. 73-75. Camden replied that he had requested this information for De Thou. William Camden to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, July 1606, London. *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, p. 5. Some of Camden's feedback on De Thou's *Historia* is published in *Camdenum Epistolæ*, ed. by Smith, pp. 356-359.

¹⁴⁰ George Carew to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, 2 September 1606, Paris. TNA SP 78/53, fol. 154r.

¹⁴¹ As reported by Isaac Casaubon to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 25 February 1611, London. *The Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon in England, 1610-14*, ed. by Paul Botley and Máté Vince, 4 vols (Geneva: Droz, 2018), I, pp. 222-228. Translated into French in Jacques-Auguste de Thou, *Choix de Lettres Françaises Inédites de J.A. De Thou* (Paris, 1877), pp. 60-64. Partially translated into English in Collinson, *Thuanus*, pp. 152-154. According to Casaubon, James was offended because De Thou had followed Buchanan so closely and James believed that Buchanan had incited and justified Mary's deposition. Isaac Casaubon to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 24 February 1611, London. *The Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon in England*, ed. by Botley and Vince, I, pp. 217-222. Also published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, p. 15.

the royal librarian, suggested a man who would be able to write a joint history of Mary and Elizabeth I based on surviving diplomatic papers and the original letters of the two queens, which this man had saved from being burnt; this detail confirms that Young was referring to Robert Cotton.¹⁴² James commanded Cotton to extract material from these manuscripts and send it to De Thou.¹⁴³

In 1612, Isaac Casaubon (a French scholar who had moved to England in 1610) informed De Thou that James was angry at his continued belief in Moray's innocence and his reluctance to produce an updated edition of his *Historia*. If De Thou would not change his history, James declared that he would publish his own.¹⁴⁴ Camden likely became involved by official command.¹⁴⁵ Camden began to

¹⁴² Patrick Young to James VI & I, undated. Bodleian Library, MS Smith 76, fols 5r-5v. Partially translated and discussed in D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), pp. 117-118, 294n49, though Woolf considers the identification of the man as Cotton to be unlikely, as 'the king and Sir Robert were already well acquainted.' Cotton, however, later wrote that after De Thou 'publysed in his History by Fals Informations of som scandalus passages concerning the Quen of Scotts of holy memory His ma^{ti} being therwith movid sent for Sir Robert Cotton who informed his highnes that he had preserved from the fier in Q. Eliz. time most of the Originall letters of the Quen of Scott' along with many of the papers of Mary's commissioners at the York inquiry to deny 'the untruths and falshoods of hir rebellus subjects in Scotland'. Nigel Ramsay, 'Sir Robert Cotton's Services to the Crown: A Paper Written in Self-Defence', in *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector*, ed. by Wright, p. 71.

¹⁴³ In early 1610, Cotton sent copies of what he had written so far to James and Francis Bacon for their feedback. Bacon does not identify the writer of the work in his letter. Francis Bacon to Robert Cotton, 7 April 1610, Gray's Inn. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, 7 vols (London, 1861-1874), IV (1868), p. 212. In February 1611, Casaubon wrote that there was a man in London who was knowledgeable about history, and who had been ordered by James to research the lives of Elizabeth and Mary, with James himself examining the man's work to check its accuracy. Isaac Casaubon to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 25 February 1611, London. *The Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon*, ed. by Botley and Vince, I, pp. 222-228. Also published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, pp. 13-14. Translated into French in de Thou, *Choix de Lettres Françaises*, pp. 60-64. Partially translated into English in Collinson, *Thuanus*, pp. 152-154. Casaubon does not identify who this man is, but Kevin Sharpe identifies him as Cotton rather than Camden. Kevin Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 90-93. Wyman H. Herendeen suggests Casaubon may have been referring to Camden and Cotton as one composite man. Wyman H. Herendeen, *William Camden: A Life in Context* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), p. 297.

¹⁴⁴ Isaac Casaubon to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 26 February 1612, London. *The Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon*, ed. by Botley and Vince, II, pp. 223-226. Also published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, p. 18.

¹⁴⁵ In James's reign, Camden declared his unwillingness to write a history more than once, so it appears likely that he became involved by official command. In 1607, for example, Camden claimed that he would rather work on his other projects than write a history. William Camden to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 22 November 1607, London. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Dupuy 836, fols 145r-145v. Published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, pp. 8-9. Translated into English in Collinson, *Thuanus*, pp. 149-151. In 1612, Camden bemoaned his task of writing the *Annales*, quoting Sidonius: 'enmity dogs the beginning of historical writing, toil its continuation, hatred its conclusion.' ['Scriptionis historicae inchoatio invidia, continuatio labor finis odium.'] William Camden to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 10 August 1612, Westminster. Bibliothèque

compile the *Annales* in 1608, though he claimed that he had begun to collect papers for a history of Elizabeth I as early as 1596, on William Cecil, Baron Burghley's instructions.¹⁴⁶ Camden and Cotton worked from original manuscript material in Cotton's library and the State Papers Office.¹⁴⁷ Contemporary evidence shows that

Nationale de France, Dupuy 632, fols 101r-101v. Published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, pp. 25-26.

¹⁴⁶ 'Addenda', in *Camdenum Epistolæ*, ed. by Smith, p. 85. Camden wrote 'Ante annos octodecim' (eighteen years earlier) in the opening address to the reader, which scholars have assumed means 1597, eighteen years before the publication date of 1615. However, the *Annales* began to be printed on 13 March 1615, which in the Old Style would be 1614. Therefore, when Camden wrote the address he would have considered eighteen years prior to be 1596, not 1597. William Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha, Ad Annum Salutis M.D. LXXXIX*. (London, 1615; STC 4496), A3r. Camden clearly gives the date as 1596 in a letter to De Thou, confirming this is the correct date. William Camden to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 10 August 1612, Westminster. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Dupuy 632, fols 103r-103v. Published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, p. 25. In August 1612, Camden told De Thou that he had started writing his *Annales* but had not got very far. William Camden to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 10 August 1612, Westminster. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Dupuy 632, fols 101r-101v. Published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, p. 25.

¹⁴⁷ For Robert Cotton's library, see: C.E. Wright, 'The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and the Formation of the Cottonian Library', in *The English Library Before 1700: Studies in its History*, ed. by Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright (London: The Athlone Press, 1958), pp. 176-212; F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), pp. 117-149; Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton*; Colin G.C. Tite, 'The Early Catalogues of the Cottonian Library', *The British Library Journal*, 6.2 (Autumn 1980), 144-157; C.J. Wright (ed.), *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy* (London: British Library, 1997); Herendeen, *William Camden*, pp. 299-302, 447-450. The manuscripts in the State Papers Office were divided into geographical categories, including 'Britania Australis' (South Britain, i.e. England and Wales) and 'Britania Septentrionalis' (North Britain, i.e. Scotland). Thomas Wilson, 'Sir Thomas Wilson's general heads of things in the Office of the Papers', 29 July 1618. TNA SP 45/20, fol. 62r. The Scottish papers included '30 greate bookes bound up, of the busines of Scotland Barwick and the Borders' in Elizabeth I's reign, 'contayneing for the moste parte the letters and negotiations of men employed there ... letters of the Kinge & Queene his mother, and of Queene Eliz: to and from one another' and more. There were also six cupboards 'of letters and minutes from private men during the tyme aforesaid.' TNA SP 45/20, fols 63v-64r. According to Sir Thomas Wilson, Keeper of the Records, these papers were all acquired by the State Papers Office after the death of Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury in 1612, 'being his and his fathers ... papers: and many of them recovered out of other mens hands in his tyme, by my industrie and procurement.' Many of these papers were incorporated into Camden's *Annales*. TNA SP 45/20, fols 65v-66r. Wilson listed the papers that Cotton used from the State Papers Office, 'partly before I had the office & ptly w^{ch} he gatt lycence for from his Ma^{ty} for the verifying of the story w^{ch} M^r Camden hath sett forth or under y^t pretence.' Wilson listed the papers according to the year they dated from, beginning with 1559 and concluding with 1589. These included the papers of English diplomats in Scotland, such as Sir Ralph Sadler and Nicholas Throckmorton; letters written by various individuals, including Moray, John Knox, Lady Margaret Douglas, Matthew Stewart, Earl of Lennox, John Lesley, Bishop of Ross, Sir William Drury, James Douglas, Earl of Morton, and William Maitland of Lethington; correspondence relating to and 'the articles of the entevew w^{ch} should have bene betwxt the Q^s of Eng & Scotland' at York; correspondence 'towching the murder of the kings father', Darnley; and letters by Mary's captors in England, including Sir Francis Knollys, Henry, Baron Scrope of Bolton, George Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, and Sir Ralph Sadler. Many of these papers were incorporated into Camden's *Annales*. Sir Thomas Wilson, 'Papers w^{ch} S R[obert] C[otton], hath prsed & transcribed att divers tymes out of the office of his Ma^{tyes} papers,' undated. TNA SP 45/20, fols 133r-134r.

Cotton did much of the research and Camden wrote the narrative, with Cotton also correcting and adding to Camden's manuscript drafts.¹⁴⁸

Given that the *Annales* was being written to revise Mary's reputation, we might ask why it is in name and structure a history of Elizabeth's reign. Cotton explained to Camden that 'since the Great disire of him to whom we owe our Duty is to se the lyf of his mother in the largest volume I pray you so far as will the confines of the story and the prevention of suspect [can] stand take up the actions of Scotland at large'.¹⁴⁹ This reveals that James did not want the *Annales* to be an outright history of his mother, possibly fearing that it would be denounced as biased or cause too much controversy. The importance of Scottish history in the *Annales* can be judged by a list Camden wrote of the subjects to cover in each year of Elizabeth's reign; references to Scotland are prominent throughout.¹⁵⁰ For the pivotal year 1567, 33 out of the 50 subjects concern Scotland.¹⁵¹

On 25 February 1615, James sent a letter to both Cotton and Camden stating that 'Oure pleasure is that you cause ... so much of the historie of England in Latin as we have perused to be printed and published that is from the yeare of our Lord 1558 untill the end of the yeare a thousand five hundred eighty-eight.'¹⁵² It was completed

¹⁴⁸ In January 1612, John Chamberlain stated that the work sent to De Thou was 'collected with the help of Sir Robert Cotton and written by Clarenceux' (Camden). John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 29 January 1611, London. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. by Norman Egbert McClure, 2 vols (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939), I, p. 332. Cotton claimed that the research he did was 'compyled into a story of Q Eliz time by m^r Camden and published in print'. Ramsay, 'Sir Robert Cotton's Services to the Crown', in *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector*, ed. by Wright, p. 71. Cotton apparently told Casaubon that he wrote the history in English, then Camden translated it into Latin to be sent to De Thou. Isaac Casaubon to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 11 July 1612, London. *The Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon*, ed. by Botley and Vince, II, pp. 509-513. Also published in *Isaaci Casauboni Epistolæ*, p. 349. See also: Collinson, 'Setting the Mould?', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Doran and Freeman, p. 81; Herendeen, *William Camden*, pp. 297-298.

¹⁴⁹ Robert Cotton to William Camden, undated. BL Cotton MS Titus C VII, fol. 209v.

¹⁵⁰ William Camden, list of subjects to be discussed in the *Annales*, organised by year. Undated. Wren Library, Trinity College, University of Cambridge, MS R.5.20, fols 81r-93v.

¹⁵¹ Wren Library, Trinity College, University of Cambridge, MS R.5.20, fols 83r-83v.

¹⁵² James VI & I to Robert Cotton and William Camden, 25 February 1615, Whitehall Palace. Copy in Camden's hand. Wren Library, Trinity College, University of Cambridge, MS R.5.20, fol. 112v. Camden wrote that this command was 'contrary to my expectation'. Draft letter from William Camden to an unknown recipient, undated. BL Add MS 36294, fol. 113r. Camden told various correspondents that James's command had been unexpected. For example, see: William Camden to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, 11 June 1615, London. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Dupuy 836, fols 150r-150v. Published in *Sylloge Scriptorum*, VII, part 5, p. 36. Mark Bland suggests that Camden expected the *Annales* to be circulated in manuscript rather than print, hence his surprise. Mark Bland, "'Invisible Dangers': Censorship and the Subversion of Authority in

and ready to be sold on 8 June.¹⁵³ The time period covered in the first volume of the *Annales* included the entirety of Mary's life from her time as queen consort of France to her execution in 1587.¹⁵⁴ James had Camden's account of Mary's life published in French and English in 1624, making it more widely accessible than the Latin edition.¹⁵⁵

Early Modern England', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 90.2 (1996), p. 156. Camden recorded that the *Annales* began to be printed on 13 March. William Camden, 'Annales ab a^o. 16[0]3 ad Annum 1623'. Wren Library, Trinity College, University of Cambridge, MS R.5.20, fol. 14r. Published in William Camden, 'Gulielmi Camdeni Annales Ab Anno 1603, ad Annum, 1623', in *Camdenum Epistolæ*, ed. by Smith, p. 12. It was registered with the Stationers' Company on 21 March as 'The history of England in Lattin from the yeare 1558 to the yeare 1588 licensed to be printed by the Kinges Majesties Letter under the Signet Directed to SIR ROBERT COTTON knight and Master WILLIAM CAMDEN, Clarenceux'. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London. 1554-1650 A.D.*, ed. by Edward Arber, 5 vols (London, 1875-1894), III (1876), p. 260. Once again, describing it as a 'history of England' obscured how much of it concerned Scotland.

¹⁵³ William Camden, 'Annales ab a^o. 16[0]3 ad Annum 1623'. Wren Library, Trinity College, University of Cambridge, MS R.5.20, fol. 14v. Published in William Camden, 'Gulielmi Camdeni Annales Ab Anno 1603, ad Annum, 1623', in *Camdenum Epistolæ*, ed. by Smith, p. 12.

¹⁵⁴ An English edition of the first volume of Camden's *Annales* was registered on 15 November 1616, but does not appear to have been published. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, ed. by Arber, III, p. 275. Camden wrote: 'I do not desire that they should be set forth in English, untill after my death, knowing how unjust carpens the unlearned Readers are.' William Camden to unknown recipient, undated. *Camdenum Epistolæ*, ed. by Smith, p. 351.

¹⁵⁵ On 4 November 1623, only five days before Camden died, a French translation of the first volume of Camden's *Annales* was registered. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, ed. by Arber, IV (1877), p. 68. In the dedication, the translator stated that he had sent the manuscript to James to ask for his approval to publish, which was evidently granted. William Camden, *Annales des Choses qui se Sont Passees en Angleterre et Irlande Sous le Regne de Elizabeth: Jusques a l'an de Salut M.D.LXXXIX. Traduites en langue françoise par P. de Bellegent Poictevin. A.A.P.D.P. du Latin de Guillaume Camden auteur*, trans. by Paul de Bellegent (London, 1624; STC 4502), 2*4v. It was registered by 'master COTTINGTON', who may have been Prince Charles's secretary, Francis, Baron Cottington. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, ed. by Arber, IV, p. 68. In January 1624, a book titled 'The life death and variable Fortunes of the most gracious and blessed queene MARY STEWARD queene of Scottes collected out of master CAMBDENS *Annales*' was also registered. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, ed. by Arber, IV, p. 73. This was William Camden and William Strangvage, *The Historie of the Life and Death of Mary Stuart Queene of Scotland* (London, 1624; STC 24508.7). On 20 March 1624, an English translation of the French edition of Camden's *Annales* was registered by George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham—James's favourite at the time, making clear that James wanted Camden's *Annales* to be available in English as well as Latin and French. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, ed. by Arber, IV, p. 76. In June 1624, a letter from an unknown writer was sent from Greenwich to the Stationers' Company, informing them that they were to 'take off a former restraint for printinge the Historie of Q: Eliz: life translated out of French into English.' W.W. Greg (ed.), *A Companion to Arber: Being a Calendar of Documents in Edward Arber's Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640 with text and calendar of supplementary documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 225. A full English version of the first volume of Camden's *Annales* was finally published in 1625. William Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Emperesse Elizabeth Queene of England, France and Ireland &c.*, trans. by Abraham Darcie (London, 1625; STC 4497).

Camden discusses Mary's attempts to be recognised as Elizabeth's heir to the English throne, raising the question of how the English succession operates and whether Mary had the senior hereditary claim. Mary advised Elizabeth that 'there was nothing more certain' to secure peace between England and Scotland and 'the union of the kingdoms so often desired', than 'if Elizabeth, dying without issue, should by the authority of Parliament declare her heir and next in line to succeed to the kingdom of England.'¹⁵⁶ Camden quotes Mary as saying that she was English on her father's side and 'most certain heir in England, and expected the kingdom'.¹⁵⁷ If Mary married Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, Elizabeth promised 'by the authority of parliament to declare her *sister, or daughter, England's heir*'.¹⁵⁸ Catherine de' Medici advised Mary not to depend on the authority of parliament, however, 'because in England, what one Parliament sanctioned, another one undid.'¹⁵⁹ Camden does not conclude whether the English Parliament had the authority to name a successor or not, though Catherine de' Medici's statement acknowledges that any parliamentary recognition could be overturned. By discussing Mary's attempts to be recognised as Elizabeth's heir, Camden does not argue that Mary was already the undoubted heir to the English throne, admitting that the succession appeared uncertain. Camden does, however, make clear that Mary had a strong hereditary claim, that Elizabeth thought about recognising Mary as her heir, and that parliamentary recognition was of debatable value.

¹⁵⁶ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, pp. 67-68, 75-76; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, pp. 76, 87. All translations from the original Latin are my own, aided by the 1625 English translation. The 1625 English translation is broadly accurate, but I have attempted to make the word choices and structure of my translations more closely resemble the Latin original.

¹⁵⁷ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 75, Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 87. This resembles the line on Mary's Westminster Abbey epitaph, discussed above: 'Mistress of Scotland by law, of France by marriage, of England by expectation'.

¹⁵⁸ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 84, Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 100.

¹⁵⁹ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 85, Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 100. The ability of successive parliaments to alter what came before was further emphasised when changes were made to the manuscript draft. Draft manuscript copy of the years 1558-1572 of William Camden's *Annales*, c. 1608-1615. BL Cotton MS Faustina F I, fol. 101r. In the manuscript draft the words 'alterum sancivit' (the one sanctioned) have been crossed out and replaced with 'quod alterum Parlamentum sanxit, alterum refigat' (what one Parliament sanctioned, another one undid), which is how it appears in the published version.

Camden also discusses the Elizabethan succession debates, acknowledging that people were motivated to support different candidates for religious reasons while also asserting that Mary was recognised as having the senior hereditary claim.¹⁶⁰ According to Camden, wiser people observed that ‘while divided in religion, Protestants seethed that the Queen of Scots, because she was of another religion, although she had the undoubted legal right, should by crafty laws be repelled, while Papists, and those who favoured what was right and good, admitted that they thought she was the true and certain legal heir.’¹⁶¹ Even Mary’s religious opponents acknowledged she had the greatest legal right. There could thus be no objection to James’s right to the English throne, as not only had he inherited the senior hereditary claim from his mother, but, unlike her, he was also Protestant.

Camden explains that others supported the claim of Lady Margaret Douglas and her sons (including James’s father, Darnley) because they were born in England, acknowledging that nationality was also a factor in determining the candidates people chose to support.¹⁶² This reminds the reader that James’s paternal line was English-born, even if his mother was a foreigner, responding to another objection against the Stuart claim to the English throne. Camden explains Mary’s invitation for Matthew Stewart, Earl of Lennox, to return to Scotland as an attempt to prevent his son, Darnley, from pursuing the English succession. ‘For if this young man of royal blood, born in England, very dear to the English, was strengthened by marrying into another English family, and set out to secure the support of English forces, he might be an obstacle to her rightful succession in England, as many thought that he was second in line to succeed to the kingdom of England. But she

¹⁶⁰ Camden cited the succession treatises of John Hales and John Lesley, Bishop of Ross. Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, pp. 72-73, 91-92, 163; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, pp. 83-84, 110-111, 216.

¹⁶¹ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 92, Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 111.

¹⁶² Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 92; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 111. Their English birth is not mentioned in one manuscript draft, revealing that this was a later addition to clarify why they were proposed as candidates. The manuscript draft states ‘de quibus optime sperabant’ (of whom they conceived good hopes) while the published version states ‘de quibus in Anglia natis optima quæque sperabant’ (of whom they conceived good hopes because they were born in England). Fair manuscript copy of the years 1558-1572 of William Camden’s *Annales*, c. 1608-1615. BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 92r; Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 92.

wanted nothing more than for the kingdoms of England and Scotland to devolve onto someone of the Scottish race, and so by him the *Stuart* ancestral name would be propagated in posterity.’¹⁶³ In the manuscript draft, Darnley was originally described as ‘the star of the Papists’ but this was crossed out and replaced with ‘very dear to the English’, as it appears in the published version. This emphasises Darnley’s credentials as an Englishman and downplays his Catholicism.¹⁶⁴ Mary’s decision to marry Darnley joins a rival claim with her own and ensures that the Stuart line (Darnley himself also being a Stuart) would continue to rule in Scotland and eventually in England. Camden presents Mary’s hereditary claim as senior to Darnley’s, but Darnley’s English birth made him a popular candidate, so those two qualities were combined in their marriage—and in their son. James not only inherited the combined hereditary claims of his parents, but also their nationalities, which made James a suitable ruler for both England and Scotland.

Following James’s example and publicly expressed desire, Camden presents Mary’s illegitimate half-brother, Moray, as the villain who orchestrated her downfall in Scotland, rather than blaming Mary herself as Buchanan and De Thou had done.¹⁶⁵ Camden unreservedly blames Moray and his allies for Darnley’s murder, though they shifted the blame onto Mary. Mary was also blamed for Darnley’s murder in George Buchanan’s *Ane Detectioun of the Duinges of Marie Quene of Scottes* and *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*, ‘the printing of which none can be ignorant of.’ Since Buchanan was part of their circle and ‘overtaken by Moray’s munificence’, however, ‘these books were condemned as false by the Estates of Scotland [the Scottish Parliament], whose faith gives this more weight’. When

¹⁶³ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 93; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 113.

¹⁶⁴ ‘Pontificques clarissimus’ (the star of the Papists) has been crossed out and replaced with ‘Anglisque admodum charus’ (very dear to the English). BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 94r. The phrase ‘et in auito Stuartorum cognomine per illum posteris propagaretur’ (and so by him the Stuart ancestral name would be propagated in posterity) was also a later addition to the manuscript. BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 93v.

¹⁶⁵ When Camden discusses Moray’s death, he also analyses his reputation. Camden admits that some praised Moray while others condemned him, the latter because he was ‘wrongfully ingrateful towards his well-deserving sister the Queen, inhumanly taking advantage of her womanly imbecility.’ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 172; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 235. Moray was the real tyrant, while Mary was a hapless victim. This paragraph on Moray’s reputation is a later addition to the manuscript draft, showing that it was decided to go to greater lengths to blame Moray for Mary’s downfall. BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 192v.

Buchanan served as James's tutor, he 'often reprehended himself (I have heard) that his virulent pen had been well sharpened in attacking the Queen, wishing to die but in the meantime as long as he lived to remove the stain, which by false slanders he had spread, revoking the truth, or to wash it away with his blood'.¹⁶⁶ Camden denies the accuracy of Buchanan's works in order to prove that Mary was blameless in Darnley's death. The story of Buchanan admitting to the young James that he had lied about his mother was a later addition in one manuscript draft, likely made at the suggestion of James himself, the audience of this supposed confession.¹⁶⁷

Camden follows this with an overview of Moray's life, further criticising him for his attacks on the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy. With John Knox's instruction, Moray claimed that 'kingdoms were due to merit, and not to lineage, and that women should be excluded from succeeding, and that their government was *monstrous*.'¹⁶⁸ The assertions that 'kingdoms were due to merit' and 'their government was *monstrous*' are not included in the manuscript drafts, showing that they were later additions to emphasise Moray's opposition to hereditary succession and female rule as a disciple of Knox.¹⁶⁹

After Moray arranged Darnley's murder and blamed Mary, leading to her imprisonment, Elizabeth I, who 'detested in her heart this unbridled insolence of subjects (who she often called perfidious, rebellious, ungrateful, and cruel) towards her sister and neighbour prince', sent Nicholas Throckmorton to try and secure

¹⁶⁶ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 110; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, pp. 137-138.

¹⁶⁷ BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 112v. The phrase '& Moravij munificentia' (by Moray's munificence) was also added later, emphasising Buchanan's unreliability by claiming that he was in Moray's pay. BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 113r. F.J. Levy recognises that 'an examination of Camden's manuscripts indicates that the blackening of Buchanan's reputation was progressive', citing the manuscript drafts of this part of the *Annales*. F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1967), p. 284 n. 77. P. Hume Brown proposes that the addition was made at James's suggestion. P. Hume Brown, *George Buchanan, Humanist and Reformer: A Biography* (Edinburgh, 1890), p. 326. In another manuscript draft, however, the bracketed phrase 'ut accepi' (I have heard) is not included, showing that it is an even later addition, which demonstrates Camden's wariness over asserting that Buchanan's retraction was undeniably true. BL Cotton MS Faustina F I, fol. 133r.

¹⁶⁸ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 111; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 139.

¹⁶⁹ 'Regna virtuti non generi deberi' and 'earum imperium esse *monstrousum*'. BL Cotton MS Faustina F I, fol. 135r; BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 114r.

Mary's release and restoration.¹⁷⁰ Throckmorton cited biblical evidence (though Camden does not identify it) about due obedience to superior powers, arguing that Mary was subject to no authority but God and could not be tried in the court of any earthly judge in Scotland, even if she had delegated her authority to them (an argument that clearly accords with James's views). The Scottish lords, however, counterargued that the rights and privileges of Scotland allowed them to depose monarchs, citing Buchanan's 'condemned dialogue', *De Jure Regni Apud Scotos*, which he wrote at 'Moray's request ... against the truth shown in the Scottish Histories.'¹⁷¹ Camden thus presents a defence of the status and authority of the Scottish monarchy, and denies the historical legitimacy of Buchanan's argument that Scotland's monarchs could be legitimately deposed. This discussion of Buchanan's *De Jure Regni Apud Scotos* does not appear in the manuscript drafts, showing that it was a later addition to further denounce Buchanan's political ideology. By contrast, most of Throckmorton's defence of hereditary monarchy is included in the manuscript drafts, demonstrating the importance of its inclusion throughout the writing process.¹⁷²

Camden presents Mary's abdication as unfairly exacted but does not dismiss it as illegitimate, as that would bring James VI's status as Scotland's monarch in Mary's lifetime into question. The Scots, by making Mary feel that her life was in danger, forced her to seal patents resigning the government of Scotland to her son and making Moray regent.¹⁷³ Mary informed Elizabeth that 'she had been forced to abdicate, and unwillingly surrendered the signed instrument, by Throckmorton's

¹⁷⁰ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 117; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 148.

¹⁷¹ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 118; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, pp. 149-150.

¹⁷² BL Cotton MS Faustina F I, fol. 145r; BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 124r. There is only one difference between the manuscript drafts and the published version in relation to Throckmorton's defence of monarchy: '& ab ipsa revocabilis' (and it was revocable, referring to Mary delegating authority to others) was not originally included in the manuscript drafts—it has been added later to BL Cotton MS Faustina F I, fol. 145r, and is not included at all in BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 124r. This phrase was added to emphasise that even if Mary had delegated authority to others, they could not use it against her as she could revoke her delegation.

