

Favourites master the ‘well known’, ‘wicked’, ‘soothing’, ‘smooth / And subtle’ ‘arts of court’.¹⁰³ They cannot ‘leave’ courts, for courts and favouritism are inseparable.¹⁰⁴

It is usually at court that favourites are shown using ‘gold’¹⁰⁵ to strengthen their following, or selling posts, or taunting or fleecing armies of suitors and petitioners. The sway of favourites is associated repeatedly with bribery and with the distribution and marketing of offices and places¹⁰⁶ (and often with the allocation of ecclesiastical patronage¹⁰⁷). In a number of plays the favourite’s first appearance shows him selling an office or exacting bribes from petitioners.¹⁰⁸ Through patronage and corruption, favourites build up ‘heard[s] of Parasites, Clients, fooles and sutors’,¹⁰⁹ of ‘creatures’¹¹⁰ who ‘flock, and fawn upon [their] greatness’.¹¹¹

Courts, like the careers of the favourites who thrive in them, provoke a wealth of Stoic disapproval. They are no friends to ‘constancy’.¹¹² Instead, amidst ‘the wavering smiles of court’, ‘cozening fortune holds the scale, which she / Hath ever done in Court’.¹¹³ Faith, morality, opinion, taste, all follow power and its sudden shifts. Men learn to ‘laugh’ or ‘nod’, or ‘wag [their] tayle[s]’, in time with the king or favourite, to ‘freeze or sweat, as my Lord is either hot or cold’, to ‘thinke . . . / As the King thinkes’. They grasp that ‘A prince’s power makes all his actions virtue’, that ‘all is good’ that the favourite ‘make[s] so’. ‘It is the bliss of courts to be employed, no matter how’, and the way to ‘favour’ is ‘to obey and please’, ‘Without examining the reasons why’.¹¹⁴ Criticism of courts is not necessarily criticism of kings. The failings of courts are sometimes presented as facts of political life, with which any monarch, however virtuous, has to live. Even so, the courts of monarchs are vicious places, sinks of venality and luxury and depravity.

They are also enemies to honour and military prowess. Though there are some valiant favourites, who have risen through exploits in war and can be ill-at-ease in courts,¹¹⁵ the run of favourites and of their adherents are ‘cowards’ who ‘ne’re heard / The Canons roring tongue, but at a Triumph’. Wearing silken or effeminate clothes and reeking of perfume,¹¹⁶ loving ‘wantonness and ease’, favourites head ‘the faction of that home-bred cowardize, / That would run backe from glory’. While brave soldiers go unprovided for, or endure hardships, in distant lands, or ‘fill up Hospitalls’ at home, favourites monopolize the rewards of office and appropriate the financial gains of war for themselves, a theme of which Massinger is once more the leading exponent.¹¹⁷ Often it is valiant and loyal generals, all of them experienced and a number of them elderly, who reproach kings for the sway of favourites.¹¹⁸

We have been examining preoccupations and language that stretch across a ‘long’ seventeenth century, from the 1590s to the decades after 1700. Yet there was change as well as continuity.

If, throughout our period, there are plays in which favourites play significant

parts, it is mainly in the early part of it that the theme of favouritism produces both theatrical innovation and freshness of political perspective. It is mainly in the early part, too, that playwrights of stature write plays that are *about* favouritism: not exclusively about it, but turning on it in theme and plot.

The pattern is set by two plays of the early 1590s, Marlowe's *Edward II* (c. 1592), the title-page of which describes Piers Gaveston as a 'mighty favorite', and the anonymous *Woodstock* (c. 1591–4), which is set in the reign of Richard II. Gaveston's lines at the outset of *Edward II*, 'What greater bliss can hap to Gaveston / Than live and be the favourite of a king?' (I. i. 4–5), are not the first recorded use of the noun 'favourite' in the English language. It can be traced back at least as far as 1579, when John Stubbs, warning Queen Elizabeth against marriage to the papist duc d'Anjou, lamented that 'princes . . . commonly' listen not to men who 'dare tell truth' but to 'their chief favourites', who 'study rather for smooth, delicate words than for plain, rough truth'. Three years or so later the fiction of Philip Sidney, who had been Stubbs' literary ally in the campaign against the Anjou match, described the 'favourites' of a tyrant, who were given 'all offices and places'.¹¹⁹ Between them, Stubbs and Sidney deployed – perhaps created – the tropes of literary favouritism. Marlowe brought them on to the stage. Gaveston's opening soliloquy announces the birth of a theatrical tradition.

In both *Edward II* and *Woodstock*, favourites take control of the monarch, oppress the nobility and commons, provoke rebellion, weaken the country's standing abroad. Both plays set pampered favourites – Gaveston and then the Spencers in *Edward II*; Bushy, Greene, Bagot and Scrope in *Woodstock* – against frugal and warlike barons, who ought to rule in harmony with the crown but whom favouritism has divided from it. In both plays the favourites are of low origin, a characteristic that involved the two playwrights in adjustments to their sources, Marlowe reducing the social standing of Edward's favourites, the author of *Woodstock* omitting the influence on Richard of favourites who were not upstarts.¹²⁰ The formulae of characterization and conflict established by the two plays would have an enduring appeal, particularly in the drama performed in the popular playhouses up to 1640.¹²¹

In the years around 1600, stage-favouritism was given an exciting and risky topicality by the prominence and fall of the Earl of Essex (pl. 10). No other favourite of our period cast so powerful a spell on the theatrical imagination. As a favourite, Essex figures mainly in plays written after his death. Dramatists were interested less in his occupancy of power than in his descent from it. They were fascinated by the combination of qualities that raised him so high and yet cast him so low, a subject to which Chapman boldly points in his plays of 1607–8 about the Biron conspiracy.¹²² But while dramatists blamed Essex's failings, they saw him not as an instrument of courtly wickedness but as a victim of it. He was he, after all, who stood for martial prowess and antique honour. He, at least, was no upstart. It was the stay-at-home party, the party of Robert Cecil, that brought Essex down, by methods that repelled not only Essex's followers but

neutral observers. Essex, as William Camden said, 'seemed not to be made for the court':¹²³ his enemies, as dramatists portrayed them, were arch-courtiers. There was thus scope for figuring both Essex and his enemies as stage-favourites.¹²⁴

The fullest exploitation of that dual potential is Daniel's *The Tragedy of Philotas*, published in 1605. Daniel, a former client of Essex, was brought before the council for writing the play, which describes the downfall of Alexander the Great's favourite Philotas, who is executed for treason. During the proceedings against Philotas, he and his opponents are given words borrowed from the confrontation between Essex and his enemies at the earl's trial. The play presents a puzzlingly uneven balance of sympathy, which seems explicable only on the supposition that Daniel altered his text before its publication, perhaps for reasons relating to his brush with authority.¹²⁵ Sometimes it seems that the fatal flaw of ambition has lured Philotas into treason: at other moments he seems the victim, perhaps the innocent victim, of courtly 'minions' who have deviously 'intrap't him (ll. 395, 426). Like Essex, Philotas is unfit for court life and in some respects superior to it (ll. 61–6). He stands for ancient liberties and for what Daniel elsewhere calls 'ancient honour neere worne out of date'.¹²⁶

The ghost of Essex is visible again, if more faintly, in another play published in 1605, Jonson's *Sejanus His Fall*, which apparently got its author, too, into trouble with the council. In *Cynthias Revells*, his satire of the Elizabethan court in 1600, Jonson had already alluded, in what seems to have been an ill-judged bid for royal approval, to Essex's fall from the queen's grace.¹²⁷ In *Sejanus His Fall* the imaginative challenge posed by Essex's career is more fully met. Jonson's Sejanus, the 'favourite' and 'minion' of the Emperor Tiberius (III. 243, 640, IV. 364, 454), is an Icarus who, in that respect, resembles Essex. Yet Jonson, like Daniel, distances Essex from the *mores* of the court. The play allocates the earl's values not to Sejanus but to the antique senators who detest the court and lament the seemingly irresistible advance of tyranny.¹²⁸

Sejanus His Fall is a new departure in the theatrical representation of favouritism. Earlier treatments described groups (or a succession) of 'favourites', who had to contend, not always on terms of advantage, with other political parties. Jonson's theme is the dominance and fall of a single favourite. In *Edward II*, it is true, Gaveston has secured a monopoly of royal favour, but that evil soon gives way to others. He does not dominate Marlowe's play as Sejanus does Jonson's. The concentration of Jonson's play on a single favourite enabled him to create, as perhaps no one had done before him, a tragic pattern out of the career of a politician who was not a king.

It also reflected a change of political climate. Until the very end of Elizabeth's reign, no favourite had secured anything like a monopoly of favour. Essex was known as 'a favourite', not 'the favourite'.¹²⁹ His fall, and Robert Cecil's swift rise to ascendancy thereafter, aroused the prospect, which would be so

prominent a theme of Jacobean and early Caroline politics, of government by a single favourite, at the expense not only of his rivals but of the authority of the crown. A contemporary observer of the twilight of Elizabeth's reign, the time when *Sejanus His Fall* was conceived and its composition begun, noted a change in the character of her rule. Hitherto, by 'feed[ing] the factious affections' of her principal subjects, she had secured their dependence on 'her favour' for 'the raysing of their own greatnes'. She had thus contrived 'to make her own direction the more absolute'. Now, however, 'the queen like Claudius is kept from hearing what is done in the market. All mysteries of state' have escaped her knowledge, and she is left to 'raigne as the moone in borrowed majestie'.¹³⁰ That, in Jonson's play, is the fate threatening Tiberius, who has surrendered power and initiative to Sejanus. Later Jonson would allude to the same danger under the early Stuarts: princes who neglect their 'proper office', he wrote, have 'often-times' the misfortune 'to draw a Sejanus to be near about them; who will at last affect to get above them'.¹³¹

Jonson's play is innovative too in another way: in its depiction of a reign of terror. Earlier dramatists had represented the evils of tyrants: Jonson communicates the evils of tyranny. He is the first dramatist to indicate the resemblances, which impressed and alarmed contemporaries, between the loss of Roman liberties under the early empire and the threat to English and European liberties posed by the monarchies of the late Renaissance.¹³² Those themes would make *Sejanus His Fall* a model for a number of seventeenth-century plays in which favourites appear. They would also bring the memory of Sejanus into the arena of political debate, where he would figure most vividly during the supremacy of Buckingham in the 1620s, but long thereafter too, at least until late in the eighteenth century.¹³³

One other play from the early years of James I, this one a comedy, shows how powerfully the idea of favouritism held the public mind of that time: John Day's *The Isle of Gulls* (1606), a work which brought severe retribution to the company that performed it. The very title was provocative, recalling as it intentionally did *The Isle of Dogs*, the play of 1597 which had landed its authors, of whom Jonson was one, in prison. Day's play is an adaptation of Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, a work written around a quarter of a century earlier. Sidney's story has a favourite, Dametas, a buffoon whose whimsical elevation by Duke Basilius illustrates the irresponsibility of absolute power. Yet Dametas and his rise occupy relatively little space in Sidney's romance, where the setting is pastoral, not courtly, the duke having broken up his court. Day transfers the story to a court and makes Dametas, who becomes the monopolist of office and favour, a central character, flourishing while the commonwealth sickens with social and political abuses.¹³⁴

Day spotted his analogical opportunity in two accidents of history: the first, that James I, like Basilius in Sidney's story, was fond of hunting, the activity from which, in the *Arcadia*, Dametas' prosperity takes its rise; the second, that James had written a book with a title, *Basilikon Doron*, that inadvertently aligned

him with the name of Sidney's duke. In Day's play as in Sidney's romance, Dametas' elevation is a whimsical exercise of the duke's arbitrary power.¹³⁵ Yet where Sidney's main criticism is directed at the duke, Day's is directed at the favourite. We cannot tell whether Day's Dametas is intended to parallel a particular Jacobean politician. If so the target may be Robert Cecil, who was widely attacked in ballads and libels in terms often reminiscent of the depictions of favourites in the drama;¹³⁶ or it may be one of the king's Scottish favourites, who were derided in 1605 in *Eastward Ho!*, another play whose authors, Jonson again among them, were put in prison.¹³⁷

One writer is conspicuous by his absence from the list of dramatists eager to dramatize the rule of favourites: Shakespeare. We can grasp the point by setting his *Richard II* beside *Woodstock*, which may have been a source for it, and where the theme of favouritism is so much ampler. In Shakespeare the favourites have minor parts. It is true that the lament of John of Gaunt for 'This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle' follows the scene which introduces Greene, Bagot and Bushy, and is prompted by the Duke of York's account of the victory won by flattery and 'will' over counsel and of the success of the king's lascivious entourage in 'stopp[ing]' his 'ear'.¹³⁸ Yet those revelations are not developed.

With one arguable exception, there are no favourites with major parts in Shakespeare. He might have chosen to make a favourite of Polonius. Yet Claudius, like Shakespeare's other wicked kings – like Richard III, like Macbeth, like Leontes – makes his own way to evil. The arguable exception is to be found in *Henry VIII*, the play Shakespeare wrote late in life with John Fletcher, whose own plays are peopled with favourites. Henry for a time allows too much power to Wolsey, the upstart favourite opposed by the ancient nobility, though the king sees his mistake and recovers from it. When in 1628, a fortnight before the Duke of Buckingham's assassination, the duke attended a revival of *Henry VIII*, observers remarked on his resemblance to Wolsey, that 'lively type of himself, having governed this kingdome eighteen years, as [Buckingham] hath fourteen'.¹³⁹ Yet that response tells us about the concerns of the observers, not of Shakespeare.

For there is in Shakespeare none of the appetite for barbed or risky topical allusion, and none of the instinct for political didacticism, that characterize many of his contemporary dramatists.¹⁴⁰ (On the one occasion when he clearly alludes to a contemporary politician – probably Essex – he does not have that politician's standing as a favourite in mind.¹⁴¹) The playwrights who wrote about favourites were the ones who got into trouble. Shakespeare did not get into trouble. It is true that the deposition scene in *Richard II*, a play which Essex may have had performed in the hope of winning support for his revolt, had to be omitted from the texts of it published in the lifetime of Elizabeth, who suspected that other accounts of Richard's reign were aimed at her. Sir John Hayward's account of Richard's deposition, published in 1599, led to his fierce interrogation and protracted imprisonment. Yet no one seems to have suspected

Shakespeare of writing *Richard II* with an eye to contemporary politics. His immunity offers a striking contrast not only to Hayward's fate but to the charges levelled at Jonson and Daniel as a result of their plays about favourites.

After the opening years of James' reign, favouritism, though a regular theatrical subject, is never again quite so dominant a one: not even during the supremacy of Buckingham. Certainly the duke was a theatrical target, most vividly and daringly perhaps in *The Maid of Honour*, the play of 1621 or 1622 by Massinger, the client of Buckingham's rival the Earl of Pembroke. Buckingham is unmistakably figured by the 'state Catamite' Fulgentio,¹⁴² the upstart and effeminate monopolist of favour and profit, under whose regime the nation has settled for a slothful peace abroad while the navy has fallen into neglect.¹⁴³ At the outset of the play a sharp and extended parallel is drawn between the events that launch Massinger's plot and the refusal of James and Buckingham to give armed assistance to the Elector Palatine. The war party is rousing led by Bertoldo, who warns the king against 'sycophants, that feed upon your favour' and 'prefer your ease before your honour'. Yet the opening contemporary allusions soon fade.¹⁴⁴ So does the opening impression of didacticism, which yields to the sort of balance of opposing insights that only Shakespeare of the previous generation essayed. Though Fulgentio remains contemptible, Bertoldo's attacks on his regime prove to be the bombast of a morally flawed character.

For in the 1620s and 1630s political drama is changing. The savage satire of courts to be found in the plays of Marston or the early Jonson, or in Donne's early poetry, has largely given way to more subtle, less partisan, less aggressive or acidic writing. The essence of drama is conflict, but there is, in the better drama, a change in the nature of that conflict. Oppositions between good and bad are becoming less straightforward. There are playwrights readier to try to capture the ethical ambivalences of power, and readier to acknowledge the humanity of flawed politicians. The representation of the favourite in Massinger's *The Great Duke of Florence* or Ford's *The Broken Heart* illustrates the trend. There is another change too. Drama which treats of politics becomes less centrally political. It is starting to have proportionately less to do with politics and more to do with romance. Plots and behaviour which begin with the pressures of politics come to centre on those of love.

To us, the great age of favourites may seem to have passed by around 1640. Yet public interest in the subject did not diminish after that date. It was not reduced by the civil wars, or by the Restoration, or by the Revolution of 1688. William III's Dutch favourites were unpopular as James' Scottish ones had been before them. In William's reign, favouritism was as prominent a theme of historical or biographical writing as it had ever been. Nathaniel Crouch's *The Unfortunate Court-Favourites of England* of 1695, which relates the careers of favourites from Gaveston in the fourteenth century to Strafford in the seventeenth, conceives of favouritism as a universal and unvarying phenomenon.¹⁴⁵

On the stage, too, the preoccupation with favouritism survived the Puritan Revolution and then the deposition of James II.¹⁴⁶ After the Restoration the subject was given fresh topicality by the fall of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, in 1667 (pl. 70). That event was quickly followed by two plays which touch on it, Orrery's *Tryphon* and Sir Robert Howard's *The Great Favourite, or the Duke of Lerma*. Though the plays were written, as those about Essex had mainly been, after the favourite's fall, Clarendon remained alive and his enemies dreaded his return. Both authors, in their portraits of favourites, use biographical touches to summon Clarendon to their audiences' minds. Howard's play, which reproduces arguments used by himself and by other MPs during the recent attacks on Clarendon, is more closely and conspicuously related to the minister's fall than Orrery's. Yet *Tryphon* carries a clear warning to Charles II which is announced in its opening speech: 'he too much deserves to lose his Throne, / Who makes a Subject's Pow'r exceed his own.'¹⁴⁷ The two plays endorse the view of the courtier who, when Clarendon delivered up the seals of office, told Charles 'that this was the first time he could ever call himself King of England, being freed from this great man'.¹⁴⁸

The ensuing decades brought many more plays – some Whig, some Tory, some Jacobite, some of no evident political bias – which addressed the theme of favouritism, and in which modern critics, with varying degrees of confidence, have detected topical allusions.¹⁴⁹ In one play of 1691, *King Edward the Third* (perhaps by John Bancroft), the allusions are unmistakable. That work consciously echoes an earlier project. Ben Jonson had begun, but not completed, a play entitled *Mortimer His Fall*, about the favourite of the early years of Edward III. His draft (which was published in his *Works* in 1640) may have been a first attempt by Jonson at the theme of the fallen favourite, for which, in *Sejanus His Fall*, he would choose a Roman setting instead. The draft would have a long afterlife, as would *Sejanus His Fall*. The play of 1691, subtitled *The Fall of Mortimer*, related the sway and fall of that favourite and drew parallels between them and the regime and fall of James II. After a revival in 1719, it was produced in a rewritten form in 1731, now with *The Fall of Mortimer* as its title.¹⁵⁰ Allusions to events of that year were introduced into the text, and the language was brought up to date to enable the medieval barons to speak the language of 'patriot[ism]' and to attack Walpole's use of placemen and mercenary parliaments.¹⁵¹ The performances of the new version caused a sensation until the government suppressed them. In the same year, perhaps in conjunction with the *The Fall of Mortimer*, there appeared *The Fall of the Earl of Essex*, a revised version of John Banks' *The Unhappy Favourite* (1682). A series of subtle touches conspires to adapt Banks' version to the political vocabulary of the 1730s and to hint at resemblances between Walpole and Essex's rival in the play, Lord Burghley. Other plays, too, joined in the public denigration of Walpole the favourite.¹⁵² Indeed in the years preceding the Licensing Act of 1737 playwrights mocked his ascendancy with vigour and boldness. The theatrical consequences were temporarily exhilarating but soon disastrous. The

theme of favouritism, which had been so widespread in political drama since the 1590s, now provoked the suppression of that drama.

Henceforth plays against favourites could (at least normally) appear only in print, not on the stage. Yet print provided a medium of sharp criticism. Jonson's *Sejanus His Fall* was rewritten in 1752, and again in 1770, with contemporary targets in view. The two adaptations protested against what the text of 1770 called 'that dramatic star chamber, the licence office', which prevented their performance.¹⁵³ The version of 1770, entitled *The Favourite*, aimed witty shafts at George III's favourite the Earl of Bute, to whom it was mockingly dedicated. So was a play-text of 1763 which *The Favourite* echoed: the republication, at the instigation of John Wilkes, of the text of *Mortimer His Fall* of 1731 and, with it, of Jonson's draft. Bute's alleged intimacy with the young king's mother neatly corresponded to Mortimer's relationship with young Edward's mother, a theme of Jonson's projected play 160 years earlier. Wilkes' saucy dedication (which includes the first usage of the word 'favouritism' recorded by the *Oxford English Dictionary*) invites Bute to produce a still better play on Mortimer. Bute, explains Wilkes, would find that task 'easy', for 'A variety of anecdotes in real life will supersede the least necessity of political fiction.'¹⁵⁴

Yet if the drama retains, until George III's reign, its power to deride contemporary favourites, the aesthetic decline of such attacks can be dated much earlier. Resilient as the attraction of the theme to playwrights was, topical treatments of favourites produced almost no drama of artistic distinction after the early 1640s. The one clear exception, Sir Robert Howard's fine (if markedly unhistorical) portrait of the ascendancy of the Duke of Lerma, *The Great Favourite*, half proves a rule, for it was based on a play written earlier, certainly before the Restoration, perhaps before the Civil Wars.¹⁵⁵ In the drama before 1640, the contemporary pertinence and the artistic potential of the theme of favouritism fed off each other: thereafter the two went separate ways.

For the historian, however, bad plays can be as informative as good ones. Interest in favouritism, as reflected in the publication of plays and in the writing of fiction and of history, was probably as strong for most of the eighteenth century as it was in the later sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. It made its slow retreat before a principle which, though it was intermittently advanced in the eighteenth century, was secured only in the nineteenth: a principle which reflected a changed understanding of the proper relationship of minister to monarch. For it was now that the leading ministers of monarchs came under attack not for undermining or usurping the crown's authority, that pre-eminent sin of stage-favourites, but for failing in their duty to restrain it.¹⁵⁶

Notes

1. In writing this essay I have incurred an exceptionally heavy debt to Dr Paulina Kewes, of the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, for her scholarly guidance and expertise.