¹⁷³ One manuscript draft originally stated that Mary's opponents threatened to take her to public trial and accuse her of having led 'an incontinent life with Bothwell' ('vitæ incontinenter actæ Bothwellio'), but it has been crossed out and replaced with 'an incontinent life' ('vitæ incontinenter actæ'). BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 125r. It was likely decided that mentioning the accusation of Mary's adultery with Bothwell was too controversial, since Buchanan had used it as evidence of Mary's involvement in Darnley's murder. George Buchanan, *The History of Scotland*, trans. by James Aikman, 4 vols (Glasgow, 1827), II, pp. 485-90, 493, 497-8, 501-515.

advice, who persuaded her that anything she was extorted to surrender in her imprisonment, *which is justified fear* [Justus Metus, a maxim of Roman law], is entirely invalid.’¹⁷⁴ Although pressured, Mary still agreed to her abdication, and Camden does not comment on the accuracy of Throckmorton’s legal argument. Camden’s focus was denying that Mary’s abdication had been a legitimate deposition, as that was the greater threat to James’s status as hereditary monarch.

At Mary’s York trial, Moray produced conjured evidence and ‘Buchanan’s libel (which was titled *Detectio*) was chosen to be exhibited, but most of the party had such little faith in it and recognised that it was written by a partial man, and one who had sold his fidelity.’¹⁷⁵ This discussion of Buchanan’s *Ane Detectioun of the Duinges of Marie Quene of Scottes* does not appear in one of the manuscript drafts and was a later addition to another, revealing that it was added to further challenge Buchanan’s reliability.¹⁷⁶

Camden also discusses the attempts to legally bar Mary from succeeding to the English throne, though he does not outright condemn them as invalid. Camden’s discussion of the 1571 *Treasons Act* begins with the phrase ‘In these times of iniquity’, making clear that Mary was being unfairly targeted.¹⁷⁷ In 1584, at Leicester’s instigation, men throughout England swore the oath of the Bond of Association, and Mary ‘easily understood that this *Association* was intended to lead to her ruin’.¹⁷⁸ Camden, however, does not mention the Bond’s potential impact on

¹⁷⁴ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 120; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, pp. 151-152. For ‘Justus Metus’, see: Adolf Berger, ‘Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law’, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, n.s., 43.2 (1953), 581-582, 768.

¹⁷⁵ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, pp. 144-145; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, pp. 189-190.

¹⁷⁶ BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 159r (not included at all); BL Cotton MS Faustina F I, fol. 183r (added later).

¹⁷⁷ ‘Horum temporum iniquitas’. Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, pp. 204-205; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, pp. 279-280. In one manuscript draft, ‘temporis iniquitas’ was initially written later in the paragraph rather than at the start; moving it to the start of the paragraph in the published version emphasises the unfairness of Mary’s treatment. BL Cotton MS Faustina F IV, fol. 230r.

¹⁷⁸ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 360; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, pp. 64-65. This paragraph on the Bond of Association and Mary’s response was not originally included in one manuscript draft, being a later addition. Draft manuscript copy of the years 1573-1576, 1573-1583, 1576-1588, 1584-1586 and 1589-1592 of William Camden’s *Annales*, c. 1608-1615. BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fols 120v-121r. The original text is on fol. 121r, while the later paragraph has been added on fol. 120v.

Mary's hereditary claim, or that of her heirs. Patrick Collinson points out that Camden portrays Leicester in a very negative light, 'above all making him the architect of a virtual conspiracy' against Mary and her claim to the English throne.¹⁷⁹ By attributing the Bond of Association to the nefarious Leicester, therefore, Camden encourages the reader to denounce and disregard it. Camden also quotes from the 1585 *Act for the Queen's Surety* (the *Act of Association*), acknowledging that it purported to deprive anyone of their claim to the English throne if they or someone acting for them attacked Elizabeth.¹⁸⁰ Camden does not discuss whether these pieces of parliamentary legislation and the Bond of Association could deny hereditary right, preferring not to revive those former debates over the validity of Mary's (and, more importantly, James's) hereditary claim, but he had already sown a seed of doubt about the English Parliament's authority over the succession.

Camden acknowledges Mary's involvement in plots during her English imprisonment, but presents her sympathetically and blames others for enticing her. Camden justifies Mary's decision to start plotting her escape on the grounds of her harsh imprisonment and Elizabeth's failure to respond to her pleas, so 'her desire for liberty led her to welcome the pernicious counsel of insidious adversaries into her heart.'¹⁸¹ Mary was moved to severer imprisonment, which some thought was intentionally done so that 'in desperation she would be driven to abrupt counsel, and opportune plots.' She was delivered letters, 'some false and some true ... by which her womanly impotence would lead her to ruin'.¹⁸² The papers of Mary's secretaries (Gilbert Curle and Claude Nau) were taken, showing that they had communicated with Anthony Babington.¹⁸³ In the surviving manuscript draft, this

¹⁷⁹ Collinson, 'Setting the Mould?', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Doran and Freeman, p. 87.

¹⁸⁰ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, pp. 370-371; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, pp. 81-82.

¹⁸¹ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 363; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 71. This resembles one of the draft versions of Mary's epitaph, discussed above.

¹⁸² Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, pp. 364-365; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, pp. 72-73.

¹⁸³ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, pp. 412-413; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 143.

discussion of Mary's secretaries is rewritten and expanded, as it ties into an important narrative discussed below.¹⁸⁴ It was decided to use the *Act of Association* to try Mary, and the commission found her guilty.¹⁸⁵

Camden makes a unique argument against the legality of this sentence, presenting Mary's execution as not meeting English legal requirements and, consequently, having no impact on her hereditary claim to the English throne—or its passage to James. The originality of Camden's argument has gone unnoticed by most scholars.¹⁸⁶ Camden voices it as the opinion of Mary's contemporaries rather than his own, claiming that many men said the sentence 'entirely depended on the credibility of the secretaries ... some thought that they were worthy of credit, while others thought they were unworthy.' The validity of their testimony was debatable, Camden explains, because they were not 'brought together in person' as was required by the 1571 *Treasons Act*.¹⁸⁷ This argument was a later addition to the manuscript draft, revealing that Camden did not originally plan to use this legal technicality to deny the legitimacy of Mary's condemnation and execution. The addition to the manuscript draft states that 'others wondered why they were not brought forward to be judged in person', but this was replaced in the published

¹⁸⁴ BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fols 149v-152r. The original paragraph is written on fol. 152r, but has been crossed out and rewritten twice, on both fol. 149v and fol. 151v (this latter rewrite has only partially survived, with large sections of the left and right edges missing). These rewrites are largely identical to the published version.

¹⁸⁵ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 413; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, pp. 143-144. Most of this paragraph is not included in the original text of the manuscript draft, being added later on a different folio. BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fols 150v (later addition), 152r (original text).

¹⁸⁶ The only scholar who appears to have recognised Camden's unique argument is L. Antheunis, 'Le secrétaire de Marie Stuart: Gilbert Curle, 1549-1609, et sa famille', *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 133 (July 1939), 70.

¹⁸⁷ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 432, Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 167. To support this argument, Camden cites Claude Nau's 1605 'apology' to James VI & I. The 'apology' Camden refers to is Claude Nau's memorial, dated 2 March 1605. BL Cotton MS Caligula B V, fols 239r-243v. The use of Curle and Nau's testimonies in Mary's trial is discussed in Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 635-639, and Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots*, pp. 244-245. Camden's *Annales* was used as a source for the account of Mary's trial in Thomas Salmon's *Compleat Collection of State-Tryals*, and so Camden's argument against the legality of Mary's trial is reproduced there unattributed and unchallenged. Salmon, *A Compleat Collection of State-Tryals*, I, p. 131. Salmon's account of Mary's trial (including the information taken from Camden) was then directly copied into other works, such as *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials* and Archibald Francis Steuart's *Trial of Mary Queen of Scots*. *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Present Time*, ed. by William Cobbet, T.B. Howell, T.J. Howell, and D. Jardine, 34 vols (London, 1809-1828), I (1809), p. 1189; Steuart, *Trial of Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 61.

version with ‘nor were they brought together in person as required by the first statute of the thirteenth year of Elizabeth [the *Treasons Act*]’, to conclusively assert that Mary’s condemnation did not meet English legal requirements and was thus legally invalid.¹⁸⁸

Camden later explains again that Mary’s execution went against the *Treasons Act*, which ordained that ‘*No-one should be summoned to be judged for attempting to ruin the life of a Prince, unless upon the testimony and legal oath of two lawful witnesses who are brought together in person*, when in her trial no witnesses were produced in person, but she was condemned by the testimony of the absent Secretaries.’¹⁸⁹ This statement is also not in the manuscript draft, revealing that Camden’s entire argument against the legality of Mary’s condemnation and execution was a later addition.¹⁹⁰

Camden also claims that the commissioners and judges at Mary’s trial ruled that the sentence against Mary did not affect James’s claim to the English throne (something that is not mentioned in contemporary accounts, though the *Act of Association* could be interpreted in this way and might have been the basis for Camden’s assertion).¹⁹¹ This claim is present in the original text of the manuscript draft, showing that Camden always intended to defend James’s claim to the English throne from

¹⁸⁸ Manuscript text: ‘alijque cur non coram in judico producti erant, demirarentur’. BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fols 159r (original text), 162r (later addition). Published text: Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 432; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 167.

¹⁸⁹ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 441; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 181. The italics are Camden’s. It is notable that Mary’s two secretaries had appeared before the commission judging Mary’s case when the commission later met in Star Chamber and proclaimed Mary’s guilt, but not when the case was being heard before Mary herself at Fotheringhay; although Camden mentions this appearance, he does not deem it legally sufficient because they were not present at the same time as Mary herself. Salmon, *A Compleat Collection of State-Tryals*, I, p. 131; Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 431; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 166.

¹⁹⁰ BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fol. 167r.

¹⁹¹ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 432, Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 167. The sentence is published in Salmon, *A Compleat Collection of State-Tryals*, I, p. 131. Following the sentence, Salmon inserts a paragraph that includes the claim that the commission ruled James’s title was not affected; however, this paragraph is taken from Camden’s *Annales* and not a contemporary source, so it is not accurate. Steurt copies his account from Salmon (or a work derived from Salmon, such as *Cobbett’s Complete Collection of State Trials*), including the paragraph taken from Camden’s *Annales*. Steurt, *Trial of Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 60.

assertions that Mary's condemnation and execution had undermined it.¹⁹² Therefore, irrespective of whether or not parliamentary legislation could strip Mary of her hereditary claim, Camden asserts that James's own claim was unaffected, while also arguing that Mary's condemnation was legally invalid and thus her own claim had indeed been left intact.

Having narrated Mary's execution, Camden provides an overview of Mary's life that emphasises her dynastic importance and her hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones—which, of course, had been inherited by James. Camden explains that this was 'the lamentable end to the life of Mary, Queen of Scots, daughter of James V, King of Scots, granddaughter of the eldest daughter of Henry VII, at the age of 46, in the 18th year of her captivity.'¹⁹³ The explanation of Mary's descent from James V and Henry VII was a later addition to the manuscript draft, to clarify the sources of Mary's hereditary claims and demonstrate her dual Scottish and English royal ancestry.¹⁹⁴ Camden reiterates that 'Moray her illegitimate brother, and other disloyal subjects with stirred up ambitions, took away her kingdom,' while in England she was held captive '(as some worthy persons have conceived) for her religion' and 'exposed into perilous attempts' by Catholics, then 'ruined by the testimonies of her absent Secretaries, who were corrupted by money it seems.'¹⁹⁵ In the manuscript draft, the blame for Mary's downfall in England is placed entirely on Catholics, whose 'inconsiderateness threw her into ruin', but no mention is made of Mary's secretaries, further proving (as discussed above) that this narrative was a later addition.¹⁹⁶ Mary herself is not blamed for anything that had happened to her. Fortune had not favoured her, and she had suffered at the hands of others—but her royal status and hereditary claims remained a focus for celebration.

¹⁹² BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fol. 159r.

¹⁹³ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 458; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, pp. 205-206.

¹⁹⁴ BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fol. 173r.

¹⁹⁵ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 458; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 206. The bracketed phrase 'as some worthy persons have conceived' ('ut æqui boniq; censuerunt') does not appear in the manuscript draft, showing that it was a later addition to be more cautious. BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fol. 173r.

¹⁹⁶ 'inconsiderate in perniciem præcipitata'. BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fol. 174r.

Finally, Camden includes another affirmation that Mary's execution did not affect James's claim to the English throne, by stating that Elizabeth sent him a ruling to which 'the Judges of England signed their names, which testified that the sentence against her, did nothing to obstruct his right to succeed, or prejudice it.'¹⁹⁷ As with the earlier affirmation that Mary's condemnation did not affect James's claim to the English throne, this statement appears in the original manuscript draft, so it was obviously an important point that Camden always intended to include, even before he added the argument that Mary's condemnation and execution was legally invalid.¹⁹⁸ Camden's intention had always been to defend James's hereditary claim to the English throne, even if Mary's had been undermined.

William Camden's *Annales* was an official commission from James VI & I and, as such, it was intended to address the troubling aspects of Mary, Queen of Scots' legacy that concerned her son. Camden was targeting an international, scholarly audience, many of whom would have been familiar with the negative representation of Mary in the works of George Buchanan (and, more recently, Jacques-Auguste de Thou). This audience would likely have been suspicious of an overtly propagandistic re-telling of Mary's life that was not sufficiently supported by evidence—as De Thou had already shown in his correspondence with Camden. As a result, Camden presented himself as an impartial narrator merely providing the information necessary for the reader to form their own judgement. Ultimately, however, Camden encouraged the reader to come away with a much more positive assessment of Mary and to see her deposition, condemnation, and execution as unjustified and illegal. As a result, Camden's account of Mary's life perfectly suited the king's agenda, and James made sure it became more widely available.

Camden repeatedly condemned George Buchanan's works, which had argued that Scotland's monarchy was elective and justified Mary's abdication as the legitimate deposition of an adulterous murderer and tyrant. By challenging the accuracy of Buchanan's works, Camden denied both that Mary's behaviour had been bad enough to justify deposition, and that Scotland's hereditary monarchs could be

¹⁹⁷ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 469; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 221.

¹⁹⁸ BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fol. 179r.

legally deposed regardless of their behaviour. This followed the example of James's *Basilikon Doron* and *The True Law of Free Monarchies*, where he not only protested his mother's innocence from Buchanan's attacks, but also argued that hereditary monarchs who behaved badly could only be punished by God.¹⁹⁹ James and Camden were not willing to go as far as to argue that, even if Mary had been an adulterous murderer and tyrant, her subjects did not have the right to depose her. They also wanted to revise Mary's controversial personal reputation, recognising the damaging implications it had for James and how thoroughly attached it was to the justification of her abdication as a deposition. Therefore, Camden presented James Stewart, Earl of Moray, as the mastermind behind Mary's downfall in Scotland and her abdication, criticising Moray's disloyalty and his ambition to subvert legitimate hereditary succession for his own advancement. By blaming these events on one man, Camden also disputed Buchanan's claim that Mary had been legitimately removed from the throne by the broader Scottish political community.

Camden did acknowledge that multiple candidates were proposed for the succession to the English throne during Elizabeth I's reign, and that it was debated whether candidates could be excluded based on their nationality or religion. However, he clarified that Mary had the senior hereditary claim regardless of her Scottish birth and Catholicism, and asserted that even her opponents acknowledged this. He also emphasised Mary's English royal descent and downplayed her Catholicism (just as Mary's funerary monument did); for example, although Camden's account of Mary's execution made her Catholicism clear, he did not frequently discuss it otherwise and pointed out that Mary had tolerated Protestantism in Scotland.²⁰⁰ Therefore, even though Camden emphasised the importance of hereditary right to the English succession, he still tried to make Mary less objectionable to English Protestant readers on national and religious grounds,

¹⁹⁹ James VI & I, *Βασιλικὸν Δῶρον* [Basilikon Doron] (Edinburgh, 1599; *STC* 14348), pp. 38-40; James VI & I, 'Basilikon Doron', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by J.P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 23-24; James VI & I, *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (Edinburgh, 1598; *STC* 14409), E2v; James VI & I, 'The Trew Law of Free Monarchies', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Sommerville, p. 82.

²⁰⁰ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 67; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, p. 76.

silently acknowledging that these were important considerations when it came to the English succession.

Additionally, Camden demonstrated that the national and religious objections that had been made against Mary did not apply to James. Like other English writers (who were discussed in Chapter 3), Camden emphasised the Englishness of James's paternal ancestry, thereby anglicising James and presenting him as a suitable monarch for England. Camden also suggested that James's own Protestantism nullified the objections made against Mary's hereditary claim on religious grounds. George Hakewill's claim that James's father had been a Protestant (discussed in Chapter 3) served this same end, by showing that James had a hereditary claim to the English throne that did not come immediately from a Catholic. Thus, Camden presented James as an entirely suitable candidate for the English throne, combining his mother's senior hereditary claim with his English paternal ancestry and Protestant faith. This was another silent acknowledgment that nationality and religion were important factors in the justification of James's succession to the English throne.

Camden discussed the possibility of the English Parliament interfering in the succession to disinherit Mary but left the legality of such an action open to debate. More assertively, Camden constructed an original argument to dispute the legality of Mary's condemnation and execution, based on the testimony of her secretaries not meeting English legal requirements. As such, Camden asserted that Mary's hereditary claim to the English throne remained untouched by parliamentary legislation. Erring on the side of caution, however, Camden repeatedly asserted that even if Mary's claim had been undermined, the Elizabethan government and legal authorities had recognised that James's own claim was unsullied. Camden therefore offered defences of James's hereditary claim, regardless of whether the English Parliament had authority over the succession, and whether his mother's hereditary claim had been legally invalidated. Camden, like most of his Jacobean contemporaries, was not attempting to define how the English succession operated, but rather to defend James's status as England's monarch from all potential objections.

Other Histories

William Camden was not the only Jacobean historian to write about Mary, Queen of Scots, but he was the most thorough, since his *Annales* was commissioned by James VI & I with the specific intention of revising Mary's reputation. Other Jacobean historians, writing without official support, were incredibly wary of discussing Mary. In a previous work, Camden himself had declared that when it came to the topic of Mary's execution, 'I had leifer [rather] it should be enwrapped up in silence, than once spoken of: Let it be forgotten quite, if it be possible: if not, yet be it hidden, as it may in silence.'²⁰¹ Other Jacobean historians shared this attitude. This section includes further analysis of the histories of Edward Ayscu and John Speed, discussed in the previous chapters, as well as Sir John Hayward's *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, originally in manuscript. Considering these works together not only highlights the similarities in how Mary was represented in Jacobean histories, but also how other factors, such as the purpose these histories were intended to serve, could result in notable differences.

Mary's representation in these three histories has received limited attention from scholars, as most have only considered her representation in Camden's *Annales*. By considering these histories as well, we can determine how typical Camden's representation of Mary was in the Jacobean period. This section analyses how these histories represent Mary's status as hereditary monarch of Scotland and her hereditary claim to the English throne, considering whether they reflect or reject the official interpretations of Mary's life put forward by James and his supporters. It further demonstrates that, and considers why, James's Protestant subjects preferred not to discuss Mary rather than adopt the official interpretation.

²⁰¹ William Camden, *Britain, or a Chorographical Description of the Most Flourishing Kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Ilands Adjoyning*, trans. by Philemon Holland (London, 1610; STC 4509), p. 511. This is an English translation of Camden's *Britannia*. Woolf points out that elsewhere in the *Britannia*, Camden makes clear that he was not writing a history and 'went out of his way to abort any unconscious slips into a narrative of men and deeds', focusing instead on a description of place. However, Camden's statement about Mary's execution, placed within his discussion of Fotheringhay Castle, makes clear that he does not want anyone to discuss Mary's execution, including historians. Woolf, *The Idea of History*, p. 21.

According to Sir John Hayward (discussed in relation to another of his works in Chapter 2), in his dedication to Prince Charles of *The Lives of the III. Normans, Kings of England* (1613), the late Prince Henry had sent for Hayward a few months before his death and complained ‘much of our Histories of *England*; and that the *English* Nation, which is inferiour to none in Honourable actions, should be surpassed by al, in leaving the memorie of them to posteritie.’²⁰² Hayward ‘finished the lives of these three Kings of *Norman* race, and certaine yeeres of Queene *ELIZABETHS* Reigne’ and presented them to Henry, who died shortly after.²⁰³ While the former work was published in Hayward’s lifetime, the latter was only published in its entirety in 1840. Hayward’s *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* was evidently begun after Elizabeth I’s death in 1603 and completed prior to Henry’s death in 1612, most likely being concentrated towards the end of that period. It is evident from the text itself that it was intended to serve an educational purpose for Henry, demonstrating how a monarch should behave from the example of history. The period of Elizabeth’s reign that Hayward covers includes her early interactions with Mary, Queen of Scots.

All three historians discuss Mary’s adoption of the title and arms of England in 1558.²⁰⁴ Speed quotes from John Lesley’s manuscript history not only to narrate this event, but also to explain Mary’s hereditary claim to the English throne. Henri II of France hoped to establish Mary on the English throne, ‘*laying her title from Margaret the eldest daughter of King Henrie the seventh, linked in Marriage with James the fourth King of that name, shee being the daughter of King James the Fifth his soone. And therefore as the neerest in blood, and lawfull heire to the Crowne of England*’.²⁰⁵ After this, however, Speed does not discuss Mary’s place in the English line of succession or the Elizabethan succession debates, avoiding these subject altogether.

²⁰² John Hayward, *The Lives of the III. Normans, Kings of England* (London, 1613; STC 13000), sig. A2r.

²⁰³ Hayward, *Lives of the III. Normans*, sig. A3r.

²⁰⁴ Ayscu writes that ‘immediately after the death of Queene Mary, the *Scottish Mary* (pretending a title to the Crowne) usurped the armes and stile of *England*.’ Edward Ayscu, *A Historie containyng the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and other occurrents between England and Scotland* (London, 1607; STC 1014), pp. 362-363.

²⁰⁵ John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045), p. 834.

Hayward uses this diplomatic episode as a learning opportunity for his intended audience, Prince Henry. Hayward explains that, to persuade Elizabeth I to aid them against the French forces in Scotland, the Scottish lords mentioned that the French ‘have also, under colour of her [Mary’s] name, pretended title to your crowne; they have proclaymed her Quene of your dominions’, and Mary had adopted the English royal arms.²⁰⁶ Unlike Speed, Hayward does not attempt to place the blame elsewhere in Mary’s defence. Hayward then celebrates the importance of the Treaty of Edinburgh, as England removed the threat of France ‘and a pretence to the crowne was disavowed, which, in these waveringe tymes, might have produced troublesome effect.’²⁰⁷ Prince Henry could learn from Elizabeth’s example as a ruler securing her kingdom from external threats, such as Mary claiming to be England’s rightful monarch. Unlike Speed, Hayward does not use this as an opportunity to illustrate Mary’s place in the English line of succession.

Ayscu and Hayward also discuss the Scottish lords’ attempt to have Mary recognised as Elizabeth’s heir. After Mary’s return to Scotland, the Scottish lords wrote to Elizabeth to encourage better relations between the two queens. They told her (in Ayscu’s words) that the best way to do this was ‘by acte of Parliament to establish the succession of the crowne of *Englande* (for want of issue of her owne body) upon the Queene their Mistresse, who in bloud was next unto it’.²⁰⁸ Elizabeth responded that she would not do anything to prejudice Mary’s ‘right to the Crowne of *England*’; however, neither would she investigate Mary’s claim, ‘but wee leave it to them, to whom it pertaineth to looke unto it.’ Elizabeth concluded: ‘I call GOD to witnesse that for our part, wee knowe none, next my selfe, whom I preferre therein before her, or (if the matter should come in question) can exclude her.’²⁰⁹ Elizabeth declared (in Hayward’s words) that ‘If ther be any law against her title, I am ignorant thereof.’²¹⁰

²⁰⁶ John Hayward, *Annales of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. by John Bruce (London, 1840), p. 47.

²⁰⁷ Hayward, *Annales*, ed. by Bruce, p. 73.

²⁰⁸ Quote from Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 375; Hayward, *Annales*, ed. by Bruce, pp. 78-79.

²⁰⁹ Ayscu, *A Historie*, pp. 377-378.

²¹⁰ Hayward, *Annales*, ed. by Bruce, p. 82.

Ultimately, Elizabeth (in Hayward's words) said, 'this I know, that in succession of kingdomes, the fundamentall law of the crowne of the realme, the immutable law of nature and of nations (which proceedeth by propinquity of bloude) is more regarded than eyther secrett implicationes or expresse cautiones of positive lawes.'²¹¹ If Mary was the rightful heir to the throne by hereditary right, then that was stronger than parliamentary approval. Thus, Hayward concludes: 'it was evedent that the Queene even at that tyme had noe conceit of any other successor then the Queene of Scotts then, in case shee should dye without issue'; however, that this diplomatic exchange 'was so unseasonably begunne, and soe immoderately followed, many did dislike.'²¹² While Elizabeth recognised that Mary was her rightful heir due to her senior hereditary claim, she disliked how the Scottish lords went about having this acknowledged. Hayward's account would teach Prince Henry how to secure his goals more successfully; however, what Ayscu and Hayward wrote also served as a defence of James VI & I's own senior hereditary claim to the English throne, which he inherited from his mother without the need for parliamentary recognition.

These Jacobean historians were incredibly wary of discussing the controversies of Mary's personal reign in Scotland—not even to defend the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy. Hayward's history ends in 1562 and there is no further discussion of Mary. Ayscu simply summarises the period from Henry, Lord Darnley's death to James Stewart, Earl of Moray's death as 'the broiles in *Scotland*'.²¹³ Speed also avoids discussing Mary's personal reign at any length. Speed simply states: 'the affaires of *Scotland* was carried with so violent a motion as set the Lords at dissentions, and the land in civill sedition', with outrages being committed against 'the vertuous King and Queene themselves, him they shamefully murdered in a most barbarous manner, and her they tooke prisoner, forced her to resigne government, and lastly to flye into forraine parts for succour.' The unnamed Scottish lords are blamed entirely, and Speed denounces Mary's abdication as forcefully exacted without analysing its potential implications; however, it is not presented as a deposition. Speed then offers a justification for his brief account:

²¹¹ Hayward, *Annales*, ed. by Bruce, pp. 82-83.

²¹² Hayward, *Annales*, ed. by Bruce, p. 86.

²¹³ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 381.

‘But knowing that this Subject is to be writ with a farre more noble pen, and our extant relations from uncertain and suspected reports; we will surcease to intermeddle in the particulars of that Queenes affaires’.²¹⁴ Speed is referring to Camden’s *Annales*; he had decided it was safer not to discuss Mary’s controversial life any further, leaving it to Camden. By largely avoiding the subject of Mary’s abdication, however, Ayscu and Speed do not attempt to defend the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy, in stark contrast to Camden’s lengthy response.

Ayscu and Speed were also incredibly wary of discussing Mary’s English captivity, including her trial and execution. Ayscu writes very little about Mary’s time in England, while Speed does not mention Mary’s involvement in any plots against Elizabeth, including the Babington Plot.²¹⁵ Speed only brings Mary up again to discuss her execution, with the brief and vague explanation that the English Parliament ‘handled the weighty cause of that great Princesse *Mary* Queene of *Scotland*, whose untimely death and unfortunate end was finished at *Fotheringhay* Castle’.²¹⁶ Speed does not even explain why Mary was executed, avoiding any discussion of its legality or impact on James’s hereditary claim to the English throne. Ayscu, however, wrote something that drew him unwanted attention.