2. Patrick Collinson, 'Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*. The Theatre Constructs Puritanism', in David L. Smith et al., eds, *The Theatrical City. Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 157–69.
3. Public perceptions of favouritism are helpfully described by Robert P. Shepherd, 'Royal Favourites in the Political Discourse of Tudor and Stuart England', Claremont University PhD thesis (1985), esp. ch. 6.
4. Ben Jonson, *Mortimer His Fall* (in C. H. Herford et al., eds, *Ben Jonson*, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925–52), vii), I. 25ff.; J. D. Jump, ed., *Rollo, Duke of Normandy* (Liverpool, repr. 1969: hereafter *Rollo*), p. xxiv; [Thomas Southland?], *The Ungrateful Favourite* (London, 1664), pp. 24, 71; Joseph Harris, *The Mistakes* (London, 1691), p. 10; cf. Balthazar Gerbier, Baron d'Ouvilly, *The False Favourit Disgrac'd* (London, 1657), p. 19. With the exception of *Sejanus His Fall*, all of Jonson's writings will be cited from the edition by Herford et al. D'Ouvilly also explored the theme of favouritism in *Les Effects Pernicieux de Meschants FAVORIS et Grands Ministres de L'Estat* (The Hague, 1653).
5. Charles Gildon, *The Roman Brides Revenge* (London, 1697), p. 2.
6. Robert Baron, *Mirza* (London, 1655 edn), sigs A6v, A7, and p. 14; cf. John Dryden, *Don Sebastian* (in E. N. Hooker and H. T. Swedenborg, eds, *The Works of John Dryden*, 20 vols (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956–)), xv), I. i. 57.
7. Ben Jonson, *Sejanus His Fall*, ed. Philip Ayres (Manchester, 1990), II. 155; John Ford, *The Broken Heart*, ed. T. J. B. Spencer (Manchester, 1980), I. i. 42; William Gifford, ed., *The Dramatic Works and Poems of James Shirley*, 6 vols (repr. New York, 1966: hereafter *Shirley*), v, p. 333; Baron, *Mirza*, pp. 42, 81, 105; John Banks, *The Unfortunate Favourite; or, the Earl of Essex* (London, 1682), p. 5.
8. A. R. Waller, ed., *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, 10 vols (Cambridge, 1905–12; hereafter *Beaumont and Fletcher*), iii, p. 321; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 57; Bevill Higgins, *The Generous Conqueror* (London, 1702), p. 40; cf. Charles Johnson, *Love and Liberty* (London, 1709), p. 6.
9. Jonson, *Sejanus*, II. 180–1, V. 69–78, 390, 908–12 (cf. Herbert P. Horne et al., eds, 'Nero' & Other Plays (London, 1888), p. 87: hereafter *Nero*); Baron, *Mirza*, p. 73; Sir Robert Howard, *The Great Favourite or The Duke of Lerma* (in D. D. Arundell, ed., *Dryden and Howard 1664–1668* (Cambridge, 1929)), pp. 226, 229, 270; Elkanah Settle, *Cambyses King of Persia* (London, 1671), pp. 5, 57; John Crowne, *The Ambitious Statesman or Loyal Favourite* (London, 1679), p. 37; cf. d'Ouvilly, *False Favourit*, p. 98.
10. Jonson, *Sejanus*, V. 201; *Rollo*, II. ii. 63–6; Shirley, v, p. 335; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 43; d'Ouvilly, *False Favourit*, p. 71; Thomas Southerne, *The Loyal Brother* (London, 1682), p. 45; Higgins, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 12; cf. Nathaniel Crouch, *The Unfortunate Court-Favourites of England* (London, 1695), p. 45.
11. John Marston, *The Malcontent*, ed. M. L. Wine (London, 1965), V. iv. 73; *Nero*, p. 52; *Rollo*, IV. i. 33–6 (cf. IV. i. 80–1); *Beaumont and Fletcher*, iii, pp. 309–10; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 43; Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, *Tryphon* (London, 1669), p. 1; Settle, *Cambyses*, pp. 5, 67–8; Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*, p. 7[7]; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, pp. 12–13.
12. *Rollo*, III. i. 254; Lodowick Carlell, *The Deserving Favourite* (London, 1629), sigs B4, G2; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 34 (cf. p. 24); Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 3.
13. Philip Massinger, *The Duke of Milan* (in Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, eds, *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, 5 vols (Oxford, 1976), i), I. iii. 282; Shirley, iv, pp. 159, 200 (cf. p. 170); James Maidment and W. H. Logan, eds, *The Dramatic Works of Sir William D'Avenant*, 5 vols (repr. New York, 1964: hereafter *Davenant*), i, pp. 21, 118, 119, 131; Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, *The History of Henry the Fifth* (published London, 1669), 'The Persons'; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 14, 16; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 3.
14. Jonson, *Sejanus*, 'Argument' (l. 5), I. 218–19, 529 (cf. Tacitus, *Annals*, IV. ii); Philip Massinger, *The Great Duke of Florence* (in Edwards and Gibson, *Massinger*, iii), I. i. 93; Carlell, *Deserving Favourite*, sig. B4; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 7.
15. Christopher Marlowe, *Edward II*, ed. Roma Gill (Oxford, repr. 1989), V. iv. 48; A. P. Rossiter, ed., *Woodstock* (London, 1946), I. ii. 19; *Davenant*, i, p. 179; *Beaumont and Fletcher*, iii, p. 313.
16. J. W. Lever, ed., *The Wasp* (Malone Society, 1974 [1976]), p. 100; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 42; d'Ouvilly, *False Favourit*, p. 97*; Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 235; Orrery, *Tryphon*, p. 1; Settle, *Cambyses*, p. 70; *The Fall of Mortimer* (London, 1731 edn), p. 12; cf. John Wilson, *Andronicus Comenius* (London, 1664), pp. 64, 73–4.
17. Marston, *Malcontent*, I. iv. 78–9; Jonson, *Sejanus*, 'Argument' (l. 15), I. 241–2 (cf. I. 366, III. 528); Samuel Daniel, *The Tragedy of Philotas*, ed. Laurence Michel (New Haven, repr. 1970), II. 713 (cf. *ibid.*, p. 58); Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, III. ii. 255–6, 325, 441–2; *Beaumont and Fletcher*, iii, pp. 359, 367; Shirley, iv, pp. 107, 121, 271; *Davenant*, i, pp. 106, 121, 179 (cf. i, p. 61), iii, pp. 14, 38,

- 49; Baron, *Mirza*, sig. A7 and pp. 14, 47–8, 73 (cf. p. 84); *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 21, 24, 52, 57, 61, 64, 7[4], 88; Orrery, *Tryphon*, pp. 1, 2 (cf. Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration. English Tragicomedy, 1660–1671* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 187); Howard, *Great Favourite*, pp. 221, 236, 255, 278; Settle, *Cambyses*, pp. 5, 83; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, pp. 37, 54 (cf. p. 22); Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*, p. 5; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, pp. 7, 12; [John Bancroft?], *King Edward the Third* (London, 1691), p. 10; William Congreve, *The Mourning Bride* (in Herbert Davis, ed., *The Complete Plays of William Congreve* (Chicago, 1967), V. ii. 88; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 12; Higgons, *Generous Conqueror*, pp. 12, 53, 64; *Majesty Misled: or, the Overthrow of Evil Ministers* (London, 1734), p. 18; [Francis Gentleman], *The Favourite* (Dublin, 1770), pp. 21, 26, 45, 49. Cf. *The Unfortunate Favourite* (London, 1689), pp. 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11; Crouch, *Unfortunate Court-Favourites*, pp. 7, 45, 99, 156; Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, ed. W. D. Macray, 6 vols (Oxford, 1888), i, p. 43; Pauline Croft, 'The Reputation of Sir Robert Cecil', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, i (1991), pp. 47, 55.
18. Jonson, *Sejanus*, 'Argument' (l. 8), I. 579, II. 139 (cf. *The Tragedy of Tiberius* (Malone Society, 1914), ll. 1033–4); Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, II. i. 430, V. i. 57–8; Carlell, *Deserving Favourite*, sig. B4; Ford, *Broken Heart*, I. i. 43; Shirley, v, pp. 349, 350; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 88 (cf. p. 91); Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 270; Settle, *Cambyses*, p. 5; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, pp. 9, 10, 11; Higgons, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 71; *The General Cashier'd* (London, 1712), pp. 53–4. The third-ranking motive is 'envy'.
19. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 556, III. 574; Daniel, *Philotas*, p. 101 (cf. p. 58); *Nero*, pp. 18, 87; *The Wasp*, p. 28; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 12. Cf. Baron, *Mirza*, p. 47; *The Unfortunate Favourite*, p. 10.
20. Jonson, *Mortimer His Fall*, 'arguments' (l. 2), I. 1; Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 10–11, II. 403, III. 562, 573, 637–40, 645, 735, 745–8, V. i. 5–9, 572–5, 719, 904–5; Daniel, *Philotas*, I. 445; A. H. Bullen, ed., *The Works of John Day* (repr. London, 1963: hereafter Day), pp. 219, 227; *The Tragedy of Tiberius*, I. 667; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, I. iii. 272–3, II. i. 18–19, 293–5, IV. i. 22, V. ii. 5–7, 223–4 (cf. Massinger, *The Bondman* (in Edwards and Gibson, *Massinger*, i), I. iii. 187); Ford, *Broken Heart*, IV. iii. 76; Shirley, ii, p. 108; *The Dramatic Works of Richard Brome*, 3 vols (repr. New York, 1966: hereafter Brome), i, p. 186; Davenant, i, p. 128, iii, p. 30; Baron, *Mirza*, sig. A7 and pp. 55, 82, 123; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 89; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 24, 91; Orrery, *Tryphon*, pp. 1, 4; Howard, *Great Statesman*, p. 236; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, p. 3; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 7; Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*, p. 17; Harris, *Mistakes*, p. 67; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 32; *Majesty Misled*, p. 79; *The Favourite*, p. 8.
21. Davenant, i, p. 121; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 123.
22. Daniel, *Philotas*, I. 511; Brome, i, p. 246; Lodowick Carlell, *The Fool would be a Favourite* (in Carlell's *Two New Playes* (London, 1657)), pp. 45, 46; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 123; Settle, *Cambyses*, p. 84; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, p. 54.
23. Marston, *Malcontent*, I. vi. 3; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 73; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 61; cf. Crouch, *Unfortunate Court-Favourites*, p. 49.
24. *Nero*, p. 18; Higgons, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 53 (cf. p. 65).
25. Jonson, *Sejanus*, II. 98–9, 151–3, V. 1–24; *The Wasp*, p. 28; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 42; Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 221; Settle, *Cambyses*, p. 84; Harris, *Mistakes*, p. 13; cf. Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 278.
26. Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, II. i. 427–8; Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, p. 359; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 40; John Bancroft, *Henry the Second* (London, 1693), p. 4; Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, IV. i. 74–6; *The Fall of Mortimer* (1731), p. 58; cf. Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 44.
27. Marston, *Malcontent*, I. v. 20–33; Jonson, *Sejanus*, II. 100, v. rff.; Day, p. 262; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 13, 89–90; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 7[4], 91; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 7.
28. Carlell, *Fool would be a Favourite*, p. 29; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 88; cf. Clarendon, *History*, i, p. 42.
29. Ford, *Broken Heart*, II. ii. 1–5 (cf. IV. i. 72–3; Harris, *Mistakes*, p. 69).
30. Davenant, i, p. 82. Cf. Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, III. ii. 224–7, 359–64; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 87; Harris, *Mistakes*, p. 19; *The Unfortunate Favourite*, p. 9; *Majesty Misled*, p. 17.
31. Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 13; cf. d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 40.
32. Baron, *Mirza*, p. 43; Settle, *Cambyses*, pp. 71–2; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 12. Cf. Jonson, *Sejanus*, IV. 61–2; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 21. 'Dullness' is a quality frequently despised by favourites.
33. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. i. 100, I. iv. 239, 402, III. iii. 20; *Woodstock*, I. iii. 118; George Chapman, *The Gentleman Usher* (ed. J. H. Smith, London, 1970), I. i. 100, 118; Jonson, *Sejanus*, V. 465, 473–

- 4, 574; Day, pp. 219, 226; *Nero*, p. 13; *The Wasp*, pp. 1, 28; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, II. i. 237 (cf. Massinger, *Bondman*, I. iii. 187); Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, p. 313; Baron, *Mirza*, sig. A7 and p. 73; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 4, 50; Settle, *Cambyses*, p. 44; *King Edward the Third*, p. 2.
34. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 284; Day, p. 231; George Chapman, *Bussy d'Ambois*, ed. N. S. Brooke (Manchester, repr. 1979), III i. 98; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, II. i. 86; Massinger, *The Great Duke of Florence* (in Edwards and Gibson, *Massinger*, iii), II. ii. 42; Ford, *Broken Heart*, IV. i. 98, 102; *Majesty Misled*, p. 17; cf. Jonson, *Every Man out of his Humour* (in Herford, *Jonson*, iii), I. ii. 162–3.
35. Chapman, *Bussy d'Ambois*, II. ii. 4–7; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, II. i. 19; Ford, *Broken Heart*, IV. i. 98, 102.
36. Jonson, *Sejanus*, V. 465–7; Day, p. 226; Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis, 1631–1642* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 206–7.
37. Day, p. 279; Bancroft, *Henry the Second*, p. 3; Congreve, *Mourning Bride*, I. i. 276; *Fall of Mortimer* (1731), pp. 26–7; cf. Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, I. i. 277–9.
38. *Woodstock*, I. iii. 184–92, II. i. 5, 18–20, II. ii. 120ff., 146–8 (cf. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 345, III. ii. 168); Daniel, *Philotas*, I. 510; Massinger, *Bondman*, I. iii. 180–4; Ford, *Broken Heart*, I. i. 39, IV. iii. 78, 93; Carlell, *Fool would be a Favourite*, p. 20; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 110 (cf. p. 107); Nathaniel Lee, *The Rival Queens*, ed. P. F. Vernon (Lincoln, Nebr., 1970), I. i. 10, II. 70, 128; cf. Jonson, *Sejanus*, II. 23–4.
39. *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 2; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 253; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 32.
40. Jonson, *Sejanus*, V. 81–4, 203–8, 366–7 (cf. I. 303–5, V. 21–3); *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 36, 72; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 32. Cf. Settle, *Cambyses*, p. 83; Clarendon, *Rebellion*, I. p. 42.
41. Jonson, *Sejanus*, III. 321–6, IV. 67–76, 115–27, 294–5, V. 739–45; Daniel, *Philotas*, II. 416ff., 741ff.; Philip Massinger, *The Roman Actor* (in Edwards and Gibson, *Massinger*, iii), III. i. 111–14, III. ii. 95ff.; Carlell, *Deserving Favourite* (London, 1659 edn), sig. N3; Beaumont and Fletcher, iii. pp. 115, 118, 120; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 62; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, pp. 109–10; Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 269; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, pp. 25–6; Timoleon: or, *The Revolution* (London, 1697), pp. 75–7; Blair Worden, 'Ben Jonson among the Historians', in Peter Lake and Kevin Sharpe, eds, *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994), pp. 88–9; cf. Chapman, *Bussy d'Ambois*, I. i. 1ff.
42. Davenant, iii, p. 27 (cf. i. p. 20); Ford, *Broken Heart*, IV. i. 78–9; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. iii. 71 (cf. Massinger, *Bondman*, I. iii. 100–1); Baron, *Mirza*, pp. 42, 95; Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 247; cf. John Dryden, *Aureng-Zebe* (in Hooker and Swedenborg, *Dryden*, xii), I. i. 68, 166.
43. Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. i. 67; cf. Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue. Philip Sidney's Arcadia and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven and London, 1996), pp. 138–9, 143–4.
44. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 410; *The Tragedy of Tiberius*, I. 669; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, I. iii. 283–4; Shirley, iv, p. 110; Harris, *Mistakes*, p. 77.
45. William Strode, *The Floating Island* (London, 1655), sig. Cv; Settle, *Cambyses*, p. 5; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, p. 25. Cf. *King Edward the Third*, p. 6; *Timoleon*, p. 30.
46. Shakespeare, *Much Ado about Nothing*, III. i. 9–11; Dryden, *Aureng-Zebe*, IV. i. 89–90.
47. Thomas Goffe, *The Tragedy of Orestes* (London, 1633); Nahum Tate, *The History of King Richard the Second* (London, 1681), sig. A1v and pp. 14, 29; William Hemings, *The Eunuch* (London, 1687), esp. pp. 36–8; Thomas Durfey, *Bussy d'Ambois* (London, 1691), 'Dramatis Personae' (cf. Chapman, *Bussy d'Ambois*, p. 3); Ennis Rees, *The Tragedies of George Chapman* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 161; Dale Randall, *Winter Fruit. English Drama, 1642–1660* (Lexington, Ky, 1995), p. 210; cf. Charles Hopkins, *Boadicea* (London, 1697), 'Dramatis Personae'.
48. See the references to *The Unfortunate Favourite* and *The Unfortunate Court-Favourites* (which was republished in 1706) elsewhere in these notes. The year 1706 also saw the publication of a tract which borrowed from Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* and which was emphatically portrayed on its title-page as a study of 'favourite[s]': *The Characters of Robert Earl of Essex, Favourite to Queen Elizabeth, and George D. of Buckingham, Favourite to K. James I and K. Ch. I* (London, 1706). See too *The French Favourites* (London, 1707).
49. Catherine Bates, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature* (Cambridge, 1992).
50. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. i. 5–6; Ben Jonson, *Cynthias Revells* (in Herford, *Ben Jonson*, iv), II. i. 125; Philip Massinger, *The Maid of Honour* (in Edwards and Gibson, *Massinger*, i), I. i. 272 (cf. Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. iii. 275–6; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. ii. 20, 36); Davenant, i, pp. 21, 23, 37; Nahum Tate, *The Loyal General* (London, 1680), p. 12; Lee, *Rival Queens*, II. 96ff.;

- Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, I. i. 69 and n. (p. 424) (cf. V. i. 274–9); *King Edward the Third*, pp. 3, 10; Hemings, *Eunuch*, pp. 37–8. Cf. Marston, *Malcontent*, II. v. 55ff.; Anne Somerset, *Unnatural Murder. Poison at the Court of James I* (London, 1997), pp. 43, 45, 50.
51. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 427 (cf. V. 47); Day, p. 226; George Chapman, *The Tragedy of Caesar and Pompey* (in T. M. Parrott, ed., *The Plays and Poems of George Chapman* (London, 1910)), I. i. 18–25; *The Wasp; Rollo*, p. 75; Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, p. 114 (cf. p. 118); Nathaniel Richards, *The Tragedy of Messallina* (London, 1640), sig. D3v; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 24; Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*, p. 71; Harris, *Mistakes*, p. 15; *The General Cashier'd*, pp. 27, 29; *Majesty Misled*, prologue; cf. Croft, 'Reputation of Sir Robert Cecil', p. 46 (on the Earl of Northampton as 'His Majesty's earwig').
52. Davenant, iii, p. 14; Goffe, *Orestes*; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*; Harris, *Mistakes*; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*; *The General Cashier'd*. In 1709 we have 'a Minister of State: a Villain' (Johnson, *Love and Liberty*, 'Dramatis Personae'), for from the later seventeenth century playwrights more commonly use the noun 'minister' instead of, or alongside, the noun 'favourite': Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, 'Persons Represented' and I. i. 66–8, 278–9, and p. 390; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 31; *The Fall of Mortimer* (1731), p. 63; *Majesty Misled*, pp. 17, 35, 55; *The Favourite*, pp. 45, 51; cf. Crouch, *Unfortunate Court-Favourites*, p. 40.
53. Day, p. 318; cf. Jonson's *The Underwood*, no. 61, l. 20.
54. Dryden, 'To My Lord Chancellor', ll. 91–4, in Hooker and Swedenborg, *Dryden*, i, p. 40.
55. George Chapman, *The Tragedy of Chabot* (in Parrott, *Plays and Poems of George Chapman. The Tragedies*), I. i. 2, I. ii. 17.
56. Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, p. 76 (cf. p. 138).
57. Mostly the female favourites of women in seventeenth-century drama are virtuous or at least innocuous.
58. Brome, i, pp. 186, 246: quoted by Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, pp. 220–1.
59. Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 57.
60. Brome, iii, p. 503; d'Ouvilly, *False Favourit*, p. 107; Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*, p. 42. Cf. Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, V. ii. 29; *The Historical Works of Bevill Higgons*, 2 vols (London, 1736), i, p. 93.
61. James Spedding et al., eds, *The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, 14 vols (London, 1857–74), xiii, p. 27 (cf. xiii, p. 14).
62. For this and the previous sentences see Massinger, *Great Duke of Florence*, I. ii. 162; Davenant, i, p. 128; Carlell, *Deserving Favourite*, sig. F; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 72; Lee, *Rival Queens*, I. i. 67–8, II. 106, 120, IV. ii. 62; Congreve, *Mourning Bride*, I. i. 271–7, IV. i. 226; John Dryden, *The Conquest of Granada* (in Hooker and Swedenborg, *Dryden*, xi), II. i. 334–5; Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, II. i. 306, V. i. 120ff., 274–7. Cf. John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi*, I. i. 431–8; Shirley, iv, p. 170; Sir Henry Wotton, *A Short View of the Life and Death of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham* (London, 1642); Crouch, *Unfortunate Court-Favourites*, pp. 148, 153, 155.
63. Cf. Orrery, *Tryphon*, pp. 2, 16, 25, 26, 32; Shirley, iv, p. 129.
64. Day, p. 286; Chapman, *Tragedy of Chabot*, II. iii. 20–35; Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, III. i. 161–85; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, I. iii. 271, 298, II. i. 291–3, V. ii. 5–7; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. iii. 29–30, IV. ii. 65–8, 176; Massinger, *Great Duke of Florence*, III. i. 13–19; Ford, *Broken Heart*, IV. iii. 76, 89–91; Davenant, i, pp. 44, 122, 189; Shirley, ii, pp. 105, 108, iv, pp. 168, 170, 182, 271; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, esp. pp. 1–2, 3, 24, 44; Orrery, *Tryphon*, p. 1; Settle, *Cymbyses*, p. 54; Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*, p. 23; Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, II. i. 302–11; Higgons, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 65; *The General Cashier'd*, p. 12. Cf. Jonson, *Cynthia's Revels*, V. vi. 28–32; Jonson, *The Gypsies Metamorphos'd*, I. 12; Lee, *Rival Queens*, II. i. 324–9; Dryden, *Aureng-Zebe*, II. i. 125–7; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 31; Somerset, *Unnatural Murder*, p. 226.
65. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 390; Marston, *Malcontent*, I. iii. 159–60 (cf. Marston, *Antonio and Mellida*, ed. G. K. Hunter (repr. London, 1965), III. i. 96–7); Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 434, 537–8, II. 178–9, 383ff., III. 535 6, 632 6, 659–60, V. 621 3; Daniel, *Philotas*, ll. 61–2; George Chapman, *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron*, ed. John Margeson (Manchester, 1988), iii. III. 20; Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, III. ii. 367–8; Massinger, *Great Duke of Florence*, I. i. 71ff.; Davenant, i, pp. 29, 45, 157, 175, iv, pp. 218–19, 221, 226; Baron, *Mirza*, pp. 23, 24, 40–2, 253; d'Ouvilly, *False Favourit*, pp. 26, 39; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 2, 4, 14; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, p. 48; Dryden, *Aureng-Zebe*, IV. i. 89–90; Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, II. i. 40–54; Orrery, *Tryphon*, pp. 1, 4; William Whitaker, *The Conspiracy* (London, 1680), p. 18; Nathaniel Lee, *Theodosius* (London, 1680), pp. 36–7; Harris, *Mistakes*, p. 54; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 32; Wilson, *Andromicus Comenius*, p. 64; *Majesty Misled*, title-page and p. 26.
66. Day, p. 220; Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, I. i. 220ff.; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. i. 47–8, V. ii.