Cyndia Susan Clegg claims that what James objected to about Ayscu’s *Historie* was its ‘affront to personal and family honor’.²¹⁷ Clegg identifies a letter sent by Thomas Erskine, Viscount Fentoun, to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, as concerning Ayscu’s *Historie*.²¹⁸ Fentoun explains that James had asked him to send to Salisbury ‘this bouke, quhiche is leatlye cumme to my hands, & acquaint him that ... I have accidentallye found no good pairt in it, if it be not the verrye worste of all, & thinking it to touche hir soe nearlye, to q^m I doe ow soe great a dewtye, besyds the blemishe it dois geve my selfe,’ it must either be suppressed or recalled. The woman to whom James ‘doe ow soe great a dewtye’ was his mother, Mary. James took issue with something written ‘in the last leafe of the bouke exseption one’—the

²¹⁴ Speed, *History of Great Britaine*, p. 841.

²¹⁵ Speed, *History of Great Britaine*, pp. 844-851.

²¹⁶ Speed, *History of Great Britaine*, p. 857.

²¹⁷ Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 94.

²¹⁸ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*, pp. 94-96.

page of Ayscu's *Historie*, Clegg points out, that discusses Mary's execution. James wished the writer to be punished, as 'he muste evir think his mother had noe favorablle justice but great wronge wthout due respecte fitting for hir'. James did not know the writer's name, but wanted Salisbury to find out who it was and 'think upone the fittest waye to make him know his erre, that uthers shuld darr to doe the lyke heirefter'.²¹⁹ For this, Ayscu's son, William (who had the book published), was arrested and Ayscu's history was not reprinted.²²⁰

Ayscu asserts that Mary's execution was both justified and legal, and that not only did James know this, but he also thought it was better that his mother was dead. Ayscu's account of Mary's execution focuses on the impact it had on James's relationship with Elizabeth, reflecting his history's focus on Anglo-Scottish relations. Although James's 'good nature' might cause him to commiserate with his mother's 'lamentable end', Ayscu writes, 'yet wel weighing the quality & measure of her offence, the lawful & orderly proceeding against her; (having received an honorable trial by sixe & thirty of the greatest and gravest personages of this realme) and considering how much her life afterwards would prejudice, not only the safety of the other two royall persons, but withal the quiet estate of the whole Island: the most prudent King wel [f]ore-saw, what wrong he might have wrought unto himself by entring into any violent course.'²²¹ This stands in obvious contrast with Camden's account, as the latter both downplays Mary's involvement in plots against Elizabeth and denies the legality of her execution.²²² It is understandable, therefore, why this part of Ayscu's *Historie* would offend James, though Ayscu makes no mention of Mary's condemnation and execution nullifying her hereditary claim to the English throne or its passage to James, given that the original purpose of his history was to defend James's candidacy.

²¹⁹ Thomas Erskine, Viscount Fentoun, to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, 22 October 1607, Royston. MS CP 122/149. Clegg's reliance on the calendar summary of the letter rather than the original manuscript results in a number of errors being copied into her work. Why James was unable to identify the writer is uncertain, as Ayscu's name is given at the end of both the dedication to Prince Henry and the opening address to the reader, if not on the title page itself.

²²⁰ William Ayscu to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, c. 1607, Westminster gatehouse. MS CP Petitions 1986.

²²¹ Ayscu, *A Historie*, p. 393.

²²² It also stands in stark contrast to Camden's assertion that it was best not to pry into the hidden feelings of princes ('Abditos Principum sensus'). Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, A4r.

These three Jacobean histories further demonstrate that English Protestant writers generally preferred to avoid the subject of Mary, Queen of Scots, and the controversies of her life. For example, Edward Ayscu and John Speed both avoided discussing Mary's personal reign in Scotland, which also meant that they wrote little about her abdication and its potential ramifications for the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy. Speed also did not discuss the Elizabethan succession debates and, after explaining how Mary was descended from Henry VII, Mary's own place in the English line of succession. This general silence highlights how unusual William Camden's in-depth analysis was—it took an official commission to persuade a Protestant, English historian to write a detailed account of the life of their monarch's mother, the person he depended on to justify his successions to the English and Scottish thrones.

Ayscu and John Hayward both discussed the failed attempts of Mary's Scottish subjects to have her officially recognised as heir to the English throne. However, they still presented Mary as the senior hereditary claimant and asserted that Elizabeth I had defended Mary's claim. The potential for the English Parliament to publicly acknowledge Mary as Elizabeth's heir was raised, but Elizabeth herself declared that it was unnecessary. By extension, these statements also served as defences of James's claim, by making England's previous monarch a defender of the Stuart family's right to succeed to the English throne.

While Ayscu acknowledged that plots against Elizabeth had revolved around Mary, he did not suggest that she was personally involved until his account of her execution, when he outright stated that she had been involved, and her execution was both legal and justified. The risks of making such a claim are demonstrated by the arrest of Ayscu's son. Speed, by contrast, never mentioned Mary's name in connection to plots against Elizabeth, offering no explanation for her execution. None of these historians discussed whether Mary's Catholicism, foreignness, or possible exclusion by parliamentary legislation undermined or nullified her—or James's—hereditary claim, although, as this chapter has demonstrated, few Jacobean historians did so openly. Overall, these histories are typical examples of the cautious Jacobean approach towards Mary, Queen of Scots (excepting Ayscu's defence of Mary's execution).

Conclusion

After James VI & I had succeeded to the English throne, he commissioned works to revise the legacy of his mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, in defence of his own authority and status. One of James's major concerns was to deny George Buchanan's argument that Mary's abdication in Scotland had been the legitimate deposition of an immoral and tyrannical ruler. Mary's funerary monument in Westminster Abbey and William Camden's *Annales* asserted that Scotland's monarchy was hereditary and promoted Mary's significance as the source of James's hereditary claim to the Scottish throne. Mary's funerary monument did this primarily through heraldry and symbols, which stressed the continuity of the Scottish monarchy and the hereditary nature of the Scottish succession. While Mary's epitaph defended her status as Scotland's hereditary monarch, it avoided the subject of her abdication. Camden, by contrast, explicitly argued that Buchanan's works were both incorrect and unreliable, as well as denying the right of the Scottish people to depose their hereditary monarchs. These official commissions presented Mary as a virtuous person and a victim, with Camden following James's example by blaming Mary's illegitimate half-brother, James Stewart, Earl of Moray, for conspiring her downfall in Scotland.

While the official explanations of James's succession to the English throne did not mention Mary or base James's hereditary claim exclusively on his maternal descent, Mary's funerary monument and Camden's *Annales* defended the seniority of Mary's own hereditary claim through her descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, and celebrated the passage of that hereditary claim to James. Mary's epitaph made no reference to any opposition to Mary's claim, thereby presenting James's own succession to the English throne as inevitable and unchallengeable. While Camden acknowledged that there had been opposition to Mary's claim based on her Catholicism, foreignness, and the possibility that she was excluded by parliamentary legislation, he asserted that even Mary's opponents recognised the seniority of her hereditary claim. Mary's epitaph condemned her execution as unprecedented and outrageous, while Camden created an original argument that it did not meet English legal requirements. Both works, whether implicitly or

explicitly, denied that Mary's condemnation and execution affected her hereditary claim or its passage to James.

Even these official commission, however, still did not attempt to define the operation of the English succession. For example, while Camden led his readers to question the English Parliament's authority over the succession, he did not explicitly deny it, but chose instead to defend James's hereditary claim in all possible scenarios—regardless of whether the English Parliament had authority over the succession, or whether his mother's hereditary claim had been legally invalidated. Leonel Sharpe, one of the few other Jacobean to openly discuss the validity of Mary's hereditary claim, had done the same in his sermon. While scholars have assumed that Mary's absence from the proclamation of James's succession was due to her hereditary claim having been legally nullified, it is evident that contemporaries were uncertain about whether this was true or not, and so decided it was best either to not discuss it, or to defend James's hereditary claim in both scenarios. The emphasis James's English subjects placed on his combined maternal and paternal hereditary claim, as discussed in Chapter 3, can therefore also be interpreted as a response to the possibility that Mary's hereditary claim was legally invalid—though they intentionally avoided the subject. Jacobean officials did not want to revive previous debates over the legitimacy of James's hereditary claim and the nature of the English succession, which is a more likely explanation—alongside their desire to anglicise James by focusing on his English ancestry, and to leave it ambiguous whether he was depending on his maternal hereditary claim, paternal hereditary claim, or both—for Mary's absence from the proclamation.

Official commissions downplayed aspects of Mary's identity and events in her life that had previously been used to challenge her hereditary claim to the English throne. Rather than conclusively asserting that Catholics and foreigners could succeed to the English throne and pass hereditary claims to their descendants, Mary's Catholicism was not represented on her funerary monument, Camden's *Annales* downplayed Mary's Catholicism, and both works stressed her English royal ancestry. Their intention was to implicitly deny that those objections against Mary had been valid, and to make Mary more palatable to English Protestants. Camden also made clear that those objections could not be applied to James himself

due to his Protestantism and his English paternal ancestry, thereby promoting James's suitability as England's monarch for reasons other than his hereditary claim. Consequently, these works silently admitted that nationality and religion were important considerations when it came to the English succession, without openly discussing whether it was necessary for James to be English and Protestant to justify his succession to the English throne.

Despite these official attempts to revise Mary's reputation, many of James's Protestant subjects in both England and Scotland were wary of publicly discussing Mary at all. A common response was silence—saying the bare minimum about Mary or consigning her to oblivion. The scholarly focus on James's two major official commissions relating to his mother—Mary's funerary monument and Camden's *Annales*—has obscured this broader silence on Mary in the Jacobean period. When we recognise this unwillingness to discuss Mary, it becomes clear that the official commissions were isolated examples. James's efforts to revise his mother's reputation went largely unacknowledged and did not create a new consensus on Mary's life and legacy in James's lifetime—if anything, James was the unusual one for wanting to discuss Mary at all.

Among James's subjects, the only group who were willing to openly discuss Mary were—perhaps unsurprisingly—Catholics. Although Catholics were happy to celebrate James's inheritance of his hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones from his mother, they were not interested in overlooking Mary's Catholicism to focus exclusively on her dynastic importance, as James wished.²²³ Some Catholics argued that Mary's status as Scotland's monarch and heir to the English throne had only been defended by their fellow Catholics, while Protestants had persecuted her in both countries. However, the Protestant Gabriel Powell counter-argued that Catholics had supported candidates for the English throne based on confessional identity rather than hereditary seniority. These disputes

²²³ Jacobean Catholics continued to present Mary as a martyr. For example, one writer declared that Mary was attacked by Protestants in both countries for 'being a catholique' and that 'her patient suffering of this and the maner of her death rendred her worthy of the crowne of martydome'. A treatise defending Mary, Queen of Scots, against George Buchanan, Jacques-Auguste de Thou, and others. Undated. BL Cotton MS Caligula B IV, fol. 136r. See also: A Defence of Mary, Queen of Scots, by an English Catholic, 1603. MS CP 140/138.

undermined the official Jacobean narrative that James's succession to the English throne had been inevitable and unchallengeable due to his senior hereditary claim. It also revived former debates over how the English succession operated—something the Jacobean regime consistently tried to avoid. Consequently, James's efforts to overcome the religious division in Mary's legacy were unsuccessful, and the confessional divide over Mary's legacy was perpetuated into the seventeenth century.²²⁴

²²⁴ Even James's official commissions could be adapted by Catholics to suit their religious purposes; for example, one anonymous Catholic wrote a manuscript history of Mary based entirely on Camden's *Annales* that ended with a transcription and translation of the epitaph on Mary's funerary monument. BL Harley MS 371, fols 59r-122v.

6. Mary, Queen of Scots, and Anglo-Scottish Union

Many of James VI & I's subjects were incredibly wary of publicly discussing Mary, Queen of Scots, as shown in Chapter 5. Additionally, it was more common to promote Anglo-Scottish union as the legitimate outcome of James's combined hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones by focusing on James's English ancestors, especially Henry VII, rather than his Scottish ancestors, as shown in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4. This served to anglicise Anglo-Scottish union and emphasise the benefits it would supposedly bring to James's English subjects. Meanwhile, James's maternal descent from Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots, was celebrated for securing the union (or reunion) of 'Britain' at the beginning of James's joint reign, as shown in Chapter 4; consequently, James's maternal ancestry also carried connotations of Britishness and the loss of English nationhood and identity. Given these combined circumstances, it is perhaps unsurprising that most Jacobean writers were unwilling to invoke Mary in defence of Anglo-Scottish union, and it was more common to invoke both of James's parents due to the perceived Englishness of James's father, Henry, Lord Darnley. As this chapter demonstrates, Mary's Catholicism and controversial reputation also made her unappealing, and even resulted in her being invoked by an MP to argue *against* one aspect of permanent union. Mary's invocation in relation to Jacobean Anglo-Scottish union has been the subject of almost no scholarly analysis, which this chapter addresses.

This chapter begins with an analysis of why Mary was so infrequently discussed in relation to Anglo-Scottish union in the Jacobean period, alongside an example of Mary being invoked to oppose the adoption of the shared name Great Britain. This further demonstrates that the nationality, religion, and previous reputation of James's ancestors were the main reasons for their invocation in relation to Anglo-Scottish union. It then analyses how Mary's proposed marriage to Edward VI was used as a potential precedent during the permanent Anglo-Scottish union debates, showing that it was primarily useful as evidence that previous English monarchs and governments had supported permanent union—not just because it related to Mary. This stresses the importance of nationality to discussions of the historical

legitimacy of Anglo-Scottish union. The chapter concludes by considering how Mary's reburial in Westminster Abbey can be interpreted as an expression of official support for the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union, while acknowledging that this interpretation can be easily overlooked and was not necessarily intentional, nor was it replicated in unofficial Jacobean works, which reveals the limitations of its influence.

Invoking Mary to Support or Oppose Anglo-Scottish Union

Mary, Queen of Scots, was rarely invoked in defence of Anglo-Scottish union during the Jacobean period. Those invocations that were made, however, have been overlooked by scholars. Bruce Galloway and Brian P. Levack even misinterpret one invocation, claiming that an MP invoked Mary to support the adoption of the name Great Britain, when further analysis reveals the MP was opposing it.¹ As this thesis has already shown, James's ancestors were invoked in relation to Anglo-Scottish union not merely because they were the sources of his hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, and could therefore be presented as making the Union of the Crowns and any permanent union that followed possible, but also due to their nationalities and previous reputations. This section demonstrates that the same reasons explain why Mary was not regularly invoked, and why it was more common to invoke both of James's parents rather than just his mother. It also shows that Mary's Catholicism contributed to her limited, or negative, invocations.

James Maxwell made the most overt invocation of Mary, Queen of Scots, in the Anglo-Scottish union debates, but this example clearly demonstrates why Mary was not invoked more regularly. Maxwell, whose grandfather and father had served the two previous generations of Scottish monarchs, was a Scottish scholar and collector of anti-papal prophecies.² Maxwell sent James a proposal for a union treatise to be titled 'Britaines Union in Love', which he planned to dedicate to the memory of

¹ It is even listed under 'contra', i.e. arguments against union. Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986), p. 35; Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack, 'Introduction', in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, ed. by Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1985), p. xxxi.

² Arthur H. Williamson, 'Maxwell, James (b. 1581?, d. in or after 1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18400>; Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack, 'Appendix', in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 243.

‘the most noble mother of Britaines peace’, Mary, who ‘in despite of the Devill and evill men bare this peace-making Union-pearle in her blessed wombe’.³ Maxwell describes Mary as one of ‘the cheefe instruments of this Union ... whom all Britaines ought to honour as shee that was appointed of God to be the blessed mother of this blessed Union’, as Anglo-Scottish union was achieved in James’s person through the combined hereditary claims he inherited from his mother. Therefore, Maxwell argues, ‘all Britaines are bounde to sacrifice unto her fame and name the honestest conceites of their mindes, and the respectfulest speeches of their mouthes’.⁴ Those who wrote about Mary had to be wary of the works of George Buchanan and others critical of her, as ‘seeing so many have reaped greate goode by the Union of these kingdomes in your Ma^{ties} personne it would seeme a thing of all other most reasonable, that shee who bare this Union-pearle in her Wombe’ should also benefit by having her reputation restored. Even this positive invocation of Mary in defence of Anglo-Scottish union acknowledges her controversial reputation and the continued negative perception of her within James’s kingdoms, which suggests that these were reasons for Mary not being invoked more regularly.

James’s parentage was used by Barnabe Barnes, an English writer, to demonstrate that he embodied both English and Scottish nationalities, thereby making him a suitable ruler for the people of both kingdoms under the Union of the Crowns. Barnes’s *Foure Bookes of Offices Enabling Privat Persons for the Speciall Service of all Good Princes and Policies* (1606) was, according to Madeleine Hope Dodds, intended to ‘show his fitness for important government employment.’⁵ Barnes explains that James’s mother was Henry VII’s ‘grandchild of the first ventre [French for belly or womb]’, while James’s father ‘was by the second ventre’.⁶ This demonstrates that James’s senior hereditary claim to the English throne came from his mother, but Barnes still values James’s paternal ancestry. Barnes celebrates Mary and Darnley’s marriage as a ‘second union in marriage’ (following the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, known as the Union of the Houses)

³ James Maxwell, ‘Britaines Union in Love’ treatise proposal. BL Royal MS 18 A LI, fol. 1r.

⁴ BL Royal MS 18 A LI, fol. 4v.

⁵ Madeleine Hope Dodds, ‘Barnabe Barnes’, *Archaeologia Aeliana*, fourth series, 24 (1946), 40.

⁶ Barnabe Barnes, *Foure Bookes of Offices Enabling Privat Persons for the Speciall Service of all Good Princes and Policies* (London, 1606; STC 1468), p. 76.

which ‘portendeth the weale of Christendome: for in it by a double union twice united in bloud’.⁷ Barnes celebrates these successive marriages for combining hereditary claims that had all now been inherited by James VI & I. Barnes then compares Mary and Darnley’s marriage to a metaphorical marriage between Scota (the mythical ancestor of the Scottish people) and Hengist (said to have led the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes in their invasion of Britain), thereby emphasising Mary’s Scottishness and Darnley’s Englishness, with James consequently embodying both national identities.⁸ Barnes expects the English and the Scots to live harmoniously together under the Union of the Crowns, since both nations were now ‘coupled in one bodie’—James’s.⁹ Barnes’s claim that James embodied both national identities was unusual, as most English writers preferred to anglicise James by emphasising his English paternal ancestry and linking him to his predecessors on the English throne. While Barnes recognises that James’s senior hereditary claim to the English throne came from his mother, he still celebrates James’s paternal ancestry due to its perceived Englishness. This further demonstrates the significance of nationality to the invocation of James’s ancestors in defence of Anglo-Scottish union.

William Camden’s *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha* (1615) uses the nationalities of James’s parents to demonstrate his suitability not only to rule both England and Scotland, but also Britain. Camden explains that Mary justified her decision to marry Darnley on the grounds that he was ‘not a foreigner, but extracted out of England, descended from the royal blood of each kingdom, and the noblest man in the whole of Britain.’¹⁰ Camden’s use of

⁷ Barnes, *Foure Bookes*, p. 77.

⁸ Philip Mark Robinson-Self, *Early Modern Britain’s Relationship to Its Past: The Historiographical Fortunes of the Legends of Brute, Albina, and Scota* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2019), pp. 2, 103. The marriage between Mary and Darnley, Barnes claims, made the union of England and Scotland ‘more firme’ than it had been under Brutus. The Brutus myth was distinctly English, as it claimed that England and Scotland had previously been united. The Scots rejected this, asserting Scotland’s origins independent of England. Barnes, however, attempted to bring the two origin myths together by referencing both Brutus and Scota. See: Roger A. Mason, ‘Scotching the Brut: Politics, History and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Britain’, in *Scotland and England 1286-1815*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1987), pp. 60-76; Daniel Woolf, ‘Senses of the Past in Tudor Britain’, in *A Companion to Tudor Britain*, ed. by Robert Tittler and Norman Jones (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), pp. 408-411.

⁹ ‘Since therefore these nations thus coupled in one bodie, be both of them knit up in your Majesties royall person and posteritie, there is not any doubt, but that they will live, love, and accord in sincere unitie together.’ Barnes, *Foure Bookes*, p. 77.

¹⁰ William Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha, Ad Annum Salutis M.D. LXXXIX*. (London, 1615; STC 4496), p. 97; William Camden, *Annales: The True and*

the term ‘Britain’ makes clear that Darnley’s suitability related not only to England and Scotland individually, but also collectively as Britain. This anticipates the eventual union of the two kingdoms under Mary and Darnley’s son, the self-proclaimed ‘King of Great Britain’, whose parentage makes him a suitable monarch for both England and Scotland. In his account of James’s birth, Camden describes how the ‘fortunate and auspicious Queen of Scots, to the eternal happiness of Britain, gave birth to James (who is now Britain’s Monarch)’.¹¹ Camden presents James’s birth as a significant event for not only Scotland, but for the entirety of Britain, anticipating James’s eventual succession to the thrones of both Scotland and England and the Union of the Crowns. Camden justifies James’s rule over both countries not only based on his combined hereditary claims, but also the nationalities of his parents, making him a suitable monarch for both England and Scotland—and, consequently, Britain. Camden does not, however, claim that England and Scotland had been subsumed into the single state of Britain, with James’s subjects no longer being English and Scottish but British, as some writers at the start of James’s joint reign claimed (as discussed in Chapter 4). By the time Camden was writing, the limitations of the Union of the Crowns were already apparent.

Camden also claims that the union of England and Scotland under James was Mary’s greatest wish, but only in combination with Elizabeth I’s wish that England remain Protestant. After narrating Mary’s execution, Camden explains that ‘some have clearly observed that princes are fated by the disposition of divine providence. For the things which Elizabeth and Mary wished from the beginning, and sought in all their plans, were thus attained.’ Camden claims that, at her execution, Mary said ‘there was nothing she desired more ardently, than for the divided kingdoms of England and Scotland to be united in the person of her son’. Meanwhile, there was nothing Elizabeth ‘desired more ardently, than for the true Religion and the health

Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth Queene of England, France and Ireland &c., trans. by Abraham Darcie (London, 1625; STC 4497), p. 119.

¹¹ Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, pp. 103-104; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, pp. 127-128. In the manuscript draft, the phrase ‘etsi matris honorem ab æmula præreptum indoleret’ (Elizabeth ‘howsoever angry to see her out-strip her in honour, who envied her’) has been added later, increasing the sense of enmity and jealousy between Elizabeth and Mary. BL Cotton MS Faustina F I, fol. 125r.

and security of the English to be conserved. And each has now been granted by the highest power'.¹² Camden presents James's succession to the thrones of both kingdoms as God's will and suggests that Mary's tragic life was ultimately vindicated by her son's triumph, as she achieved her wish through him—and he achieved it through the hereditary claims he inherited from her. Similarly, Maxwell writes that Mary's 'greatest glorie' was that she did not cry for revenge in response to her ill-treatment, 'but for Union of two warring and jarring nations.'¹³ Camden makes clear, however, that Mary wanted England and Scotland to be united under James, rather than herself; this was likely to avoid reminding readers of Mary's periodic claims to be England's rightful monarch and her involvement in plots to depose Elizabeth and put herself on the English throne. Camden also combines this with Elizabeth's wish that England remain Protestant, choosing only to invoke Mary alongside an invocation of England's previous monarch. This acknowledges that James's suitability for the English throne was not only based on his hereditary claim, but also on his Protestantism.

Mary was even invoked to undermine support for one aspect of permanent Anglo-Scottish union. When the House of Commons was debating whether England and Scotland should adopt the shared name of Great Britain on 18 April 1604, an objection was raised that concerned Mary. According to the unidentified MP, it had been twenty years 'since a great Controversy between the Papists, *English*, and *Scottish*', over Mary's title; should she be called 'Queen of *Scotland, England, France, and Ireland*', with Scotland taking precedence over England? John Lesley, Bishop of Ross, 'to make an End of it, would have it, Queen of *Great Brittain*', which the Scots were 'well content' with.¹⁴ It is unclear what this is based on.¹⁵ The

¹² Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha*, p. 460; Camden, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth*, Book 3, p. 208. Interestingly, this entire paragraph is a later addition to the manuscript draft, not appearing in the original text. BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fols 163r (original text), 174r (later addition). In the manuscript draft, the sentence about divine providence was originally written at the end of the epitaph for Mary, but it was later decided to move the sentence earlier and expand upon it. BL Cotton MS Faustina F X, fol. 173v.

¹³ BL Royal MS 18 A LI, fol. 5r.

¹⁴ *The Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2d 1628. In the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First* (London, 1742), p. 177.

¹⁵ Lesley does not appear to have suggested that Mary adopt this title. In his succession treatise, Lesley had stated that if Mary succeeded to the English throne, 'Then shall we moste fortunateli see, and moste gloriouslie enjoye a perfecte and entire monarchie of this Ile of Britanie or Albion

MP took issue with the title for national and religious reasons: it was proposed by a Scottish Catholic (Lesley), and accepted by both Catholics and Scots. If Mary's reputation had been positive, this example could have been invoked as a historic precedent in support of adopting the name Great Britain; instead, it was used to show why English, Protestant MPs should oppose it, given its associations with Catholicism and the Scots.¹⁶ The speaker reminded his fellow MPs that Catholics had claimed Mary was England's rightful monarch during Elizabeth I's lifetime, which was connected to Catholic plots to depose Elizabeth and put Mary on the English throne. This MP felt that associating Mary with an aspect of permanent union would undermine support for it due to the confessional and national identities of Mary and her supporters.

William Camden and James Maxwell were exceptional in their decision to invoke Mary not only to defend Anglo-Scottish union, but also as a supporter of it.¹⁷ Camden's *Annales* was an official commission intended to support James's status

united and incorporated after a moste marvelous sorte, and in the worthe and excellent person of a Prince mete and capable of suche a monarchie.' John Lesley, *A Defence of the Honour of ... Marie Quene of Scotlande ... with a Declaration Aswell of Her Right, Title & Interesse to the Succession of the Crowne of Englande* ([Paris], 1569; *STC* 15504), Book 3, 147v; John Lesley, *A Treatise Concerning the Defence of the Honour of ... Marie Queene of Scotland ... with a Declaration, As Well of Her Right, Title, and Interest, to the Succession of the Crowne of England* (Liège, 1571; *STC* 15506), Book 3, 29v. The 1584 edition phrased it differently, but conveys the same sentiment. Lesley, *Treatise Towching*, 70v. The 1584 edition also included the following rhyme on the title page: 'All Britain Yle (dissentions over past) / In peace & faith, will growe to one at last.' John Lesley, *A Treatise Towching the Right, Title, and Interest of the Most Excellent Princesse Marie, Queene of Scotland, And of the Most Noble King James, Her Graces Sonne, to the Succession of the Crowne of England* (Rouen, 1584; *STC* 15507), title page.

¹⁶ Galloway and Levack mention this example, but assume it was being used as a positive precedent for adopting the name Great Britain. The context of the example shows that it was being used to oppose the adoption of the name. It is also listed under 'contra', i.e. arguments against union. Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland*, p. 35; Galloway and Levack, 'Introduction', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. Galloway and Levack, p. xxxi.