- 47; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. iii. 53–4; Massinger, *The Picture* (in Edwards and Gibson, *Massinger*, iii), II. ii. 149; *King Edward the Third*, p. 2 ('there will be Mortimer in every State').
67. Day, pp. 211–12; Daniel, *Philotas*, pp. 155–6. Cf. Hooker and Swedenborg, *Dryden*, xiv, pp. 309ff.; *The Fall of Mortimer* (London, 1763 edn), Dedication; Worden, 'Ben Jonson', p. 79.
68. Baron, *Mirza*, sig. A3v; Lodowick Carlell, *Heraclius, Emperor of the East* (London, 1664), sig. A3v; John Dryden and Nathaniel Lee, *The Duke of Guise* (in Hooker and Swedenborg, *Dryden*, xi), prologue (l. 1) (cf. Hooker and Swedenborg, *Dryden*, xi. 314–15); *Timoleon*, sig. A3v; *Majesty Misled; or The Overthrow of Evil Ministers* (London, 1734), epilogue; cf. R. C. Richardson, ed., *Images of Oliver Cromwell. Essays for and by Roger Howell, Jr.* (Manchester, 1993), pp. 39–40.
69. *Woodstock*, V. i. 56ff.; Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 113ff., II. 472–5 (cf. III. 484–5); Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. i. 83ff.; Beaumont and Fletcher, iii. p. 78; Brome, iii, pp. 460–1, 503; Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 235; *Piso's Conspiracy* (London, 1676: an adaptation of *Nero*), pp. 4–5. Cf. Webster, *Duchess of Malfi*, I. i. 2ff.; Wilson, *Andronicus Comenius*, p. 5.
70. Davenant, iv, pp. 218–19. Cf. Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, III. iii. 138–42; Shirley, ii, p. 114; *King Edward the Third*, p. 56 ('And Evill Kings I fear have been the cause'), with which cf. *The Fall of Mortimer* (1731), p. 63 ('A wicked, worthless Minister the Cause').
71. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 365, V. i. 28; *Woodstock*, IV. i. 42; Jonson, *Sejanus*, II. 157; *The Wasp*, pp. 17, 100; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 26; Howard, *Great Favourite*, pp. 236, 244–5, 246–7; Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*, p. 62; *King Edward the Third*, p. 2; *The General Cashier'd*, p. 30. Cf. *A Vindication of the Fall of Mortimer* (London, 1731), p. 5; *Majesty Misled*, p. 25; Somerset, *Unnatural Murder*, p. 56.
72. Baron, *Mirza*, p. 40; *King Edward the Third*, p. 2.
73. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 433–4; *Nero*, pp. 32, 54; Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, I. i. 26; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, II. i. 70–6; *Rollo*, IV. i. 7, 76; Shirley, iv, pp. 107, 110; Davenant, i, p. 28; Baron, *Mirza*, pp. 41, 123; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 2, 3, 72; Harris, *Mistakes*, p. 43; *The General Cashier'd*, p. 27; *The Fall of Mortimer* (1731), p. 14; *Majesty Misled*, pp. [iv], v; Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, p. 236.
74. Jonson, *Mortimer His Fall*, 'Arguments' (ll. 8, 13–14); Shirley, iv, p. 107.
75. *Woodstock*, V. i. 187–92; Baron, *Mirza*, pp. 41, 42.
76. Jonson, *Sejanus*, 'Argument' (ll. 18–19), V. 647; Daniel, *Philotas*, I. 454 (cf. ll. 1968–9); Day, p. 226; Shirley, ii, p. 185; Davenant, i, pp. 28, 124, 168; Richards, *Messallina*, 'The Actors Names'; Baron, *Mirza*, pp. 8, 40; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 27.
77. Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 247.
78. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 259, 425; *King Edward the Third*, p. 2; *Fall of Mortimer* (1731), p. 14. Cf. Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, p. 94; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 41.
79. Robert Davenport, *King John and Matilda* (London, 1655), sigs B3v, B4v; *Rollo*, IV. iii. 19–33; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 41; Orrery, *Tryphon*, p. 4; cf. d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, pp. 105–6.
80. Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. iii. 50; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, pp. 69–70; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 3; Howard, *Great Favourite*, pp. 235, 242, 244; cf. Jonson, *Sejanus*, II. 436.
81. Davenport, *King John*, sigs B4v, D4, H2; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 3; *King Edward the Third*, p. 11; Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, pp. 206–8, 265–6.
82. Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. iii. 80–1; d'Ouville, *False Favourit*, pp. 69–70; cf. Howard, *Duke of Lerma*, p. 235.
83. Jonson, *Sejanus*, II. 436–42 (cf. Jonson, *Every Man out of his Humour*, prologue (l. 124)); Daniel, *Philotas*, II. 1581–2; Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 245.
84. Marston, *Malcontent*, I. iv. 159–60.
85. Jonson, *Sejanus*, IV. 30, 354–5; *Nero*, p. 38; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. iii. 33–4, II. i. 234–5; Davenant, i, p. 141.
86. Jonson, *Sejanus*, IV. 301; Shirley, iv, p. 200. Cf. Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. iii. 22–3; Lee, *Rival Queens*, IV. ii. 228.
87. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 64–6, 259, II. 444–9, III. 701, IV. 221–4; *Nero*, p. 65; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, II. i. 85; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, II. i. 112–14, IV. i. 84; Massinger, *Great Duke of Florence*, I. ii. 51, IV. ii. 59; Shirley, iv, pp. 108, 200; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 16; Bancroft, *Henry the Second*, p. 4; Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, II. i. 31; *King Edward the Third*, p. 1; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 2; Higgins, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 11; Worden, 'Ben Jonson', pp. 79–80, 84; cf. Marston, *Malcontent*, I. vii. 13–21.
88. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 433, IV. 14–21, 300–4, 325–6, 522; *Nero*, p. 14; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, II. i. 12; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. i. 79–81, 116–17; Shirley, iv, p. 105.

89. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 259, IV. 362; Day, p. 287; *Rollo*, IV. i. 63; Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, p. 87; Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 242; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 17; Lee, *Rival Queens*, IV. ii. 233 (cf. II. 299). Cf. Daniel, *Philotas*, p. 152; Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, IV. ii. 37–41; Webster, *Duchess of Malfi*, I. i. 17–18; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, IV. i. 151; *The General Cashier'd*, p. 35.
90. Jonson, *Sejanus*, III. 286–7; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. iii. 83; Howard, *Great Favourite*, pp. 244–5.
91. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 419–20, II. 390–1, IV. 167–70, 281–2; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, II. i. 135–7 (cf. I. ii. 76; Massinger, *Bondman*, I. iii. 128–32); Baron, *Mirza*, p. 24; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 28; Lee, *Rival Queens*, II. 75–6; cf. Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, I. i. 34.
92. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 243 6, IV. 306; Daniel, *Philotas*, II. 178ff.; *Nero*, p. 30; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. ii. 46–8, 77–87, II. i. 263–4, V. ii. 90–2; Massinger, *Great Duke of Florence*, I. i. 7–8; Massinger, *Picture*, I. ii. 124–4; *Rollo*, I. i. 131–3, 180–2; Brome, iii, p. 459; Davenant, i, pp. 191–2; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 24; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 28; *King Edward the Third*, pp. 2, 3; Johnson, *Love and Liberty*, pp. 2–3. Cf. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 9; *Woodstock*, I. ii. 38–50.
93. Worden, 'Ben Jonson'.
94. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 379–84; Daniel, *Philotas*, p. 101 and ll. 67 72, 1577–8, 1815, 1968–9; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, II. i. 159–61, III. ii. 5 ('sacred majesty': cf. Worden, 'Ben Jonson', p. 74); Lee, *Rival Queens*, IV. i. 10–11, IV. ii. 110.
95. Jonson, *Sejanus*, III. 16–17 (cf. *Rollo*, I. i. 119), V. 257; Daniel, *Philotas*, II. 407–8, 940–1, 1767ff. (cf. ibid., pp. 1–2); Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, I. i. 4–6; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, II. i. 6–12, IV. ii. 21–2; Massinger, *Bondman*, I. iii. 129–32; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, IV. i. 143–5 (cf. I. i. 59–65, I. ii. 13); Howard, *Great Favourite*, p. 244; Wilson, *Andronicus Comenius*, p. 3. Cf. Jonson, *Volpone*, I. ii. 11–12; Baron, *Mirza*, sig. A6v; *King Edward the Third*, p. 3.
96. Jonson, *Sejanus*, V. 566–7, 640–1 (with which cf. III. 472); Shirley, ii, pp. 114, 115.
97. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 344–7; Davenant, iv, p. 268; Lee, *Rival Queens*, IV. ii. 20, 224ff.; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 17 (with which cf. Jonson, *Everyman out of his Humour*, epilogue (l. 13)).
98. Massinger, *Great Duke of Florence*, I. i. 5–8, I. ii. 5–11, IV. ii. 280–2, 295–6; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. iii. 10, 80–81. Cf. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 374–97, 453ff., 503–7; Lee, *Rival Queens*, IV. ii. 120–30; *King Edward the Third*, p. 11.
99. *Woodstock*, IV. iii. 19, 34; Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 404, II. 312, IV. 138–9; *Nero*, pp. 33–4 (with which cf. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 86ff.); Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. i. 39–40; *King Edward the Third*, prologue and pp. 2, 5; Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, p. 208. Cf. Marston, *Malcontent*, 'Induction', l. 64; Johnson, *Love and Liberty*, pp. 2–3.
100. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. ii. 61; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, V. ii. 77–8; Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, esp. pp. 154, 160–6; Davenant, iv, p. 225; Orrery, *Tryphon*, p. 3; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, esp. ded. and pp. 85–6; Higgons, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 46; *The General Cashier'd*, pp. 10–11, 12; Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, p. 209; cf. Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, V. i. 467.
101. Cf. Worden, 'Ben Jonson', pp. 75–6, 85.
102. d'Ouvilly, *False Favourit*, p. 110; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 24, 52. Cf. *Timeoleon*, sig. A2 and pp. 69–70, 78; Clarendon, *Rebellion*, i, p. 43.
103. Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 2–6 (cf. II. 399, IV. 290–5); Davenant, i, pp. 45, 49, iii, p. 16 and n. (cf. i, p. 106, iv, p. 22); Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, p. 2; Higgons, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 40 (cf. p. 11). Cf. Richards, *Messallina*, sig. B4; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, 'Actors Names'; Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, I. i. 22; Congreve, *Mourning Bride*, I. i. 215, IV. i. 190; Johnson, *Love and Liberty*, p. 6.
104. Bancroft, *Henry the Second*, p. 4. Cf. *Nero*, p. 13 (cf. p. 32); Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, pp. 9, 12, 45; Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, III. i. 456–7; Albert Tricomi, *Anticourt Drama in England 1603–1642* (Charlottesville, VA, 1989), pp. 125, 171; John Hall, *The Grounds and Reasons of Monarchy*, in J. Toland, ed., *Works of James Harrington* (London, 1700), p. 14; Somerset, *Unnatural Murder*, p. 65.
105. Massinger, *Roman Actor*, IV. i. 93–4; *Rollo*, II. ii. 106–9; Shirley, ii, p. 257; d'Ouvilly, *False Favourit*, p. 98; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 45. Cf. Marston, *Antonio and Mellida*, III. i. 96–7; Davenant, i, p. 175.
106. Daniel, *Philotas*, I. 447; Day, pp. 220, 236–7, 286–7 (cf. p. 276; Tricomi, *Anticourt Drama*, p. 39); Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. i. 43–6; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, IV. i. 63–6; *Rollo*, V. ii. 181; Shirley, ii, p. 157; Davenant, i, p. 124, iv, p. 250; Carlell, *Fool would be a Favourite*, pp. 21, 29; Baron, *Mirza*, pp. 48, 55, 85–6; d'Ouvilly, *False Favourit*, pp. 14, 97*; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 6, 14; Howard, *Great Favourite*, pp. 248–9; Banks, *Unfortunate Favourite*, pp. 21, 22; Crowne, *Ambitious Statesman*, pp. 4, 21; *King Edward the Third*, p. 12; *Timoleon*, pp. 27, 29–30;

- The Fall of the Earl of Essex* (London, 1731), p. 5; *Majesty Misled*, p. 66; *The Favourite*, pp. 36–7; Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, p. 208. Cf. *Woodstock*, I. iii. 182–7; Crouch, *Unfortunate Court-Favourites*, p. 4.
107. *The Wasp*, p. 73; Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, I. i. 34–6; Davenant, i, pp. 126–7; Strode, *Floating Island*, sig. D2.
 108. Marston, *Malcontent*, I. v. i; Jonson, *Sejanus*, I. 181–9; Day, pp. 221–2; Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, I. i. 7ff. (cf. II. ii. 90–2); Wilson, *Andronicus Comenius*, pp. 6–7; *King Edward the Third*, pp. 4–5; cf. Howard, *Great Favourite*, pp. 215–17.
 109. Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, III. ii. 8.
 110. Jonson, *Sejanus*, IV. 457; Shirley, ii, p. 157, iv, pp. 107, 268; Baron, *Mirza*, ‘The persons of the Play’; d’Ouville, *False Favourit*, ‘The Persons’; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 61 (cf. p. 57); Congreve, *Mourning Bride*, IV. i. 428; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, ‘Dramatis Personae’; Higgons, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 53; *The General Cashier’d*, p. 53; *The Fall of Mortimer* (1731), p. 25; cf. Clarendon, *Rebellion*, i, p. 27.
 111. Shirley, ii, p. 157; cf. Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, III. ii. 411–12.
 112. d’Ouville, *False Favourit*, p. 17.
 113. Nero, p. 13; Davenant, iv, p. 221.
 114. Jonson, *Mortimer His Fall*, I. 18; Jonson, *Sejanus*, III. 715–17, 735; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, IV. i. 25–6; Massinger, *Roman Actor*, I. ii. 70–1; Massinger, *Picture*, I. ii. 129–30; Shirley, iv, p. 194; Goffe, *Orestes*, IV. i, fol. [19v]; *Timoleon*, p. 24; *General Cashier’d*, p. 58. Cf. Webster, *Duchess of Malfi*, I. i. 119–20; *King Edward the Third*, p. 2 (‘smile’).
 115. Daniel, *Philotas*; Davenant, i, pp. 19, 21, 26, 82–3, 85, 91, 99, iii, p. 16; Massinger, *Great Duke of Florence*, I. i. 67–70; Ford, *Broken Heart*, I. ii. 11–12; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 2; Lee, *Rival Queens* (Hephestion).
 116. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 345–6; Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, II. ii. 137–9 (cf. Massinger, *Picture*, I. ii. 81–5); Davenant, i, pp. 19, 28, 104, iii, p. 6; *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 4; cf. Hemings, *Eunuch*, p. 36.
 117. Marlowe, *Edward II*, I. iv. 404–5; Daniel, *Philotas*, II. 453–5; Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, I. i. 43ff.; Massinger, *Duke of Milan*, III. i. 13–17, 22–7 (cf. Ben Jonson, *Everyman in his Humor* (1601 quarto: in Herford, *Jonson*, iii), II. i. 74–5); Massinger, *Picture*, I. ii. 14ff., II. ii. 164–6; Davenant, i, p. 28 (cf. i, pp. 154–5); *The Ungrateful Favourite*, pp. 6, 14, 15; Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*, pp. 21, 22, 40; Harris, *Mistakes*, pp. 2, 28; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, pp. 8–9; Gildon, *Roman Brides Revenge*, pp. 7, 25; Higgons, *Generous Conqueror*, p. 13; *Timoleon*, pp. 62–4; Christine Gerrard, *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole* (Oxford, 1994), p. 158. Cf. Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, pp. 82, 129; Southerne, *Loyal Brother*, p. 7; Dryden, *Don Sebastian*, IV. iii. 437–65; Randall, *Winter Fruit*, pp. 68ff.
 118. Jonson, *Sejanus*, III. 253ff.; Beaumont and Fletcher, iii, pp. 76ff.; Baron, *Mirza*, p. 123; Lee, *Rival Queens*, II. 127, IV. ii. 128ff. (cf. II. 95–6). Cf. *The General Cashier’d*, esp. ‘Persons Represented’ and pp. 10–11, 13, 20; cf. d’Ouville, *False Favourite*, pp. 82, 92.
 119. John Stubbs, *The Discovery of a Gaping Gulph*, ed. Lloyd E. Berry (Charlottesville, Va, 1968), p. 30; Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia* (*The New Arcadia*), ed. Victor Skretkowicz (Oxford, 1987), p. 182 (cf. p. 176: ‘minions’); Worden, *Sound of Virtue*, pp. 146–7. The young Francis Bacon wrote of the ‘favourites’ of the French king in 1582: Spedding, *Bacon*, viii, p. 26. The first usage of the noun recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary* belongs to 1583; the first usage of it recorded by the *OED* to describe people in favour with princes is in Shakespeare’s *Much Ado About Nothing* (above, n. 46); but cf. *Henry VI Part I*, IV. i. 190.
 120. *Edward II*, p. 20; *Woodstock*, p. 212.
 121. For the popular tradition see Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, ch. 8.
 122. Chapman, *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron*, Appendix III.
 123. William Camden, *The History of the . . . Princesse Elizabeth . . . by way of Annals* (London, 1630), pt iv, p. 189; cf. *The Characters of . . . Essex . . . and . . . Buckingham*, p. 4 (with which cf. Clarendon, *History*, i, p. 28).
 124. That technique would be repeated in 1682 in Banks, *Unhappy Favourite*; see too Gerrard, *Patriot Opposition*, p. 164.
 125. Cf. Daniel, *Philotas*, pp. 36ff. Daniel, who otherwise draws the martial Essex and the martial Philotas together, surprisingly has an enemy of Philotas charge him, implausibly, with being the leader of the peace party (ll. 453–6).
 126. Quoted in Michel’s (indispensable) introduction to *Philotas*, p. 4.

127. Herford, *Jonson*, i, pp. 394–6.
128. Worden, 'Ben Jonson', p. 78.
129. Spedding, *Bacon*, ix, pp. 43, 45.
130. Bodleian Library, Smith MS. 17, pp. 42–3.
131. Herford, *Jonson*, vii. 601 ('Discoveries', ll. 1224–6); cf. the similar observation by Jonson's friend Sir Robert Cotton in *Cottoni Posthumus* (London, 1651), 'A Short View', p. 8.
132. Worden, 'Ben Jonson', pp. 85–6; Worden, *Sound of Virtue*, pp. 258–9.
133. Worden, 'Ben Jonson', p. 69; John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, *Cato's Letters*, ed. Ronald Hamowy, 2 vols, Liberty Fund (Indianapolis, 1995), pp. 112, 115–16, 124, 249, 558, 969; John Thelwall, *The Tribune*, 3 vols (London, 1795–6), iii, p. 303 (cf. P. P. Howe, ed., *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, 2 vols (London, 1930–4), vi, p. 303); John Brewer, *Party Ideology and Popular Politics at the Accession of King George III* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 258; below, pp. 173–4. For the legacy of Jonson's play in his own lifetime see Martin Butler, 'Romans in Britain: The Roman Actor and the Early Stuart Classical Play', in Douglas Howard, ed., *Philip Massinger. A Critical Reassessment* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 139–70; cf. B. L. De Luna, *Jonson's Romish Plot* (Oxford, 1967), p. 13.
134. Worden, *Sound of Virtue*, pp. 214, 217–19.
135. Day, p. 210; cf. *The Ungrateful Favourite*, p. 2.
136. Croft, 'Reputation of Sir Robert Cecil', p. 43–69.
137. *Ibid.*, p. 56; Tricomi, *Anticourt Drama*, pp. 31–3.
138. *Richard II*, II. i. 15ff.
139. Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, p. 201; Somerset, *Unnatural Murder*, p. 90; see too *Henry VIII*, III. ii. 102–5.
140. Blair Worden, 'Shakespeare and Politics', *Shakespeare Survey*, 44 (1991), pp. 1–15.
141. *Henry V*, V. ii. 29–34.
142. Massinger, *Maid of Honour*, I. i. 272.
143. *Ibid.*, 229–30. For the baneful effect of favouritism on the navy see also Marlowe, *Edward II*, II. ii. 167–8; cf. *The Wasp*, p. 73. The literary representation of Buckingham is prominently discussed in R. Little, 'Perpetual Metaphors: The Configuration of the Courtier as Favourite in Jacobean and Caroline Literature', Cambridge PhD thesis (1993).
144. Blair Worden, 'Literature and Political Censorship in Early Modern England', in A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse, eds, *Too Mighty to be Free* (Zutphen, 1987), pp. 55–7.
145. Cf. Roger Coke, *A Detection of the Court and State of England*, 2 vols (London, 1667), i, pp. 333, 335.
146. In the early 1640s Laud and Strafford were attacked as favourites in the drama and in playlets: Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, pp. 236ff.; Randall, *Winter Fruit*, pp. 55ff.; Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper. English Newsbooks 1641–1649* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 201–3. Baron's play *Mirza* (?1655) warns Charles II against favouritism; cf. Randall, *Winter Fruit*, pp. 130–4.
147. George McFadden, *Dryden. The Public Writer, 1660–1685* (Princeton, NJ, 1978), p. 13; Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration*, pp. 127–31, 186–8. In the printed text of 1669, it seems, 'too much' was cautiously replaced by 'almost': *Tryphon*, p. 1; *The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery*, 2 vols (London, 1739), i, pp. 129, 136. Howard's preoccupation with the evils of favouritism recurs in his *Historical Observations upon the Reigns of Edward I. II. III and Richard II. With Remarks upon their Faithful Counsellors and False Favourites* (London, 1689).
148. *Dictionary of National Biography*, Hyde.
149. Robert D. Hume, *The Development of English Drama in the Later Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1976), pp. 221, 223, 456; Derek Hughes, *English Drama 1660–1700* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 264–5, 278–9, 363 and n., 430–1; Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 66–71, 131, 167, 268.
150. The story is well told by Lance Bertelsen, 'The Significance of the 1731 Revisions to *The Fall of Mortimer*', *Restoration and 18th Century Theatre Research*, II (2) (1987), pp. 8–25. See too Herford, *Jonson*, vii, p. 53; Robert D. Hume, *Henry Fielding and the London Theatre, 1728–1737* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 80–2.
151. *The Fall of Mortimer* (1731), pp. 4, 22ff. Cf. *The Fall of the Earl of Essex*, p. 5; *Majesty Mislaid*, pp. 56, 70; [Francis Gentleman], *Sejanus, A Tragedy* (London, 1752), p. xiv and 'Dramatis Personae'.
152. Gerrard, *Patriot Opposition*, pp. 78–80, 114, 154–6, 158–60, 163–4; Hume, *Henry Fielding*, q. v. 'Walpole', esp. pp. 77–8; John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination* (London, 1997), p. 372. I know of no discussion of *The Fall of the Earl of Essex*, a play that would repay closer attention.

153. *Sejanus, A Tragedy*, title-page; *The Favourite*, p. x.
154. *The Fall of Mortimer* (1763), p. xiii.
155. H. J. Oliver, *The Problem of John Ford* (Melbourne, 1955), Appendix.
156. For hints of that change see Peter Whiteley, *Lord North. The Prime Minister Who Lost America* (London, 1996), pp. 218, 225.

I2

Francis Bacon: Your Flexible Friend

DAVID WOOTTON

The opening words of *The Prince* provide us with a fleeting glimpse of a Renaissance courtier going about his daily business: ‘Those who wish to acquire favor with a ruler most often approach him with those among their possessions that are most valuable in their eyes, or that they are confident will give him pleasure. So rulers are often given horses, armor, cloth of gold, precious stones, and similar ornaments that are thought worthy of their social eminence.’¹ The year is 1516 and Machiavelli is writing to Lorenzo de’ Medici. He begins with talk of gifts because what he has to offer is a gift far more valuable than precious stones: ‘an understanding of the deeds of great men’; though according to an apocryphal story, on the day when Machiavelli attended on Lorenzo to offer him his book, a rival for the prince’s favour presented him with a pair of greyhounds. The book remained unread, while the greyhounds gave Lorenzo much pleasure.²

Machiavelli’s rhetorical strategy would have been familiar to his sixteenth-century readers. Here is Erasmus dedicating the *Parabolae* to Pieter Gillis in 1514: ‘Friends of the commonplace and homespun sort, my open-hearted Pieter, have their idea of relationship, like their whole lives, attached to material things; and if ever they have to face a separation, they favour a frequent exchange of rings, knives, caps and other tokens of the kind, for fear that their affection may cool when intercourse is interrupted.’ Erasmus, of course, sends his friend not a cap or a knife, but a book, a token of the meeting of minds. In her delightful essay on books as gifts, Natalie Davis has explored these tropes.³ Here I propose to read Bacon’s *Essays* as gifts exchanged within networks of patronage and friendship (pl. 31); but I am also concerned with two material gifts of the sort that Machiavelli and Erasmus despised: a plain cup of assay and a bunch of keys. They, we shall see, were gifts as eloquent as any essay. My reading of these gifts, both literary and material, is intended to provide an insight into the changing culture of friendship in Elizabethan and Jacobean England; and in this world, I will argue, the favourite needs to be interpreted as a special sort of friend.

Gifts, as my opening quotation shows, were exchanged not only between friends but also between patrons and clients, and we need to keep this double context in mind if we are to understand the position of the royal favourite in early modern Europe; for the favourite (at least in Jacobean England) was both the king's chosen friend and the universal fount of patronage. From all quarters gifts flowed into his hands: from ambassadors, courtiers, suitors, dependants and, above all, from the king himself. And it was the favourite who handed out not only jewels and rings, but also office, place and position. It was he who arranged lucrative marriages and offered his protection to anxious litigants. Vast networks of gift-giving had his person as their common centre; and through him people unknown to each other were linked in ties of dependence and alliance, ties variously represented as ties of kinship, friendship and service. Bacon's essays on friendship provide a privileged point of entry into this lost world, in which it was through gifts, not salaries, that one hoped to make one's fortune; through patronage, not open competition, that one endeavoured to make one's way in life; and through the praise of loyal friends, not impartial critics, that one aspired to establish an enduring reputation.

Before we can understand these essays as gifts we must elucidate the rules of gift-giving, and it is with these that I begin. My argument then turns to analyse the Elizabethan and Jacobean literature on friendship. With these preliminaries completed, I discuss Bacon's three essays on friendship in the context of three friendships in Bacon's life – with Essex, Buckingham (pls 34–40) and Toby Matthew (pl. 32). The first two of course were royal favourites. I say three essays, although even those familiar with Bacon's *Essays* may remember only one.⁴ The first is Bacon's essay 'Of Followers and Frends', first published in 1597, at the height of Essex's influence with Elizabeth, and Bacon's influence with Essex, in a volume dedicated to Bacon's brother Anthony. 'Of Followers and Frends' reflects the culture of the Elizabethan court in its final decade, and needs to be read alongside essays such as 'Of Sutors', 'Of Faction' and 'Of Ceremonies and Respects'. The second is Bacon's essay 'Of Frendship', published in 1612 in a volume which Bacon had intended to dedicate to Prince Henry, but which the prince's death caused to be rededicated to Bacon's brother-in-law, John Constable. At the time Bacon was struggling to make his way in the Stuart court, the culture of which (quite different from the Elizabethan) is reflected in essays such as 'Of Great Place', 'Of Ambition' (both of which, unlike Bacon's first essay 'Of Frendship', discuss favourites: the first private, the second royal), 'Of Vaine-Glory' and 'Of Counsell'.

The third is Bacon's quite different essay of the same title, published in 1625, after Bacon had fallen from power and been disgraced, in a volume dedicated to his erstwhile patron Buckingham. It is this essay, not that of 1612, which discusses royal favourites (in other words Buckingham himself), while it was natural in Bacon's changed circumstances that another essay new to this

volume should be entitled ‘Of Adversity’, and that the whole volume should end with ‘Of Vicissitude of Things’. But the essay ‘Of Friendship’ itself was privately dedicated to Bacon’s close friend Toby Matthew, and thus carried as it were a double dedication. At the same time, beyond this immediate context, Bacon’s new essay ‘Of Friendship’ or ‘De Amicitia’ was associated with his plan to publish his essays in Latin, so that they might endure long after the English language had been forgotten, as long perhaps as Cicero’s essay known by the same title. Thus each of the three major editions of the *Essays* had an essay on friendship associated with it, and taken together they present three different images of friendship. We may label these three, for convenience, the friend as patron, the friend as royal favourite and the friend as faithful companion.

The Giving of Gifts

Friendship has a thin and ambiguous place in our culture. It has no clear conventions, rights or duties. In the early seventeenth century, however, friendship was a subject which was widely discussed and clearly understood. Every gentleman was familiar with Cicero’s ‘On Friendship’ and with two other classic texts that were also prolonged meditations on friendship: Plutarch’s ‘How to Distinguish a Flatterer from a Friend’, and Seneca’s ‘On Benefits’. To these had been more recently added Montaigne’s essay on his love for Etienne de la Boëtie. Alongside them was placed Psalm 116, ‘Quid retribuam?’ These texts made clear what we may call the principles of friendship, principles which were given their clearest modern expression in Marcel Mauss’ classic study *The Gift* (1925), a work whose subject matter is identical with that of Seneca, though, strangely, Seneca is never mentioned.⁵ Seventeenth-century readers were also acutely aware of certain paradigm cases of friendship and favouritism: David and Jonathan; Joseph and Pharaoh; Sejanus and Tiberius; Gaveston and Edward II.⁶

The insignificance of friendship in our own culture helps account for the fact that the literature on early modern friendship is scattered and unsystematic. In addition to Natalie Davis’ essay there are two admirable and wide-ranging discussions by Sharon Kettering, one on gift-giving and patronage, the other on friendship and clientage in early modern France. A number of social historians have seen the relevance of Mauss’ work on the gift to an understanding of early modern England. There is an excellent account of Montaigne’s friendship with La Boëtie, and a number of other valuable discussions of individuals which take friendship as their theme. There are fine discussions of subjects that bracket mine: Catherine Bates on the rhetoric of courtship in Elizabethan England; Simon Adams on Elizabeth’s favourites; Linda Levy Peck on ‘benefits, brokers and beneficiaries’ in the court of James; Alan Bray on male friendship and sodomy in Elizabethan and Jacobean England; and Antonio Feros on Spanish

conceptions of the favourite. Lorna Hutson has written on friendship in sixteenth-century English literature. In the nineteenth century the question of whether Bacon had betrayed his friend Essex by participating in his prosecution was much discussed; Bacon's dealings with Buckingham have more recently attracted some attention; but Toby Matthew still awaits the historian he deserves, and I can find no significant literature on Bacon's three essays on friendship.⁷

We should begin with the fundamental principles of gift-giving (for the gift of friendship is a special case of gift-giving) in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. We may identify them by taking an example from Bacon's *apophthegms*, a collection of witty sayings, for since wit is culturally specific if we can see the wit in this saying we will have the beginnings of a grasp of our subject: 'Sir Thomas More had sent him by a suitor in the chancery two silver flagons. When they were presented by the gentleman's servant, he said to one of his men: "Have him to the cellar, and let him have of my best wine." And turning to the servant said, "Tell thy master, friend, if he like it, let him not spare it."⁸ More had been offered a gift, and the exchange of gifts is the mark of friendship. He had also been offered a bribe, which he must reject. His actions should be interpreted as a deliberate inversion of the principles of gift-giving: first, a friend must never refuse or return a gift. More returns the flagons, but in doing so he pretends that he has misunderstood their character as a gift, for he returns them with wine in them. He behaves as if, far from being offered a gift, he is responding to a neighbourly request for a cup of sugar. Second, a gift must never resemble a commercial exchange, and so there should be a delay of time between gift and counter-gift, or the two should be simultaneous, so that the giver gives before he knows what he has received (as with Christmas presents). More gives back as soon as he receives. Third, givers should not compete to outdo each other. But More carefully gives more than he has received so that there can be no question of his being in the suitor's debt. Fourth, it is not the gift but the thought that counts, for the gift is a token of devotion. More's suitor does not offer money (at least in appearance), but a token of affection. More too repays with something that has no obvious monetary value, but his gift is perishable, while the ideal gift, like friendship, must be enduring (a jewel, a picture, a book). (In an extreme case, Montaigne himself becomes his friend's picture, Montaigne's book about his friend his gift to friendship.) Consequently – here is the fifth principle – one usually keeps, one does not consume, a gift, but More's gift is to be consumed. (Hospitality is a striking exception here, since it is a gift to be consumed, but hospitality imposes only temporary, not lasting, obligations; gifts intended to embody love and friendship thus tend to take the form of enduring objects: even horses and greyhounds live on in their offspring.)

More's action may be witty, but why is 'Tell thy master, friend, if he like it, let him not spare it' an apophthegm, a witty saying? For two reasons. First, because a gift is a token of oneself, a symbol of the fact that friends belong

to each other: More, by insisting that his suitor must not 'spare' his gift, asserts his right not to spare his suitor. And second, because of the seemingly carelessly misplaced 'friend': this friendly transaction, which has gone so awry, is after all not one between friends. More is more friendly to the servant, who has offered him nothing, than to his master, who has tried to purchase friendship.

It may seem strange to interpret this exchange in the context of friendship, but we need to remember that friendship, for Cicero and Seneca, More and Bacon, was first and foremost a pact for mutual assistance, a form of mutual clientage. Friendship, like gift-giving, was inherently paradoxical in nature. It must be freely given, and yet it represented an obligation. So, just as gift exchanges ought never to resemble commercial exchanges, and must consist both of appropriate objects and of appropriate thoughts, so the ideal friendship would be one in which both offered assistance, but neither knew whether he would end up as debtor or creditor. The ideal friendship was one between equals, who then became unequal, so that one could be dependent on the other and so test his friendship, and in which the inequality was then reversed so that the erstwhile beneficiary could demonstrate his undying gratitude. Such a friendship was a mutual insurance policy on which both parties made a claim, but at different times and under very different circumstances, so that each one by demonstrating loyalty was not merely recognizing an obligation but passing a test of character.⁹

It is such an ideal friendship that Bacon had with Toby Matthew. In exile in 1619, Matthew carried a set of keys to Bacon's house.¹⁰ Bacon had plenty of servants to admit guests (a hundred of them, in fact), so the keys can have had no function.¹¹ Rather they were a token, a lasting symbol guaranteeing Matthew's access to Bacon's own person and symbolizing that what was Bacon's was Matthew's. The keys were an ideal gift in that on the one hand it was only the thought they symbolized that counted, while on the other they represented a firm and enduring promise of future assistance.

Friendship is thus inseparable, in the early modern period, from alliance, clientage and favouritism – concepts which are to us antithetical to friendship, because in our view friendship is a matter for private life, while public life is ostensibly governed by the revolutionary principles of impartiality and the career open to talents. More, it may be thought, was giving impartiality priority over an offer of alliance; but if so he was not typical. Much ink was spilled in the nineteenth century in debating whether or not Bacon was a corrupt judge. We need only to read a passage in 'Of Sutors' which survived unchanged from edition to edition to know that he saw no shame in avowing partiality, even though he acknowledged there could be no excuse for corruption: 'If affection lead a man to favour the wrong side in justice, let him rather use his countenance to compound the matter than to carry it. If affection lead a man to favour the less worthy in desert, let him do it without depraving or disabling the better deserver.'¹²

The Politics of Friendship

Again and again when discussing social relations Elizabethan and Jacobean authors resort to the language of Machiavelli. It is in the course of an essay on reputation, for example, that we are reminded that 'Fear is a more certain ground than love for maintaining authority, because love is in the power of the lover, fear in him that maketh himself feared.'¹³ To see friendship as alliance is to see it as politics, and we should not be surprised to discover that Machiavelli makes his way into discussions of friendship. Thus Machiavelli's famous chapter on conspiracies is interpreted as a discussion of how far one dare entrust secrets to one's friends.¹⁴ But to see friendship in terms of politics was to associate it with fear and with danger.

In this section I want to take five discussions of friendship (four of the five being from volumes of essays written in the tradition of Bacon's own *Essays*: Cornwallis' *Essays*, 1600; Johnson's *Essaies*, 1601; Tuvil's *Essaies Politicke and Morall*, 1608; and Robinson's *New Essays*, 1628) and use them to illustrate what were perceived as the dangers of friendship. One reason for doing this is that Bacon has much less to say about the risks of friendship than most of his contemporaries; it is astonishing to what extent they treat friendship as a focus of anxiety, as the most difficult of all social negotiations.¹⁵ What they offer indeed is a series of commonplaces designed to teach their readers the rules of safe friendship.

First, never be in a hurry to make a friend. Cicero had recommended that you share so many meals with your prospective friend before you risked regarding him as a friend that you consume a bushel of salt together. Second, always test a friendship before relying on it. The cooper first puts water in the barrel before he relies on it to hold wine.¹⁶ Third, beware of a friendship that serves the other's purposes not yours, or you are in danger of being like the oak which supports the ivy, and whose reward is to be eventually consumed by it.¹⁷ ('They are sworn brothers, they will live and die together; but they scarce sleep in this mind; the one comes to make use of the other, and that spoils all; he entered this league not to impair, but to profit himself. . . .'¹⁸) Fourth, always be careful before entrusting secrets to anyone, even a friend, for this is to place yourself in voluntary servitude, to put yourself in another's power.¹⁹ There are few who can be entrusted with a secret: 'There are few that can say and say truly, as that Grecian of former times did, who being told that his breath did smell, answered that it was by reason of the many secrets which had a long time lain rotting and putrefying within him. . . .'²⁰ These basic rules are simple and straightforward.

There are others that are more surprising. You should make friends only of those who seem to shun friendship. 'If he be very forward, beware; for either he is a common friend, and so no friend, or else he means to betray you. They are surest that are won with labour, and certainest that are purchased with difficulty: for an open prostitute man or woman is loathsome, and flexible.'²¹

Paradoxically, the friends you can rely on are not those you have helped in the past, but those who have reason to hope you will help them in the future. Thus if you want to have your friend do you a favour you should remind him of your gratitude for previous favours he has done you, never, under any circumstance, of the favours you have done him.²² It is, in any case, almost impossible to reject a friend's request for a favour, even one that you are in no position to perform, without endangering the friendship. If you say 'no' quickly (while making promises for the future), you may be acting in your friend's best interests, since delay exacerbates disappointment, but you are likely to seem unwilling to help. If you pretend for as long as possible that the request will be granted, eventual failure may suggest ill-faith. But to succeed in doing your friend a favour may also endanger the friendship: to put someone in your debt when they have no prospect of early repayment is to risk turning a friend into an enemy.²³ Wherever you turn, in fact, friendship threatens to turn into its opposite.²⁴ Thus one should withhold secrets, even from friends; but not to entrust your secrets to your friends is to imply distrust, and to risk turning friends into enemies. Worse still, one should never forget that supposed friends are more dangerous than open enemies: 'Sampson lived safely enough amongst his enemies the giantly Philistines, but in his wife's lap where he thought himself safest he was quickly subdued. . . .'²⁵ Friendship, it turns out, is close to hatred. Much of this anxiety is summed up in one of Bacon's apophthegms, which reappears in the essay 'Of Revenge': 'Cosmus Duke of Florence was wont to say of perfidious friends: "That we read that we ought to forgive our enemies, but we do not read that we ought to forgive our friends."',²⁶

These principles, both obvious and subtle, reflect universal principles of human psychology. But late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century writers believed that friendship had become unusually difficult in their own time for three reasons. In the first place, they believed that they and their contemporaries were peculiarly obsessed with questions of status (although they flattered themselves that in this respect they were all too like the citizens of ancient Rome), and that status anxiety could corrode friendship:

The Romans, not to defraud any man of a due and convenient Congie [greeting], retained certain Admonitors (called *Nomenclatores*) who should suggest the name, quality, and account of every one they encountered, that they might be saluted in a conformable style: for to look strange and disdainful, to be backward in returning these respects procureth hatred even in the dearest friends, so much more dangerous, by how much men can less endure to be despised than injured, because other grievances concern only the body, and bring this comfort, that he is somebody in his conceit who so offended him: but the injuries of contempt are a disreputation, and the offended taketh himself to be accounted nobody, and therefore such omissions can hardly by any means be redeemed. . . .²⁷

This preoccupation with status made friendships between equals (traditionally the purest form of friendship) peculiarly delicate, for equality provided the perfect environment for competition and rivalry to flourish.

Second, they believed they lived in an age which, in order to show due respect to status, had become preoccupied with courtesy or court-manners. But where codes of behaviour were strictly defined it was all too easy to slide unintentionally from compliment to insult: 'I have known some affecting courtesy overthrow their labours with not having choice of compliments, but confounding a gentleman and a peasant with the likeness of salutation and farewell. They were to blame to set up shop so ill-furnished. As men differ so must their usages and respects. Not to all "I am the servant of your servant's servant." Even those who had mastered the language of courtesy stood at a disadvantage when it came to expressing true sentiments, for their language had become devoid of all meaning:

We accomplement, and civilized, or civeted (for our actions smell like a profound courtier), kiss the hand as if we meant to take assay of it, embrace curiously, and spend even at his entrance a whole volume of words. . . . 'O signor, the star that governs my life in contentment, give me leave to inter myself in your arms.' 'Not so, sir, it is too unworthy an enclosure to contain such preciousness. . . .'²⁸

Compliments thus became meaningless forms of flattery, and flattery was the third and final obstacle to friendship which was peculiarly prevalent in their own, self-fashioning day. This was a theme to which contemporaries returned again and again. 'There are some that fashion themselves to nothing more than how to become speculative into another, to the end to know how to work him, or wind him, or govern him: but this proceedeth from a heart that is double and cloven; and not entire, and ingenuous.'²⁹ 'There was once more certainty, but now policy can put on all shapes, so that the wolf and the lamb are hardly to be distinguished, either by their habit, words or actions.'³⁰ 'In these our present times . . . flattery is become such a common art and so much practised of most men that almost every rustic companion and illiterate peasant can represent like a looking-glass what man's qualities and conditions he will.' '"Their lips", saith Solomon, "drop as an honeycomb, and their mouths are more soft than oil, but the end of them is as bitter as gall, and as sharp as a two-edged sword. . . ." In greatest danger of being deceived were the rich and the powerful, who found themselves surrounded by flatterers 'as thick as flies about butcher's shambles'.³¹

Consequently, just as men and women whose hearts had been broken swore off love, so those who had been deceived tried (and similarly failed) to give up the quest for friendship. In the following passage Sir William Cornwallis first denies the existence of friendship, then affirms his faith in it, and then finally adopts the cynical attitude to it he finds so contemptible in others. Was he aware of his own inconsistency? I think not.

There is no love upon the earth. . . . If I could be sure of them, I would say I loved too, and make men say they are my friends: but it is an uncertain trade this loving, and stands upon such a company of circumstances as I like it not. I make no difference between common lovers, and common whores, they both flatter and make the name of love their bawds to serve their particular pleasures. For my choice of friends, virtue shall be the groundwork, and so I may build surely. Let his fortunes be what they will, I care not. Yet if I might choose, I would have him poor, for so I might easiest show my affection to him, and profit myself with least cost: for I hold observation much more precious than wealth, and I will rather give him my purse than my time.³²

One text may serve as an epitome of this extensive literature on the dangers of friendship. *The Triall of True Friendship, or Perfit Mirror Wherby to Discerne a Trustie Friend from a Flattering Parasite* was written by M.B. and published in 1596. Its epigraph is 'Try ere you trust; believe no man rashly'; its final words are 'Praemonitus praemunitus': forewarned, forearmed.

And one cautionary tale may serve to remind us just what was at stake. In 1616 Bacon prosecuted Somerset (pl. 12) for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. The trial was the *cause célèbre* of the age. Why had Somerset and his wife poisoned Overbury while he was held prisoner in the Tower? Because Overbury had dangerous information that he was threatening to use against them. Modern historians have entertained themselves finding different ways of telling the story of the crime.³³ For Bacon nothing could have been simpler: it was a story about the dangers of friendship. Overbury was the epitome of an untrustworthy friend. He had opposed Somerset's marriage 'under pretence to do the true part of a friend (for that he counted her an unworthy woman); but the truth was that Overbury, who (to speak plainly) had little that was solid for religion or for moral virtue, but was a man possessed with ambition and vainglory, was loth to have any partners in the favour of my Lord of Somerset. . . . So all was but miserable bargains of ambition.' Thus Somerset's hatred was not misplaced. And so Bacon was able to conclude that just 'as it is a principle in nature, that the best things are in their corruption the worst, and the sweetest wine makes the sharpest vinegar, so fell it out with them [Somerset and Overbury], that this excess (as I may term it) of friendship [evidenced by the exchange of secrets] ended in mortal hatred on my Lord of Somerset's part'.³⁴

Three Friends, Three Essays

There are three friendships which illustrate the real-life underpinnings of Bacon's three essays on friendship.

ESSEX

Recent scholarship has rejected the old picture of the reign of Queen Elizabeth (pl. 5) as a constant struggle between factions, but in doing so has cast into bolder relief her last decade when Essex (pl. 10) and his supporters struggled to wrest power from Burghley and laid claim to a monopoly of patronage.³⁵ Essex divided the world into friends and enemies, and among his friends was Bacon. In 1595 Essex worked long and hard to have Bacon appointed solicitor general, declaring, 'Upon me [not Burghley] the labour must lie of his establishment, and upon me the disgrace will light of his being refused,' and insisting that 'my credit is engaged in his fortune'. With Essex's support, Bacon had felt confident in pressing his own case 'as long as I have a tongue to speak, or a pen to write, or a friend to use.'

Yet, despite all Essex's efforts, Bacon failed; indeed his friend's support seemed to have harmed Bacon's cause, for the queen was suspicious of Essex's factional behaviour. Essex was thus obliged to rescue his honour by making Bacon a present of some land. Bacon replied by sending him a letter with a remarkable ending: 'For your Lordship, I do think myself more beholding to you than to any man. And I say, I reckon myself as a *common* (not popular, but *common*); and as much as is lawful to be enclosed of a common, so much your Lordship shall be sure to have.' The meaning seems clear: Bacon intends to insist that Essex cannot purchase his loyalty, and that his first obligation will always be to public service. Bacon was declaring his unwillingness to be dependent on a single patron, to become a mere member of a faction. And Essex seems to have understood this, for when he later sought to advance Bacon he insisted that he pressed his case not because Bacon was a friend but because he was dedicated to the public interest ('I would not for the second time hurt him with my care and kindness; but I will commend unto your lordship [Buckhurst] his cause, not as his alone, nor as mine his friend's, but as a public cause').³⁶ It has been suggested that Bacon's letter was written with the intention that it should be shown to the queen.³⁷ If so it gives us a good idea of the sentiments that were approved of in Elizabeth's court: Elizabeth herself expected public service to take priority over friendship.

A year later, after Essex had sacked Cadiz, Bacon wrote to him explaining how a favourite of the queen should conduct himself, and urging him not to press too hard on his good fortune, but to imitate his predecessors Leicester and Hatton, and abandon his implicit claim to more favourable treatment than they had received. Essex, he urges, must pay court to the queen; must appear to praise her sincerely, and not merely for form's sake. (In a contemporary essay, 'Of Ceremonies and Respects', Bacon lays similar stress on the politic use of praise: 'And certainly there is a kind of conveying of effectual and imprinting passages, amongst compliments, which is of singular use, if a man can hit upon it'.)³⁸ Essex must make clear that he places loyalty to his queen above loyalty to his friends by deliberately recommending people for positions and then

abandoning them. He must not seek to monopolize the position of military leader, but must encourage her to appoint other soldiers to her Privy Council. He must allow others as well as himself to play the role of favourite if he wants to be secure in the queen's favours. The advice is epitomized in the recommendation that Essex should seek the position, not of earl marshal, but of privy seal, for 'it fits a favourite to carry her Majesty's image in seal, who beareth it best expressed in heart'.³⁹

Bacon's letter is a helpful account of the qualities Elizabeth looked for in a favourite, and represents a deliberate attempt to steer Essex towards the consensual, conciliar activity which had characterized the major part of her reign, and away from his own factional struggle with Burghley. No individual should appear to monopolize the queen's patronage or policy; the surest road to influence lay through courtly eloquence, not martial deeds; and the queen's favourites must demonstrate that their loyalty to her was greater than their loyalty to their friends. Because Essex would not adapt himself to this advice he doomed himself to a tragic end. In his apophthegms Bacon recorded a remark that could have been his own: 'A great officer at court, when my Lord of Essex was first in trouble, and that he and those that dealt for him would talk much of my Lord's friends and of his enemies; answered to one of them: "I will tell you, I know but one friend and one enemy my Lord hath; and that one friend is the Queen, and that one enemy is himself."'⁴⁰ Essex had fatally misjudged the Elizabethan politics of friendship.