¹⁷ In his union treatise, David Hume of Godscroft addresses his English readership: 'If in thanks to him [James] he then asks that you wish for this people [the Scots] to be united with yourselves, can you refuse? Refuse to be united with this nurse, this mother who bore him, raised him, educated him, to whom he owes himself, to whom you owe him born such as he is, him brought up and him preserved, to whom you owe yourselves and this state of things so much to be desired?' David Hume of Godscroft, *The British Union: A Critical Edition and Translation of David Hume of Godscroft's 'De Unione Insulae Britannicae'*, ed. and trans. by Paul J. McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 101, 103. The editors and translators, Paul J. McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson, note that Paulina Kewes suggested to them 'that implicit in this comment is a very negative allusion to Mary Stewart as being his mother in only the most limited sense. Scotland and her people had become his real mother. Thereby Hume discounts blood as a source of legitimacy and, in so doing, subverts one of the central claims of James's *Basilikon Doron*.' Hume, *The British Union*, ed. by McGinnis and Williamson, p. 101n.58. Unlike Maxwell, however, this reference is not overt.

as hereditary monarch of both England and Scotland; it is understandable, therefore, that Camden would also celebrate the Union of the Crowns. By invoking Mary's wish that England and Scotland be united under James, Camden defended the legitimacy of the Union of the Crowns based on James's combined hereditary claims. Camden's decision to also invoke Elizabeth to celebrate James's Protestantism does, however, suggest a reason why Mary was not invoked more regularly in relation to Anglo-Scottish union—her Catholicism. As the unknown MP's speech demonstrates, the Catholicism of Mary and her supporters could even be invoked to encourage Protestants to oppose the adoption of the name Great Britain, which was presented as Catholic by association.

The examples of Barnabe Barnes and Camden also reveal the importance of nationality to invocations of Mary in relation to Anglo-Scottish union. Both writers used Mary to show that James's Scottish maternal ancestry made him a suitable monarch for Scotland, but they additionally invoked Henry, Lord Darnley, to show that James's English paternal ancestry also made him a suitable monarch for England. Consequently, these writers justified the Union of the Crowns not only based on James's combined hereditary claims but also his combined nationalities. This further demonstrates the importance of national identity to justifications of the Union of the Crowns. While official commissions downplayed Mary's Scottishness and emphasised her English ancestry to make her less objectionable to James's English subjects, the latter group clearly did not think this was sufficient and so she was invoked alongside Darnley in these defences of the Union of the Crowns. The unknown MP even invoked Mary and her Scottish supporters to persuade his English colleagues to oppose the adoption of the name Great Britain, which was presented as foreign by association.

Maxwell wanted his readers to view Mary favourably because she (according to God's will) was responsible for the Union of the Crowns, which he asserted had brought great benefits. Considering it was not generally accepted that Anglo-Scottish union in any form was beneficial, and Mary's own reputation was already controversial, it is understandable that other writers did not choose to connect the two as Camden and Maxwell did. It was more typical to invoke ancestors who

already had positive reputations, such as Henry VII, and therefore present Anglo-Scottish union in a positive light by association.

These examples further demonstrate that James's ancestors were not invoked in support of Anglo-Scottish union merely because they were the sources of his hereditary claims, but rather because of their confessional identities, national identities, and personal reputations. It took an official commission—Camden's *Annales*—to celebrate the Union of the Crowns as the result of the combined hereditary claims Mary passed down to James and the fulfilment of her own wish for Anglo-Scottish union, but unofficial works did not consider this a valuable historical precedent and follow suit. The idea of a Union of the Crowns occurring through Mary's succession to the thrones of both England and Scotland could even be presented in a threatening manner to an English, Protestant audience, due to Mary's Scottishness and Catholicism.

The Precedent of Mary's Proposed Marriage to Edward VI

There was, however, one key reason to invoke Mary, Queen of Scots, more frequently in discussions of permanent Anglo-Scottish union: a permanent union had been proposed in her lifetime that depended on her hereditary claim to the Scottish throne to legitimise it. Henry VIII and England's Lord Protector, Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, had both wanted to marry Mary to Henry's son, Edward VI; when the Scots resisted this, the English invaded Scotland to try and secure the marriage by force (known as the 'Rough Wooing'). Somerset attempted to persuade the Scots to support the marriage by circulating *An Epistle or Exhortacion, to Unite & Peace, Sent from the Lorde Protector & Others the Kynges Moste Honorable Counsaill of England To the Nobilitie, Gentlemen, and Commons, and Al Others the Inhabitauntes of the Realme of Scotlande* (1548).¹⁸ According to Marcus Merriman, Somerset 'hoped to lay before the Scots the fullest and most moderate case he could' and the *Epistle* had 'three basic elements: the exposition of the justness of the English case, an elaboration of the advantages of the union,

¹⁸ *An Epistle or Exhortacion, to Unite & Peace, Sent from the Lorde Protector & Others the Kynges Moste Honorable Counsaill of England To the Nobilitie, Gentlemen, and Commons, and Al Others the Inhabitauntes of the Realme of Scotlande* (London, 1548; STC 22268).

and a demonstration of the lack of any alternative course of action.’¹⁹ The *Epistle* was repeatedly invoked in Jacobean discussions of permanent union, but the reasons for this have yet to be fully analysed by scholars.²⁰ This section analyses these examples, demonstrating once again that it was primarily due to national concerns that James’s ancestors were invoked in the Anglo-Scottish union debates, rather than due to their significance as the source of James’s hereditary claim(s).

During the permanent Anglo-Scottish union debates, various Jacobean writers interpreted the failure to arrange a marriage between Mary, Queen of Scots, and Edward VI as evidence that God had not wanted England and Scotland to be united until James VI & I’s succession to the English throne. The most common explanation given is that God wanted both kingdoms to become Protestant before they were united.²¹ This providential interpretation encourages readers to accept the Union of the Crowns as God’s will. The problem with this interpretation was that

¹⁹ Marcus Merriman, *The Rough Wooings: Mary Queen of Scots, 1542-1551* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000), p. 274. See also: Roger A. Mason, *Kingship and the Commonwealth: Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), pp. 249-261. The invocation of the proposed marriage and Somerset’s *Epistle* to address concerns about Anglo-Scottish union had begun even before James’s succession to the English throne. Mary herself had discussed how beneficial union would be for both countries and claimed that Henry VIII had sought it in James V’s lifetime and Edward VI had sought it in her lifetime. As reported by Robert Beale to Sir Francis Walsingham, 14 November 1581, Sheffield. BL Add MS 48027, fol. 228r. John Harington’s 1602 succession treatise also acted as a union treatise. Harington explains that in Somerset’s *Epistle* ‘there ar many considerations fitly to be applyed at this present’. If Mary and Edward had married, only by having children to inherit their joint hereditary claims would they have ‘confirmed and established that desyred Conjunction,’ but if they did not have children then ‘all had been againe disunited’. In James’s person, however, ‘alreadie the two royal bloodes of both nations’ were ‘infalliblye and unseperately united’. John Harington, *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown (A.D. 1602)*, ed. by Clements R. Markham (London, 1880), pp. 15-16. This made a future Anglo-Scottish union under James more stable and durable than it would have been if Mary and Edward had married. Though writing about the succession, Harington also believed that Somerset’s *Epistle* provided a blueprint for a fair and equal union. Harington, *A Tract*, ed. by Markham, p. 19.

²⁰ For example, see: Christopher Ivic, *The Subject of Britain, 1603-25* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), pp. 32-33. Mary’s actual marriage to François II of France was also discussed as a possible precedent for Anglo-Scottish union, though that is beyond the focus of this thesis as their marriage was irrelevant to the legitimacy of the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union. For example, see: *A Discourse against the Union*, 1604. TNA 14/7, fol. 173v; John Doddridge, ‘A Brief Consideracion of the Unyon’, in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 147; John Russell, ‘A Treatise of the Happie and Blissed Unioun’, in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 126.

²¹ For example, see: Edward Ayscu, *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (London, 1607; STC 1014), A7r; Robert Fletcher, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle Shewing His Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title To All His Kingdomes* (London, 1603; STC 11086), A3r-A3v; Robert Pont, ‘Of the Union of Britayne’, in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, pp. 6-7, 30; Russell, ‘A Treatise of the Happie and Blissed Unioun’, in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 110.

Mary herself had been a Catholic and the Scottish Reformation was carried out against her authority and wishes, so she could not be personally praised for this religious development. In addition, Mary's Catholicism had been perceived as a threat to Protestantism in both Scotland and England during her lifetime. Therefore, stressing the importance of shared Protestantism as a basis for Anglo-Scottish union undermines the idea that having a shared hereditary monarch was sufficient justification, as each country's state religion—one of which had been established in defiance of the monarch—was also presented as an important factor.

The proposed marriage was also used to show the support of previous English monarchs and English and Scottish governments for permanent union.²² For example, Sir John Hayward points out that Henry VIII and 'all the chiefe Nobilitie of the realme expressly desired it, when they laboured to have a mariage knit between *Edward* and *Mary*'.²³ John Russell explains how the marriage was 'concludit and agriet to have been effectuat be consent of the Erl of Arrane, Lord Hamiltoun, Protector and governor of this kingdome for the tyme, and of the hail nobles and people of Scotland', but it was only prevented by David Beaton, a Catholic Cardinal, and the Catholic clergy.²⁴ The value attached to the proposed marriage in these examples was as evidence that previous English monarchs, particularly Henry VIII, and both English and Scottish governments had supported Anglo-Scottish union—not that Mary herself had done so.²⁵ This demonstrates the

²² For example, one MP in the House of Commons pointed out that 'In *H. VIII. E. VI.* and the late Queen's Days, this Union [was] much affected.' *The Journals of the House of Commons*, p. 177. Another, John Bond, pointed out that 'the wisdom of our Gravest Councill, in the time of *E : 6* Endeavoured, so farr as by a Battel; whenas both the Liberties were offered and all things as by his Majestie now desired, were presented to that Nation but prevented by the Suttlety of our Invious Neighbours, the French.' Robert Bowyer, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606-1607*, ed. by David Harris Willson (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), p. 195 n. 1.

²³ John Hayward, *A Treatise of Union of the Two Realmes of England and Scotland* (London, 1604; *STC* 13011), p. 55. Thornborough also claims that Henry VIII had 'his whole drift, to match his sonne Prince Edward to Queene Mary, foreseeing in his providence the inestimable benefite of uniting the two kingdomes'. John Thornborough, *A Discourse Plainely Proving the Evident Utilitie and Urgent Necessitie of the Desired Happie Union of the Two Famous Kingdomes of England and Scotland by Way of Answer to Certaine Objections Against the Same* (London, 1604; *STC* 24035), p. 22.

²⁴ Russell, 'A Treatise of the Happie and Blissed Unioun', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 110. See also: Pont, 'Of the Union of Britayne', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, pp. 6-7.

²⁵ Sir George Buck wrote that the 'foundation of this great worke hath bin layd' by many previous English kings, 'as lately by King *Henry* the eight when he mediated the mariage of his sonne the Prince of *England* with the Princesse of *Scotland* your Majesties mother'. George Buck, *Δαφνις Πολυστεφανος* [*Daphnis Polystephanos*] *An Eclog Treating of Crownes, and of Garlandes, and to*

importance of the nationality of the historical figures who were invoked in defence of Anglo-Scottish union. Implicit in these discussions, however, is the assumption that Mary's and Edward's respective hereditary claims would have legitimised the union that resulted from their marriage, so this did serve as a useful precedent for James's argument that his combined hereditary claims legitimised permanent union.

Various union treatises cite Somerset's *Epistle* to show that Somerset and the English government had proposed uniting England and Scotland under 'the common name of *Britaine*', giving the name historical legitimacy.²⁶ Thomas Craig explains that Edward VI was willing 'to give up the name of England ... and to adopt the name Britain as common to both people' so that 'union should not be impeded by the memory of old enmities which the names England and Scotland preserved'.²⁷ Considering that, at the time, the English had defeated the Scots in battle and occupied a great part of Scotland, how could either country reject the same proposal now?²⁸ The value of this historic example, however, had nothing to do with Mary—it was due to the proposal coming from Englishmen, once again signalling the importance of the national identity of the historical figures being invoked.

The primary value of invoking the proposed marriage of Mary, Queen of Scots, and Edward VI was to demonstrate the support of previous English monarchs, and English and Scottish governments for permanent Anglo-Scottish union—not because invoking Mary herself was considered a persuasive strategy. As Scotland's monarch, Mary's hereditary claim to the Scottish throne would have justified and

Whom of Right they Appertaine. Addressed, and Consecrated to the Kings Majestie (London, 1605; STC 3996), A3r.

²⁶ Hayward, *A Treatise of Union*, p. 55. See also: 'A Treatise about the Union of England and Scotland', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, p. 63; 'The Union of Bothe Kingdomes', undated. BL Add MS 48114, fol. 112r; Thomas Craig, *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae Tractatus* by Sir Thomas Craig, ed. and trans. by C. Sanford Terry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1909), pp. 256-257; Henry Savile, 'Historicall Collections', in *The Jacobean Union*, ed. by Galloway and Levack, pp. 207-208.

²⁷ Craig, *De Unione*, p. 392.

²⁸ Craig, *De Unione*, p. 393. Another anonymous union treatise writer concurred, writing that 'to holde that wch our state then thought convenient now to bee impossible, is impossible to bee other, then an obstinate folly and perversnisse.' 'Discourse on the Unions of Kingdoms in name, alleging precedents from ancient and modern history, and arguments in favour of the King's adopting the title of King of Great Britain', 1604. TNA SP 14/7, fol. 87r.

legitimised a permanent union resulting from her marriage to Edward VI, though this was mostly taken for granted rather than made explicit by Jacobean writers. For example, when Sir Edwin Sandys claimed that no union by marriage had ever resulted in two countries uniting under a new name, Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton ‘brought owt a President of ... Ed: ye 6th: of England by whom there was an overture of uniting ye 2 realmes by mariage and imposing this new name.’²⁹ The example of the proposed marriage was used to argue that hereditary right could legitimise permanent union, though even this was disputed; an anonymous union treatise writer argued that it would only have secured a personal union.³⁰

Mary’s Reburial in Westminster Abbey

As this chapter has already demonstrated, there was little enthusiasm among James VI & I’s subjects for invoking Mary, Queen of Scots, in defence of Anglo-Scottish union. Two of the limited examples were official commissions: William Camden’s *Annales*, discussed earlier in this chapter, and Mary’s funerary monument in Westminster Abbey. In Chapter 5, the funerary monument was analysed in relation to James’s hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones; here, it is discussed in relation to Anglo-Scottish union. Few scholars have analysed the funerary monument from this perspective.³¹ Keith M. Brown argues that James’s decision to bury his family members in Westminster Abbey ‘began the process of Anglicizing the death rituals of his dynasty ... In death, as in life, the Stewarts were becoming an English family.’³² This section, however, considers whether James’s decision to rebury his mother in Westminster Abbey was intended to transform it from an English site into an Anglo-Scottish or British site, in support of the Union of the

²⁹ ‘Particulars [by Dudley Carleton] of the conferences with the Lords, and debates in the lower House touching the Union’, 27 April 1604. TNA SP 14/7, fol. 233r.

³⁰ *A Discourse against the Union*, 1604. TNA SP 14/7, fol 173v-174r.

³¹ Peter Sherlock, for example, does not discuss the implications of burying a Scottish monarch in an English royal burial site beyond the fact it linked the Stuarts to the Tudors. Although Sherlock claims that James and his councillors intended Elizabeth and Mary’s funerary monuments to influence ‘popular and official conceptions of British history’, he does not discuss the monuments in relation to the concept of Britain or the Anglo-Scottish union debates. Peter Sherlock, ‘The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory’, *Journal of British Studies*, 46.2 (2007), p. 263.

³² Keith M. Brown, ‘The Vanishing Emperor: British Kingship and its Decline 1603-1707’, in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 73.

Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union. It demonstrates that, although Mary's reburial and funerary monument can be interpreted in this way, this meaning was not made overt and can thus be overlooked.

Prior to James's succession to the English throne, Westminster Abbey was considered an English national site as the location of the coronations and burials of many of England's monarchs (as discussed in Chapter 5).³³ Had permanent Anglo-Scottish union taken place, what purpose would Westminster Abbey have served in the new kingdom of Great Britain? Would it also be the site of British coronations and royal burials, as it was after the permanent union of 1707? Francis Bacon considered this possibility in a document discussing permanent union. Bacon argues for an equal union between England and Scotland but admits that some aspects might make it appear that Scotland had become 'an accession unto the realm of England.' This included the location of future coronations; 'if it shall be at Westminster, which is the ancient, august, and sacred place for the kings of England, [this] may seem to make an inequality.'³⁴ Bacon suggests that Westminster Abbey could become a British royal site after permanent union, though he admits that this might appear to be favouring England over Scotland. Under the Union of the Crowns, all six of James's successors had English coronations in Westminster Abbey while only two had Scottish coronations, and four were buried in Westminster Abbey, emphasising its significance for the joint monarchs of England and Scotland.³⁵

³³ For contemporaries discussing Westminster Abbey's significance as an English royal site, see: Gottfried von Bülow, 'Journey through England and Scotland Made by Lupold von Wedel in the Years 1584 and 1585', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s., 9 (1895), 232-233; Thomas Platter, *Thomas Platter's Travels in England 1599*, trans. by Clare Williams (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937), p. 178.

³⁴ Francis Bacon, 'Certain Articles or Considerations Touching the Union of the Kingdoms of England and Scotland. Collected and Dispersed for his Majesty's Better Service,' c. 1604. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, 7 vols (London, 1861-1874), III (1868), p. 225.

³⁵ Charles I had his English coronation in 1626, but only had his Scottish coronation in 1633. Charles II had his Scottish coronation in 1651 while the English monarchy was abolished, then had his English coronation in 1661 after the Restoration. James II & VII, William III & II, Mary II and Anne had English coronations but did not bother with Scottish coronations. Charles II, William III & II, Mary II and Anne were all buried in Westminster Abbey—specifically in Henry VII's Lady Chapel. For more discussion of the impact of the Union of the Crowns on coronations, see: Douglas Shaw, 'Scotland's Place in Britain's Coronation Tradition', *The Court Historian*, 9.1 (2004), 41-60.

Mary's burial in Westminster Abbey arguably transformed it from an English to an Anglo-Scottish royal burial site, reflecting the Union of the Crowns. Mary's monument uses heraldry to show her Scottish royal lineage back to the twelfth century, going beyond the ancestors necessary to demonstrate her inheritance of a hereditary claim to the English throne from Margaret Tudor. The monuments of English monarchs going back to the eleventh century were visible elsewhere in the abbey, and with the inclusion of this heraldry on Mary's monument, Scotland's monarchs over a similar period were also represented in the same space. This harmonised the two national histories in the traditional burial place of England's monarchs, arguably converting it into a shared Anglo-Scottish site that defended the legitimacy of the Union of the Crowns based on James's combined hereditary claims, which he inherited from the English and Scottish monarchs who were jointly represented in Westminster Abbey.

Mary's burial in Westminster Abbey can also be interpreted as an intentional effort to blur the lines between England and Scotland as distinct kingdom, reflecting James's desire for them to be permanently united as the single kingdom of Great Britain. The burial of Scotland's former monarch among England's former monarchs supports James's claim that the union of the two countries was 'made in my blood'—the blood of his English and Scottish predecessors, now buried alongside one another, who provided him with the senior hereditary claims to both thrones. Mary's epitaph also explains her hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones and describes James as 'monarch of Great Britain', defending the creation of Great Britain (or at least James's adoption of this title) as the result of his succession to both thrones by hereditary right.³⁶ Thus, with Mary's burial there, Westminster Abbey could also be conceived of as a British site, as she had made the creation of Great Britain possible.

The funerary monuments James commissioned for his mother and Elizabeth I can also be interpreted as defences of Anglo-Scottish union. For example, Elizabeth's monument includes the marshalled royal arms of England and Scotland, most likely

³⁶ Jodocus Crull, *The Antiquities of St. Peters, or the Abbey Church of Westminster, Containing All the Inscriptions, Epitaphs, &c. upon the Tombs and Grave-Stones* (London, 1711; ESTC T72143), p. 89.

representing the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots. James VI & I's motto, 'beati pacifici' (blessed are the peacemakers) is shown below, making clear that the peace he had secured was between England and Scotland and it had come about due to his descent from the marriage of Margaret and James IV, which provided him with his hereditary claims to both thrones.³⁷ Elizabeth and Mary's monuments both feature Tudor roses and Scottish thistles, and Mary's monument also features James's quartered arms of England and France, Ireland, and Scotland. The English arms and emblems are not limited to Elizabeth's monument and the Scottish arms and emblems to Mary's monument; this integration reflects James's desire to permanently unite England and Scotland on the basis of his combined hereditary claims, so that they would no longer be separate and distinct kingdoms.

Just as James attempted to make his court and residences Anglo-Scottish or British sites through the display of combined royal emblems (as discussed in Chapter 2), so he arguably attempted to make Westminster Abbey an Anglo-Scottish or British site through the burial of a Scottish monarch at an English royal site, and the combination of royal emblems and coats of arms. Westminster Abbey was also the chosen burial place for James's wife, Anna of Denmark, their children who predeceased them, and James himself. This further emphasised that Westminster Abbey had been transformed from an English to a British site, since the king, queen, princes, and princesses of Great Britain were buried there. James might have failed to secure permanent Anglo-Scottish union, but the Union of the Crowns persisted and the reburial of his mother in Westminster Abbey was used to defend it. The legitimacy of the Union of the Crowns depended on James's combined hereditary claims, and Westminster Abbey was an appropriate place to assert his belief that hereditary right justified and legitimised permanent union, since it was a site that demonstrated the antiquity and hereditary nature of the English monarchy—and with Mary's reburial, the Scottish monarchy as well.

³⁷ Joseph Hunter, 'Heraldry of the Monument of Queen Elizabeth, at Westminster', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 1.3 (July 1850), p. 194. Hunter assumes these are the arms of James VI & I, but that is incorrect as James's arms quartered England and France, Ireland and Scotland.

As discussed in the previous chapters, most Jacobean historians continued to discuss the histories of England and Scotland separately, which highlights how unique it was for Mary's reburial and funerary monument to visually integrate the histories of England and Scotland in Westminster Abbey. Another Jacobean visual representation of Mary further demonstrates this point. *Baziliologia, a Booke of Kings Beeing the True and Lively Effigies of All Our English Kings from the Conquest Untill this Present* (1618) is a Jacobean collection of engravings.³⁸ It appears that the original publication consisted of twenty-seven engravings: the title page; twenty-four of England's monarchs (from William the Conqueror to James VI & I); and two consorts (Anne Boleyn and Anna of Denmark).³⁹ Some owners then chose to add a contemporary engraving of Mary; H.C. Levis records that Mary was included in five of the nine copies of *Baziliologia* he studied.⁴⁰ The *Baziliologia's* title makes clear that it focuses on England's monarchs, not mentioning Scotland or Britain. Some owners, however, chose to expand this focus to include Mary, a Scottish monarch. The engraving describes Mary as 'Mother to our Sovereigne lord James of greate Brittain France & Ireland king', justifying her inclusion on dynastic grounds as James's mother. Mary was also possibly added to explain why James was also Scotland's monarch, and not just England's monarch like the other monarchs in the volume. This engraving does not, however, explain Mary's hereditary claims to the English throne, nor do owners appear to have added engravings of earlier Scottish monarchs as well. This further demonstrates that there was no widespread interest in integrating English and Scottish history to justify the Union of the Crowns, limiting it to an official commission like Mary's reburial and funerary monument.

³⁸ *Baziliologia, a Booke of Kings Beeing the True and Lively Effigies of All Our English Kings from the Conquest Untill this Present* (London, 1618; STC 13581).

³⁹ Arthur M. Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Descriptive Catalogue with Introductions, Part II: The Reign of James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), p. 115; H.C. Levis, *Baziliologia A Booke of Kings Notes on a Rare Series of Engraved Royal Portraits from William the Conqueror to James I Published under the Above Title in 1618* (New York: The Grolier Club, 1913), p. 105.

⁴⁰ Levis, *Baziliologia*, pp. 95, 108, 115, 116, 119. See also: Hind, *Engraving in England... Part II: The Reign of James I*, pp. 115, 132. Renold Elstrack (engraver) and Compton Holland (publisher), *The most excellent Princesse Mary queene of Scotland, c. 1618*, engraving on paper, 19.2 x 11.4 cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1848,0911.264. An engraving of James's father, Henry, Lord Darnley, was also included, but to a lesser extent. Darnley is described as James's father and his hereditary claim to the English throne is not explained either. Renold Elstrack (att. engraver) and George Humble (publisher), *The Pourtraicture of the right Excellent Prince Henry Lo: Darnley, Duke of Albany, c. 1618*, engraving on paper, 19 x 11.4 cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1884,0412.15.

Conclusion

Mary, Queen of Scots, was rarely invoked in defence of Jacobean Anglo-Scottish union, despite her significance for James VI & I's hereditary claims to the thrones of both England and Scotland. This was the result of multiple factors: her Catholicism, her Scottishness, and her controversial personal reputation—in particular, the memory of the threat she was thought to have posed to England's Protestants during her lifetime. As Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 have demonstrated, some of James's ancestors were invoked more regularly than others in defence of Anglo-Scottish union due to their nationalities and previous reputations; for example, Henry VII was regularly invoked to anglicise union and stress the benefits it would bring to the English people. It was not enough to simply assert that Anglo-Scottish union was the legitimate outcome of James's status as hereditary monarch of both England and Scotland—it also had to be made palatable to the English audience these works were usually addressing. Associating Mary with Anglo-Scottish union risked making it appear Catholic, Scottish, and dangerous to English Protestants.

Mary's hereditary claims were recognised by some Jacobean works as a useful defence of Anglo-Scottish union. For example, the most common reason to invoke Mary was to discuss her proposed marriage to Edward VI, and her role in that was simply to legitimise the resulting Anglo-Scottish union based on her status as Scotland's hereditary monarch—her English hereditary claim was irrelevant to those discussions. James Maxwell argued that Mary was responsible for the Union of the Crowns because she provided James with his combined English and Scottish hereditary claims, but no other unofficial work appears to have made this argument—even those writers who celebrated James's descent from Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots, for making the Union of the Crowns possible (discussed in Chapter 4) did not explicitly mention Mary, despite her being one of the ancestors in that line of descent. The two other prominent invocations of Mary's hereditary claims in defence of Anglo-Scottish union were both official commissions—Mary's funerary monument in Westminster Abbey, and William Camden's *Annales*. However, both works were more concerned with defending James's separate positions as hereditary monarch of England and Scotland than defending Anglo-Scottish union as the outcome of his dual status.

Mary's Scottish nationality was used to defend Anglo-Scottish union, though only in combination with the English nationality of James's other ancestors. The most common strategy was to assert that James embodied the nationalities of both kingdoms through his Scottish mother and English father, thereby making him a suitable ruler for the people of both kingdoms and demonstrating why they should live in harmony together. This reveals the importance of James's perceived nationality as a justification for the Union of the Crowns, rather than just his combined hereditary claims. Mary's Scottishness was not considered useful on its own, however, as both official and unofficial works did not want to present James as primarily or exclusively Scottish, and an unknown MP even stoked English opposition to the adoption of the name Great Britain by associating it with Mary and her (Catholic) Scottish supporters. Most Jacobean writers preferred to anglicise James rather than celebrate his combined nationalities, and although Mary's English ancestry was stressed in official commissions, this was not as appealing as the immediate Englishness of James's paternal descent. As such, Mary was also not useful for making Anglo-Scottish union more appealing to an English audience by anglicising it; for example, the value of invoking her proposed marriage to Edward VI was to demonstrate that English rulers had supported union, not because Mary herself had supported it.