It is at around the same time that he counselled Essex on how to be a favourite that Bacon must have written his essay 'Of Followers and Frends', with its criticism of factious followers, glorious followers and pompous and popular followers. Much of the essay reads like a meditation on the conflicts between Essex and the queen. It was Essex who needed to be reminded that 'the most honourable kind of following, is to be followed as one that apprehendeth to advance virtue and desert in all sorts of persons', and was therefore prepared to advance those who were not his exclusive friends. It was Elizabeth who believed that 'To be governed (as we call it) by one is not safe: for it shows softness, and gives a freedom to scandal and disreputation.' Placed in this context, the essay ends with a defence of the Elizabethan court as it had been before the conflict between Essex and Burghley threatened to tear it apart. In the contemporary 'Of Faction' Bacon took the same line. 'Mean men, in their rising, must adhere [to factions]; but great men, that have strength in themselves, were better to maintain themselves indifferent and neutral.' 'When factions are carried too high and too violently it is a sign of weakness in princes, and much to the prejudice both of their authority and business.'⁴¹

But this endorsement of Elizabeth's court as she herself conceived of it was also a direct attack on Cicero's conception of friendship. Cicero insists a friend is ideally *identical* to oneself. If he is one's superior he must act like one's equal. An excess of resources and power was, he maintained, incompatible with friendship. The limit case was that of the tyrant: 'That is how a tyrant lives –

without mutual trust, without affection, without any assurance of enduring goodwill. In such a life suspicion and anxiety reign everywhere, and friendship has no place.⁴² This contraposition between friendship and tyranny lay at the heart of Etienne de la Boëtie's *Voluntary Servitude*, in which all relationships of inequality were rejected and friendship between equals was presented as the ultimate ideal. It was this idealization of friendship which had first drawn Montaigne to La Boëtie, and it is this egalitarian and republican conception of friendship that Montaigne echoes in his own essay on friendship.⁴³ Part of this conception was the claim that true friendship was an exclusive relationship: one friend was the most one could have.⁴⁴

Nothing could be more calculated than Bacon's conclusion: 'To take advice of some few friends is ever honourable, *for lookers on, many times, see more than gamesters; and the vale best discovereth the hill.* There is little friendship in the world, and least of all between equals, which was wont to be magnified. That that is, is between superior and inferior, whose fortunes may comprehend the one the other.'⁴⁵ In taking the model of friendship as the relationship between patron and client, queen and councillor, where there can be no question of rivalry, Bacon is adapting the ideal of friendship to reflect the realities of court life. In doing so he is implicitly rejecting Cicero's and Montaigne's ideal of the friend as the mirror of one's true self, and as someone who, after death, lives on in oneself. Between client and patron there could be no need for that total sincerity which Cicero and Montaigne had praised. Thus Bacon was in danger of identifying friends with followers, favourites and even flatterers. When, around the time he wrote this essay, Bacon told Essex to give greater appearance of sincerity when praising Elizabeth, he insisted there could be no question of flattery, but he intended to be understood as meaning that this was exactly what was needed. For Cicero, by contrast, 'there can be no worse blot on a friendship than fawning sycophancy and adulation'. Elsewhere Bacon quotes Solomon: 'He that praiseth his friend aloud, rising early, it shall be to him no better than a curse' ('Of Praise', 1612).⁴⁶ But not here.

In Essex's circle Elizabeth herself came to be seen as a tyrant, and his supporters soon praised friendship as an alternative to courtly corruption. The turning point, the scholarly literature suggests, was the publication of Grenewey's translation of the *Annales* of Tacitus in 1598.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, it is tempting to read Bacon's first essay on friendship, published in 1597, as a warning directed at this nascent crypto-republicanism. So too in his 1596 letter advising Essex on how to be an Elizabethan favourite he had advised him to be cautious: 'to take all occasions to speak against popularity and popular causes vehemently; and to tax it in all others: but nevertheless to go on in your honourable commonwealth courses as you do'.⁴⁸ Essex's cult of friendship and his taste for faction were already part and parcel of his 'commonwealth courses', and in 'Of Followers and Frends', as in 'Of Faction', Bacon was offering him a courtly alternative. In a later essay, 'Of Praise', Bacon rejected the republican view, so eloquently stated by Machiavelli, that the common people were good

judges of political leaders: ‘fame is like a river, that beareth up things light and swollen, and drowns things weighty and solid’.⁴⁹ Had he said as much in 1597, Essex, who hoped to be borne aloft on a torrent of popular support, might well have taken exception. In Stuart England the case for courtly values could be put more bluntly.

BUCKINGHAM

In Elizabeth’s court the queen’s bedchamber had been a private, female world. Power lay in the public world of the council. In James’ court the royal bedchamber was the locus of power (pl. 19).⁵⁰ As Bacon wrote to the future Buckingham: ‘you are not only a courtier, but a bed-chamber man, and so are in the eye and ear of your master’ (and, unlike other bedchamber men, in his bosom too, he went on to add).⁵¹ Those who shared the daily intimacy of bed, board and hunt determined events. Elizabeth’s courtiers had paid court to her: the word had newly come to refer to the blandishments of the lover as well as the insinuations of the courtier. In James’ court friendship replaced courtship as the official language of self-advancement, and the result was a new symmetry between the relationship of king and courtier on the one hand and that of patron and client on the other: for, if courtiers could aspire to be the king’s friend and favourite, favourites could have their own friends, their own favourites. Public and private were no longer as easily separable as they had been when Bacon had insisted that he was a common, that he was dedicated to the public. These changes soon transformed the language of friendship, and were naturally reflected in Bacon’s *Essays*.

In ‘Of Ambition’ (1612) he sketched two ways of managing a court, the first of which we can recognize as Jacobean, the second as Elizabethan:

It is counted by some a weakness in princes to have favourites. But it is of all others the best remedy against ambitious great ones. For when the way of pleasing and displeasing lieth by the favourite it is impossible any other should be over-great. Another means to curb them is to balance them by others, as proud as they are. But then there must be some middle counsellors, to keep things steady: for without that ballast the ship will roll too much.⁵²

Having grasped James’ methods, he was quick to attach himself to Villiers even before it could be said of him ‘You are as a new-risen star, and the eyes of all men are upon you.’ In what is probably his earliest surviving letter to him he writes: ‘I am yours surer to you than to my own life. For, as they speak of the Turquoise stone in a ring, I will break into twenty pieces before you have the least fall.’ Soon after he wrote Villiers a detailed document outlining how he should fulfil his role as favourite: ‘You are now the King’s Favourite, so voted, and so esteemed by all. . . . It is no new things for Kings and Princes to have their privadoes, their favourites, their friends. . . . no man thinks his business

can prosper at Court, unless he hath you for his good Angel, or at least that you be not a *Malus Genius* against him.⁵³ This was to acknowledge that Villiers held a position that no favourite of Elizabeth had ever held, that of monopolist of royal patronage. Naunton was to write in 1633, in his famous account of Elizabeth's reign:

her ministers . . . were only favourites not minions, such as acted more by her own princely rules and judgment than by their own will and appetites; which she observed to the last, for we find no Gaveston, Vere, or Spencer to have swayed alone during forty-four years. . . . she was absolute and sovereign mistress of her grace and . . . those to whom she distributed her favours were never more than tenants at will.⁵⁴

His intention was evidently to draw an implicit contrast between Leicester as favourite and Buckingham as minion. But it was easy to draw this contrast with hindsight; Bacon certainly failed to realize its full implications at the time.

In 1617 Buckingham planned to arrange a marriage alliance between his own family and that of Sir Edward Coke (despite the opposition of Coke's daughter, who was to be wed against her will). Bacon, long Coke's enemy, opposed the match, which, he insisted, was not in the king's interest. With James and Buckingham away in Scotland, he acted to frustrate Buckingham's plans. Immediately he discovered he had overstepped the bounds. King and favourite both sent him vitriolic letters. It was no good for Bacon to protest that he had acted as a friend, to tell Buckingham, 'parent-like', that 'by my great experience in the world [I] must needs see further than your Lordship can', and to protest to James 'if I should be requested in it from my Lord of Buckingham, the answer of a true friend ought to be, that I had rather go against his mind than against his good'.⁵⁵ Our first thought is likely to be that Bacon had misjudged his legal authority or his political influence.⁵⁶ But to the participants and the onlookers it was clear that Bacon on the one hand and James and Buckingham on the other had different understandings of what friendship entailed. 'Every courtier', Bacon was told, 'is acquainted that the Earl professeth openly against you as forgetful of his kindness, and unfaithful to him in your love and in your actions . . . not forbearing in open speech to tax you, as if it were an inveterate custom with you, to be unfaithful to him as you were to the Earls of Essex and Somerset.' James, consequently, corrected Bacon by outlining to him the duties of a true friend:

even in good manners you had reason not to have crossed anything wherein you had heard his name used, till you had heard from him; for if you had willingly given your consent and hand to the recovery of the young gentlewoman, and then written both to us and to him what inconvenience appeared to you to be in such a match, that had been the part indeed of a true servant to us and a true friend to

him, but first to make an opposition, and then to give advice by way of friendship, is to make the plough to go before the horse.

In short, the favourite's friend must act as his servant.

Bacon was nothing if not flexible, and made an abject submission to Buckingham. 'I can be but yours, and desire to better myself, that I may be of more worth to such an owner,' was the language he now knew to adopt. His grasp of the true nature of their relationship was epitomized in the New Year's gift he offered him at the end of the year: 'I am bold to send your Lordship for your New-Year's gift a plain cup of assay, in token that if your Lordship in anything shall make me your [as]sayman, I will be hurt before your Lordship shall be hurt. I present to you therewith my best service, which shall be my All-Year's gift.'⁵⁷ Over the next few years Bacon was, as the king desired he should be, Buckingham's faithful servant. When he was impeached in 1621 (when, as Buckingham's assayman, he took upon himself the anger directed at the duke), it was to Buckingham that he naturally turned for the restoration of his fortunes. Yet again he demonstrated that he had not grasped the new rules of friendship. For Buckingham wanted first from Bacon an acknowledgement that everything that was his was Buckingham's. He must hand over York House. Bacon refused: 'York House is the house where my father died, and where first I breathed, and there will I yield my last breath, if it so please God, and the King will give me leave. . . . no money or value shall make me part with it.'

Once again Bacon had failed to play a friend's part. But this time he recuperated his position deftly: even the king praised his 'after-game'.⁵⁸ Bacon rejected a request from the Duke of Lennox to purchase York House, saying that since he had refused it to Buckingham he could let no one else have it. And then he allowed Buckingham to determine that Cranfield should have it at any price he chose. If the house was not to be Buckingham's it was to be his to give away. Only then could Bacon begin to travel the long road to a restoration of his fortunes.

When we read the essay 'Of Frendship' Bacon published in 1625 in a volume dedicated to Buckingham, we are entitled to look, as Buckingham would have done, for an endorsement of the Jacobean politics of friendship. And this is exactly what we find:

It is a strange thing to observe, how high a rate great kings and monarchs do set upon this fruit of friendship, whereof we speak. So great, as they purchase it, many times, at the hazard of their own safety and greatness. For princes, in regard of the distance of their fortune, from that of their subjects and servants, cannot gather this fruit except (to make themselves capable thereof) they raise some persons to be as it were companions and almost equals to themselves, which many times sorteth to inconvenience. The modern languages give unto such persons the name of *favourites* or *privadoes*, as if it were a matter of grace or conversation. But the Roman name attaineth the true use and cause thereof,

naming them *participes curarum*, for it is that which tieth the knot. And we see plainly that this hath been done, not by weak and passionate princes only, but by the wisest and most politic that ever reigned. Who have oftentimes joined to themselves some of their servants, whom both themselves have called friends, and allowed others likewise to call them in the same manner, using the word which is received between private men.

And Bacon ends his essay with what seems at first a conventional account of how friends can help each other. But the ideal friend turns out to be little more than a great man's go-between, a private ambassador. Of such men Bacon himself had need when he had to make his peace with Buckingham or the king:

How many things are there which a man cannot, with any face or comeliness, say or do himself? A man can scarce allege his own merits with modesty, much less extol them. A man cannot sometimes brook to supplicate or beg, and a number of the like. But all these things are graceful in a friend's mouth which are blushing in a man's own. So again, a man's person hath many proper relations which he cannot put off. A man cannot speak to his son but as a father, to his wife but as a husband, to his enemy but upon terms; whereas a friend may speak as the case requires, and not as it sorteth with the person. But to enumerate these things were endless. I have given the rule: where a man cannot fitly ply his own part, if he have not a friend, he may quit the stage.⁵⁹

'Of Frendship' was surely intended to be read as an endorsement of Jacobean friendship. Yet, as one would expect in someone who believed himself to have been unjustly treated by his erstwhile friends, Bacon has trouble controlling the tone of his remarks. He devotes a page to great Romans and their friends, but the examples are disturbing. Here we meet, to our surprise, Tiberius and Sejanus, whose intimacy caused the Senate to dedicate an altar to friendship. And later he discusses at length how, if friends are to give good advice, they must have 'the liberty of a friend' to speak their mind, and must be the opposite of flatterers. It can scarcely be a coincidence that Bacon repeats here a phrase he had used, not only in 'Of Followers and Frends' thirty years before, but also less than a decade earlier, when he had tried to justify his opposition to the Buckingham–Coke marriage alliance, and had been told in no uncertain terms that he must not question Buckingham's good judgement: 'As for business, a man may think, if he will, that two eyes see no more than one, or that a gamester seeth always more than a looker on, or that a man in anger is as wise as he that hath said over the four and twenty letters, or that a musket may be shot off as well upon the arm as upon a rest, and such other fond and high imaginations, to think himself all in all.'⁶⁰ 'Of Frendship' is a complicated text partly because Bacon resented the way Buckingham had treated him. But there is another reason, for we must read it as dedicated not only to Buckingham, but also to Toby Matthew.

TOBY MATTHEW

Toby Matthew was born, son of the future Archbishop of York, in 1577, when Bacon was seventeen.⁶¹ In 1595 he played the part of an esquire in a 'device' written by Bacon for Essex to have performed on the queen's day. By 1604 Bacon was Matthew's patron: Matthew served in Bacon's stead as member of parliament for St Albans, Bacon having also been elected for Ipswich. That same year Matthew left England to travel on the continent, where he converted to Catholicism. He returned in 1606, when Bacon protected him, though he could not keep his friend out of prison. In 1608 Matthew went abroad again, was ordained by Bellarmine (1614), and joined (secretly) the Jesuit order. Meanwhile Bacon faithfully corresponded with him, and sent him copies of his works as they were written. In 1617 he returned to England, again benefiting from Bacon's protection. The next year he published an Italian translation of Bacon's *Essays*. In January 1619 the king sent Matthew into exile (with Bacon's keys in his pocket) for his steadfast refusal to take the oath of allegiance, but he was permitted to return in 1621.

Matthew had excellent connections at court, particularly with Gondomar and Buckingham's mother. In 1623 he was sent to Madrid to advise Charles and Buckingham on the Spanish match. In these years it was now Bacon who was the client, he the patron. When Bacon was impeached he sent a letter of consolation written in his own hand, 'as if', said Bacon, 'it had been in old gold'. Bacon wrote in reply: 'Your company was ever of contentment to me, and your absence of grief: but now it is of grief upon grief.' In 1623 he describes Matthew in a letter to Buckingham in the conventional terms of friendship: 'to me another myself'. In his will he is 'my ancient good friend'.⁶² This was a paradigm case of friendship as I earlier defined it, with each helping the other when he could reasonably expect no help in return.

It is not surprising then that Matthew and Bacon thought of each other when they thought of friendship. In 1623 Bacon wrote to him in Spain to discuss the translation of his works into Latin, 'for these modern languages will at one time or other play the bank-rowtes with books: and since I have lost much time with this age, I would be glad as God shall give me leave to recover it with posterity. For the essay of friendship, while I took your speech of it for a cursory request I took my promise for a compliment. But since you call for it I shall perform it.'⁶³ Later (as I take it) he writes: 'Good Mr Matthew, it is not for nothing that I have deferred my essay *De Amicitia*, whereby it hath expected the proof of your great friendship towards me.'⁶⁴ Here, then, are two further contexts for Bacon's final essay on friendship. It is a work written both for a true friend and for posterity.

Before we look at the essay of 1625 under this double aspect, however, we need to glance back at the original essay of the same title, which stood at the front of Bacon's volume intended for Prince Henry. This too is a conventional praise of friendship ('friendship multiplieth joys and divideth griefs'). Friend-

ship here is quite distinct from the patron-client relationship, indeed its very antithesis: 'Want of true friends . . . is . . . an imposition upon great fortunes. . . . And therefore it is good to retain sincerity, and to put it into the reckoning of ambition that the higher one goeth, the fewer true friends he shall have.' But on the other hand it does not require equality, let alone identity. Bacon carefully redefines true friendship so that it remains within the reach of either a young prince and future king, or a busy middle-aged lawyer still advancing his career. What he describes is something below the level of his own friendship with Matthew: 'Perfection of friendship is but a speculation. It is friendship when a man can say to himself "I love this man without respect of utility. I am open-hearted to him. I single him from the generality of those with whom I live. I make him a portion of my own wishes."'⁶⁵ In 1625 Bacon will need to go further if he wants to catch posterity's ear.

I will not analyse in detail here what Lisa Jardine has termed Bacon's 'sensitive and optimistic treatment of friendship'.⁶⁶ We have seen already that it has a darker side. Its dominant theme is that 'it is a mere and miserable solitude to want true friends, without which the world is but a wilderness'. Let us note merely two remarkable characteristics of Bacon's essay. The central theme of the Elizabethan literature on friendship had been the danger associated with entrusting secrets to a friend. Even in the 1612 essay Bacon writes, 'A man may keep a corner of his mind from his friend, and it be but to witness to himself that it is not upon facility but upon true use of friendship that he imparteth himself.' Now Bacon longs to unburden himself. 'Those that want friends to open themselves unto are cannibals of their own hearts. . . . A man were better relate himself to a statue or picture than to suffer his thoughts to pass in smother.' For the Elizabethans the second great risk of friendship was the corrupting influence of flattery, but for Bacon 'there is no such flatterer as is a man's self; and there is no such remedy against flattery of a man's self as the liberty of a friend'. Friendship thus appears here idealized, perfected. By the time the essay ends its subject is delicately ambiguous: 'I have given the rule. Where a man cannot fitly play his own part, if he have not a friend, he may quit the stage.' On the one hand, we have seen, the stage stands for court life, where, without friends one can make no headway. On the other hand the stage is life itself: 'For a crowd is not company, and faces are but a gallery of pictures, and talk but a tinkling cymbal, where there is no love.'⁶⁷

One last peculiarity of this essay must be noted. Cicero has Scaevola speak of Africanus. Montaigne had written of his own *La Boëtie*. Bacon never mentions Matthew's name. Could this silence be endured? Surely he intended his Latin 'De Amicitia', the text posterity was intended to read, to link his name to Matthew's, as Achilles' to Patroclus'. In Matthew, Bacon had discovered true friendship. But throughout his career he had sought to adapt the language and sentiments of friendship to the demands of court life, where friendship was inseparable from flattery, patronage and favouritism. At court there was no love without utility, and perfection of friendship was 'but a speculation'. There

rulers purchased friendship from their favourites, while favourites sold favours to their friends. If Bacon, ever flexible, had begun to turn away from a courtly conception of friendship it was merely because, now penniless himself, he could no longer afford to purchase friends at court at the going rate.

Notes

1. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. and trans. D. Wootton (Indianapolis, 1995), p. 5.
2. Roberto Ridolfi, *The Life of Niccolò Machiavelli* (Chicago, 1963), p. 164.
3. Erasmus quoted from *Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto, 1974–), iii: *The Correspondence of Erasmus*, trans. R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thompson, no. 312, in Natalie Zemon Davis, 'Beyond the Market: Books as Gifts in Sixteenth-Century France', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 33 (1983), pp. 69–87, at p. 77.
4. For the texts and their publication history, see Francis Bacon, *The Essays or Counsels, Civil and Morall*, ed. M. Kiernan (Oxford, 1985). The recent literature on Bacon has surprisingly little to say on the theme of friendship.
5. Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. I. Cunnison (London, 1966).
6. For a lengthy poem on the last of these (obviously written with Buckingham in mind) see Anon., *The Deplorable Life and Death of Edward the Second, King of England, Together with the Downfall of the two Unfortunate Favourites, Gavestone and Spencer* (London, 1628).
7. Sharon Kettering, 'Gift-Giving and Patronage in Early Modern France', *French History*, 2 (1988), pp. 131–51; *idem*, 'Friendship and Clientage in Early Modern France', *French History*, 6 (1992), pp. 139–58. See also Guy Fitch Lytle, 'Friendship and Patronage in Renaissance Europe', in F. W. Kent and P. Simons, eds, *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 47–61. For the work of two social historians see Mervyn James, 'English Politics and the Concept of Honour, 1485–1642' [1978], in his *Society, Politics, and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 308–415 (on friendship), and Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 19–22, 397–403 (on gift-giving). Jean Starobinski, *Montaigne in Motion* (Chicago, 1985), pp. 36–66. Any list of other works in which friendship is a central theme must be somewhat arbitrary, but see Edward Berry, 'Hubert Languet and the "Making" of Philip Sidney', *Studies in Philology*, 85 (1988), pp. 305–20; F. W. Conrad, 'The Problem of Counsel Reconsidered: The Case of Sir Thomas Elyot', in P. A. Fideler and T. F. Mayer, eds, *Political Thought and the Tudor Commonwealth* (London, 1992), pp. 75–107; Susan Brigden, '"The Shadow that You Know": Sir Thomas Wyatt and Sir Francis Bryan at Court and in Embassy', *Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), pp. 1–31. The following studies bracket mine: Catherine Bates, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature* (Cambridge, 1992); Simon Adams, 'Favourites and Factious at the Elizabethan Court', in R. G. Asch and A. M. Birke, eds, *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 265–87; Adams, 'The Patronage of the Crown in Elizabethan Politics: The 1590s in Perspective', in J. Guy, ed., *The Reign of Elizabeth: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 20–45; Linda Levy Peck, 'Benefits, Brokers and Beneficiaries: The Culture of Exchange in Seventeenth-Century England', in B. Y. Kunze and D. D. Brautigam, eds, *Court, Country and Culture: Essays on Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin* (Rochester, NY, 1992), pp. 109–27; Alan Bray, 'Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England', *History Workshop*, 29 (1990), pp. 1–19; Antonio Feros, 'Twin Souls: Monarchs and Favourites in Early Seventeenth-Century Spain', in Richard L. Kagan and G. Parker, eds, *Spain, Europe and the Atlantic World: Essays in Honour of John H. Elliott* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 27–47. Lorna Hutson, *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England* (London, 1994) does not displace an earlier work, Laurens J. Mills, *One Soul in Bodies Twain: Friendship in Tudor and Stuart Drama* (Bloomington, Ind., 1937). For an example of the nineteenth-century debate on Bacon and Essex, see Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The Life and Writings of Francis Bacon* (Edinburgh: reprinted from *Edinburgh Review*, 1837), pp. 19–34; [James Spedding], *Evenings with a Reviewer*, 2 vols (London, 1848), i, pp. 91–251; *idem*, *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*, 7 vols (London, 1861–74), iii, pp. 161–2. It is worth remarking that fundamental

- to Macaulay's famous attack on Bacon is the rejection of a culture of patronage, friendship and gift-giving in the name of the values of a professionalized civil service. For Bacon and Buckingham, see Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (London and New York, 1981), pp. 29–32, 44–50, 70–1, 97–100, 117–19. See also my 'Friendship Portrayed: A New Account of *Utopia*', *History Workshop Journal*, 45 (1998), pp. 29–47.
8. Francis Bacon, 'Apophthegms New and Old', in *The Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. J. Spedding, R. L. Ellis and D. D. Heath, 7 vols (London, 1857–74), vii, p. 128, no. 23.
 9. See, for example, [Haly Heron], *A Newe Discourse of Morall Philosophie* (London, 1579), p. 27.
 10. Michael Kiernan in Bacon, *Essays*, p. lxxxix; for evidence of the importance Matthew placed on this gift see his letter to Gondomar quoted in Arnold Harris Mathew and Annette Calthrop, *The Life of Sir Tobie Matthew* (London, 1907), p. 161.
 11. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, vi, p. 338.
 12. Bacon, *Essays*, p. 150 (spelling and punctuation modernized, as in all quotations from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources).
 13. Robert Johnson, *Essaies or Rather Imperfect Offers* (London, 1601), 'Of Reputation', [fol. 52v: handwritten pagination in British Library copy, which has been cropped by the binder].
 14. [D. Tuvil], *Essaies Politicke and Morall* (London, 1608), 'Of Cautions in Friendship', fol. 86r–v.
 15. Interestingly, the two most optimistic discussions of friendship (prior to Bacon's final essay) known to me are relatively early: [William Paulet], *The Lord Marques Idlenes* (London, 1586), 'Of Friendship and Friends', pp. 36–9, where the main risk is that you might have to judge a contention between two of your friends, 'for to judge between two enemies, the one remaineth a friend; but to judge between two friends, the one is made an enemy'; 'Anonymus', *Remedies against Discontentmet* (London, 1596), ch. 7: 'Of the Choice of Frendes', sig. C7r–C8r, where the main danger seems to be posed by friends who are 'always pensive and ready to sigh upon every occasion'.
 16. John Robinson, *New Essaies* (London, 1628), 'Of Societie and Friendship', p. 203; Johnson, *Essaies*, 'Of Wisedome', [fol. 41r–v]; M. B., *The Triall of True Friendship, or Perfitt Mirror Wherby to Discerne a Trustie Friende from a Flattering Parasite* (London, 1596), sig. B1v.
 17. Johnson, *Essaies*, 'Of Liberalitie', [fol. 55r]; M. B., *Triall*, sig. C1r–v.
 18. William Cornwallis, *Essaies* (London, 1600), 'Of Love', sig. D8v.
 19. Johnson, *Essaies*, [fol. 41r]; Cornwallis, *Essaies*, 'Of Friendship and Factions', sig. E3v.
 20. [Tuvil], *Essaies*, 'Of Cautions in Friendship', fol. 8or.
 21. Cornwallis, *Essaies*, 'Of Friendship and Factions', sig. E3r.
 22. Johnson, *Essaies*, 'Of Greatness of Mind', [fol. 2r–v]; 'Of Wisedome', [fol. 43r], 'Of Reputation', [fol. 52r–v].
 23. Johnson, *Essaies*, 'Of Affabilitie', [fols 30r–31v]; Cornwallis, *Essaies*, 'Of Friendship and Factions', sig. E4r.
 24. Robinson, *New Essays*, 'Of Societie and Friendship', pp. 204–8.
 25. M. B., *Triall*, sig. E4r.
 26. Bacon, 'Apophthegms', *Works*, vii, p. 154, no. 206.
 27. Johnson, *Essaies*, 'Of Affabilitie', [fols 29v–30r]; see also 'Anonymus', *Remedies*, sig. G1v.
 28. Cornwallis, *Essaies*, 'Of Entertainment', sig. F7r–v; Cornwallis, *A Second Part of Essays* (London, 1601), 'Of Complements', sig. P6v.
 29. [Tuvil], *Essaies*, 'Of Cautions in Friendship', fol. 88v.
 30. Cornwallis, *Essaies*, 'Of Friendship and Factions', sig. E2v.
 31. M. B., *Triall*, sig. B1v (see also Psalm 55), E3v, C1v.
 32. Cornwallis, *Essaies*, 'Of Love', sig. E1r–v.
 33. For example David Lindley, *The Trials of Frances Howard* (London, 1993).
 34. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, v, p. 313.
 35. John Guy, 'Introduction. The 1590s: The Second Reign of Elizabeth I', in Guy, ed., *Reign of Elizabeth*, pp. 1–19.
 36. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, i, pp. 354, 366, 365, 373; ii, p. 35.
 37. Fulton H. Anderson, *Francis Bacon: His Career and his Thought* (New York, 1962), p. 58.
 38. Bacon, *Essays*, p. 158.
 39. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, ii, p. 43.
 40. Bacon, 'Apophthegms', *Works*, vii, pp. 167–8: ex-Resuscitatio (1661), no. 21.
 41. Bacon, *Essays*, p. 155.
 42. Cicero, 'Laelius: On Friendship', in *On the Good Life*, trans. M. Grant (Harmondsworth, 1971), p. 204.

43. Michel de Montaigne, *Essais*, I.28: for a recent translation see *The Essays of Michel de Montaigne*, trans. M. A. Screech (Harmondsworth, 1991), pp. 205–15; Etienne de la Boëtie, *Slaves by Choice*, trans. M. Smith (Egham, 1988).
44. M. B., *Triall*, sig. B2r.
45. Bacon, *Essays*, p. 149.
46. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, ii, p. 42; Cicero, ‘Laelius: On Friendship’, p. 221; Bacon, *Essays*, p. 160.
47. Richard C. McCoy, ‘Francis Davison and the Cult of Elizabeth’, in Guy, ed., *Reign of Elizabeth*, pp. 212–28, at pp. 224, 226; Fritz Levy, ‘The Theatre and the Court in the 1590s’, in *ibid.*, pp. 274–300, at pp. 277–8; J. H. M. Salmon, ‘Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England’, in L. L. Peck, ed., *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 169–88.
48. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, ii, p. 44.
49. Bacon, *Essays*, p. 159.
50. Neil Cuddy, ‘The Revival of the Entourage: The Bedchamber of James I, 1603–25’, in D. Starkey, ed., *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London, 1987), pp. 173–225.
51. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, vi, p. 27 (cf. p. 13).
52. Bacon, *Essays*, p. 116.
53. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, vi, p. 28; v, p. 245; vi, p. 14.
54. Sir Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia*, ed. J. S. Curovski (Washington, DC, 1985), p. 40.
55. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, vi, pp. 239, 224, 233.
56. Catherine Drinker Bowen, *The Lion and the Throne: The Life and Times of Sir Edward Coke, 1552–1634* (London, 1957), pp. 339–55; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 45.
57. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, vi, pp. 248, 245; vii, p. 37; vi, p. 288.
58. *Ibid.*, vii, pp. 327, 343.
59. Bacon, *Essays*, pp. 81–2, 86–7.
60. *Ibid.*, pp. 85, 149; Spedding, *Letters and Life*, vi, p. 239.
61. David Mathew, *Sir Tobie Matthew* (London, 1950) does not replace Mathew and Calthrop, *Matthew* for biographical information.
62. Spedding, *Letters and Life*, vii, pp. 287, 423, 542.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 429.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 344; but Spedding’s conjecture about the date is surely wrong. The letter clearly relates to the prospect of a pardon, and must be contemporary with the correspondence of July 1624, reproduced on pp. 518–20, in which Matthew is mentioned.
65. Bacon, *Essays*, p. 80.
66. Lisa Jardine, *Francis Bacon: Discovery and the Art of Discourse* (Cambridge, 1974), p. 234.
67. Bacon, *Essays*, pp. 81, 80, 83, 85, 87, 81.

*Images of Evil, Images of Kings: The Contrasting
Faces of the Royal Favourite and the Prime Minister
in Early Modern European Political Literature,
c. 1580–c. 1650¹*

ANTONIO FEROS

Introduction

Some three decades years ago, Leicester Bradner examined two distinct views held by seventeenth-century English and Spanish dramatists when writing about royal favourites. Spanish playwrights, Bradner noted, sought to ‘arouse sympathy for the king and the friend he loves’, while the English stressed ‘the issues of good and bad government’ by presenting the royal favourite as an evil counsellor and a usurper, and the monarch who let him prosper as a weak ruler.² Why these disparate treatments of the royal favourite? This query is particularly poignant when we consider that the English and Spanish dramatists believed that they were confronting a similar political phenomenon. Both knew that the rise of the favourite depended on the monarch’s whim and that the favourite’s fate was determined by the inexorable turn of the wheel of fortune. And, in both monarchies, playwrights used similar examples to portray the favourite, examples taken from the Old and New Testaments (Joseph, Haman and John the Evangelist), Roman history (Sejanus) and the past of their own countries (Gaveston in England and Alvaro de Luna in Spain).

To Bradner, the answer to the above question was simple. The English dramatists denounced favourites whom they viewed as clear evidence of declining standards in the government of the Commonwealth, and as a testimony that seventeenth-century rulers were no longer the ‘supermonarchs’ whom had dominated the European political scene in the 1500s. In contrast, the Spanish dramatists had become prisoners of flattery, the most malicious courtly depravity. Most modern historians share Bradner’s views. For them, the favourite was a political anomaly, the result of the existence of weak monarchs (Henri III of France, Philip III of Spain, James I and Charles I of England). Like the English dramatists, modern historians also believe that the presence of favourites brought political crises, chaos, factional confrontations and ultimately open rebellion.

Early modern Europeans would not have understood modern historians' attempts to demonstrate that only weak monarchs had favourites, nor would they have understood attempts to create the intricate divisions and subdivisions into which modern historians classify favourites – favourite, *privado*, *valido*, private favourite, political favourite and prime minister (*premier ministre*, *ministro principal*). In early modern Europe, these concepts referred to the same court character – a person who enjoyed the monarch's favour and confidence and who as a result played a key role in court policy, the distribution of royal patronage, the appointment of royal officials and other activities associated with the monarch's craft. Early modern Europeans also knew that a royal favourite could rise from disparate political and social milieux, from the ranks of nobility or from the ranks of royal officials.

But, more importantly, early modern Europeans believed that royal favourites were a permanent fixture in personal monarchies. 'There is not a king [who does not have] close to him a *privado* who rules over him,' wrote the Spanish Antonio de Guevara in his *Aviso de Privados*, published in 1539. As long as there are kings there will be favourites, was his prophetic prediction. Fadrique Furió Ceriol, another sixteenth-century Spanish writer, agreed. In his *El Concejo y Consejeros del Príncipe*, written in 1559, Ceriol asserted that to understand a monarchy one has to analyse not only the prince, but also his officials, 'tutors, servants, friends and *privados*'. Guevara and Ceriol were just two of many early modern European writers who claimed that favourites were an integral part of the monarchical form of government. The French Claude de Seyssel, for example, also defended the view that a monarch should have a special confidant, as did Jesus Christ with John the Evangelist, 'to whom He revealed more great secrets than He did to the others'.³

In early modern Europe to win the monarch's favour was not considered illegitimate or corrupt, but a legitimate goal of all courtiers. 'The goal of the perfect courtier', Castiglione wrote in *Il Cortegiano*, was to attract the attention of the prince and gain 'the love of his master in such a complete way as to become his favourite'. To receive the king's favour was viewed as a proof of one's virtues and demonstrated that those chosen by the monarch to become their close servants possessed some unique quality. The presence at the royal court of a perfect courtier, or as seventeenth-century writers would say a perfect royal favourite, meant that a 'prince who is worthy of his service, even though his dominion is small, can count himself a truly great ruler'.⁴

It was indeed this view of the royal favourite as a permanent component of personal monarchies – as permanent as princes, royal officials and courtiers – which made the royal favourite an important subject of early modern political writers. These authors were conscious of the diverse relationships between specific monarchs and their favourites as well as of the favourites' diverse social backgrounds, and how the public role of the favourite adapted to each monarch's personality and kingcraft. But, in writing about royal favourites, early modern political writers tried mainly to discover and explain general rules

governing the rise and public roles of royal favourites in a political world experiencing profound changes.

The analysis of early modern Spanish, French and English discourses on royal favourites is the subject of this chapter. But before turning to this discussion I want to make explicit some of my methodological premises. I believe that the negative views on royal favourites were similar in the three monarchies and thus I will survey them as a shared discourse. Regarding positive views on royal favourites, however, I consider them to be distinct and thus to merit a separate discussion in each monarchy. My aim is not to persuade the reader that the accepted view of the royal favourite as a force of evil should be replaced by a view of the favourite as a force of goodness. Rather it is to recover the complexity of the discourse on royal favourites in pre-modern Europe.⁵

Evil Counsellors

Negative views of the royal favourite have dominated modern historians' interpretation of the favourite's place in early modern European monarchies. Reflecting the views of authors who opposed favourites and defended assorted opinions on how a monarchy should be ruled, most modern historians have maintained that in early modern Europe the royal favourite was regarded with suspicion and that his presence was considered a danger to the well-being of the commonwealth. That such opposition existed is, of course, well known and, as noted above, reflected similar concerns in the three monarchies. From the fifteenth-century civil wars in England, France and the Iberian kingdoms early modern political writers drew what turned out to be an enduring conclusion: that the civil conflicts resulted from the existence of evil counsellors – favourites, *mignons* or palace servants – who enticed their monarchs to oppress their subjects and prevent participation by other members of the body politic in the ruling of the kingdoms. The immediate result was a very distinctive image of the royal favourite as a person who attained power not because of his virtues and qualities but because of his cunning and ability to flatter the king. Once the favourite saw himself as the holder of the ruler's grace, he revealed his true nature: an avaricious, power-hungry individual whose sole purpose was to expropriate the king's authority. When monarchs let themselves be dominated by such disgraceful characters, the results were disastrous: the monarchs themselves were despised, their subjects rebelled, harmony and peace were destroyed and the entire kingdom was in pandemonium.

To early modern European writers the royal favourite epitomized the capital sin *par excellence*, ambition, what Augustine called 'a perverse desire of height'.⁶ The royal favourite appeared as an evil counsellor whose ultimate and secret obsession was to become equal to his master, if not the master himself. The anonymous author of *Leicester's Commonwealth*, for example, warned Queen Elizabeth that the Earl of Leicester's intimated plan was 'to possess himself (as

now he has done) of Court, Council, and Country without controlment, so that nothing wanted to him but only his pleasure, and the day already conceived in his mind to dispose as he list both of prince, crown, realm, and religion'.⁷ Even if the royal favourite did not attempt to usurp the king's crown, he surely transformed his monarch into a tyrant through his undeserved influence and evil advice. The Spanish Jesuit Juan de Mariana, for example, believed that the worst thing that could happen to a kingdom is that the king let himself be dominated by flattering courtiers and be transformed into a tyrant. Favourites, who dominated the court and gained more authority, favour and wealth than the king's other subjects, believed that 'royal power is greater than the laws and the community, that the king is the owner of his subjects' property, and that everything – including the law – depends on the king's will'.⁸

It was due to their devouring ambition and their intrinsically evil nature that favourites caused continuous confrontations between monarchs and subjects. Sir John Eliot, for example, believed – as did many of his contemporaries – that the relationship between Charles I and his subjects, represented by parliament, was harmonious until the Duke of Buckingham became involved in public affairs. It was Buckingham who 'had cast an alteration in the air', creating a mood of mistrust between Charles I and his vassals, Eliot wrote in *Negotium Posterorum*, composed after the parliament of 1625. Years later, the French duc de Rohan made similar comments when he declared that 'The absolute rule of favourites is the ruin of a state. For either they alter it for their own profit or they give cause to the ambitious to do so, and at the very least they are the pretext for all the quarrels that occur in it'.⁹

According to those early modern Europeans who believed that the ideal form of government was a monarchy in which the monarch was helped and bridled by his counsellors the role of the royal favourite should be clearly limited. 'I do not say', wrote Claude de Seyssel, 'that [the king] cannot have someone familiar with him and above all others in his confidence with whom as with himself he privately shares his lesser domestic affairs and secrets which do not touch the state. . . .' But a monarch should always remember, he continued, that 'it would be a dangerous thing . . . for him to decide matters of great importance, especially matters of state, according to the opinion of one man'.¹⁰ Instead of relying on his favourite, the monarch should rule with the assistance of his counsellors. These counsellors should be 'many, set over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, (one man not engrossing all)'. The worst possible scenario, Sir William Walter continued, is when 'the king's Council rides upon one horse'.¹¹

Early modern European writers who believed in the unlimited power of the king expressed similar fears. 'It is an infallible rule', wrote Machiavelli in *The Prince*, 'that a prince who is not himself wise cannot be soundly advised, unless he happens to put himself in the hands of a man who is very able and controls everything. Then he could certainly be well advised, but he would not last long, because such a governor would soon deprive him of his state.' Thus the exist-



24. The favourite naked of interest and clothed with valour: the Count Duke of Olivares. Title-page of *El Fernando* by Juan Antonio y Vera of Figueroa, Count of La Roca. (British Library, London)



25 Philip IV of Spain, painted by Velázquez in 1644, at a moment between favourites following the fall of Olivares. (Frick Collection, New York)



26 The man of state as the man of God: the triple portrait of Cardinal Richelieu (1642) by Philippe de Champaigne. (National Portrait Gallery, London)



27 Richelieu's successor: Jules Mazarin. Painted by Pierre Mignard. (Musée Condé, Chantilly)

28 Richelieu's château – which he never inhabited – at the new town of Richelieu. Engraving by Jean Marot.





29 George Ossoliński, Grand Chancellor of the Crown of Poland.
Painting of 1635 by Bartolomaeus
Strobel. (National Museum in Warsaw)



30 Adam Kazanowski, favourite of
Prince Ladislas of Poland. Painting by
J. Van Rij. (Wawel Royal Castle, Cracow)



31 Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor of England: analyst of favour and friendship.
Painting attributed to Abraham Blyenberch. (Royal Society, London)



32 Toby Matthew: Bacon's ideal friend. Painting of 1616. (National Portrait Gallery, London).



33 The Duke of Lerma, the quintessential favourite, painted by Rubens.
(Museo del Prado, Madrid)

34 William Larkin, *George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham* (1616). (National Portrait Gallery, London)



35 Peter Paul Rubens, oil sketch for *Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Buckingham* (1625). (Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth)





36 Peter Paul Rubens, *Equestrian Portrait of the Duke of Buckingham* (1629). (Formerly at Osterley Park, now destroyed)



37 After Rubens, *Glorification of the Duke of Buckingham*. (Whereabouts unknown)



38 Peter Paul Rubens, *Glorification of the Duke of Buckingham* (before 1625). (National Gallery, London)

39 Peter Paul Rubens,
*Glorification of the Duke
of Buckingham* (1629).
(Formerly at Osterley
Park, destroyed 1949)



40 Gerrit van
Honthorst, *Apollo and
Diana* (1628).
(Hampton Court)





41 Attributed to Velázquez, *Count Duke of Olivares* (1624). (Museu de Arte de São Paulo)



42 Diego Velázquez, *Count Duke of Olivares* (c. 1625). (Hispanic Society of America, New York)



43 Paul Pontius after Rubens, *Count Duke of Olivares*. Engraving of 1626.

44 Diego Velázquez, *Equestrian Portrait of the Count Duke of Olivares*. (Museo del Prado, Madrid)



45 Diego Velázquez, *Riding Lesson of Prince Balthasar Carlos* (1636). (Collection of the Duke of Westminster, London)



46 Juan Bautista Maino, *Recapture of Bahía* (1635). (Museo del Prado, Madrid)



ence of a single counsellor, who could by means of his closeness to the king usurp the ruler's power, was the main threat to creating and conserving strong and stable monarchies. Machiavelli's alternative to this dreadful situation required a king who asked for advice from his counsellors, but who nevertheless ruled alone.¹²

Machiavelli was only one of many political writers who viewed the existence of a powerful royal counsellor as the main challenge to personal monarchies. Three of the most influential early modern political writers, Jean Bodin, Giovanni Botero and Justus Lipsius, shared a similar understanding of an ideal monarch: a monarch who surrounded himself with good counsellors, who listened with respect and attention, who gave his counsellors the freedom to speak the truth, but who ultimately decided alone what was best for the well-being of the commonwealth. As Lipsius wrote, this ideal monarch should consult his or her advisers but not abdicate 'the force of Principality' by referring all things to his councils or by sharing his authority with a single favourite.¹³ The king's subjects could not accept a monarch dependent on one single counsellor, claimed Giovanni Botero, because this suggested that the king was weak and unable to assume his responsibilities, and that the favourite thus threatened the monarch's sovereignty. Botero also reminded monarchs that their subjects would sooner or later rebel against the favourites and in doing so they would 'offend the king himself', as was demonstrated by the cases of Edward II of England and Queen Joanna of Naples among others.¹⁴

Unlike the writers who opposed the presence of a royal favourite because they feared he would promote royal absolutism, the defenders of an all-powerful monarch feared the existence of a favourite or a prime minister for exactly the opposite reason: an influential favourite would reduce the possibility of enhancing the king's power. These theorists believed that the preservation of order and political stability required that the monarch be presented as the unique holder of sovereignty, as a vivid image of God. As a master should never let a servant become too familiar with him, neither could a true monarch let a subject share his authority. Moreover, it was unthinkable that God could create another god. As Bodin wrote:

royal rights cannot be delegated, and are inalienable . . . and if for whatever reason a Prince communicates his rights to one of his subjects, this subject would become the king's companion and the king would no longer be a sovereign. . . . For as the supreme God cannot make another God equal to himself . . . so we may also say that the Prince, who is for us God's image, cannot make a subject equal to himself.¹⁵

The same views were echoed by the Spaniard Juan de Vitrián. In the universe there was only one God, in each household one master, in each body one soul, he wrote; the monarch 'as a human god, the master and the soul of the body politic' could only be one.¹⁶

The conflicts, crises and rebellions in the English, French and Spanish monarchies during the 1620s and 1630s were to many sufficient proof that the presence of powerful royal favourites were leading the monarchies to the edge of destruction. Favourites were indeed the obstacles to a well-ordered and well-ruled monarchy, and the best a monarch could do was to keep them as private companions, far away from state affairs.¹⁷

The King's Friend and Ministro Principal

The same court character, the royal favourite, was thus viewed as a monster with two faces. In one, the royal favourite appeared as a promoter of absolutism and tyranny; in the other, he appeared as an obstacle to enhancing royal power. But, as Tomás y Valiente's superb study of royal favourites in seventeenth-century Spain demonstrates, to these two images we should add a third. This third image was created not only by flatterers but also by writers who tried to understand the workings of personal monarchies. Many of the authors considered here believed that the presence of a powerful royal favourite and/or a prime minister was not the result of a crisis in the system, or of a weakening in the character of seventeenth-century monarchs, but was a response to new political realities. The new circumstances confronting a monarch after 1570 were well understood at the time. The acquisition of new territories and the increasing confrontations with other European powers meant that a monarch had many more matters to resolve, that an increasing number of officials became involved in public affairs and that new institutions had to be created. A monarch alone could not possibly attend to all matters, remember all problems or control all men under his orders. What the king needed, claimed many political writers, was a man of confidence, a favourite, who acting as a kind of prime minister or chief counsellor could help his master to manage public affairs, protect the monarch against the inevitable complaints against his government and allow him to devote his time to solving the most important public matters.

Yet the favourite's participation in the government of the monarchy had to be accomplished without diminishing the monarch's power and prerogatives. As several modern historians have contended, not all early modern writers viewed the defence of royal favourites as incompatible with theories defending the absolute powers of the king. E. H. Kossman, for example, notes that sixteenth-century monarchs ruled in close collaboration with their councils and parliaments, but when 'these bodies tended to become self-willed institutions, ambitious of independent responsibilities, the absolute king preferred to ignore them and consult only his inner council of ministers'. Kossman, in characterizing royal absolutism as a force endlessly aiming to increase the king's power, reminds us that one of the most common practices during the seventeenth century was to leave old institutions untouched but at the same time 'to superimpose new ideas, institutions and rules upon them and so to create a

whole new layer of government, a higher platform of sovereignty'. Late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century monarchs increasingly began to turn for advice to particular ministers who were chosen and dismissed by the monarch and who dedicated themselves to protecting the king's interests.¹⁸ We can characterize the behaviour of sixteenth-century monarchs with Francis Bacon's words about Queen Elizabeth, who 'after the manner of the choicest princes before her, did not always tie her trust to place, but did sometime divide private favour from office'.¹⁹ In contrast, seventeenth-century monarchs tended to prefer the advice of those who enjoyed their private favour and who as a result were placed at the apex of the court hierarchy.

The positive discourse on the royal favourite began to emerge in the 1580s. Until then, there had been, of course, manifestations of support of particular favourites, but these did not amount to a well-formulated positive discourse on royal favourites. What was new after the 1580 was the emergence of powerful favourites who caught the imagination of their contemporaries, and who left their imprint on the politics of their times. In each monarchy, although at different times, one favourite alone came to monopolize the monarch's favour, and unlike sixteenth-century monarchs seventeenth-century rulers publicly recognized that their favourite played a key role in the ruling of the monarchy. The favourites themselves also promoted their position as the monarch's sole favourite or prime minister and their active participation in public affairs. Both developments led to the creation of an extensive positive discourse on royal favourites.