A significant reason Mary was not invoked more regularly in defence of Anglo-Scottish union was her Catholicism. When Camden discussed Mary's support for the union of England and Scotland under James, he only did so alongside an invocation of Elizabeth I that celebrated James's succession for maintaining and protecting England's Protestant faith. This further demonstrates the importance of James's Protestantism as a justification for his succession to the English throne. Given that the Union of the Crowns was also celebrated for uniting two Protestant kingdoms, it is understandable that the Catholic Mary was not considered a useful figure to invoke. The unknown MP even encouraged his fellow MPs to oppose the adoption of the name Great Britain by claiming that Mary's Catholic supporters had approved of it, thereby tarnishing it by association.

Mary's controversial personal reputation was also a reason not to invoke her in defence of Anglo-Scottish union. When James Maxwell invoked Mary, he did so with the hope that connecting her to union would lead to her being viewed more favourably. Unfortunately for Maxwell, this was not typically how historical figures were invoked. Since there was uncertainty and disagreement about whether the Union of the Crowns and permanent union would be beneficial to James's subjects, the value of such invocations was to associate union with historical figures who already had positive reputations, thereby giving union historical legitimacy. Since Mary's reputation was not primarily positive in the Jacobean period, there was little value in invoking her to defend Anglo-Scottish union. James himself does not appear to have invoked Mary in defence of union—no doubt because he knew that there was nothing to be gained from associating his controversial mother with his beloved Anglo-Scottish union project, even if his official commissions asserted that she was the source of his combined hereditary claims and had thus played a role in making the Union of the Crowns possible.⁴¹

Mary *could* have been a useful historical figure to invoke in defence of Anglo-Scottish union. Mary herself had sought to be recognised as Elizabeth I's heir and claimed that the union of the two kingdoms under a shared monarch would benefit

⁴¹ In 1614, James did mention Mary when discussing a possible dynastic union between England and the Palatinate occurring if his female-line descendants were to succeed to the English throne. However, he only mentioned Mary to argue that it had been God's will that a dynastic union between England and Scotland occur in the person of a descendant of Henry VII, as Mary's marriage to François II of France had been childless, thereby preventing the dynastic union of Scotland and France being maintained in their descendants (and also possibly incorporating England as well, if Mary or her descendants had also succeeded to the English throne). James said this to the English Parliament to encourage them to see a dynastic union between England and the Palatinate as beneficial to England, as England would remain the more powerful partner (as he said they were in the Anglo-Scottish union), while a dynastic union with France would not guarantee England's superiority. Thus, James was not discussing Mary in relation to Anglo-Scottish union, but in relation to a possible Anglo-Palatinate union. William Cobbett (ed.), *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, from the Norman Conquest, in 1066, to the year, 1803*, 36 vols (London, 1806-1820), I (1806), pp. 1151-1152. See also: Maija Jansson (ed.), *Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988), pp. 15-16, though this version of the speech does not mention Mary. The Spanish ambassador, Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, Count of Gondomar, also witnessed and reported on the speech. Gondomar claims that James described Mary I and Mary, Queen of Scots, as 'both legitimate queens and successors to the English throne' so if they had had issue with their respective husbands 'England would have become subject to Spain or France'. However, it is highly unlikely that James described his mother as England's rightful monarch, so this is probably Gondomar's own invention. Jansson, *Proceedings in Parliament 1614*, p. 8.

them both.⁴² While it was not universally agreed that Henry VII had actively sought Anglo-Scottish union (even if he had accepted the legality of it, according to Polydore Vergil), Mary was clearly in favour of it. Camden pointed to Mary's support for the union of England and Scotland under a shared monarch; however, he asserted that Mary had wanted her son to succeed to both thrones rather than herself. This was likely because James's English subjects still remembered that Mary had claimed to be, and her Catholic supporters had recognised her as, England's rightful monarch during Elizabeth I's lifetime, with many Catholic plots revolving around putting Mary on the English throne—even if Jacobean largely removed Mary from their accounts of these plots and sought to divest her of personal blame. As such, this clearly demonstrates that Anglo-Scottish union was not simply justified as the legitimate outcome of James's combined hereditary claims; how it had been secured also had to be presented in a way that appealed to his English subjects.

⁴² For example, on one occasion Mary discussed how beneficial union would be for both countries and claimed that Henry VIII had sought it in James V's lifetime and Edward VI had sought it in her lifetime. As reported by Robert Beale to Sir Francis Walsingham, 14 November 1581, Sheffield. BL Add MS 48027, fol. 228r.

Conclusion

As this thesis has demonstrated, the Jacobeans had a much more flexible understanding of hereditary right than a rigid scholarly definition of the concept allows. Different people offered conflicting interpretations of James VI & I's succession to the English throne by hereditary right, and this was not considered controversial or contradictory. The official explanations consistently asserted that James's new position was due to the hereditary claim he inherited as the senior surviving descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York through their eldest daughter, Margaret Tudor, which maintained the Union of the Houses of Lancaster and York in his person. However, the official explanations were intentionally ambiguous about how this hereditary claim had passed down to James—whether through his maternal or paternal descent from Margaret, or both—which allowed James's subjects to interpret it as they pleased, with many preferring to rely on both, rather than choosing between them. It was acceptable for James and his subjects to disagree over the representation of his hereditary claim, so long as they all reached the conclusion that he was England's rightful monarch.

The most important factors shaping Jacobean representations of James's hereditary claim to the English throne were nationality and religion, as James's Protestant English subjects interpreted his ancestry so that he shared their own national and confessional identity. James's ancestry was represented in a way that made him a suitable monarch for England, not just to show that he had the senior hereditary claim to the English throne, which demonstrates that James's subjects did not want to defend his new position based solely on the legitimacy conveyed by hereditary right. This is most clearly demonstrated by the widespread efforts in both official and unofficial works to link James to Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, the most recent English monarch and consort James was descended from, and the emphasis unofficial works placed on James's paternal descent from Margaret Tudor (which was presented as English and, according to some, Protestant), rather than his (arguably senior but indisputably Scottish and Catholic) maternal descent from Margaret. By asserting that Henry VII and Elizabeth of York were the source of James's English hereditary claim, both official and unofficial works emphasised

dynastic continuity between James and his predecessors on the English throne by presenting him as another Tudor monarch who also embodied the Union of the Houses, rather than as the first monarch of a new, foreign dynasty. This reveals that James's hereditary claim alone was not considered sufficient to justify his succession to the English throne; he also had to be suitably English and Protestant, and so the Scottishness and Catholicism of his ancestry was downplayed or overlooked.

Many of the questions raised in the Elizabethan succession debates about how the English succession operated were not resolved by James's succession, or indeed by the justifications that followed it, as most Jacobean works were not attempting to define the nature of the English succession but simply to defend James's status as England's monarch. Most Jacobean works were thus not like Elizabethan succession treatises, as they did not continue to debate how the succession operated. Rather than respond to the former objections against the hereditary claims of James and his ancestors and risk reviving those debates, the most common strategy was to ignore them or imply that they had not been valid in the first place. For example, rather than asserting that foreigners and Catholics could succeed to the English throne and pass hereditary claims to their descendants, the common Jacobean response was to anglicise James and his ancestry rather than focusing on their foreignness, and James's own Protestantism was celebrated while the Catholicism of his ancestors was downplayed. Thus, James and the ancestors he depended on for his hereditary claim were not represented as overly foreign or Catholic, making those former objections against them irrelevant. The exact nature of the English succession was left intentionally ambiguous, and it remained open to debate whether foreigners or Catholics could succeed to the English throne—though debate was actively avoided. James, however, was presented as England's undoubted monarch regardless of the specifics of how the English succession operated.

Even those Jacobean works that did discuss the operation of the English succession more directly did not attempt to define it, but instead to defend James's hereditary claim under any possible interpretation of how the succession operated. For example, the limited number of works that directly addressed the question of

whether Mary, Queen of Scots' hereditary claim had been nullified by parliamentary legislation argued that James's own hereditary claim was valid in all possible scenarios. These works did not want to risk making James's right to the throne entirely dependent on an acceptance that the English Parliament did not have authority over the succession, as that could result in people challenging James's position by arguing the opposite. Rather than publicly discussing the validity of Mary's hereditary claim, however, the more common response in Jacobean works was to depend on James's combined maternal and paternal hereditary claims to the English throne to justify his succession, thereby implicitly suggesting that if the former hereditary claim was legally nullified, James could still depend on the latter. More generally, while the official explanations of James's succession did not acknowledge that the English Parliament had any authority over the succession, they also did not outright deny it. Therefore, it remained open to debate whether the English Parliament had authority over the succession—but again, in either case, James was presented as England's undoubted monarch.

Unofficial works frequently suggested that factors other than James's hereditary claim were also—and perhaps equally—significant to his succession. These included the speedy recognition and proclamation of his succession by the English Privy Council, Elizabeth I's (supposed) nomination of James as her successor, and James's Protestantism. These works typically suggested that while hereditary right was the *de jure* justification for James's succession to the English throne, it was not necessarily the *de facto* reason he had successfully secured it, as they reminded their readers of previous fears that Elizabeth I's death would result in a war over the succession. While the official explanations presented James's hereditary claim as indisputable and his succession to the English throne as inevitable and unchallengeable, without the need for the approval or assistance of any other body, unofficial works recognised that James's hereditary claim alone had not been enough to guarantee his succession, and so they celebrated those whom they believed had helped secure the throne for him. Even official works, however, implicitly acknowledged the possibility that conflict might have resulted from Elizabeth I's death by stressing that James not only had the senior hereditary claim to the English throne, but also embodied the Union of the Houses and thereby

guaranteed England's internal peace—an advantage that built on, but was additional to, hereditary right.

James also continued to defend the hereditary nature of the Scottish throne and his own status as Scotland's hereditary monarch after his English succession. He did this by continuing to denounce George Buchanan's arguments that Scotland was an elective monarchy and his mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, had been legitimately deposed for her tyrannous and immoral behaviour. James commissioned works that presented Mary as a virtuous victim who was not guilty of the crimes Buchanan had accused her of, while also denying that Scotland's hereditary monarchs could be legitimately deposed, regardless of their behaviour. These denunciations demonstrate that James was not willing to rely solely on his theoretical beliefs and argue that Mary could not be deposed even if she were guilty of Buchanan's worst criticisms. Mary's reputation was so controversial, and the arguments against the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy so closely tied to personal criticisms of Mary herself, that James felt he could not address one without addressing the other. This, however, implied that there was still a connection between a monarch's behaviour and whether their subjects could legally depose them, as James was unwilling to completely detach these two issues when it came to his mother. Many of James's Protestant subjects in both England and Scotland, however, preferred not to publicly discuss Mary. As a result, few were willing to publicly defend James's theoretical views about the hereditary nature of the Scottish monarchy or his revisions of Mary's reputation, leaving both subjects open to continued debate.

James's hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, and how the English and Scottish successions operated, continued to be discussed throughout his joint reign. This demonstrates that the legitimisation of a monarch's position should be understood as an ongoing process rather than a time-limited 'event' concentrated only at the start of their reign. James and his subjects continued to commission or produce works that reflected on these topics, which is evident when a variety of genres are analysed rather than focusing exclusively on succession panegyrics. Discussion of these topics was also revived at key moments: for example, when James became concerned about the eligibility of the foreign-born descendants of his daughter, Elizabeth, to succeed to the English throne if his male line failed; or

when James commissioned George Hakewill to respond to Benjamin Carier's argument that James depended entirely on Catholics for his hereditary claim to the English throne. This further demonstrates that the nature of James's hereditary claim, and of the operation of the English succession more generally, had not been conclusively resolved by James's own succession or the explanations that followed it.

Many English works preferred to focus on James's status as England's monarch rather than celebrate the Union of the Crowns. Consequently, works justifying James's English succession and works justifying the Union of the Crowns often differed over which of James's lines of descent they emphasised, as the former typically relied on both James's maternal *and* paternal hereditary claims to the English throne, while the latter focused on his maternal descent for combining hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones. This demonstrates that artists and writers interpreted James's hereditary claims in different ways, depending on what it was they wished to legitimise. For example, some of James's subjects celebrated the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV, King of Scots, for making the Union of the Crowns possible by combining English and Scottish hereditary claims in James's maternal line; however, they did this to assert that James's joint rule of England and Scotland had resulted in the union (or reunion) of 'Britain', with England and Scotland subsumed into a single state, and James's subjects no longer English or Scottish, but British. Opposition to that subsummation may explain why many of James's English subjects opted to justify his succession to the English throne based on both his maternal and paternal hereditary claims, rather than relying solely on James's Scottish maternal descent, which, on its own, suggested the loss of English nationhood and identity.

Most Jacobean did not believe that it was sufficient to argue that the Union of the Crowns was the natural and legitimate outcome of James's combined hereditary claims—even official works did not rely solely on this argument. Instead, the Union of the Crowns was presented to James's English subjects as a continuation and preservation of their own national history, identity, and monarchy, which would benefit them—the same strategy that was adopted to justify James's succession to the English throne. For example, James VI & I himself, alongside official and

unofficial works, paralleled Henry VII and Elizabeth of York's Union of the Houses with the Union of the Crowns to give the latter historical precedent by linking it with an established feature of England's national historical narrative. Henry VII was widely celebrated for declaring that the Union of the Crowns would not only be the legitimate outcome of his daughter's descendants succeeding to the English throne, but also would not be damaging to England or result in England becoming subordinate to Scotland. James, the Jacobean regime, and James's subjects all anglicised the Union of the Crowns to make it appealing to the English people, rather than simply relying on hereditary right as a sufficient justification. This demonstrates the importance of nationality not only to defences of James's succession to the English throne, but also the Union of the Crowns that resulted from it.

James's ancestors were invoked in defence of both the Union of the Crowns and permanent Anglo-Scottish union due to their significance as the sources of his hereditary claims, and to argue that hereditary right justified and legitimised Anglo-Scottish union. The number of invocations per ancestors was, however, markedly disproportionate, and this reflected the English audience that these works were typically addressing. For example, the widespread invocation of Henry VII to defend Anglo-Scottish union was due not only to Henry being the source of James's hereditary claim to the English throne, but also because Henry was an English monarch with a positive posthumous reputation among James's English subjects. James's Scottish ancestors, meanwhile, were largely avoided because they were foreign, Catholic, and had mixed to negative reputations in England—regardless of their significance as the sources of James's hereditary claims. When James's Scottish ancestors were invoked, it was usually to show that historical *English* figures had supported union in their lifetimes—for example, Henry VIII himself and Edward VI's regency governments seeking a marriage alliance with Mary, Queen of Scots, to secure permanent Anglo-Scottish union. This further demonstrates the importance of nationality to Jacobean justifications of Anglo-Scottish union.

James's subjects were divided over his argument that his combined hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones necessitated and legitimised permanent

Anglo-Scottish union. Given that many of James's English subjects interpreted his hereditary claim in a way that anglicised him, it is understandable that they did not support the loss of their English national identity as the result of that same hereditary claim. James's subjects did take the initiative in adopting Polydore Vergil's story about Henry VII as a defence of permanent union; however, the story was valued because it was an Anglo-centric interpretation of what form permanent union should take, which preserved England's nationhood and national identity to the disadvantage of Scotland. This vision of permanent union was more likely to appeal to James's English subjects. Additionally, an acceptance of the theoretical legitimacy of permanent union did not clarify what form it should take, at which point national concerns took priority. James's English subjects were willing to use hereditary right to defend James's succession to the English throne, but not necessarily to defend permanent union—their interpretation of hereditary right and what it could achieve depended on how acceptable they found the project it was intended to legitimise.

Silence was an important strategy used by many of James's subjects to avoid coming into conflict with James's interpretation of the lives and legacies of his ancestors—in particular, Mary, Queen of Scots. While James's subjects enthusiastically embraced the idea that James had succeeded to the English throne by the hereditary claim he inherited from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, following the example of the official proclamation of James's succession, they chose not to adopt the narrative of Mary's life that James promoted. Mary was largely consigned to oblivion, neither criticised nor defended. Although this self-censorship was certainly more welcome than continued attacks, their silence can also be interpreted as a form of resistance to James's wishes.

The reputations of James VI & I's ancestors changed because of their invocations to justify James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Anglo-Scottish union based on hereditary right. The marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York was still widely celebrated as the Union of the Houses that had secured England's internal peace after the Wars of the Roses, a peace that was embodied in their descendants. However, James was associated with their marriage in both official and unofficial works to assert continuity with his English predecessors, and to argue

that his succession guaranteed that England would not be plunged into dynastic warfare. Some Jacobean began to challenge the Tudor origin myth by arguing that Elizabeth of York had a superior hereditary claim to Henry VII, but they still celebrated the Union of the Houses and its embodiment by James VI & I.

A major change in the Jacobean period was the widespread connection made between the Union of the Houses and the Union of the Crowns. The latter was presented as an extension of, and improvement on, the former, with the Union of the Houses no longer being presented as an end in itself. Polydore Vergil's story was used to make Henry VII an advocate for, or prophet of, James VI & I's succession to the English throne and the resulting Anglo-Scottish union. The story's widespread utilisation in Elizabethan succession treatises, Jacobean union treatises, and Jacobean histories dramatically altered Henry's reputation by linking him to Anglo-Scottish union as he had not been before.

Margaret Tudor became vastly more significant in the Jacobean period, as she was celebrated as the source of the hereditary claim(s) on which James justified his succession to the English throne. For example, James's descent from Margaret was clearly and intentionally explained in English histories for the first time. James's English subjects emphasised his double descent from Margaret as the combined sources of his hereditary claim to the English throne. Consequently, Margaret's marriages to both James IV, King of Scots, and Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus, were celebrated, while the legality of the latter was no longer questioned as it had been during the Elizabethan succession debates. This was to avoid the revival of debates over the legality of their daughter, Lady Margaret Douglas, and whether Douglas was capable of passing a hereditary claim to her descendants—including her grandson, James VI & I. James's father, Henry, Lord Darnley, became much more significant in the Jacobean period as James's subjects used him to assert that James had an English lineage that could be traced back to Margaret Tudor, allowing them to claim that James himself, and one of his hereditary claims to the English throne, was English.

Margaret Tudor's marriage to James IV, however, was usually invoked to celebrate not only James VI & I's succession to the English throne, but also the resulting

Union of the Crowns. Margaret and James IV's marriage was credited with making the union (or reunion) of 'Britain' possible, though this was largely limited to works created near the start of James's joint reign, as they took inspiration from the official union proclamation. Once it became apparent that James VI & I's status as combined hereditary monarch of England and Scotland had not automatically resulted in the two kingdoms being permanently united, Margaret and James IV's marriage was not as widely celebrated, with most works focusing primarily on Henry VII's role in arranging it.

James IV and James V still had divided legacies, as they had in the sixteenth century. Scottish works downplayed their conflict with England and celebrated their dynastic importance for James VI & I's combined hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, to make these historical figures more palatable to an English audience. However, there was less consensus about them in English works. While some focused on their significance as vessels for James VI & I's hereditary claims, the widespread emphasis placed on James's paternal ancestry reflected a desire among the English for their monarch to share their own national identity and not depend entirely on Scotland's former monarchs as the source of his hereditary claim to the English throne. James IV and James V were not considered valuable figures to invoke in defence of Anglo-Scottish union, and William Martyn expressed unconcealed hostility towards them and the Scottish people while choosing not to acknowledge their dynastic importance to James VI & I.

James VI & I's official commissions attempted to revise the previously negative reputation of his mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, but his efforts were not successful in his own lifetime. James wished to celebrate Mary's dynastic importance as the source of his hereditary claims to the English and Scottish thrones, while downplaying her Catholicism and denying that she was an adulterous, murderer, and tyrant. James also wanted to refute that Mary's abdication in Scotland was a legitimate deposition, and that her execution had been legal. However, James failed to secure a consensus among his Catholic and Protestant subjects over their representation of Mary. While many Protestants were willing to remove Mary from their narratives of Catholic plots against Elizabeth I, Catholics continued to represent Mary as a martyr and adapted James's commissions for their own

confessional ends. While Protestants were not openly critical of Mary, their silence demonstrates that they were unwilling to adopt James's interpretation of her life and legacy. As with James's other Scottish ancestors, there was thought to be little benefit to invoking Mary in defence of Anglo-Scottish union, and on one occasion she was even invoked to oppose the adoption of the name Great Britain.

James VI & I's succession to the English throne did not result in the creation of a new Anglo-Scottish or British history to defend his status as hereditary monarch of both kingdoms and the Union of the Crowns that resulted from it, even though some writers claimed that they would write such a history.¹ England and Scotland's national historical narratives remained largely separate. Even the widespread insertion of Polydore Vergil's story about Henry VII into English histories was merely an example of James's eventual succession and the resulting Union of the Crowns being integrated into England's pre-existing national historical narrative. Most English writers prioritised their own sense of national identity over any other consideration when it came to the representation of James VI & I's ancestors—including when they sought to explain and justify James's succession to the English throne and the resulting Anglo-Scottish union through hereditary right.

The 2018 film, *Mary Queen of Scots*, ends with the title character breaking the fourth wall and addressing her son, James VI, as she stands before, kneels beside, and leans over the block on which she will be executed. She says:

James, my only son, I pray that with your life you will succeed where I could not, and for which I am about to give my life. In my end is my beginning. I shall be watching you from heaven as your crown one day unites two kingdoms, and we shall have peace.

¹ For example, see: Francis Bacon to Thomas Egerton, Baron Ellesmere, 2 April 1605. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, 7 vols (London, 1861-1874), III (1868), pp. 249-252; Thomas Craig, *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae Tractatus by Sir Thomas Craig*, ed. and trans. by C. Sanford Terry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1909), pp. 200, 468; John Lewis, 'Proposals to James I by John Lewis [of Llynwene] a barrister formerly practising in the Marches Court, for a history of Britain in ten books', c. 1604-1606. BL Royal MS 18 A XXXVII.

This is intercut with a scene of James approaching and sitting on a throne that Elizabeth I occupied earlier in the film, visually representing his eventual succession to the English throne. The word ‘succeed’ has a double meaning in this quote; Mary prays that James will be successful by succeeding to the English throne.² Over the last century, this narrative has been used in numerous films to give Mary’s life story a (admittedly posthumous) happy ending: the Union of the Crowns was made possible by the English and Scottish hereditary claims that James inherited from his mother, and although Mary herself suffered a tragic demise, she ultimately triumphed through her son’s glory. The origins of this narrative can be traced back to the Jacobean period, when James VI & I commissioned works to celebrate his mother as the source of his combined hereditary claims. Although James failed to persuade many of his contemporaries to accept this interpretation of his mother’s legacy, he would undoubtedly be thrilled to see that his project of rehabilitation had ultimately succeeded—albeit in unexpected ways.

² *Mary Queen of Scots*, dir. by Josie Rourke, screenplay by Beau Willimon (Focus Features and Universal Pictures, 2018). I thank Aidan Norrie for pointing out the double meaning of the word ‘succeed’ in this quote.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris

MS Dupuy 632

MS Dupuy 836

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS. Don. C.43

MS Lat misc a.I

MS Smith 76

British Library, London

Add MS 17970

Add MS 22925

Add MS 32092

Add MS 36294

Add MS 48027

Add MS 48114

Add MS 48343

Add MS 57336

Add MS 59741

Cotton MS Caligula B V

Cotton MS Caligula C VIII

Cotton MS Caligula C IX

Cotton MS Faustina F I

Cotton MS Faustina F IV

Cotton MS Faustina F X

Cotton MS Titus A XIII

Cotton MS Titus C VI

Cotton MS Titus C VII

Harley MS 371

Harley MS 1314

Royal MS 18 A XXXVII

Royal MS 18 A LI

Royal MS 18 A LXXII

Sloane MS 3199

Stowe MS 158

The Cecil Papers, Hatfield House Archives

MS CP 117/149

MS CP 122/149

MS CP 140/138

MS CP 153/97

MS CP 192/131

MS CP 192/137

MS CP Petitions 1986

College of Arms, London

Num. Sch. 18/18

Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.