Without doubt, the positive discourse on royal favourites was more complex and prevalent in Spain than elsewhere. It is difficult to pinpoint the exact reason why this was the case, but I believe that one of the main factors that contributed to the emergence of a positive discourse on royal favourites in Spain was Philip II's decision to place a small group of favourites in the apex of the governmental machinery. Between the 1560s and his death in 1598, Philip II (pl. 3) relied on his closest servants and officials (for example, the Prince of Eboli, the Count of Chinchón and especially Cristóbal de Moura in the 1590s) to rule the increasingly complex Spanish Monarchy.

The emergence of this group of powerful favourites did not reinforce the anti-favourite discourse. Few writers, if any, viewed Philip II as a weak king controlled by evil favourites. His reign was a period of political stability and his favourites did not become subjects of court scandals. They did not parade at the court with their scandalous behaviour, as supposedly did Henri III's favourites; nor did they plot against their master, as did the Earl of Essex against Queen Elizabeth. It was under these circumstances that a new generation of Spanish theorists began to make claims that had been unthinkable in the past. They believed, for example, that a royal favourite with an active but clearly limited public role could positively influence the well-being of both the king and the kingdom. The enthronement of a new monarch, Philip III (1598–1621), and the rise of a new favourite, the Duke of Lerma (pl. 33), bolstered the positive

discourse on royal favourites. During the first years of Philip III's reign, and as a political comment to Lerma's *privanza*, political authors portrayed the royal favourite as the king's chief counsellor in charge of the everyday government of the Monarchy.²⁰

Positive theories on royal favourites evolved even more radically after 1609, when Fray Pedro de Maldonado, Lerma's confessor, completed his *Discurso del Perfecto Privado* ('Discourse on the Perfect Favourite'), which, although an unpublished pamphlet, revolutionized the way in which royal favourites were depicted in seventeenth-century Spain.²¹ In writing his pamphlet, Maldonado's first goal was to discredit prior claims against royal favourites. He recognized that those who opposed the presence of a royal favourite did so because they believed that a monarch who depended on one of his subjects could not remain free and eminent. 'I am of different opinion, and believe', Maldonado wrote, 'that if the favourite is how a favourite should be, the royal favourite is the most noble and finest part of the monarchy.' Maldonado did not accept the view that the presence of a royal favourite was simply a lesser evil reflecting the human fallibility of the king, but he firmly believed that a royal favourite was the ultimate good for the well-being of the monarch and the commonwealth: 'the commonwealth is safer with a bad monarch who has a good *privado*, than with a good monarch who has a bad *privado*'. Had tyrants had good favourites at their side the course of history would have been different, he claimed. In Maldonado's views, by having favourites monarchs were behaving according to the laws of nature and God's will. The sun shines on the entire earth, but some parts receive more light than others; the soul gives life to the body, but favours especially the head and the heart; God, who gives life to all humans and creates them in His image, favours some over others. Even Jesus Christ gave singular favour to two apostles: John and Peter.

Although Maldonado's views were extremely important and had a great impact on his contemporaries, his influence extended beyond his times. Until Maldonado, the common definition of a favourite was simple, a courtier who – for whatever reason – enjoyed the king's favour. But, in his pamphlet, Maldonado presented a more complex view of the favourite which greatly helped to justify his role in the day-to-day administration of the monarchy. 'We call *privado*', Maldonado wrote, 'a man whom [the king] has chosen among the rest for a particular kind of equality based on love and perfect friendship.' I have analysed elsewhere the implications of portraying the favourite as the king's friend.²² For our purposes here, it is sufficient to note that by defining the favourite as the king's friend Maldonado wanted to protect the favourite against being accused of trying to usurp the king's power. As the king's friend, the favourite could be introduced as the king's other self and thus as his echo, his shadow, his public image, and as the intermediary between the king and his subjects.²³

Contrary to the opinions of many modern historians, I believe that the discourse on royal favourites did not change substantially during Lerma's

(1598–1618) and Olivares' (1621–43) *privanzas*. Olivares (pls 24 and 41–6) was, indeed, both a royal favourite and a prime minister, as Lerma had been before him. Here it is important to differentiate Olivares' public statements claiming that he was not the king's favourite but his minister from theories put forth by his supporters. What Olivares and his supporters attempted, which was not the case under Lerma's *privanza*, was to discredit former favourites, particularly Lerma, but not to question the institution itself. This strategy was clearly articulated by Virgilio Malvezzi, Olivares' propagandist: 'the *privanza* is like the monarchy; if it is in good hands it is very good; if it is in bad hands it is terrible'.²⁴

In fact, from the very inception of Philip IV's reign, it was evident that continuity was going to dominate the political discourse on favourites. On 4 May 1621, a few days after Philip III's death, in the presence of Philip IV and Olivares, Fray Gerónimo de Florencia delivered a funeral sermon on the late king, and advised that to protect the well-being of the community the monarch needed at his side a high-ranking servant, whom Florencia called 'the father of the king . . . a *privado* and a confidant who should be in charge of all public affairs'.²⁵ It was in fact during Olivares' *privanza* that the genre of mirror-for-favourites literature reached its apex. Dozens of books dedicated to Olivares and/or Philip IV continued to proclaim the king's duty to have a favourite-prime minister. Mártil Rizo, an expert on royal favourites, defined the favourite as the king's 'good friend and minister' and contended that an ideal form of government was a personal monarchy as long as the monarch had at his side a just favourite who acted as the king's *alter ego*.²⁶ Virgilio Malvezzi went even further by presenting royal favourites as perfect and unselfish creatures in the service of crown and country. 'Angels', Malvezzi wrote, 'are the figures of God with us; Favourites, the figures of Angels with Princes; Princes, of God with men'.²⁷ The positive discourse in seventeenth-century Spain was so strongly rooted in the political culture that, even after Olivares' fall in 1643, many Spanish writers continued to defend royal favourites and their role in the ruling of the Monarchy. This was the case, for example, with Fray José Láinez, who in his *El Josué esclarecido*, a book dedicated to Philip IV, still defined the favourite as 'the king's prime minister . . . a character defined in the Holy Scripture as the King's friend . . . and who is the King's right hand, or better a king without crown'.²⁸

Le Premier Ministre

The French case presents both differences and similarities with the Spanish case. We know that in France there were favourites-prime ministers who acquired as much power as and played roles in the ruling of the monarchy similar to their Spanish counterparts. More importantly, some of the concepts and images used to describe and support royal favourites-prime ministers were

rather similar, as were the conclusions reached by authors in both monarchies concerning the role of the king's favourite or prime minister. There were, however, some notable differences. A positive discourse on royal favourites developed later in France than in Spain, and some concepts used by Spanish writers – particularly the views of the favourite as the king's friend – were not employed by the French, who preferred, as we shall see, to present the servant chosen by the king to help him rule the monarchy as the king's prime counsellor or *premier ministre*.

Why a positive discourse on royal favourites did not develop until the 1620s in France was at least in part due to the country's special political situation between the 1570s and the 1620s. During Henri III's reign, from 1574 to 1588, royal favourites became the centre of a battle with political and religious implications. The pamphlets, poems, political treatises and satires of this period represent one of the most ferocious campaigns of denigration ever mounted. Indeed, Henri's favourites were depicted as evil counsellors, tyrants, poisoners and Machiavellians, while their master Henri III was portrayed as a weak monarch, a tyrant and a devil.²⁹ Given such a political atmosphere, it seems obvious that the possibilities for a positive discourse on royal favourites were, to say the least, minimal.

That a king should not rely on favourites became one of the principles on which Henri IV grounded his style of government, which he and his propagandists presented as directly opposed to Henri III's style. The assassination of Henri IV in 1610 led to a new period of political instability, and a new round of anti-favourite sentiments now voiced against Marie de Médicis' favourite, Concino Concini. De Luynes' (pl. 17) short minionship, from 1617 to 1621, also did not lead to more positive views on royal favourites, despite the fact that during those years political stability was the norm, and de Luynes' control over Louis XIII's entourage and council seemed total. After all, as John Holles informed Sir Richard Altham, de Luynes was the greatest 'favourite . . . that ever was in France, since the *maires of the palace*'.³⁰

The death of de Luynes in December 1621 precipitated the rise of Richelieu (pls 26 and 47–57) who, as Louis XIII's *premier ministre*, remained in power until his death in 1642. His presence changed the French political discourse on royal favourites. Although most modern historians refuse to consider Richelieu as a favourite, early modern Europeans did not have such misgivings. For them Richelieu was indeed a royal favourite, an individual who enjoyed the personal and political confidence of Louis XIII, and as a result played an important role in the ruling of the monarchy. The Englishman James Howell, whose reports on Spain and France in the first decades of the seventeenth century were particularly perceptive, declared in 1626 that Richelieu 'is grown to be the sole Favourite of the King of France, being brought in by the Queen-Mother'. Peter Paul Rubens also had no problems in comparing Richelieu to other favourites (Lerma and Sejanus, for example), while asserting that Richelieu was a usurper who had taken complete control of the state, transforming

Louis XIII into a simple 'figure-head'. Even some of Richelieu's apologists did not hesitate to present Richelieu as Louis' 'favori', as Mousnier has noted in commenting on François de Colomby's *L'Autorité des roys* (1631).³¹

The most important difference between Richelieu and other favourites is that although Richelieu knew how to play the role of a courtier, as is demonstrated by his relationship with Marie de Médicis, he rose to power not as a member of the king's household, but from his position as a member of the king's council. 'From this vantage point', Bergin has noted, 'he differs from his [French] rivals [and his Spanish counterparts] essentially by the manner in which he succeeded in gradually transforming his initial toehold through the successive, piecemeal conquest of power which eventually made him such a dominant figure in government during the last decade of his career.'³² Accordingly, the language Richelieu and his followers used to justify his position and influence drew heavily on the theories of the role of the king's counsellors. No reference is made to the king's friendship and love towards his favourite, as in Spain with Lerma and Olivares. It is important to note, however, that many of the historical examples Richelieu and his followers employed to defend his *ministériat* were identical to those used in Spain to defend Lerma and Olivares.

That the discourse to defend Richelieu's position was based on the theories about the king's councils and counsellors is evident in Richelieu's political testament, especially the chapters on 'Le conseil du Prince'. Like many other early modern political writers, Cardinal Richelieu claimed that a good monarch was one who relied on the advice and help of honest counsellors and who refrained from action without their advice. Richelieu's discourse included particular views on the qualities of a good counsellor. He should be wise, incorruptible, knowledgeable about history, honest in his advice and always ready to correct the prince's errors and vices. The king's counsellor should also be loyal to God, the king, the state, and be 'keen on defending the public good'.³³ The theories of Richelieu's supporters were similar. 'If it were permitted to make faire dreams and magnificent wishes' – Jean de Silhon, Richelieu's creature, wrote in his *Ministre d'Estat*, published in 1631 – 'it were to be desired that a Prince alone should make up his council, that he were the sole director of his business, that he were the sole intelligence to give it motion.' But because monarchs were humans and as such imperfect they needed the counsel of others.³⁴

Yet Richelieu and his supporters extracted different conclusions from the theories on the ruler's need to receive counsel than did those who opposed favourites and prime ministers, arguing that to impose his authority a monarch needed to have *one counsellor* with superior authority over the rest. As Scipion Dupleix wrote in his *Histoire de Louis le Juste* (1635): 'One does not discuss matters of state with [many ministers] to hear their reasons and sentiments; the decision should be made only between the prince and the general director so that the secret may not be divulged. . . . After all, since political government is

organized after the model of the celestial hierarchy, no criticism of it can be made.' Richelieu himself, in his political testament, corroborated this view: to have a well-ordered monarchy the ruler should promote one of his counsellors over the rest, and one whose authority should be 'inferior only to that of his master'.³⁵

Richelieu's allies also presented the *premier ministre*'s authority as a reflection of the monarch's will, as the sun reflects God's light and Moses echoes God's words.³⁶ The *premier ministre* was compared, like the royal favourite in Spain, to Hercules, and many of Richelieu's creatures did not hesitate to depict Richelieu as the prime cause of France's successes, and as a king without a crown: 'Through you,' wrote Jacques Ribier in 1641, 'we are in a happier century, since you have the government of the realm in your hands and you direct affairs as the soul, the genius and intelligence of this great body.'³⁷

The Favourite as a Private Companion

As in Spain, political writers in England began to focus on the royal favourite during the last decades of the sixteenth century. This increasing attention given to favourites can at least in part be attributed to the presence of several favourites, whose 'leading characteristic was [their] physical and personal attraction for the queen. . . . They were individuals who both occupied the central positions at the court, and enjoyed an apparently unequalled degree of intimacy with and indulgence by the queen'.³⁸ It was this physical and personal attraction for the queen that determined how Elizabeth's contemporaries portrayed these favourites. Thomas Blundeville's translation of the word favourite as 'lover' in his English rendition of Furió Ceriol's book on the king's counsellors, a translation Blundeville dedicated to Leicester, is an example of how the language on favourites adapted to the circumstance of a regnant queen with male favourites.³⁹

Queen Elizabeth's contemporaries also believed that the queen had given her favourites more power and influence than had been the case under previous rulers, a belief that ultimately led to an extremely negative discourse on favourites. Between 1580 and 1605, English writers published some of the most excoriating attacks against royal favourites with such dramatic force that they continue to sway today's readers. Writers attacked not only courtiers-favourites-lovers (Leicester and Essex) but also counsellors-favourites (Cardinal Wolsey, William Cecil and Robert Cecil), who were all portrayed as evil counsellors with the desire to dominate both crown and country. These works, I believe, discredited the positive concepts that other early modern European writers used to portray the royal favourite. The anonymous *Burghley's Commonwealth*, Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* and Samuel Rowley's *When you see me, you know me*, for example, demonstrated that by permitting one counsellor to have authority over the rest the ruler created a demi-king

whose ambition led him to usurp the monarch's power. To term the monarch's favourite as his lover and/or friend did not help. The language of love and friendship used by favourites in *Leicester's Commonwealth*, Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II*, Michael Drayton's *Piers Gaveston Earle of Cornwall* and Ben Jonson's *Sejanus His Fall*, also concealed the true intention of ambitious courtiers who did not vacillate in using the favour of their masters, lovers and friends to gain control over royal power. This anti-favourite, anti-prime-minister discourse had a lasting impact in England and I believe that it affected the ways in which favourites were perceived throughout the reigns of the Stuarts. This is to say not that there were no writers who viewed the royal favourite in a positive light, but that this positive discourse never gained the same prominence in England as it did in Spain with Lerma and Olivares and in France with Richelieu.

During the reigns of James I (pl. 19) and Charles I there were authors who employed a language of love and friendship to describe and justify the role of the royal favourite in public affairs. Even English monarchs themselves resorted to this language to express their confidence in their favourites. Famous are the words of James I when he declared in the Privy Council, 'I love Buckingham more than anyone else, and more than you who are here assembled. I wish to speak on my own behalf, and not to have it to be a defect, for Jesus Christ did the same, and therefore I cannot be blamed. Christ had his John and I have my George.'⁴⁰ But, more generally, during the reigns of James and Charles political writers viewed the concepts of love and friendship used to describe the favourite with straightforward hostility or, at the very least, with apprehension. We can point to numerous examples of this hostility, such as Francis Osborne's comments in his *Traditional Memoirs* and the satirical poems published against Charles and Buckingham, which presented a monarch dominated by an irrational, often corrupt, love towards one of his subjects.⁴¹

Even those who did not oppose favourites and those who openly supported them had misgivings about portraying the royal favourite as the king's friend. Francis Bacon (pl. 31), who in some works supported royal favourites, on occasion used a language rather similar to that used by Spanish authors. In a letter of advice addressed to Buckingham, for example, Bacon asserted that all monarchs had favourites, whom he called 'privadoes and friends'. Monarchs, he continued, had opted to have favourites 'sometimes out of their affection to the person of the man (for Kings have their affections as well as private men), sometimes in contemplation of their great abilities (and that's a happy choice), and sometimes for their own ends'.⁴²

Bacon returned to this topic in the 1625 version of his essay 'Of Friendship'. Here, as in his letter to Buckingham, Bacon insisted that all monarchs, weak and wise, had favourites. But, in contrast to his letter to Buckingham, Bacon now called the attention of his readers to the danger that a favourite could pose to the king and the inappropriateness of calling the royal favourite the king's friend. 'It is strange to observe', Bacon wrote, 'how high a rate great kings and monarchs

do set upon this fruit of friendship whereof we speak – so great, as they purchase it many times *at the hazard of their own safety and greatness.*⁴³ The reason for Bacon's misgivings can be found in contemporary theories on friendship – especially in the idea that friendship created equality. Based on these theories, for a monarch to have a friend implied, as Bacon noted himself, that the king elevates a subject to a position almost equal to the king, 'which many times sorts to inconvenience'. John Speed had already expressed this concern in his *The History of England* published in 1611. By claiming that the root of all problems for Edward II was his friendship with his favourite Gaveston, Speed declared that in keeping such a relationship Edward II forgot that 'those affections, which oftentimes deserve praise in a private person, are subject to much construction in a public'. By making Gaveston 'his half-self', Edward II opened the doors to an extreme civil confrontation which ultimately led to the killing of Gaveston and the dethronement of the king himself.⁴³

Despite the fact that Buckingham monopolized royal grace and confidence from 1616 to 1628, the discourse on what role the royal favourite should occupy in governing the monarchy remained radically different in England from its counterparts in Spain and France. The concept of the favourite as the king's friend never became dominant in the English political discourse, and neither did the concept of the favourite as the king's chief counsellor or prime minister, even though there were attempts to portray the favourite as such.⁴⁴ Almost all English authors claimed that a king had to have several favourites and not just one, and believed that the favourites should be entirely subject to their monarch's will. Robert Naunton, for example, claimed that Elizabeth's favourites 'were many, and those memorable. But they were only favourites not minions, such as acted more by her own princely rules and judgment than by their own will and appetites'.⁴⁵ Behind these views was the belief that while a monarch had the right to have a close companion, a favourite, he should limit the favourite's public role. This was an idea already expressed early in the reign of James I by Edward Forset who, after declaring that 'the counselors of state', and not the royal favourites, should help the king to rule the monarchy, declared that 'The favourites of a Prince may be resembled to the fantasies of the Soule, with whom he sports and delights himself; which to do (so the integrity of judgment, and Majesty of State be retained) is in neither of both reprobable'.⁴⁶

The content of the English discourse on royal favourites and how it differed from that of the French and Spanish discourses is well illustrated by Thomas Fuller's *The Holy State* published in 1642. As its title indicates, in his book Fuller analysed the various components of a personal monarchy, among which he included the royal favourite. In his analysis of the royal favourite, Fuller expressed the prevailing views on this topic – that the favourites should be many, that they should be dependent on the monarch's will and that their public role should be strictly limited. Illustrative of Fuller's views on favourites and their public role were the historical cases he chose to distinguish an evil from an

ideal favourite. As examples of evil favourites Fuller chose Cardinal Wolsey and Haman, both accused of trying to usurp the king's authority after becoming the king's chief counsellor. The example he chose for the ideal favourite was Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, one of the favourites of Henry VIII. What made Brandon an ideal favourite according to Fuller was that Brandon always remained the king's boon companion. Brandon, unlike Wolsey and Haman, never attempted to become the king's chief counsellor, and thus was never viewed by the king as a threat to his sovereignty.⁴⁷

Epilogue

In one of the most influential modern studies on English politics during the 1620s, Conrad Russell made an interesting and controversial reference to the topic of favourites. ‘The appearance of a “valido”, or first minister’, Russell wrote, ‘was a general phenomenon in many European courts,’ and he wonders ‘whether the Stuarts’ error may not have been the creation of this institution, but the failure to continue it after the death of Buckingham in 1628.’⁴⁸ As seen in this chapter, since the late decades of the sixteenth century some political writers had proposed that the king should place more responsibility in the hands of his officials for his own protection. In this context, the royal favourite came to play an increasingly important role by becoming – at least in theory – the monarch’s protective shield and chief counsellor.

We also know that favourites were not as successful as their defenders predicted and desired. The reasons, I believe, were not lack of effort by the favourites themselves, or the absence of theories to defend their active role in the government of the monarchy, but the fact that the dominant paradigm on royal power did not change throughout this period. By the late sixteenth century, it was generally accepted that a monarch had to rule alone and this view continued to prevail throughout the second half of the seventeenth century. It appeared impossible for many early modern Europeans to defend simultaneously contemporary theories of royal power and an active role for the royal favourite. This was especially true in moments of crisis, when attacks on royal favourites were perceived as direct attacks on their masters. Philip Sidney cleverly foresaw this possibility, when in his defence of the Earl of Leicester he wrote that those who wanted to subvert the queen’s power, ‘before the occasion be ripe for them, to show their hate against the prince, do first vomit it out against’ her most devoted counsellor.⁴⁹

A favourite and prime minister, Louis XIV claimed in his memoirs, could fulfil a positive function; after all, he wrote, ‘if he despoils you of part of your glory, he unburdens you at the same time of your thorniest cares’. But, at the same time, the existence of a favourite–prime minister questioned the royal persona, his power and sovereignty, by transforming the king into a simple figurehead in the eyes of his subjects. The only way to resolve this contradiction

was for the favourite to remain in the shadow of the king. To conserve his power and ultimately to conserve the monarchy, a king had to rule following the example set by Henri IV of France and not by Philip III of Spain, claimed Beaumont de Pérefixe, a tutor of Louis XIV. A monarch must disregard his personal attachments towards his servants and never delegate any of his prerogatives to those he loves. The king 'cannot deceive himself in this, because there is no person more proper than himself, however ignorant he be, to rule his kingdom, God having destined this function to him, and not to others, and the people being always disposed to receive commands when they come out of his sacred mouth'.⁵⁰

Notes

1. I should like to thank the editors John H. Elliott and Laurence Brockliss and those who attended the symposium on the World of the Favourite celebrated in Magdalen College, Oxford, for their comments and suggestions. Special thanks to Irma T. Elo for her insights and help. I wish to dedicate this essay to the late Francisco Tomás y Valiente, murdered by terrorists on 14 February 1996. Professor Tomás y Valiente was an inspiration to many of us through his work, teaching and activities as a defender of democracy in Spain. His book *Los validos en la monarquía española del siglo XVII*, revised edn (Madrid, 1982) first aroused my interest in royal favourites and has been a constant influence in my work.
2. Leicester Bradner, 'The Theme of *Privanza* in Spanish and English Drama, 1590–1625', in A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez, eds, *Homenaje a William L. Fichter* (Madrid, 1971), pp. 98, 106.
3. Antonio de Guevara, *Aviso de Privados* (Valladolid, 1539), fol. 9v; Fadrique Furio Ceriol, *El Concejo y Consejeros del Príncipe*, ed. D. Sevilla Andrés (Valencia, 1952), p. 100; and Claude de Seyssel, *The Monarchy of France* (1515), trans. J. H. Hexter, ed. Donald Kelley (New Haven and London, 1981), p. 73.
4. Baldassare Castiglione, *El Cortesano*, Spanish trans. Juan Boscán (1534), 2 vols (Madrid, 1985), ii, p. 115, and i, p. 22.
5. I realize that to discuss the discourse on favourites in three monarchies so briefly it is necessary to simplify a very complex theme. This particularly pertains to my treatment of the French and the English discourses on favourites. My purpose here is to give a framework for comparison rather than to provide a thorough treatment of early modern European political discourses.
6. Cf. Arthur Kirsch, 'Shakespeare's Tragedies', in John F. Andrews, ed., *William Shakespeare: His World, his Work, his Influence*, 3 vols (New York, 1985), ii, p. 518.
7. *Leicester's Commonwealth* (1584), ed. D. C. Peck (Athens, Ga, 1985), pp. 187 and 73.
8. Juan de Mariana, *De Rege et Regis Institutione* (1599), ed. L. Sánchez Agesta (Madrid, 1981), pp. 37, 105, 97, 110, 165. 6. See also Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum* (1583), ed. Mary Dewar (Cambridge, 1982), bk 1, ch. 7, p. 54.
9. Sir John Eliot, *Negotium Posterorum*, in *Proceedings in Parliament*, 1625, ed. Maija Jansson and William B. Bidwell (New Haven and London, 1987), p. 523; cf. J. H. M. Salmon, 'Rohan and the Reason of State', in his *Renaissance and Revolt* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 106.
10. Seyssel, *Monarchy of France*, p. 79.
11. J. Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State*, 7 vols (London, 1721), i, p. 219.
12. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. Quentin Skinner (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 81–2.
13. Justus Lipsius, *Six Books of Politickes or Civil Doctrine* (London, 1594), bk iv, ch. 9, p. 81.
14. Giovanni Botero, *Diez libros de la razón de estado* (1593), trans. Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas (Madrid, 1613), bk ii, ch. 11, fol. 52, and bk i, ch. 14, fol. 17–19.
15. Jean Bodin, *Les Six Livres de la République*, ed. Christiane Fremont, Marie-Dominique Couzinet and Henri Rochais, 6 vols (Paris, 1986), bk 1, ch. 10, p. 299.
16. Juan de Vitrián, *Las Memorias de Felipe de Comines*, 2 vols (Antwerp, 1643), i, p. 31, and ii, p. 114.
17. See Diego Saavedra Fajardo, *Idea de un príncipe político-cristiano representada en cien empresas* (1640) (fac. edn, Murcia, 1985), *empresa* 50, pp. 362–3.