MS V.b.232

Lambeth Palace Library, London

MS 4769

The National Archives, Kew

SP 12/23

SP 12/28

SP 12/45

SP 14/1

SP 14/6

SP 14/7

SP 14/71

SP 14/92

SP 45/20

SP 52/8

SP 52/14

SP 78/53

SP 99/1

Wren Library, Trinity College, University of Cambridge

MS R.5.20

Primary Sources

A New Song to the Great Comfort and Rejoycing of All True English Harts, at our Most Gracious King JAMES his Proclamation, Upon the 24. of March Last Past in the Cittie of London. To the Tune of Englands Pride is Gone (Edinburgh, 1603; STC 14426.7)

Adams, G.B., and H. Morse Stephens, ed., *Selected Documents of English Constitutional History* (London: Macmillan, 1901)

Adamson, John, ed., *TA TΩN MOYΣΩΝ EΙΣΟΔΙΑ: The Muses Welcome to the High and Mightie Prince James... At His Majesties Happie Returne to His Old and Native Kingdome of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1618; STC 140)

Adamson, John, ed., *TA TΩN ΜΟΥΣΩΝ ΕΖΟΔΙΑ: Planctus, & Vota Musarum in Augustissimi Monarchæ Jacobi, Magnæ Britannia, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ Regis, &c.* (Edinburgh, 1618; STC 142)

Akrigg, G.P.V. ed., *Letters of King James VI & I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984)

An Excellent New Ballad, Shewing the Petigree of our Royall King James the First of that Name in England. To the Tune of, Gallants All Come Mourne with Mee (London, 1603; STC 14423)

Anno xxvii. Reginae Elizabethæ. At the Parliament Begunne and Holden at Westminster, the xxiii. Day of November, in the xxvii. Yeere of the Reigne of Our Most Gracious Sovereigne Lady Elizabeth... and There Continued, Untill the xxix, of March Following (London, 1585; STC 9485.7)

Atkinson, E.G., ed., *Acts of the Privy Council of England. 1615-1616* (London: HMSO, 1925)

Ayscu, Edward, *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (London, 1607; STC 1014)

Bacon, Francis, *A Briefe Discourse, Touching the Happie Union of the Kingdomes of England, and Scotland* (London, 1603; STC 1117)

Bacon, Francis, *The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall* (London, 1625; STC 1147)

Bacon, Francis, *The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (London, 1622; STC 1159)

Bacon, Francis, *The Twoo Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the Proficience and Advancement of Learning, Divine and Humane* (London, 1605; STC 1164)

Barnes, Barnabe, *Foure Bookes of Offices Enabling Privat Persons for the Speciall Service of all Good Princes and Policies* (London, 1606; STC 1468)

Baziliologia, a Booke of Kings Beeing the True and Lively Effigies of All Our English Kings from the Conquest Untill this Present (London, 1618; STC 13581)

Bellany, Alastair, and Andrew McRae, eds., *Early Stuart Libels* <<http://www.earlystuartlibels.net/htdocs/index.html>> [accessed 12 July 2021]

Birrel, Robert, 'The Diarey of Robert Birrel, Burges of Edinburgh', in *Fragments of Scottish History* (Edinburgh, 1798)

Botley, Paul, and Máté Vince, eds, *The Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon in England, 1610-14*, 4 vols (Geneva: Droz, 2018)

Bowyer, Robert, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606-1607*, ed. by David Harris Willson (New York: Octagon Books, 1971)

A Briefe Chronicle, of All the Kings of Scotland, Since it was First Inhabited, Untill this Present Yeare 1623 (Aberdeen, 1625; STC 22007)

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

Broughton, Richard, *A Just and Moderate Answer to a Most Injurious, and Slaunderous Pamphlet, Intituled, An Exact Discovery of Romish Doctrine in Case of Conspiracie and Rebellion. Wherein the Innocency of Catholike Religion is Proved, and Every Objection Returned Upon the Protestant Accuser, and his Owne Profession* (England, 1606; STC 18188)

Brown, Keith M., et. al., ed., *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707* (St Andrews, 2007-2021) <<https://www.rps.ac.uk/>>

Bruce, John, ed., *Correspondence of King James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1861)

Buchanan, George, *Ane Detectioun of the Duinges of Marie Quene of Scottes* (London, 1571; STC 3981)

Buchanan, George, *Ane Detectioun of the Doingis of Marie Quene of Scottis* (St Andrews, 1572; STC 3982)

Buchanan, George, *The History of Scotland*, trans. by James Aikman, 4 vols (Glasgow, 1827)

Buchanan, George, *De Jure Regni Apud Scotos* (Edinburgh, 1579; STC 3973)

Buchanan, George, *Rerum Scoticarum Historia* (Edinburgh, 1582; STC 3991)

Buchanan, George, and Thomas Wilson (att.), *De Maria Scotorum Regina, totaque eius contra Regem coniuratione, fodo cum Bothuelio adulterio, nefaria in maritum crudelitate & rabie, horrendo insuper & deterrimo eiusdem parricidio: plena & tragica planè historia* (London, 1571; STC 3978)

Buck, George, *Δαφνις Πολυστεφανος [Daphnis Polystephanos] An Eclog Treating of Crownes, and of Garlandes, and to Whom of Right they Appertaine. Addressed, and Consecrated to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1605; STC 3996)

von Bülow, Gottfried, 'Journey through England and Scotland Made by Lupold von Wedel in the Years 1584 and 1585', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s., 9 (1895), 223-270

Burton, John Hill, and David Masson, eds, *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, 14 vols (Edinburgh, 1877-1898)

By the Queene. A true Copie of the Proclamation lately published by the Queenes Maiestie vnder the great Seale of England, for the declaring of the Sentence, lately giuen against the Queene of Scottes, in fourme as followeth (London, 1586; STC 8160)

Calderwood, David, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. by Thomas Thomson, 8 vols (Edinburgh, 1842-1849)

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, ed. by Horatio F. Brown, Rawdon Brown, G. Cavendish Bentinck, and Allen B. Hinds, 38 vols (London: HMSO, 1864-1947)

Camden, William, *Annales des Choses qui se Sont Passees en Angleterre et Irlande Soubz le Regne de Elizabeth: Jusques a l'an de Salut M.D.LXXXIX. Traduites en langue françoise par P. de Bellegent Poictevin. A.A.P.D.P. du Latin de Guillaume Camden autheur*, trans. by Paul de Bellegent (London, 1624; STC 4502)

Camden, William, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha, Ad Annum Salutis M.D. LXXXIX.* (London, 1615; STC 4496)

Camden, William, *Annales: The True and Royall History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth Queene of England, France and Ireland &c.*, trans. by Abraham Darcie (London, 1625; STC 4497)

Camden, William, *Britain, or a Chorographicall Description of the Most Flourishing Kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Ilands Adjoyning*, trans. by Philemon Holland (London, 1610; STC 4509)

Camden, William, *Remaines, Concerning Britaine: But Especially England, and the Inhabitants Thereof* (London, 1614; STC 4522)

Camden, William, and William Strangvage, *The Historie of the Life and Death of Mary Stuart Queene of Scotland* (London, 1624; STC 24508.7)

Carier, Benjamin, *A Treatise, Written by M. Doctor Carier, Wherein Hee Layeth Downe Sundry Learned and Pithy Considerations, By Which He Was Moved, To Forsake the Protestant Congregation, and to Betake Himselfe to the Catholicke Apostolike Roman Church* (Brussels, 1614; STC 4623)

de Carvajal y Mendoza, Luisa, *The Letters of Luisa de Carvajal y Mendoza*, ed. by Glyn Redworth, trans. by David McGrath and Glyn Redworth, 2 vols (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012)

Certaine Matters Composed Together (Edinburgh, 1594; STC 18016)

Cobbet, William, T.B. Howell, T.J. Howell, and D. Jardine, eds, *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Present Time*, 34 vols (London, 1809-1828)

Cobbett, William, ed., *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, from the Norman Conquest, in 1066, to the year, 1803*, 36 vols (London, 1806-1820)

Cockburn, J.S., ed., *Calendar of Assize Records: Essex Indictments, James I* (London: HMSO, 1982)

Cockburn, J.S., ed., *Calendar of Assize Records: Sussex Indictments, James I* (London: HMSO, 1975)

Colleton, John, *A Supplication to the Kings Most Excellent Majestie* (London, 1604; STC 14432)

Collier, J. Payne, ed., *The Egerton Papers. A Collection of Public and Private Documents, Chiefly Illustrative of the Times of Elizabeth and James I, from the Original Manuscripts, the Property of the Right Hon. Lord Francis Egerton, M.P.* (London, 1840)

Colville, John, *The Palinod of John Colvill wherein he doth Penitently Recant his Former Proud Offences, Specially that Treasonable Discourse Lately Made by him Against the Undoubted and Indeniable Title of his Dread Sovereigne Lord, King James the Sixt, Unto the Crowne of England, after Decease of her Maiesty Present* (Edinburgh, 1600; STC 5587)

The Copie of a Leter, Wryten by a Master of Arte of Cambrige, to his Friend in London ([Paris], 1584; STC 5742.9)

Cowper, William, *Tvvo sermons preached in Scotland before the Kings Maiesty the one, in his chappell royall of Holy-Roode-house at his Highnesse comming in: the other, in the church of Drumfreis at his Highnesse going out* (London, 1618; STC 5944)

Craig, Thomas, *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae Tractatus* by Sir Thomas Craig, ed. and trans. by C. Sanford Terry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1909)

Craig, Thomas, *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England, in Two Books*, ed. and trans. by James Gadderar (London, 1703; ESTC T144321)

Crull, Jodocus, *The Antiquities of St. Peters, or the Abbey Church of Westminster, Containing All the Inscriptions, Epitaphs, &c. upon the Tombs and Grave-Stones* (London, 1711; ESTC T72143)

Daniel, Samuel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1603; STC 6258)

Dekker, Thomas, *The Double PP* (London, 1606; STC 6498)

Devon, Frederick, ed., *Issues of the Exchequer; Being Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue During the Reign of King James I* (London, 1836)

Drayton, Michael, *To the Majestie of King James. A Gratulatorie Poem* (London, 1603; STC 7231)

Ellis, Henry, ed., *Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1843)

Englands Wedding Garment. Or a Preparation to King James his Royall Coronation (London, 1603; STC 14421)

An Epistle or Exhortacion, to Unite & Peace, Sent from the Lorde Protector & Others the Kynges Moste Honorable Counsaill of England To the Nobilitie, Gentlemen, and Commons, and Al Others the Inhabitauntes of the Realme of Scotlande (London, 1548; STC 22268)

Fisher, F.J., ed., 'The State of England Anno. Dom. 1600 by Thomas Wilson', *Camden Miscellany*, third series, 52 (London: Camden Society, 1936)

Fletcher, Robert, *A Briefe and Familiar Epistle Shewing His Majesties Most Lawfull, Honourable and Just Title To All His Kingdomes* (London, 1603; STC 11086)

Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to call to his mercy out of this transitory life our soveraigne lady, the high and mighty prince, Elizabeth late Queene of England, France, and Ireland, by whose death and dissolution, the imperiall crowne of these realmes aforesaid are now absolutely, wholly, and solely come to the high and mighty prince, James the Sixt, King of Scotland... (London, 1603; STC 8298)

Fuller, Thomas, *The History of the Worthies of England* (London, 1662; Wing F2440)

Gainsford, Thomas, *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittain* (London, 1610; STC 11526)

Galloway, Bruce R., and Brian P. Levack, eds, *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1985)

Godwin, Francis, *Rerum Anglicarum Henrico VIII. Edwardo VI. et Maria Regnantibus, Annales* ([London], 1616; STC 11945)

Gordon, John, *England and Scotlands Happinesse in Being Reduced to Unitie of Religion* (London, 1604; STC 12062.3)

Gordon, John, *A Panegyrique of Congratulation for the Concord of the Realmes of Great Brittain in Unitie of Religion, and Under One King* (London, 1603; STC 12061)

Graves, Peter, trans., 'The Danish Account of the Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark', in David Stevenson, *Scotland's Last Royal Wedding: The Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1997), pp. 79-122

Greg, W.W., ed., *A Companion to Arber: Being a Calendar of Documents in Edward Arber's Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640 with text and calendar of supplementary documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)

Hakewill, George, *An Answer to a Treatise Written by Dr. Carier, By Way of a Letter to his Majestie Wherein he Layeth Downe Sundry Politike Considerations; by which hee Pretendeth Himselfe was Moved, and Endevoureth to Move Others to be Reconciled to the Church of Rome, and Imbrace that Religion, Which he Calleth Catholike* (London, 1616; STC 12610)

Hales, John, 'A Declaration of the Succession of the Crown Imperiall of England', in George Harbin, *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted; the History of the Succession since the Conquest clear'd* (London, 1713), pp. xx-xlii

Harington, John, *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown (A.D. 1602)*, ed. by Clements R. Markham (London, 1880)

Harry, George Owen, *The Genealogy of the High and Mighty Monarch, James, by the Grace of God, King of Great Brittain, &c.* (London, 1604; STC 12872)

Hartley, T.E., ed., *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I, Volume I 1558-1581* (London: Leicester University Press, 1981)

Hartley, T.E., ed., *Proceedings in the Parliament of Elizabeth I, Volume II 1584-1589* (London: Leicester University Press, 1995)

Hay, Denys, ed. and trans., *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A.D. 1485-1537* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1950)

Hayward, John, *An Answer to the First Part of A Certaine Conference, Concerning Succession, Published Not Long Since Under the Name of R. Dolman* (London, 1603; STC 12988)

Hayward, John, *Annales of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. by John Bruce (London, 1840)

Hayward, John, *The Lives of the III. Normans, Kings of England* (London, 1613; STC 13000)

Hayward, John, *A Treatise of Union of the Two Realmes of England and Scotland* (London, 1604; STC 13011)

Hayward, John, *Gods Universal Right Proclaimed. A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse, the 27 of March 1603. Being the Next Sunday After Her Majesties Departure* (London, 1603; STC 12984)

Herbert, William, *A Prophetie of Cadwallader, last King of the Britaines* (London, 1604; STC 12752)

Holinshed, Raphael, *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande and Ireland* (London, 1577; STC 13568.5)

Hume of Godscroft, David, *The British Union: A Critical Edition and Translation of David Hume of Godscroft's 'De Unione Insulae Britannicae'*, ed. and trans. by Paul J. McGinnis and Arthur H. Williamson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)

I.F., *King James his welcome to London. With Elizaes Tombe and Epitaph, and our Kings Triumph and Epitimie* (London, 1603; STC 10798)

Imrie, John, and John G. Dunbar, eds, *Accounts of the Masters of Works for Building and Repairing Royal Palaces and Castles, Volume 2: 1616-1649* (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1982)

James VI & I, *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1609; STC 14401.5)

James VI & I, *Βασιλικὸν Δῶρον [Basilikon Doron]* (Edinburgh, 1599; STC 14348)

James VI & I, *By the King. Forasmuch as the Kings Majestie, in his Princely Disposition to Justice...* (London, 1603; STC 8314)

James VI & I, *By the King Whereas Wee Have Ever Since It Pleas'd God To Establish Us In the Imperiall Crowne of Great Britaine, Equally Regarded the Good of Both the Late Kingdomes of Scotland and England...* (London, 1605; STC 8377)

James VI & I, *His Majesties Speech in the Starre-Chamber, the XX. of June. Anno 1616* (London, 1616; STC 14397)

James VI & I, *His Majesties Speech to both the Houses of Parliament, in his Highnesse Great Chamber at Whitehall, the day of the Adjournement of the Last Session, which was the Last Day of March 1607* (London, 1607; STC 14395)

James VI & I, *The Kings Majesties Speech, as it was Delivered by him in the Upper House of the Parliament, to the Lords Spirituall and Temporall, and to the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there Assembled, On Munday the 19. day of March 1603. Being the First Day of this Present Parliament, and the First Parliament of his Majesties Raigne* (London, 1604; STC 14390)

James VI & I, *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (Edinburgh, 1598; STC 14409)

Jansson, Maija, ed., *Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988)

Johnston, John, *A Trewe Description of the Nobill Race of the Stewards Succedinge Lineallie to the Croun of Scotland unto this Day: and Now this Yeir 1603. unto the Croun of England* (Amsterdam, 1603; STC 14787.4)

The Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2d 1628. In the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First (London, 1742)

Journals of the House of Lords Beginning Anno Vicesimo Elizabethæ Reginae,
volume 2 (n.d.)

Larkin, James F., and Paul L. Hughes, eds, *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973)

The Lawes and Actes of Parliament Maid Be King James the First, And His Successours Kinges of Scotland: Uisied, Collected and Extracted Furth of the Register (Edinburgh, 1597; STC 21877)

Leigh, William, *Great Britaines, Great Deliverance, from the Great Danger of Popish Powder* (London, 1606; STC 15425)

Lesley, John, *A Defence of the Honour of... Marie Quene of Scotlande... with a Declaration Aswell of Her Right, Title & Intereste to the Succession of the Crowne of Englande* ([Paris], 1569; STC 15504)

Lesley, John, *The Historie of Scotland*, trans. by James Dalrymple, ed. by E.G. Cody and William Murison, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1888-1895)

Lesley, John, *The History of Scotland, from the death of King James I. in the Year M.CCC.XXXVI, to the Year M.D.LXI.*, ed. by T. Thomas (Edinburgh, 1830)

Lesley, John, *De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum Libri Decem* (Rome, 1578)

Lesley, John, *A Treatise Concerning the Defence of the Honour of... Marie Queene of Scotland... with a Declaration, As Well of Her Right, Title, and Interest, to the Succession of the Crowne of England* (Liège, 1571; STC 15506)

Lesley, John, *A Treatise Towching the Right, Title, and Interest of the Most Excellent Princesse Marie, Queene of Scotland, And of the Most Noble King James, Her Graces Sonne, to the Succession of the Crowne of England* (Rouen, 1584; STC 15507)

The Letters of John Chamberlain, ed. by Norman Egbert McClure, 2 vols (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939)

The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon, ed. by James Spedding, 7 vols (London, 1861-1874)

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed. by J.S. Brewer, R.H. Brodie, and James Gairdner, 21 vols (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, and HMSO, 1862-1910)

Lewis, John, *The History of Great Britain, From the First Inhabitants Thereof, 'Till the Death of Cadwalader, Last King of the Britains; and of the Kings of Scotland to Eugene V* (London, 1729; ESTC T113293)

Lindsay, Robert, *The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland*, ed. by Æ.J.G. Mackay, 3 vols (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1899-1911)

Maidment, James, ed., *Letters and State Papers during the Reign of King James the Sixth. Chiefly from the Manuscript Collections of Sir James Balfour of Denmyln* (Edinburgh, 1838)

Manuscript Pamphleteering in Early Stuart England <<https://mpese.ac.uk/>>

Martyn, William, *The Historie, and Lives, of the Kings of England from William the Conqueror, Unto the End of the Raigne of King Henrie the Eight* (London, 1615; STC 17526)

Martyn, William, *The Historie and Lives, of the Kings of England: From William the Conqueror, Unto the End of the Raigne of King Henry the Eighth* (London, 1628; STC 17528)

Martyn, William, *The Historie, and Lives, of Twentie Kings of England With the Successions of the Dukes, and Earles, of this Realme; From the Conquest, Untill*

the Twelfth Yeare of the Famous Raigne of the Most Admired Prince King James the First. Together with the Times of the Creations of the Barons, and Baronets, of this Kingdome (London, 1615; STC 17526)

Mavericke, Radford, *Three Treatises Religiously Handled, And Named According to the Severall Subject of Each Treatise: The Mourning Weede. The Mornings Joy. The Kings Rejoycing.* (London, 1603; STC 17148.7 and 17683a.5)

Maxwell, James, *Queene Elizabeths Looking-Glasse of Grace and Glory* (London, 1612; STC 17705)

Meredeth, Richard, *Two Sermons Preached before his Majestie, in his Chappell at Whitehall* (London, 1606; STC 17832)

McRae, Andrew, and John West, eds, *Literature of the Stuart Successions: An Anthology* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017)

Millar, Oliver, ed., 'Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', *Walpole Society*, 37 (1958-1960)

Milles, Thomas, *A Catalogue of the Kings of Scotland. Together with their Severall Armes, Wives, and Issue* (London, 1610; STC 22008)

Monipennie, John, *The Abridgement or Summarie of the Scots Chronicles* (London, 1612; STC 18014)

Morton, Thomas, *An Exact Discoverie of Romish Doctrine in the Case of Conspiracie and Rebellion by Pregnant Observations: Collected (Not Without Direction from our Superiours) Out of the Expresse Dogmaticall Principles of Popish Priests and Doctors* (London, 1605; STC 18184)

Morton, Thomas, *A Full Satisfaction Concerning a Double Romish Iniquitie* (London, 1606; STC 18185)

Munday, Anthony, *The Triumphes of Re-United Britania* (London, 1605; STC 18279)

Mure, William, *The Works of Sir William Mure of Rowallan*, ed. by William Tough, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1898)

Murray, Thomas, ed., *The Laws and Acts of Parliament Made by King James the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Queen Mary, King James the Sixth, King Charles the First, King Charles the Second Who Now Presently Reigns, Kings and Queen of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1681; Wing S1265)

Muriell, Christopher, *An Answer unto the Catholiques Supplication, Presented Unto the Kings Majestie, for a Tolleration of Popish Religion in England. Wherein is Contained a Confutation of their Unreasonable Petitions* (London, 1603; STC 18292)

Nichols, John, ed., *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols (London, 1823)

Nichols, John, ed., *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 4 vols (London, 1828)

Nixon, Anthony, *Elizaes Memoriall. King James His Arrivall. And Romes Downefall* (London, 1603; STC 18586)

Northerne Poems Congratulating the Kings Majesties Most Happy and Peaceable Entrance to the Crowne of England (London, 1604; STC 14427)

Papiers D'État, Pièces et Document Inédits ou Peu Connus Relatifs a l'Historie de l'Écosse au XVI^e Siècle, tirés des Bibliothèques et des Archives de France, ed. by Alexandre Teulet, 3 vols (Paris, 1851)

Paton, Henry M., ed., *Accounts of the Masters of Works for Building and Repairing Royal Palaces and Castles, Volume 1, 1529-1615* (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1957)

Persons, Robert, att., *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inland* (Antwerp, 1595; STC 19398)

Philodikaios, Irenicus, *A Treatise Declaring, and Confirming against all Objections the Just Title and Right of the Moste Excellent and Worthie Prince, James the Sixt* (Edinburgh, 1599; STC 19881.5)

Platter, Thomas, *Thomas Platter's Travels in England 1599*, trans. by Clare Williams (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937)

Pont, Robert, *De Unione Britannia, Seu De Regnorum Angliæ et Scotiae Omniumque Adjacentium Insularum Britanicarum in Unam Monarchiam Consolidatione* (Edinburgh, 1604; STC 20103)

The Poores Lamentation for the Death of our Late Dread Sovereigne the High and Mightie Princesse Elizabeth, late Queene of England, France and Ireland With their Prayers to God for the High and Mightie Prince James by the Grace of God King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith (London, 1603; STC 7594)

Powell, Gabriel, *The Catholikes Supplication Unto the Kings Majestie; for Toleration of Catholike Religion in England: With Short Notes or Animadversions in the Margine. Whereunto is annexed Parallel-wise, a Supplicatorie Counterpoise of the Protestants, unto the Same Most Excellent Majestie.* (London, 1603; STC 20141)

Powell, Gabriel, *A Consideration of the Papists Reasons of State and Religion, for Toleration of Poperie in England, intimated in their Supplication unto the Kings Majestie, & the States of the Present Parliament* (Oxford, 1604; STC 20144)

Pricket, Robert, *Unto the Most High and Mightie Prince, his Sovereigne Lord King James. A Poore Subject Sendeth, a Souldiors Resolution* (London, 1603; STC 20343)

Read, Evelyn Plummer, and Conyers Read, eds., *Elizabeth of England: Certain Observations Concerning the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth by John Clapham* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1951)

Salmon, Thomas, ed., *A Compleat Collection of State-Tryals, and Proceedings Upon Impeachments for High Treason, and Other Crimes and Misdemeanours*, 4 vols (London, 1719)

Sharpe, Leonel, *A Sermon Preached at Cambridge before the Universitie, the Knights, and Chiefe Gentlemen of the Shiere, the Maior and Townesmen, the 28. of March* (Cambridge, 1603; STC 22376)

Shuger, Deborah, ed., *Religion in Early Stuart England, 1603-1638: An Anthology of Primary Sources* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012)

Smith, Thomas, ed., *V. CL. Gulielmi Camdeni, et Illustrium Virorum Ad G. Camdenum Epistolæ* (London, 1691)

Sommerville, J.P., ed., *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Speed, John, *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045)

Spottiswoode, John, *The History of the Church of Scotland*, 3 vols (Edinburgh: 1850)

Steurt, A. Francis, ed., *Trial of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: William Hodge and Company, 1923; republished 1951)

Stow, John, *The Annales of England* (London, 1605; STC 23337)

Stow, John, and Edmund Howes, *The Annales, or Generall Chronicle of England, Begun First by Maister John Stow, and After Him Continued and Augmented with Matters Forreyne, and Domestique, Auncient and Moderne, Unto the Ende of This Present Yeere 1614. By Edmond Howes, Gentleman* (London, 1615; STC 23338)

Sylloge Scriptorum Varii Generis et Argumenti: in qua Plurima de Vita, Moribus, Gestis, Fortuna, Scriptis, Familia, Amicis, et Inimicis Thuani, 7 vols (London, 1733)

Thornborough, John, *A Discourse Plainely Proving the Evident Utilitie and Urgent Necessitie of the Desired Happie Union of the Two Famous Kingdomes of England and Scotland by Way of Answer to Certaine Objections Against the Same* (London, 1604; STC 24035)

Thornborough, John, *The Joiefull and Blessed Reuniting the Two Mighty & Famous Kingdomes, England & Scotland into their Ancient Name of Great Brittain* (Oxford, 1605; STC 24036)

de Thou, Jacques-Auguste, *Choix de Lettres Françoises Inédites de J.A. De Thou* (Paris, 1877)

A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London. 1554-1650 A.D., ed. by Edward Arber, 5 vols (London, 1875-1894)

The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Majestie, From the Time of His Departure from Edenbrough; Till His Receiving at London: With All or the Most Speciall Occurrences (London, 1603; STC 17153)

Vergil, Polydore, *Anglica Historia* (1555 version), ed. and trans. by Dana F. Sutton <<http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/polverg/>> [accessed 17 July 2019]

Warner, George F., ed., 'The Library of James VI. 1573-1583 from a Manuscript in the hand of Peter Young, his Tutor', in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, 1 (Edinburgh, 1893), xii-lxxv

Wentworth, Peter, *A Pithie Exhortation to Her Majestie for Establishing Her Successor to the Crowne* (Edinburgh, 1598; STC 25245)

Wilbraham, Roger, 'The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests for the Years 1593-1616, Together with Notes in Another Hand for the Years 1642-1649', *Camden Third Series*, 4 (1902), pp. 3-139

Wilkinson, Edward, *Isahacs Inheritance; Dew to Our High and Mightie Prince, James the Sixt of Scotland, of England, France and Ireland the First* (London, 1603; STC 25643)

Wilkinson, Robert, *Barwick Bridge: or England and Scotland Coupled in a Sermon Tending to Peace and Unitie. Preached before the King at Saint Andrewes* (London, 1617; STC 25652)

Wylie, J.H., ed., *Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report on the Records of the City of Exeter* (London: Hereford Times, 1916)

Works of Art

Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris

Elstrack, Renold, *The Most Royall Progeny of the Kings of England Continued from William Sirnamed Conquerour to Our Most Gracious Sovereigne James the First King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland*, included on John Speed, *The Invasions of England and Ireland*, c. 1603-1604, engraving on paper, 164 x 218cm. Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, inv. no. GE DD-6056

British Library, London

Colman, Morgan, *Genealogy of James VI and I and Anna of Denmark*, 1607, engraving on paper. British Library, General Reference Collection 604.1.5

British Museum, London

de Bruyn, Nicolaas (engraver), and Jean le Clerc (publisher), *Iacobi. I. Britannicarum Insularum Monarchæ*, 1604, engraving and letterpress on paper, 48.5 x 36.2cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1974,1207.6

Elstrack, Renold (engraver), and Compton Holland (publisher), *The most excellent Princesse Mary queene of Scotland*, c. 1618, engraving on paper, 19.2 x 11.4 cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1848,0911.264

Elstrack, Renold (att. engraver), and George Humble (publisher), *The Pourtraicture of the right Excellent Prince Henry Lo: Darnley, Duke of Albany*, c. 1618, engraving on paper, 19 x 11.4 cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1884,0412.15

Elstrack, Renold (engraver), and John Speed (publisher), *The Most Happy Unions Contracted Betwixt the Princes of the Blood Royall of Theis Towe Famous Kingdomes of England & Scotland*, 1603, engraving on paper, 46.4 x 39.3cm. STC 23039g.3. British Museum, inv. no. 1856,0614.149

Holland, Compton (publisher), *James the fourth: King of Scotland*, c. 1616-1621, engraving on paper, 17.1 x 11.7cm. British Museum, inv. no. O,7.67

James VI & I Double Crown coin (1604-1605), gold. British Museum, inv. no. 1935,0401.6874

James VI & I Thistle Crown coin (1604-1625), gold. British Museum, inv. no. GHB.537

Visscher, Claes Jansz, att., *James I and Queen Anne*, undated, engraving on paper, 40.2 x 45.1cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1935,0413.82

Wright, Benjamin, *The Roial Progenei of our Most Sacred King James*, 1603, engraving on paper, 37.2 x 27cm. British Museum, inv. no. 1882,0812.540

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

Elstrack, Renold (engraver), and John Speed (publisher), *James I and Anne of Denmark*, undated, c. 1603, engraving on paper, 28.3 x 37.8cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. no. 28.7.13

The Moscow Kremlin Museums

Jeffries, William, silver-gilt water pots, 1604-1605, 64cm (height). The Moscow Kremlin Museums, inv. no. Mz-642 and Mz643

National Museums Scotland, Edinburgh

James VI & I Thistle Crown coin (1604-1625), gold. National Museums Scotland, inv. no. A.1911.506.1189

National Portrait Gallery, London

Mytens, Daniel, *King James I of England and VI of Scotland*, 1621, oil on canvas, 148.6 x 100.6 cm. National Portrait Gallery, London, inv. no. NPG 109

National Trust, UK

After Daniel Mytens, *King James I (James VI of Scotland) (1566-1625) in Garter Robes*, seventeenth century, oil on canvas, 61.9 x 42.2 cm. Ham House, Surrey (National Trust), inv. no. NT 1140214

Studio of Daniel Mytens, *King James I (James VI of Scotland) (1566-1625)*, c. 1621-1625, oil on canvas, 244.5 x 175.5 cm. Knole, Kent (National Trust), inv. no. NT 129891

Rosenborg Castle, Denmark

The Collar of the Order of the Garter, 1603, gold and enamel, 55cm (length). Rosenborg Castle, Denmark, inv. no. Rosenborg 1.37

Royal Collection, UK

German School, *Frederick Henry, Charles Louis and Elizabeth: Children of Frederick V and Elizabeth of Bohemia*, c. 1618-1619, oil on canvas, 135.3 x 140 cm. Royal Collection, UK, inv. no. RCIN 404329

Halder, Jacob, *Armour garniture of Henry, future Prince of Wales, for the field, tourney, tilt and barriers*, c. 1608, blued steel, gilt, brass, and copper-zinc alloys, etched. Royal Collection, UK, inv. no. RCIN 72831

van Somers, Paul, *James VI & I (1566-1625)*, c. 1620, oil on canvas, 227 x 149.5cm. Royal Collection, UK, inv. no. RCIN 404446

Films

Mary Queen of Scots, dir. by Josie Rourke, screenplay by Beau Willimon (Focus Features and Universal Pictures, 2018)

Secondary Sources

Abbott, D.M., 'Buchanan, George (1506-1582)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3837>>

Alker, Sharon, and Holly Faith Nelson, 'Macbeth, the Jacobean Scot, and the Politics of the Union', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 47.2 (Spring 2007), 379-401

Allen, Thomas, *The History and Antiquities of London, Westminster, Southwark, and Parts Adjacent*, 4 vols (London, 1827-1829)

Anderson, Judith H., *Biographical Truth: The Representation of Historical Persons in Tudor-Stuart Writing* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984)

Anglo, Sydney, 'Ill of the Dead: The Posthumous Reputation of Henry VII', *Renaissance Studies*, 1.1 (1987), 27-47

Anglo, Sydney, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992)

Anglo, Sydney, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Antheunis, L., 'Le secrétaire de Marie Stuart: Gilbert Curle, 1549-1609, et sa famille', *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 133 (July 1939), 58-85

Ashe, Laura, 'Holinshed and Mythical History', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 155-171

Axton, Marie, 'The Influence of Edmund Plowden's Succession Treatise', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 37.3 (1974), 209-226

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

Ayres, Sara, and Joseph B.R. Massey, 'Images of Anna of Denmark, Series B: The English and Irish Accession', *Depicting Anna of Denmark* (blog), 11 June 2021 <<https://depictingannaofdenmark.blogspot.com/2021/06/room-2-images-of-anna-of-denmark-series.html>> [accessed 6 July 2021]

Baker, David Weil, 'Jacobean Historiography and the Election of Richard III', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 70.3 (September 2007), 311-342

Baldo, Jonathan, *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories: Stages of Forgetting in Early Modern England* (New York: Routledge, 2012)

Baker, David J., "'Stands Scotland Where it Did?': Shakespeare on the March", in *Shakespeare and Scotland*, ed. by Willy Maley and Andrew Murphy (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 20-36

Barnard, John, 'Introduction', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695*, ed. by John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 1-25

Baron, S.A., 'Gainsford, Thomas (bap. 1566, d. 1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10284>>

Beckett, Margaret J., 'The Political Works of John Lesley, Bishop of Ross (1527-96)' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2002)

Bell, Gary M., *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives, 1590-1688* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1990)

Bendall, Sarah, 'Speed, John (1551/2-1629)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26093>>

Berger, Adolf, 'Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, n.s., 43.2 (1953), 335-809

Berry, Philippa, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer, 'Reinventing the Matter of Britain: Undermining the State in Jacobean Masques', in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. by David J. Baker and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 119-134

Bevan, Jonquil, 'Scotland', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695*, ed. by John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 687-700

Blackburn, Thomas H., 'Edmund Bolton, Critic, Antiquary, and Historian: A Biographical and Critical Study with an Edition of *Hypercritica*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1962)

Blakeway, Amy, *Regency in Sixteenth-Century Scotland* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2015)

Bland, Mark, "'Invisible Dangers": Censorship and the Subversion of Authority in Early Modern England', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 90.2 (1996), 151-193

Bossy, John, 'The English Catholic Community 1603-1625', in *The Reign of James VI and I*, ed. by Alan G.R. Smith (London: Macmillan, 1973), pp. 91-105

Bowie, Karin, "'A Legal Limited Monarchy": Scottish Constitutionalism in the Union of the Crowns, 1603-1707', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 35.2 (2015), 131-154

Bowman, Glen, 'Early Calvinist Resistance Theory: New Perspectives on an Old Label', *Journal of Law and Religion*, 23.1 (2007), 309-319

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Birth of Scottish History', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 76.1.201 (April 1997), 4-22

Broun, Dauvit, 'Britain and the Beginning of Scotland', *Journal of the British Academy*, 3 (2015), 107-137

Broun, Dauvit, 'Dunkeld and the Origin of Scottish Identity', *The Innes Review*, 48.2 (Autumn 1997), 112-124

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Origin of Scottish Identity', in *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past*, ed. by Claus Bjørn, Alexander Grant, and Keith J. Stringer (Copenhagen: Academic Press, 1994), pp. 40-45

Broun, Dauvit, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain from the Picts to Alexander III* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007)

Brown, Keith M., *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715* (London: Macmillan, 1992)

Brown, Keith M., 'The Vanishing Emperor: British Kingship and its Decline 1603-1707', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 58-87

Brown, P. Hume, *George Buchanan, Humanist and Reformer: A Biography* (Edinburgh, 1890)

Buachalla, Breandán Ó, 'James our True King: the Ideology of Irish Royalism in the Seventeenth Century', in *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall, and Vincent Geoghegan (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 7-35

Busch, Wilhelm, *England under the Tudors, Volume 1: King Henry VII*, trans. by Alice M. Todd (London, 1895)

Burgess, Glenn, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992)

Burke, Peter, *Varieties of Cultural History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997)

Burnett, Charles J., 'The Development of the Royal Arms to 1603', *Journal of the Heraldry Society of Scotland*, 1 (1977-1978), 9-19

Burnett, C.J., 'The Thistle as a Symbol', in *Emblems of Scotland* (Dunfermline: The Heraldry Society of Scotland, 1997), pp. 45-52

Burnett, Charles J., and Christopher J. Tabraham, *The Honours of Scotland: The Story of the Scottish Crown Jewels* (Edinburgh: Historic Scotland, 1993)

Burns, Edward, *The Coinage of Scotland*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1887)

Burns, J.H., 'Politia Regalis Et Optima: The Political Ideas of John Mair', *History of Political Thought*, 2.1 (Spring 1981), 32-61

Burns, J.H. 'The Political Ideas of George Buchanan', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 30.1.109 (April 1951), 60-68

Burns, J.H., *The True Law of Kingship: Concepts of Monarchy in Early-Modern Scotland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)

Bushnell, Rebecca W., 'George Buchanan, James VI and Neo-Classicism', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 91-111

Butler, Martin, *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Cameron, Jamie, *James V: The Personal Rule, 1528-1542* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2011)

Campana, Joseph, 'The Child's Two Bodies: Shakespeare, Sovereignty and the End of Succession', *English Literary History*, 81.3 (2014), 811-839

Carlisle, Edward Irving, 'Sharp or Sharpe, Leonel (1559-1631)', *Dictionary of National Biography*, 52 (London, 1897), 411-412

Catellani-Dufrêne, Nathalie, 'L'icône et l'idole. Les représentations de Marie Stuart dans l'œuvre de George Buchanan', *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 36.4 (Autumn 2013), 81-100

Cavanagh, Dermot, 'Uncivil Monarchy: Scotland, England and the Reputation of James IV', in *Early Modern Civil Discourses*, ed. by Jennifer Richards (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 146-161

Chedgzoy, Kate, Elspeth Graham, Katharine Hodgkin, and Ramona Wray, 'Researching Memory in Early Modern Studies', *Memory Studies*, 11.1 (2018), 5-20

Chrimes, S.B., *Henry VII* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972)

Clare, Janet, *'Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority': Elizabethan and Jacobean Censorship* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990)

Clegg, Cyndia Susan, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Colclough, David, "'I Have Brought Thee Up to a Kingdome": Sermons on the Accessions of James I and Charles I', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 205-221

Cole, Mary Hill, 'The Half-Blood Princes: Mary I, Elizabeth I, and Their Strategies of Legitimation', in *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*, ed. by Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 71-88

Collinson, John, *The Life of Thuanus* (London, 1807)

Collinson, Patrick, 'The Elizabethan Exclusion Crisis and the Elizabethan Polity', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 84 (1994), 51-92, reprinted in Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 61-88

Collinson, Patrick, 'One of Us? William Camden and the Making of History: The Camden Society Centenary Lecture', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 8 (December 1998), 139-163, reprinted in Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 245-269

Collinson, Patrick, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011)

Collinson, Patrick, 'William Camden and the Anti-Myth of Elizabeth: Setting the Mould?', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 79-98, reprinted in Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 270-286

Colvin, H.M., D.R. Ransome, and John Summerson, *The History of the King's Works: Volume III, 1485-1660 (Part 1)* (London: HMSO, 1975)

Coffey, John, 'George Buchanan and the Scottish Covenanters', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Roger A. Mason and Caroline Erskine (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 189-204

Connerton, Paul, 'Seven Types of Forgetting', *Memory Studies*, 1.1 (January 2008), 59-71

Courtney, Alexander, 'The Scottish King and the English Court: The Secret Correspondence of James VI, 1601-3', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 134-151

Cramsie, John, 'The Philosophy of Imperial Kingship and the Interpretation of James VI and I', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006), pp. 43-60

Cressy, David, 'Binding the Nation: The Bonds of Association, 1584 and 1696', in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, ed. by DeLloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 217-234

Cressy, David, 'National Memory in Early Modern England', in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. by John R. Gillis (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 61-73

Cuddy, Neil, 'Dynasty and Display: Politics and Painting in England, 1530-1630', in *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630*, ed. by Karen Hearn (London: Tate Publishing, 1995), pp. 11-20

Cunningham, Sean, *Henry VII* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007)

D'Avray, D.L., *Dissolving Royal Marriages: A Documentary History, 860-1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)

Davies, C.S.L., 'Tudor: What's in a Name?', *History*, 97.325 (January 2021), 24-42

Davies, Daniel, 'Medieval Scottish Historians and the Contest for Britain', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 82.2 (June 2021), 149-175

Dawson, Jane, 'Anglo-Scottish Protestant Culture and Integration in Sixteenth-Century Britain', in *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, ed. by Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (London: Longman, 1995), pp. 87-114

Dawson, Jane, *John Knox* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015)

Dawson, Jane E.A., 'Mary Queen of Scots, Lord Darnley, and Anglo-Scottish Relations in 1565', *The International History Review*, 8.1 (February 1986), 1-24

Dawson, Jane E.A., *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary Queen of Scots: The Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Dawson, Jane, 'Scotland and the Example of Geneva', *Theology in Scotland*, 16.2 (2009), 55-73

Dawson, Jane, 'Scotland, Ireland and the Vision of a 'British' Protestant Reformation', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 106.424 (Winter 2017/2018), 439-447

Dawson, Jane E.A., 'Trumpeting Resistance: Christopher Goodman and John Knox', in *John Knox and the British Reformations*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 130-155

Dawson, Jane E.A., 'The Two John Knoxes: England, Scotland and the 1558 Tracts', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 43.4 (October 1991), 555-576

Dean, Leonard F., 'Sir Francis Bacon's Theory of Civil History-Writing', *English Literary History*, 8.3 (1941), 161-183

Dennis, Mark, 'The Unicorn', in *Emblems of Scotland* (Dunfermline: The Heraldry Society of Scotland, 1997), pp. 20-31

DeSilva, Jennifer M., and Emily K. McGuire, 'Revising Mary Queen of Scots: From Protestant Persecution to Patriarchal Struggle', *Journal of Religion and Film*, 25.1 (April 2021), <<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/jrf/vol25/iss1/59>>

Dickson, Robert, and John Philip Edmond, *Annals of Scottish Printing from the Introduction of the Art in 1507 to the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1890)

Dillon, Anne, *The Construction of Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1535-1603* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2002; reprinted 2016)

Dodds, Madeleine Hope, 'Barnabe Barnes', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, fourth series, 24 (1946), 1-59

Doelman, James, *King James I and the Religious Culture of England* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2000)

Donaldson, Gordon, *The First Trial of Mary, Queen of Scots* (New York: Stein and Day, 1969)

Doran, Susan, '1603: A Jagged Succession', *Historical Research*, 93.61 (August 2020), 1-23

Doran, Susan, 'James VI and the English Succession', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 25-42

Doran, Susan, 'Polemic and Prejudice: A Scottish King for the English Throne', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 215-235

Doran, Susan, 'Revenge her Foul and Most Unnatural Murder? The Impact of Mary Stewart's Execution on Anglo-Scottish Relations', *History*, 85.280 (October 2000), 589-612

Doran, Susan, and Paulina Kewes, 'The Earlier Elizabethan Succession Question Revisited', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 20-44

Doran, Susan, and Paulina Kewes, 'Introduction: A Historiographical Perspective', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 3-19

Dowd, Michelle M., *The Dynamics of Inheritance on the Shakespearean Stage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

Dunbar, John G., *Scottish Royal Palaces: The Architecture of the Royal Residences during the Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Periods* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1999)

Dutton, Richard, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000)

Dutton, Richard, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991)

Dutton, Richard, 'Patronage, Licensing, and Censorship', in *A Concise Companion to English Renaissance Literature*, ed. by Donna B. Hamilton (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), pp. 75-93

Dzelzainis, Martin, 'Milton, *Macbeth*, and Buchanan', *The Seventeenth Century*, 4.1 (Spring 1989), 55-66

Eaves, Richard Glen, 'Margaret [Margaret Tudor] (1489-1541)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18052>>

Eccles, Mark, 'Thomas Gainsford, "Captain Pamphlet"', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 45.4 (Autumn 1982), 259-270

Edwards, David, 'Securing the Jacobean Succession: The Secret Career of James Fullerton of Trinity College, Dublin', in *The World of the Galloglass: Kings, Warlords and Warriors in Ireland and Scotland*, ed. by Séan Duffy (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), pp. 188-219

Elliott, J.H., 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', *Past & Present*, 137 (November 1992), 48-71

Emond, Ken, *The Minority of James V: Scotland in Europe, 1513-1528* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2019)

Engel, William E., 'The Decay of Memory', in *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacies*, ed. by Christopher Ivic and Grant Williams (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 21-40

Epstein, Joel J., *Francis Bacon: A Political Biography* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1977)

Epstein, Joel J., 'Francis Bacon and the Issue of Union, 1603-1608', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 33.2 (1970), 121-132

Erskine, Caroline, 'George Buchanan, English Whigs and Royalists, and the Canon of Political Theory', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Roger A. Mason and Caroline Erskine (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 229-248

Erskine, Caroline, 'George Buchanan and Revolution Principles', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Roger A. Mason and Caroline Erskine (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 289-306

Ewart, Gordon, and Dennis Gallagher, *Fortress of the Kingdom: Archaeology and Research at Edinburgh Castle* (Edinburgh: Historic Scotland, 2014)

Fincham, Kenneth, and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24.2 (April 1985), 169-207

Floyd-Wilson, Mary, 'Delving to the Root: *Cymbeline*, Scotland, and the English Race', in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. by David J. Baker and William Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 101-115

Ford, Alan, "'Firm Catholics" or "Loyal Subjects"?: Religious and Political Allegiance in Early Seventeenth-century Ireland', in *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, ed. by D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall, and Vincent Geoghegan (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), pp. 1-31

Fox, Adam, 'Custom, Memory and the Authority of Writing', in *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 89-116

Fox, Adam, 'Remembering the Past in Early Modern England: Oral and Written Tradition', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9 (1999), 233-256

Fradenburg, Louise Olga, *City, Marriage, Tournament: Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991)

Fradenburg, Louise Olga, 'Troubled Times: Margaret Tudor and the Historians', in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), pp. 38-53

Fraser, Antonia, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969; reprinted 2015)

Fussner, F. Smith, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962)

Galloway, Bruce, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986)

Galloway, Bruce R., and Brian P. Levack, 'Introduction', in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, ed. by Bruce Galloway and Brian P. Levack (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1985), pp. ix-lxxx

García-Reidy, Alejandro, 'Political Rhetoric in Lope de Vega's Representation of Elizabeth I', in *The Image of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Spain*, ed. Eduardo Olid Guerrero and Esther Fernández (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), pp. 227-250

Glanville, Philippa, 'The Court Plate of James I', *Sotheby's: Art at Auction 1990-91*, ed. Sally Prideaux (New York: Sotheby's Publications, 1991), pp. 17-22

Goodare, Julian, *The Government of Scotland, 1560-1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Goodare, Julian, 'James VI's English Subsidy', in *The Reign of James VI*, ed. Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000), pp. 110-125

Goodare, Julian, 'Mary [Mary Stewart] (1542-1587)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18248>>

Grabes, Herbert, ed., *Writing the Early Modern English Nation: The Transformations of National Identity in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001)

Grant, James, *Memorials of the Castle of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1850)

Green, Christopher, 'The Lion of Scotland', in *Emblems of Scotland* (Dunfermline: The Heraldry Society of Scotland, 1997), pp. 7-12

Green, Roger P.H., 'The King Returns: *The Muses' Welcome* (1618)', in *Neo-Latin Literature and Literary Culture in Early Modern Scotland*, ed. by Stephen J. Reid and David McOmish (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 126-162

Greig, Elaine Finnie, 'Stewart, Henry, duke of Albany [*known as* Lord Darnley] (1545/6-1567)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26473>>

Gribbon, Crawford, 'John Knox, Reformation History and National Self-fashioning', *Reformation & Renaissance Review*, 8.1 (2006), 48-66

Griffiths, Antony, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689* (London: British Museum Press, 1998)

Gunn, S.J., 'Henry VII (1457-1509)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12954>>

Guy, John, *'My Heart is My Own': The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Harper Perennial, 2004)

Hadfield, Andrew, 'Hamlet's Country Matters: The "Scottish Play" Within the Play', in *Shakespeare and Scotland*, ed. by Willy Maley and Andrew Murphy (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 87-103

Hadfield, Andrew, *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Hadfield, Andrew, 'Sceptical History and the Myth of the Historical Revolution', *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 29.1 (Winter 2005), 25-44

Hadfield, Andrew, 'Shakespeare and Politics in the Time of the Gunpowder Plot', *The Review of Politics*, 78.4 (Autumn 2016), 571-588

Hadfield, Andrew, *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Matter of Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Harmsen, Theodor, 'Colleton, John (1548-1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5909>>

Hay, Denys, *Polydore Vergil: Renaissance Historian and Man of Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952)

Heal, Felicity, 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1&2 (March 2005), 109-132, reprinted in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 105-128

Helgerson, Richard, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992)

Herendeen, Wyman H., *William Camden: A Life in Context* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007)

Hibbard, Caroline M., 'Early Stuart Catholicism: Revisions and Re-Revisions', *The Journal of Modern History*, 52.1 (March 1980), 1-34

Highley, Christopher, *Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Hind, Arthur M., *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Descriptive Catalogue with Introductions, Part II: The Reign of James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955)

Hiscock, Andrew, *Reading Memory in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Holmes, Peter, 'Broughton [alias Rouse], Richard (c. 1561-1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3587>>

Hopkins, Lisa, 'Cymberline, the *Translatio Imperii*, and the Matter of Britain', in *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly*, ed. by William Maley and Philip Schwyzer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 143-156

Hornblower, Simon, and Antony Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, third revised edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Houliston, Victor, 'Filling in the Blanks: Catholic Hopes for the English Succession', *SEDERI*, 25 (2015), 77-104

Houliston, Victor, 'The Hare and the Drum: Robert Persons's Writings on the English Succession, 1593-6', *Renaissance Studies*, 14.2 (2000), 235-250

Hunt, Arnold, Dora Thornton, and George Dalglish, 'A Jacobean Antiquary Reassessed: Thomas Lyte, the Lyte Genealogy and the Lyte Jewel', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 96 (2016), 169-205

Hunter, Joseph, 'Heraldry of the Monument of Queen Elizabeth, at Westminster', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 1.3 (July 1850), 194-199

Ihinger, Kelsey J., 'The Mirror in Albion: Spanish Theatrical Reimaginings of Queen Elizabeth I and Mary Stuart', *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, 70.1 (2018), 33-57

Ivic, Christopher, 'Mapping British Identities: Speed's *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine*', in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. by David J. Baker and William Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 135-155

Ivic, Christopher, 'Shakespeare's Elizabethan England/Jacobean Britain', in *Celtic Shakespeare: The Bard and the Borders*, ed. by Willy Maley and Rory Loughnane (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 103-118

Ivic, Christopher, *The Subject of Britain, 1603-25* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020)

Jack, Sybil M., 'National Identities within Britain and the Proposed Union in 1603-1607', *Parergon*, 18.2 (2001), 75-101

Jackson, Clare, 'Buchanan in Hell: Sir James Turner's Civil War Royalism', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Roger A. Mason and Caroline Erskine (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 205-228

Jones, David Martin, 'Sir Edward Coke and the Interpretation of Lawful Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England', *History of Political Thought*, 7.2 (1986), 321-340

Jones, J. Gwynfor, *Early Modern Wales, c.1525-1640* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994)

Kagan, Richard L., *Clio and the Crown: The Politics of History in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009) 155-176

Kanemura, Rei, 'Historical Perspectives on the Anglo-Scottish Union Debate: Re-reading the Norman Conquest in the 1610s', *History of European Ideas*, 40.2 (2014),

Kanemura, Rei, 'The Idea of Sovereignty in English Historical Writing, 1599-1627' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2012)

Kanemura, Rei, 'Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I', *Journal of British Studies*, 52.2 (April 2013), 317-342

Kelliher, Hilton, 'British Post-Medieval Verse in the Cotton Collection: A Survey and Handlist', in *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy*, ed. by C.J. Wright (London: British Library, 1997), pp. 307-390

Kelly, Henry A., *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970)

Kerrigan, John, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Kewes, Paulina, 'History and Its Uses: Introduction', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1&2 (March 2005), 1-31, reprinted as 'History and Its Uses', in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 1-30

Kewes, Paulina, 'History Plays and the Royal Succession', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 493-509

Kewes, Paulina, 'Parliament and the Principle of Elective Succession in Elizabethan England', in *Writing the History of Parliament in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, ed. by Paul Cavill and Alexandra Gajda (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp. 106-132

Kewes, Paulina, 'The Puritan, the Jesuit and the Jacobean Succession', in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. by Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 47-70

Kidd, Colin, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Kidd, Colin, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

Killroy, Deborah, 'All the King's Men? A Demographic Study of Opinion in the First English Parliament of James I, 1604-10', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 41.1 (2021), 1-23

Kincaid, Arthur, 'Buck [Buc], Sir George (bap. 1560, d. 1622)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/3821>>

Kingdon, Robert M., 'Calvinism and Resistance Theory, 1550-1580', in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, ed. by J.H. Burns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 194-218

Kinney, Arthur F., 'Scottish History, the Union of the Crowns and the Issue of Right Rule: The Case of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*', in *Renaissance Culture in Context: Theory and Practice*, ed. by Jean R. Brink and William F. Gentrup (London: Routledge, 1993; republished in 2017), pp. 18-53

Kirk, James, 'Pont, Robert (1524-1606)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22507>>

Kuijpers, Erika, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, and Jasper van der Steen, eds, *Memory Before Modernity: Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2013)

Lambert, Sheila, 'The Printers and the Government, 1604-1640', in *Aspects of Printing from 1600*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987), pp. 1-29

Lambert, Sheila, 'State Control of the Press in Theory and Practice: The Role of the Stationers' Company Before 1640', in *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France, 1600-1910*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1992), pp. 1-32

Lane, Robert, "'The Sequence of Posterity": Shakespeare's *King John* and the Succession Controversy', *Studies in Philology*, 92.4 (Autumn 1995), 460-481

LaRocca, John J., "'Who Can't Pray with Me, Can't Love Me": Toleration and the Early Jacobean Recusancy Policy', *Journal of British Studies*, 23.2 (Spring 1984), 22-36

Lawson-Peebles, Robert, 'A Conjoined Commonwealth: The Implications of the Accession of James VI and I', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 46 (2016), 56-74

Laynesmith, J.L., *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Lazar, Jessica, '1603. *The Wonderfull Yeare*: Literary Responses to the Accession of James I' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2016)

Lee Jr., Maurice, *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991)

Leeds, John C., 'Universals, Particulars, and Political Discourse in John Mair's *Historia Maioris Britanniae*', in *The Impact of Latin Culture on Medieval and Early Modern Scottish Writing*, ed. by Alessandra Petrina and Ian Johnson (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2018), pp. 87-99

Lemon, Rebecca, *Treason by Words: Literature, Law, and Rebellion in Shakespeare's England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006)

Levack, Brian P., 'English Law, Scots Law and the Union, 1603-1707', in *Law-Making and Law-Makers in British History*, ed. by Alan Harding (London: Royal Historical Society, 1980), pp. 105-119

Levack, Brian P., *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987)

Levack, Brian P., 'Law, Sovereignty and the Union', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 213-237

Levack, Brian P., 'Toward a More Perfect Union: England, Scotland, and the Constitution', in *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J.H. Hexter*, ed. by Barbara C. Malament (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), pp. 57-74

Levine, Mortimer, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question, 1558-1568* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966)

Levis, H.C., *Baziliologia A Booke of Kings Notes on a Rare Series of Engraved Royal Portraits from William the Conqueror to James I Published under the Above Title in 1618* (New York: The Grolier Club, 1913)

Levy, F.J., *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1967)

Lewis, Jayne Elizabeth, *Mary Queen of Scots: Romance and Nation* (London: Routledge, 1998)

Llewellyn, Nigel, 'The Royal Body: Monuments to the Dead, For the Living', in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540-1660*, ed. by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), pp. 218-240

Lucas, Scott, 'Holinshed and Hall', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 203-216

Lloyd, Megan, *The Valiant Welshman, the Scottish James, and the Formation of Great Britain* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2018)

Loomie, Albert J., 'Toleration and Diplomacy: The Religious Issue in Anglo-Spanish Relations, 1603-1605', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 54.6 (1963), 1-60

Loomis, Catherine, *The Death of Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)

Loomis, Catherine, 'Elizabeth Southwell's Manuscript Account of the Death of Elizabeth I', *English Literary Renaissance*, 26.3 (1996), 482-509

Loomis, Catherine, "'Withered Plants Do Bud and Blossome Yeelds": Naturalizing James I's Succession', in *Law and Sovereignty in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Robert S. Sturges (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2011), pp. 133-150

MacColl, Alan, 'The Meaning of "Britain" in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45.2 (April 2006), 248-269

MacDonald, Alan R., *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625: Sovereignty, Polity and Liturgy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998)

MacDonald, Alan R., 'James VI and I, the Church of Scotland, and British Ecclesiastical Convergence', *The Historical Journal*, 48.4 (2005), 885-903

MacDougall, Norman, *James IV* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1997)

MacIvor, Iain, *Edinburgh Castle* (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1993, reprinted in 1997)

MacKechnie, Aonghus, 'James VI's Architects and their Architecture', in *The Reign of James VI*, ed. by Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000), pp. 154-169

Mackenzie, George, *Lives and Characters of the Most Eminent Writers of the Scots Nation*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1708-1722)

MacLeod, Catherine, *The Lost Prince: The Life and Death of Henry Stuart* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2012)

MacQueen, Hector L., 'Regiam Majestatem, Scots Law, and National Identity', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 74.1.197 (1995), 1-25

Malden, John, 'The Double Tressure', in *Emblems of Scotland* (Dunfermline: The Heraldry Society of Scotland, 1997), pp. 13-19

Maley, Willy, *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

Mann, Alastair, 'Parliaments, Princes, and Presses: Voices of Tradition and Protest in Early Modern Scotland', in *Sites of Discourse—Public and Private Spheres—Legal Culture*, ed. by Uwe Böker and Julie A. Hibbard (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002), pp. 79-92

Mann, Alastair J., *The Scottish Book Trade, 1500 to 1720: Print Commerce and Print Control in Early Modern Scotland* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000)

Manning, John J., 'Hayward, Sir John (1564?-1627)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12794>>

Mapstone, Sally, 'Shakespeare and Scottish History: A Case Study', in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. by Juliette Wood and Sally Mapstone (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), pp. 158-193

Marshall, Rosalind K., 'Douglas, Lady Margaret, countess of Lennox (1515-1578)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/7911>>

Marshall, Tristan, *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages under James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, reprinted 2018)

Marwil, Jonathan, *The Trials of Counsel: Francis Bacon in 1621* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1976)

Mason, Roger A., '1603: Multiple Monarchy and Scottish Identity', *History*, 105.366 (2020), 402-421

Mason, Roger A., 'Certain Matters Concerning the Realme of Scotland: George Buchanan and Scottish Self-Fashioning at the Union of the Crowns', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 92.1 (April 2013), 38-65

Mason, Roger A., 'Debating Britain in Seventeenth-Century Scotland: Multiple Monarchy and Scottish Sovereignty', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 35.1 (2015), 1-24

Mason, Roger A., 'Imagining Scotland: Scottish Political Thought and the Problem of Britain, 1560-1650', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 3-13

Mason, Roger A., 'Introduction', in *John Knox: On Rebellion*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. viii-xxiv

Mason, Roger A., *Kingship and the Commonweal: Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998)

Mason, Roger A., 'Knox, Resistance and the Moral Imperative', *History of Political Thought*, 1.3 (Autumn 1980), 411-436

Mason, Roger A., 'Knox, Resistance and the Royal Supremacy', in *John Knox and the British Reformations*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 154-175

Mason, Roger A., 'Rex Stoicus: George Buchanan, James VI and the Scottish Polity', in *New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland*, ed. by John Dwyer, Roger A. Mason, and Alexander Murdoch (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), pp. 9-33

Mason, Roger A., 'Scotching the Brut: Politics, History and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Britain', in *Scotland and England 1286-1815*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1987), pp. 60-76

Mason, Roger A., 'Scotland', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 647-662

Mason, Roger A., 'The Scottish Reformation and the Origins of Anglo-British Imperialism', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 161-186

Mason, Roger A., ed., *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Mason, Roger A., and Martin S. Smith, 'Introduction', in *A Dialogue on the Law of Kingship among the Scots: A Critical Edition of George Buchanan's 'De Iure Regni apud Scotos Dialogus'*, ed. by Roger A. Mason and Martin S. Smith (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. xv-lxxi

Massey, Joseph B.R., 'The Saxon Connection: St Margaret of Scotland, Morgan Colman's Genealogies, and James VI & I's Anglo-Scottish Union Project', *Royal Studies Journal*, 8.1 (2021), 79-110

Mayer, Jean-Christophe, 'Introduction', in *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England. Politics, Polemics, and Cultural Representations*, ed. by Jean-Christophe Mayer (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2004), pp. 1-20

Mayer, Jean-Christophe, 'Introduction: Breaking the Silence', in *Breaking the Silence on the Succession: A Sourcebook of Manuscripts and Rare Elizabethan Texts (c.1587-1603)*, ed. by Jean-Christophe Mayer (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2003), pp. 1-28

McCabe, Richard A., 'Panegyric and Its Discontents: The First Stuart Succession', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 19-36

McCoog, Thomas M., 'Construing Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1582-1602', in *Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, ed. by Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), pp. 95-127

McCoog, Thomas M., 'Harmony Disrupted: Robert Parsons, S.J., William Crichton, S.J., and the Question of Queen Elizabeth's Successor, 1581-1603', *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 73.145 (2004), 149-220

McCoog, Thomas M., *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1598-1606: "Lest Our Lamp Be Entirely Extinguished"* (Leiden: Brill, 2017)

McCullough, P.E., 'Hakewill, George (bap. 1578, d. 1649)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/11885>>

McCullough, Peter E., *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

McEachern, Claire, 'The Englishness of the Scottish Play: *Macbeth* and the Poetics of Jacobean Union', in *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours*, ed. by Allan I. MacInnes and Jane Ohlmeyer (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002), pp. 94-112

McEachern, Claire, 'Literature and National Identity', in *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, ed. by David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 314-325

McEachern, Claire, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590-1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

McElroy, Tricia, 'Performance, Print and Politics in George Buchanan's *Ane Detectioun of the duinges of Marie Quene of Scottes*', in *George Buchanan: Political Thought in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Roger A. Mason and Caroline Erskine (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 49-70

McGill, Martha, and Alasdair Raffe, 'The Uses of Providence in Early Modern Scotland', in *The Supernatural in Early Modern Scotland*, ed. by Julian Goodare and Martha McGill (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), pp. 160-177

McLaren, Anne, 'Challenging the Monarchical Republic: James I's Articulation of Kingship', in *The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England: Essays in Response to Patrick Collinson*, ed. by John F. McDiarmid (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 165-180

McLaren, Anne, 'Gender, Religion, and Early Modern Nationalism: Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Genesis of English Anti-Catholicism', *The American Historical Review*, 107.3 (June 2002), 739-767

McRae, Andrew, 'Welcoming the King: The Politics of Stuart Succession Panegyric', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 186-204

Merriman, Marcus, 'Hamilton, James, second earl of Arran, and duke of Châtellherault in the French nobility (c. 1519-1575)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/12081>>

Merriman, Marcus, *The Rough Wooings: Mary Queen of Scots, 1542-1551* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2000)

Merriman, Marcus, 'Stewart, Matthew, thirteenth or fourth earl of Lennox (1516-1571)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26497>>

Merritt, J.F., 'The Cradle of Laudianism? Westminster Abbey, 1558-1630', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 52.4 (October 2001), 623-646

Merritt, J.F., 'Reinventing Westminster Abbey, 1642-1660: A House of Kings from Revolution to Restoration', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 67.1 (January 2016), 122-138

Merritt, J.F., *Westminster, 1640-60: A Royal City in a Time of Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013)

Milton, Anthony, 'Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *The Historical Journal*, 41.3 (1998), 625-651

Milward, Peter, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978)

Morrill, John, 'A British Patriarchy? Ecclesiastical Imperialism under the Early Stuarts', in *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, ed. by Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 209-237

Mottram, Stewart, *Empire and Nation in Early English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008)

Mottram, Stewart, and Sarah Prescott, eds, *Writing Wales, from the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012)

Murdoch, Graeme, *The Intellectual, Political and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches, c. 1540-1620* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Murphy, Erin, *Familial Forms: Politics and Genealogy in Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011)

Nadel, George H., 'History as Psychology in Francis Bacon's Theory of History', *History and Theory*, 5.3 (1966), 275-287

Nenner, Howard, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995)

Newton, Diana, *The Making of the Jacobean Regime: James VI and I and the Government of England, 1603-1605* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005)

Ng, Sue Fang, 'Milton, Buchanan, and King Arthur', *The Review of English Studies*, 70.296 (September 2019), 659-680

Nolan, David, 'The First Play on Mary Queen of Scots', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 57.226 (Summer 1968), 174-179

Nora, Pierre, 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*', *Representations*, 26 (Spring 1989), 7-24

Notestein, Wallace, *The House of Commons, 1604-1610* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971)

Oakley, Francis, 'On the Road from Constance to 1688: The Political Thought of John Major and George Buchanan', *Journal of British Studies*, 1.2 (May 1962), 1-31

Oates, Rosamund, *Moderate Radical: Tobie Matthew and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018)

Oman, Charles, *The English Silver in the Kremlin, 1557-1663* (London: Methuen & Co., 1961)

Parker, Brett F., 'Recasting England: The Varieties of Antiquarian Responses to the Proposed Union of Crowns, 1603-1607', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 43.2 (2013), 393-417

Parr, Anthony, 'Nixon, Anthony (fl. 1592-1616)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/20206>>

Patterson, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984; 1991 edition)

Paul, Harry N., *The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, Why, and How It Was Written By Shakespeare* (New York: Macmillan, 1950)

Payne, M.T.W., 'An Inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark's "ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcells" at Denmark House, 1619', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 13.1 (2001), 23-44

Pečar, Andreas, 'Printed and Censored at the Same Time for One and the Same Statement?: The Fate of George Hakewill's Writings in the Context of the Spanish Match', in *Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Book*, ed. by Pete Langman (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 75-88

Peltonen, Markku, 'Bacon, Francis, Viscount St Alban (1561-1626)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/990>>

Peltonen, Markku, 'Bacon's Political Philosophy', in *The Cambridge Companion to Bacon*, ed. by Markku Peltonen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 283-310

Phillips, James Emerson, *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth-Century Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964)

Pitcher, John, 'Daniel, Samuel (1562/3-1619)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/7120>>

Pittock, Murray, 'From Edinburgh to London: Scottish Court Writing and 1603', in *The Stuart Courts*, ed. by Eveline Cruickshanks (Stroud: Sutton, 2000), pp. 13-28

Pocock, J.G.A., *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, second edition with retrospect (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

Pollmann, Judith, *Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)

Pollnitz, Aysha, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

Questier, Michael, 'Crypto-Catholicism, Anti-Calvinism and Conversion at the Jacobean Court: The Enigma of Benjamin Carier', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 47.1 (1996), 45-64

Questier, Michael, *Dynastic Politics and the British Reformations, 1558-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019)

Quintrell, Brian, 'Morton, Thomas (bap. 1564, d. 1659)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/19373>>

Rabb, Theodore K., *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561-1629* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998)

Rabb, Theodore K., 'Sir Edwin Sandys and the Parliament of 1604', *The American Historical Review*, 69.3 (1964), 646-670

Radstone, Susannah, and Bill Schwarz, eds, *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010)

Ramsay, Nigel, 'Sir Robert Cotton's Services to the Crown: A Paper Written in Self-Defence', in *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and His Legacy*, ed. by C. J. Wright (London: British Library, 1997), pp. 68-80

Rhodes, Neil, 'Wrapped in the Strong Arms of the Union: Shakespeare and King James', in *Shakespeare and Scotland*, ed. by Willy Maley and Andrew Murphy (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 37-52

Richards, Judith M., 'The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England', *The English Historical Review*, 117.472 (2002), 513-535

Rickard, Jane, *Authorship and Authority: The Writings of James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007)

Rieske, Constantin, 'Doing the Paperwork: Early Modern Converts, Their Narratives and the (Re)Writing of Religious Lives', *The Medieval History Journal*, 18.2 (2015), 404-429

Ritchie, Pamela E., *Mary of Guise in Scotland, 1548-1560: A Political Career* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 2002)

Robbins, Keith, *Great Britain: Identities, Institutions and the Idea of Britishness* (Harlow: Addison Wesley, 1998; Abingdon: Routledge, 2013)

Roberts, Julian, 'The Latin Trade', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695*, ed. by John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 141-173

Roberts, Peter, 'The English Crown, the Principality of Wales and the Council in the Marches, 1534-1641', in *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago*, ed. by Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 118-147

Roberts, Peter, 'The Union with England and the identity of "Anglican" Wales', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, fifth series, 22 (1972), 49-70

Roberts, Peter, 'Wales and England after the Tudor "Union": Crown, Principality and Parliament, 1543-1624', in *Law and Government under the Tudors*, ed. by Claire Cross, David Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 111-138

Robinson-Self, Philip Mark, *Early Modern Britain's Relationship to Its Past: The Historiographical Fortunes of the Legends of Brute, Albina, and Scota* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2019)

Russell, Conrad, '1603: The End of English National Sovereignty', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 1-14

Russell, Conrad, 'The Anglo-Scottish Union 1603-1643: A Success?', in *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, ed. by Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 238-256

Russell, Conrad, 'James VI and I and Rule Over Two Kingdoms: An English View', *Historical Research*, 76.192 (2003), 151-163

Russell, Conrad, *King James VI and I and his English Parliaments*, ed. by Richard Cust and Andrew Thrush (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Russell, Conrad, 'Topsy and the King: The English Common Law, King James VI and I, and the Union of the Crowns', in *Law and Authority in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to Thomas Garden Barnes*, ed. by Buchanan Sharp and Mark Charles Fissel (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), pp. 336-345

Ryan, Antony Charles, 'Carier, Benjamin (bap. 1565, d. 1614)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/4663>>

Schwytzer, Philip, 'The Jacobean Union Controversy and *King Lear*', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 34-47

Schwytzer, Peter, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)

Shaw, Douglas, 'Scotland's Place in Britain's Coronation Tradition', *The Court Historian*, 9.1 (2004), 41-60

Sherlock, Peter, 'The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the Manipulation of Memory', *Journal of British Studies*, 46.2 (2007), 263-289

Sherlock, Peter, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008)

Sherlock, Peter, 'The Revolution of Memory: The Monuments of Westminster Abbey', in *Revolutionary England, c.1630-c.1660: Essays for Clive Holmes*, ed. by George Southcombe and Grant Tapsell (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), pp. 201-217

Shrank, Cathy, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Simpson, Andrew R.C., 'Counsel and the Crown: History, Law and Politics in the Thought of David Chalmers of Ormond', *The Journal of Legal History*, 36.1 (2015), 3-42

Skinner, Quentin, 'The Origins of the Calvinist Theory of Revolution', in *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J.H. Hexter*, ed. by Barbara C. Malament (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), pp. 309-330

Smailes, Helen, and Duncan Thomson, *The Queen's Image* (Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland, 1987)

Smith, Antony D., *National Identity* (London: Penguin, 1991)

Smith, Jeremy L., 'Mary Queen of Scots as Susanna in Catholic Propaganda', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 73 (2010), 209-220

Smith, Jeremy L., 'Revisiting the Origins of the Sheffield Series of Portraits of Mary Queen of Scots', *The Burlington Magazine*, 152.1285 (April 2010), 212-218

Smith, Jeremy L., 'The Sheffield Portrait Types, their Catholic Purpose, and Mary Queen of Scots's Tomb', *British Catholic History*, 33.1 (2016), 71-90

Smuts, R. Malcolm, 'Royal Mothers, Sacred History, and Political Polemic', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 282-302

Sommerville, J.P., 'King James VI and I and John Selden: Two Voices on History and the Constitution', in *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, ed. by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), pp. 290-322

Sommerville, J.P., 'Literature and National Identity', in *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, ed. by David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 457-486

de Somogyi, Nick, 'Fletcher, Robert (fl. 1581-1606)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9741>>

Squire, Romilly, 'The Saltire', in *Emblems of Scotland* (Dunfermline: The Heraldry Society of Scotland, 1997), pp. 32-44

Staines, John. D., *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560-1690* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)

Stenson, Allison S., 'Writing Sonnets as a Scoto-Britane: Scottish Sonnets, the Union of the Crowns, and Negotiations of Identity', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 41 (2016), 195-210

Stevenson, J.H., *Heraldry in Scotland*, 2 vols (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1914)

Stevenson, Jane Barbara, 'Adulation and Admonition in *The Muses' Welcome*', in *James VI and I, Literature and Scotland: Tides of Change 1567-1625*, ed. by David J. Parkinson (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), pp. 267-281

Stevenson, Katie, and Gordon Pentland, 'The Battle of Flodden and its Commemoration, 1513-2013', in *England and Scotland at War, c.1296-c.1513*, ed. by Andy King and David Simpkin (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 355-380

Stewart, Alan, *The Cradle King: A Life of James VI & I* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2003)

Stewart, Ian, 'Coinage and Propaganda: An Interpretation of the Coin-Types of James VI', in *From the Stone Age to the 'Forty-Five: Studies Presented to R.B.K. Stevenson, Former Keeper National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland*, ed. by Anne O'Connor and D.V. Clarke (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1983), pp. 450-462

Stewart, Laura, “‘Brothers in Truth’: Propaganda, Public Opinion and the Perth Articles Debate in Scotland’, in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. by Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 151-168

Stewart, Laura, ‘The Political Repercussions of the Five Articles of Perth: A Reassessment of James VI and I’s Religious Policies in Scotland’, *Sixteenth Century Journal* 38.4 (2007), 1013-1036

Strickland, Agnes, *Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses Connected with the Regal Succession of Great Britain*, 8 vols (Edinburgh and London, 1850-1859)

Strong, Roy, *Henry Prince of Wales and England’s Lost Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986; reprinted by Pimlico, 2000)

Strong, Roy, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits, Volume I: Text* (London: HMSO, 1969)

Sturges, Robert S., ‘The Guise and the Two Jerusalems: Joinville’s *Vie de saint Louis* and an Early Modern Family’s Medievalism’, in *Aspirations, Representation and Memory: The Guise in Europe, 1506-1688*, ed. by Jessica Munns, Penny Richards, and Jonathan Spangler (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 25-46

Sullivan Jr., Garrett A., *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Tassi, Marguerite A., ‘Martyrdom and Memory: Elizabeth Curle’s Portrait of Mary, Queen of Scots’, in *The Emblematic Queen: Extra-Literary Representations of Early Modern Queenship*, ed. by Debra Barrett-Graves (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 101-132

Thomas, Andrea, ‘James V (1512-1542)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14591>>

Thurley, Simon, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993)

Tinkler, John F., 'Bacon and History', in *The Cambridge Companion to Bacon*, ed. by Markku Peltonen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 232-258

Tinkler, John F., 'The Rhetorical Method of Francis Bacon's *History of the Reign of King Henry VII*', *History and Theory*, 26.1 (February 1987), 32-52

Tite, Colin G.C., 'The Early Catalogues of the Cottonian Library', *The British Library Journal*, 6.2 (Autumn 1980), 144-157

Todd, Margo, 'Powell, Gabriel (bap. 1576, d. 1611)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22646>>

Trevisan, Sara, 'Noah, Brutus of Troy, and King James VI and I: Biblical and Mythical Ancestry in an Anonymous Genealogical Role', in *Mythical Ancestry in World Cultures, 1400-1800*, ed. by Sara Trevisan (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), pp. 137-164

Trevisan, Sara, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2020)

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *George Buchanan and the Ancient Scottish Constitution* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1966)

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *The Invention of Scotland: Myth and History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008)

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *Queen Elizabeth's First Historian: William Camden and the Beginnings of English 'Civil History'* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1971)

Tunstall, Elizabeth, 'The Paradox of the Valentine Thomas Affair: English Diplomacy, Royal Correspondence and the Elizabethan Succession', *Parergon*, 38.1 (2021), 65-87

Turnbull, Michael T.R.B., 'L'Église d'Écosse et le martyr controversé de Marie Stuart', in *Le sang de princes: Cultes et mémoires des souverains suppliciés, XVIe-XXIe siècles*, ed. by Paul Chopelin and Sylvène Édouard (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2014), pp. 257-266

Tutino, Stefania, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570-1625* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007)

Tutino, Stefania, "'Makyng Recusancy Deathe Outrighte'?: Thomas Pounce, Andrew Willet and the Catholic Question in Early Jacobean England', *Recusant History*, 27.1 (2004), 31-50

Tyacke, Nicholas, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)

Jesús M. Usunáriz, 'The Political Discourse on Elizabeth I in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Spain', in *The Image of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Spain*, ed. by Eduardo Olid Guerrero and Esther Fernández (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019), pp. 81-111

Van Eerde, Katherine S., 'Robert Waldegrave: The Printer as Agent and Link Between Sixteenth-Century England and Scotland', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 34.1 (Spring 1981), 40-78

VanDrunen, David, 'The Use of Natural Law in Early Calvinist Resistance Theory', *Journal of Law and Religion*, 21.1 (2006), 143-167

Vercruyssen, Jos E., 'A Scottish Jesuit from Antwerp: Hippolytus Curle', *The Innes Review*, 61.2 (2010), 137-149

Vignaux, Michèle, 'The Succession and Related Issues through the Correspondence of Elizabeth, James, and Robert Cecil', in *The Struggle for the Succession in Late Elizabethan England. Politics, Polemics, and Cultural Representations*, ed. by Jean-Christophe Mayer (Montpellier: Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, 2004), pp. 65-88

Villi, Stefano, 'From Mary Queen of Scots to the Scottish Capuchins: Scotland as a Symbol of Protestant Persecution in Seventeenth-Century Italian Literature', *The Innes Review*, 64.2 (2013), 100-119

Walsham, Alexandra, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Walsham, Alexandra, 'Providentialism', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. by Felicity Heal, Ian W. Archer, and Paulina Kewes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 427-442

Walter, John, 'The "Recusancy Revolt" of 1603 Revisited, Popular Politics, and Civic Catholicism in Early Modern Ireland', *The Historical Journal* (April 2021), 1-26 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X21000327>>

Walton, Kristen Post, *Catholic Queen, Protestant Patriarchy: Mary, Queen of Scots, and the Politics of Gender and Religion* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Warnicke, Retha M., *Mary Queen of Scots* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006)

Waurechen, Sarah, 'Imagined Polities, Failed Dreams, and the Beginnings of an Unacknowledged Britain: English Responses to James VI and I's Vision of Perfect Union', *Journal of British Studies*, 52 (2013), 575-596

Weir, Alison, *The Lost Tudor Princess: A Life of Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2015)

Wheeler, Harvey, 'The Constitutional Ideas of Francis Bacon', *The Western Political Quarterly*, 9.4 (1956), 927-936

Wijffels, Alain, 'A British *ius commune*? A Debate on the Union of the Laws of Scotland and England during the First Years of James VI/I's English Reign', *Edinburgh Law Review*, 6.3 (2002), 315-355

Wilkinson, Alexander S., *Mary Queen of Scots and French Public Opinion, 1542-1600* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Williams, Glanmor, *Recovery, Reorientation and Reformation: Wales, c.1415-1642* (Oxford and Cardiff: Clarendon Press and University of Wales Press, 1987), reprinted as *Renewal and Reformation: Wales, c.1415-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)

Williamson, Arthur H., 'Maxwell, James (b. 1581?, d. in or after 1635)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18400>>

Williamson, Arthur H., 'Patterns of British Identity: 'Britain' and its Rivals in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in *The New British History: Founding a Modern State 1603-1715*, ed. by Glenn Burgess (London: I.B. Tauris, 1999), pp. 138-172

Williamson, Arthur H., 'Scotland, Antichrist and the Invention of Great Britain', in *New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland*, ed. by John Dwyer, Roger A. Mason, and Alexander Murdoch (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), pp. 34-42

Williamson, Arthur H., *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2003)

Willson, David Harris, 'King James I and Anglo-Scottish Unity', in *Conflict in Stuart England: Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein*, ed. by William Appleton Aiken and Basil Duke Henning (London: Jonathan Cape, 1960), pp. 43-55

Willson, D. Harris, *King James VI and I* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1956)

Withers, Charles, 'Geography, Royalty and Empire: Scotland and the Making of Great Britain, 1603-1661', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 113.1 (1997), 22-32

Wood, Andy, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Woodward, Jennifer, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England, 1570-1625* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997)

Woolf, D.R., 'Ayscu [Ayscough], Edward (1550-1616/17)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/69723>>

Woolf, D.R., 'Change and Continuity in English Historical Thought, c. 1590-1640' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1983)

Woolf, Daniel R., 'From Histories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1&2 (March 2005), 33-70, reprinted in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 31-67

Woolf, Daniel, 'Historical Writing in Britain from the Late Middle Ages to the Eve of the Enlightenment', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing Volume 3: 1400-1800*, ed. by Jose Rabasa, Masayuki Sato, Edoardo Tortarolo, and D.R. Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 473-496

Woolf, D.R., *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990)

Woolf, Daniel R., 'John Seldon, John Borough and Francis Bacon's *History of Henry VII, 1621*', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 47.1 (Winter 1984), 47-53

Woolf, D.R., 'Martyn, William (bap. 1562, d. 1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18240>>

Woolf, D.R., 'The Power of the Past: History, Ritual and Political Authority in Tudor England', in *Political Thought and the Tudor Commonwealth: Deep Structure, Discourse and Disguise*, ed. by Paul A. Fideler and T.F. Mayer (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 19-50

Woolf, D.R., *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Woolf, Daniel, 'Senses of the Past in Tudor Britain', in *A Companion to Tudor Britain*, ed. by Robert Tittler and Norman Jones (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), pp. 407-429

Woolf, Daniel, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Woolf, D.R., 'Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory', *Canadian Journal of History/Annales Canadiennes d'Histoire*, 20.2 (1985), 167-191

Wormald, B.H.G., *Francis Bacon: History, Politics, and Science, 1561-1626* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

Wormald, Jenny, 'The Creation of Britain: Multiple Kingdoms or Core and Colonies?', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 2 (1992), 175-194

Wormald, Jenny, 'Gunpowder, Treason, and Scots', *Journal of British Studies*, 24.2 (April 1985), 141-168

Wormald, Jenny, 'The Happier Marriage Partner: The Impact of the Union of the Crowns on Scotland', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 69-87

Wormald, Jenny, 'The Headaches of Monarchy: Kingship and the Kirk in the Early Seventeenth Century', in *Sixteenth Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, ed. by Julian Goodare and Alasdair A. MacDonald (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 365-393

Wormald, Jenny, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: The Scottish Context and the English Translation', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 36-54

Wormald, Jenny, 'James VI, James I and the Identity of Britain', in *The British Problem, c. 1530-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago*, ed. by Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 148-171

Wormald, Jenny, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991)

Wormald, Jenny, 'One King, Two Kingdoms', in *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, ed. by Alexander Grant and Keith Stringer (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 123-132

Wormald, Jenny, 'Resistance and Regicide in Sixteenth-Century Scotland: The Execution of Mary Queen of Scots', *Majestas*, 1 (1993), 67-87

Wormald, Jenny, 'The Union of 1603', in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. by Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 17-40

Wormald, Jenny, “‘A Union of Hearts and Minds?’ The Making of the Union between Scotland and England, 1603’, *Revista Internacional de los Estudios Vascos*, 5 (2009), 109-124

Wortham, Christopher, ‘Shakespeare, James I and the Matter of Britain’, *English*, 45.182 (Summer 1996), 97-122

Wright, C.E., ‘The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and the Formation of the Cottonian Library’, in *The English Library Before 1700: Studies in its History*, ed. by Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright (London: The Athlone Press, 1958), pp. 176-212

Wright, C.J., ed., *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy* (London: British Library, 1997)

Yule, George, ‘James VI and I: Furnishing the Churches in His Two Kingdoms’, in *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*, ed. by Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 182-208

Zagorin, Perez, *Francis Bacon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998)