18. E. H. Kossman, 'The Singularity of Absolutism', in his *Louis XIV and Absolutism* (Columbus, Ohio, 1976), pp. 11–12; see also J. Vicens Vives, 'Estructura administrativa estatal en los siglos XVI y XVII', in his *Coyuntura económica y reformismo burgués* (Barcelona, 1969), p. 124.
19. Sir Francis Bacon his *Apologie in certaine imputations concerning the late Earle of Essex* (1604), in Francis Bacon, *The Works*, 17 vols, ed. James Spedding, x (London, 1868), p. 142.
20. On the theories developed during the reign of Philip II, see Antonio Feros, 'Twin Souls: Monarchs and Favourites in Early Seventeenth-Century Spain', in Richard L. Kagan and Geoffrey Parker, eds, *Spain, Europe and the Atlantic World: Essays in honour of John H. Elliott* (Cambridge, 1995), esp. pp. 31–2. On portraits of the royal favourite as the king's prime minister, see Antonio Pérez (Baltasar Alamos de Barrientos), *Norte de Príncipes*, ed. Martín de Riquer (Madrid, 1969), pp. 15–79.
21. Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, mss 18721/48, no pages.
22. Feros, 'Twin Souls', *passim*; and Antonio Feros, *The King's Favourite: The Duke of Lerma. Power, Wealth and Court Culture in the Reign of Philip III of Spain, 1598–1621* (forthcoming Cambridge University Press), ch. 6.
23. On the influence of Maldonado's definition of a favourite and the implications of defining the favourite as the king's friend, see Feros, 'Twin Souls', pp. 39–42.
24. Virgilio Malvezzi, *Historia del Marqués Virgilio Malvezzi* (1640), in Juan Yáñez, *Memorias para la Historia de Don Felipe III, Rey de España* (Madrid, 1773), p. 23.
25. Gerónimo de Florencia, *Sermón que predicó a la majestad Católica del rey Don Felipe Quarto* (Madrid, 1621), fol. 26v–27v.
26. Juan Pablo Martír Rizo, *Norte de Príncipes* (1626), ed. J. A. Maravall, 2nd edn (Madrid, 1988), p. 64; *idem*, *Historia de la vida de Lucio Anneo Séneca* (1625), ed. B. de la Vega (Madrid, 1944), pp. 72–3; and *idem*, *Historia de la vida de Mecenas* (Madrid, 1626), fol. 60.
27. Virgilio Malvezzi, *Il ritratto del privato cristiano* (1635), ed. María Luisa Doglio (Palermo, 1993), p. 35; Malvezzi's book was translated into Spanish in 1635 and into English in 1647.
28. José Laínez, *El Josué esclarecido* (Madrid, 1653), p. 506.
29. See, for all the depictions, Pierre Champion, 'La Légende des mignons', *Humanisme et Renaissance*, 6 (1939), pp. 493–528; Jacqueline Boucher, *La Cour de Henri III* (1986), pp. 23–6; and David Potter, 'Kingship in the Wars of Religion: The Reputation of Henri III of France', *European History Quarterly*, 25 (1995), pp. 485–528.
30. Joseph Bergin, *The Rise of Richelieu* (New Haven and London, 1991), p. 163; John Howell to Sir Richard Altham, 1 May 1620, in James Howell, *Epistolae Ho-Elianae: The Familiar Letters of James Howell*, ed. Joseph Jacobs (London, 1892), p. 138.
31. Howell, *Epistolae Ho-Elianae*, p. 222; *The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens*, trans. and ed. Ruth Saunders Magurn (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), pp. 147–9; Roland Mousnier, *L'Homme rouge ou la vie du cardinal de Richelieu* (Paris, 1992), p. 459.
32. Bergin, *The Rise of Richelieu*, p. 261; see also Mousnier, *L'Homme rouge*, pp. 221–33, 262–82.
33. *Testament politique*, ed. Louis André (Paris, 1957), pp. 287–305.
34. Jean de Silhon, *The Minister of State, wherein is shown the true use of Modern Policy* (London, 1658), p. 52.
35. Cf. William F. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State* (Princeton, 1972), p. 467; Richelieu, *Testament politique*, pp. 395–7.
36. See, for example, Étienne Thieuau, *Raison d'état et pensée politique à l'époque de Richelieu* (Paris, 1966), pp. 239–40, and Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, p. 220.
37. Malcolm Bull, 'Poussin's Bacchanals for Cardinal Richelieu', *Burlington Magazine*, 137 (1995), pp. 5–6; cf. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State*, p. 414.
38. Simon Adams, 'Favourites and Factious at the Elizabethan Court', in R. G. Asch and A. M. Birke, eds, *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c. 1450–1650* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 265–6.
39. Fadrique Furió Ceriol, *Of Councils and Counselors*, trans. Thomas Blundeville (London, 1570), p. 18. On the prevalence of the language of love to refer to the queen's favourites, see Catherine Bates, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature* (Cambridge, 1992).
40. Cf. Stephen Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603–1642* (London, 1883), iii, p. 98. Gardiner took this quotation not from an official document produced by the Privy Council, but from a letter of the Spanish ambassador in England, Count of Gondomar, to the Archduke of Austria (12 December 1617); see *Correspondencia oficial de don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, conde de Gondomar*, 4 vols (Madrid, 1936), i, p. 93. Gondomar was Lerma's ally and he knew first-hand the language used in Spain to justify the favourite's public role, a language based, as we discussed above, on the concepts and language of friendship.

41. See *James I by his Contemporaries*, ed. R. Ashton (London, 1969), pp. 113–14; and *Poems and Songs relating to George Villiers, duke of Buckingham*, ed. F. W. Fairholt, in *Percy Society*, 29 (London, 1851), p. 5.
42. Bacon, *Works*, xiii, p. 14; in his edition of Francis Bacon's works, Spedding published two versions of Bacon's letter to Buckingham, pp. 13–56. I have consulted and used both. Bacon's letters to Buckingham are very similar to Antonio Pérez's letter to Lerma entitled 'A un gran privado' (1594), in Antonio Pérez, *Relaciones y cartas*, ed. Alfredo Alvar Ezquerro, 2 vols (Madrid, 1986), ii, pp. 77–80.
43. 'Of Friendship', in Francis Bacon, *The Essays*, ed. John Pitcher (Harmondsworth, 1987), p. 139, emphasis added; John Speed, *The History of England* (1611) (London, 1623), pp. 668, 670. Speed dedicated this edition to James I.
44. See, for example, Godfrey Goodman, *The Court of King James the First*, ed. John S. Brewer, 2 vols (London, 1839), i, pp. 256–7; and Bacon's letter to Buckingham, xiii, pp. 14–15, 27–8. Bacon's counsels to Buckingham in how to help the monarch to rule the monarchy are very similar to Alamos de Barrientos' counsels to Lerma on how to act as Philip III's prime minister; see Alamos de Barrientos, *Norte de Príncipes*, pp. 15–79.
45. Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia or Observations on Queen Elizabeth, her Times and Favorites* (1633), ed. John Cerovski (Washington, DC, 1985), pp. 40–1; see also Fulke Greville's 'A dedication to Sir Philip Sidney', in *The Prose Works of Fulke Greville*, ed. John Gouws (Oxford, 1986), pp. 108–9; Henry Wotton, 'A parallel of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham', in his *Reliquiae Wottonianae* (London, 1672), p. 163; and Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, 8 vols (Oxford, 1888), i, pp. 38–9.
46. Edward Forset, *A Comparative Discourse of the Bodies Natural and Politique* (London, 1606), pp. 15–16.
47. Thomas Fuller, *The Holy State and the Profane State* (1642), ed. Maximilian Graff Walten, 2 vols (New York, 1938), ii, pp. 237–57.
48. Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Oxford, 1979), p. 10 and n. 3.
49. Philip Sidney, 'A Discourse in defence of the earl of Leicester', in *The Miscellaneous Works of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. William Gray (New York, 1966), p. 308.
50. Louis XIV, *Mémoires for the Instruction of the Dauphin*, ed. Paul Sonnino (New York, 1970), pp. 130 and 31; Henri de Beaumont de Péréfixe, *The History of Henry IV, Surnamed the Great* (1661), English trans. J. Dauncey, 1663 (New York and Paris, n.d.), pp. 212–13.

'Peut-on Assez Louer Cet Excellent Ministre?'
*Imagery of the Favourite in England,
France and Spain*

JONATHAN BROWN

If favourites held centre-stage in the European court of the seventeenth century, they have been minor players in recent studies of courtly imagery. Despite the fact that individual compositions have been carefully analysed, there has never been an attempt to define the image of the favourite as a category of court art. The terrain, admittedly, is vast, too vast to be surveyed in a short essay. However, perhaps a start can be made by focusing on three favourites, the Duke of Buckingham, the Count-Duke of Olivares and Cardinal Richelieu. By adopting a comparative approach to a study of their images, it may become easier to perceive the outlines of an iconography of the favourite.

The choice of these protagonists is based on their preponderant roles at three of the major monarchical courts of western Europe; in other words, they were chosen for their political significance. Furthermore, the imagery of these favourites stands out for its quality and quantity alike. These statesmen recognized the importance of visual images as a way to define, enhance and defend their unique position in the public realm. They also recognized that the best artists would produce the most convincing statements of their positions. Thus, in due course, we shall discuss works by Velázquez and Maino, Philippe de Champaigne and Poussin, and, of course, Rubens. These favourites had access to the machinery of production of court imagery and continually sought ways to turn it to their advantage.

Another point concerns the social origins of our favourites. As has often been said, they belonged either to the gentry or to the second rank of nobility. They were *arrivistes* to the inner circle of court and to the upper echelons of societies where appearances, or public conduct, were heavily freighted with significance. The pictures commissioned by our favourites are projections of their altered states of reality. Self-definition is the name of the game, the end of which is to offer burnished, idealized images of these complex, often unloved personalities.

Yet all was not mere role-playing. The three favourites continually struggled against foes and factions who despised them and sought to remove them from

power. It follows that some of their images reflect the incessant combat of those who commissioned them. Nevertheless, I do not wish to suggest that a single template will fit all. Distinctive visual codes were elaborated in London, Paris and Madrid before Buckingham, Richelieu and Olivares arrived on the scene, and partly determined how their approaches to representation were fashioned.

Let us begin our tour along *la route du favori* at the court of St James'. In a very useful chapter in his book, *The Great Duke of Buckingham* (1939), Charles Richard Cammell lists some eighty portraits of the mercurial favourite of the early Stuarts.¹ These images can readily be divided into two categories. The largest by far shows George Villiers in full-length or half-length placed against a neutral background. Certainly one of the most spectacular is the version (pl. 34) in the National Portrait Gallery, London, by William Larkin, a fascinating portraitist who worked in the second decade of the seventeenth century.² Although stilted in manner, this portrait admirably captures the beauty of face and physique which launched this ambitious son of a Leicestershire knight on a meteoric career. The occasion of the commission was Villiers' installation as Knight of the Garter in 1616, when he was twenty-four years old, and the artist has done his best to create a resplendent image.

Larkin's portrait, which just precedes Villiers' ascent to the status of favourite, hews to the well-entrenched conventions of Jacobean aristocratic portraiture, as exemplified by Robert Peake the Elder (*Henry, Prince of Wales*, London, National Portrait Gallery). This is exactly the point. By appropriating the hieroglyphic pose and painstaking execution of the elaborate finery, which typify what Roy Strong has called the 'English icon', Larkin effortlessly elevates this upstart squire to the highest rank of nobility. Here, as in his later career, Villiers would show himself to be a canny exploiter of visual codes of aggrandizement.

During the early 1620s, the portraits of Buckingham follow the new fashion for Dutch-style imagery introduced into the court by Cornelius Janssen and others. While these portraits are marked by greater naturalism (as well as by the moustache and beard raised by Buckingham after 1620), they are singularly unrevealing of the duke's magnified political power. The only picture to break the mould is the extraordinary work painted by van Dyck in late 1620–early 1621, to commemorate the marriage of Villiers with Lady Katherine Manners.³ This flashy picture may be considered as either audacious or tasteless, but in any case it certainly is not concerned with Buckingham's political prowess.

It was not until 1625 that Buckingham encountered the painter he required. This was Peter Paul Rubens, arguably the most eloquent court painter of his time. Buckingham and Rubens met in Paris in the spring of 1625. The duke had come to escort Henrietta Maria to London, and Rubens to install the famous series of pictures dedicated to the life of Marie de Médicis (see pl. 16), pictures which Buckingham clearly saw and admired. What Rubens had to offer was rhetoric, a far more effective way to define and, if need be, to defend a position.

And by 1625 Buckingham needed the most persuasive visual rhetorician that money could buy.

Painter and patron agreed upon two works, the *Glorification of the Duke of Buckingham* and an equestrian portrait. Both of these works were destroyed by fire in 1949, but are known from photographs. In addition, Rubens' preparatory oil-sketches survive, and it is through the progression from the preliminary to the definitive composition that we can see an embattled favourite mounting a defence against a determined and growing opposition in parliament and at court.

The *Equestrian Portrait*, for which Rubens was paid the handsome sum of £500, was initially a rather conventional work, as we know from the oil-sketch (pl. 35) now in the Kimbell Art Museum.⁴ The pose replicated the one used in an engraving of 1625 by Willem de Passe, to which Rubens has added Neptune accompanied by a naiad, symbols of Buckingham's office of admiral of the fleet. Also included is a multi-purpose personification of a wind god, who holds the trumpet of fame and a laurel wreath of victory. Fair winds promise fame and glory to the triumphant admiral.

The final version (pl. 36), delivered to the duke in the autumn of 1627 (and first recorded in York House in 1635), is now loaded with symbolism directed toward the growing legion of detractors, including the members of the Commons who impeached him in the heated debates of 1626.⁵ On the left is Victoria with a laurel wreath and cornucopia, while on the right is Caritas, holding in one hand a flaming heart and dragging with the other the snake-haired and clearly vanquished demon of Discord. The wind gods, now reduced to putti heads, huff and puff to create the favourable zephyrs which will sweep the English fleet to victory and silence the nay-sayers and detractors.

Buckingham's enemies, of course, were not to be rebutted by a mere equestrian portrait. The team of Buckingham and Rubens, therefore, was moved to try again, and the result is one of the most grandiloquent representations of a favourite executed in the seventeenth century, the *Glorification of the Duke of Buckingham*. It now seems that the picture was developed in three stages, becoming ever more grandiose as it progressed.⁶ Stage one, known only in a copy after a presumed lost sketch, is again not especially inspired or pointed (pl. 37). Buckingham, holding a standard, is led towards the temple of virtue, assisted by Minerva and heralded by Fame, blowing a trumpet. Beneath are a lion, representing Anger, and Discord, who grasp at Buckingham's leg, trying to pull him down. At the left, the triumphal scene is witnessed by the Three Graces, offering a crown to the ascendant duke.

In phase two (pl. 38), the allegorical apparatus has been conspicuously enriched. Fame is transformed into Mercury, who assists Minerva in leading the duke towards a structure with twisted columns, where Virtue (cornucopia) and Honour (lance) await him. Below, Anger and Discord, repulsed by a female figure, try to impede the duke's ascent. The Three Graces are again present and six putti, holding such attributes as a palm of victory and the trumpets of fame,

add grace notes to the paean of praise. One putto holds his trumpet aloft; by abstaining from blowing it, he refers to the withholding of 'ill fame', or the spreading of falsehood. Most audacious of all is the pose of the duke, which has been identified as an adaptation of the Risen Christ in Correggio's *Resurrection of Christ* in the cupola of S. Giovanni Evangelista, Parma.

The final version (pl. 39), octagonal in shape, was intended to decorate a ceiling in 'my lord's closet' (privy chamber?) and involves a further clarification of the allegory. The Graces are somewhat diminished while the temple of Virtue and its guardians are magnified and the numbers of the opposition are increased by the addition of a dragon and harpy. The shriller tone of apology may be seen as a response to Buckingham's enemies in the Commons, who were resorting to extremes of rhetoric. On 10 May 1626, in the course of the debate on impeachment, Sir John Eliot, Buckingham's most outspoken foe, had likened him to 'the beast called by the ancients *Stellionatus*; a beast so blurred, so spotted, so full of foul lines, that they knew not what to make of it'.⁷ In the face of such excesses, Rubens' allegory may seem less vainglorious. In any case, actions, as usual, spoke louder than images. The defeat of the English at the Isle of Ré in the winter of 1627 exactly coincided with the completion of the picture and makes Rubens' overblown rhetoric seem an empty, desperate gambit.

This, of course, is the view of hindsight. In 1628, however, Buckingham had come to believe that images could help to shape perceptions of reality. On 16 May 1627, just prior to the duke's departure for the campaign at the Isle of Ré, a masque was presented to their Majesties at York House wherein (as described by the Reverend Joseph Mead) 'first [came] forth the duke, after him Envy, with diverse open-mouthed dogs' heads, representing the people's barking; next came Fame, then Truth, etc'.⁸ As this event makes clear, favour depended not on parliament but on the king, who was unshaken in his conviction that Buckingham was indispensable.

The visual testimony of the king's allegiance to his favourite is a picture which stemmed from a royal commission, although it is hard not to see the hand of Buckingham in it too. This is the work by the Dutch painter Gerrit van Honthorst, who arrived in London in April 1628 and immediately set to work on a painting for the Banqueting House (pl. 40).⁹ In this masque-like composition, we see Charles and Henrietta Maria dressed as Apollo and Diana, receiving the Seven Liberal Arts, who are introduced by Buckingham, disguised as Mercury. In the lower-left corner, the figures of Envy and Hate are destroyed by Virtue and Love. As Buckingham sponsored the victories of the reign, he now sponsors the arts, which will adorn the peace, glorify the monarchy and stifle the opposition. The familiar trope of the monarch as promoter of the arts of war and peace is appropriated by Buckingham in Rubens' *Equestrian Portrait* and Honthorst's allegory, which accurately reflect his role in the government of Charles I. The *Glorification of the Duke of Buckingham* tacitly acknowledges that the king's subjects viewed these developments with dismay and anger. The abdication of governance to a favourite was viewed by many as a usurpation and

contravention of the natural order, and these paintings clearly expose the fault line in rule by favourite.

In some respects, the representations of the Count-Duke of Olivares fall within the parameters established by the imagery of Buckingham. For example, the earliest portrait of the Spanish favourite is the strange, ungainly work painted by Velázquez, or perhaps an assistant, now in the Museu de Arte of São Paulo (pl. 41). Velázquez, whose entry into the court of Philip IV was sponsored by Olivares, received partial payment for this version on 4 December 1624, two years after the count-duke had consolidated his position as favourite, or minister, as he preferred to be known. Olivares' hulking figure fills most of the composition, and the attributes of his position – the key of the privy chamber and the spurs of the master of the horse – are almost blatantly displayed. However, the format is entirely traditional for portraits of Spanish rulers and nobility. Just as Larkin cast Buckingham as an English icon, so Velázquez presents Olivares as a Spanish grandee.

A year or so later, Velázquez revised his image of Olivares as seen in the portrait now in the collection of the Hispanic Society of America (pl. 42). While cosmetically more appealing, this version is given a decided political twist by the inclusion of the long reed whip, held erect in the favourite's right hand. As Antonio Martínez Ripoll has pointed out, this object is not the symbol of the office of *caballerizo mayor*, as traditionally stated.¹⁰ Rather, it is a riding crop, an object with a well-established metaphorical value by which the ruler governs the masses, who are likened to a horse in need of discipline and authority in order to perform its tasks. If this interpretation is correct, then Velázquez has adopted a rather direct means to display the favourite's power.

But then Olivares was not one for subtlety where his image was concerned, and it is here that he parts ways with Buckingham's resort to allegory to promote and defend his policies and reputation. By an extraordinary coincidence, Rubens created a portrait of Olivares at exactly the time he was working on his commissions for Buckingham. However, Olivares seems to have drawn different conclusions about Rubens' value as an advocate for his position.

The work in question is a handsome portrait engraving, designed by Rubens and executed by his assistant, Paul Pontius (pl. 43). Although small in scale, the composition is densely packed with meaning.¹¹ Without attempting a full exposition of the emblematics, it can be said that the design represents Olivares as endowed with strength and wisdom (the two genii seated on the socle), which enable him, through wise and forceful government (the rudder and baton entwined by a serpent), to bring glory to Spain, as represented by the six-pointed star, Hesperus, which shines over the terrestrial globe, touching Iberia with one of its points. Trumpets and burning torches, symbols of fame, surround the portrait, while swags of wheat, fruit and vegetables indicate the prosperity of a country living in peace.

Upon receiving the engraving, Olivares wrote a warm letter of thanks to Rubens, dated 8 August 1626, expressing appreciation of the work. 'God give

me light and strength for this [task of governing], and then it may be thought that I esteem the portrait as it deserves to be, and that its message will not be entirely misplaced.¹²

Olivares' false modesty appears to have masked true indifference towards Rubens' imagery. Two years later, the Flemish master spent eight months in Madrid, yet received no further commissions from Olivares, who by then could have used the help, now that he was beginning to hear the rumbles of discontent with his ministry. These would grow ever louder in the 1630s.

Olivares' response to his detractors can hardly be called subtle. Around the middle of the decade, as the war with France was getting under way, he commissioned three works, comparable to the ones produced for Buckingham during his period of crisis, which attempt to bolster the power of the favourite and disarm the enemy. One of these is the monumental equestrian portrait by Velázquez in the Prado (pl. 44). Nothing is known of the genesis of this composition, and its date and purpose remain matters of conjecture. Although many writers, myself included, have associated the commission with the Spanish victory at Fuenterrabía in 1638, this is purely a circumstantial argument in that the battle scene in the background is of a generic kind. It could be that the picture owes its origins to the start of war with France, an idea which is supported by the recent technical studies of Carmen Garrido, who dates it to around that time.¹³ However, we should not spend time in worrying about the precise date or pretext at the expense of understanding the portrait for what it so patently represents – the count-duke as a confident, powerful warrior. Velázquez, unlike Rubens, chooses to make the point without recourse to symbolism, although both he and Olivares were on familiar terms with Rubens' allegorized *Equestrian Portrait of Philip IV* (copy, Uffizi), which was executed in 1628–9 and hung in the Alcázar of Madrid. Directness, not allusion, is the idiom chosen by Velázquez to glorify the image of military might; even the unlettered could understand.

Much the same approach is applied to a more explicit representation of Olivares as the guiding hand of the destiny of the monarchy – the *Riding Lesson of Balthasar Carlos*, also datable to the 1635–6 period (pl. 45). The scene is set in the courtyard of the Buen Retiro (although it has recently been argued that the tilting-yard of the Alcázar is represented), and the action is a riding lesson of the young prince and heir to the Spanish crown.¹⁴ Equestrian exercises were commonly used as metaphors for governance, so it makes sense that the teacher should be Olivares and not Philip IV, who watches the lesson from a distant balcony, accompanied by the queen. However, it needs to be emphasized that this painting (presumably commissioned by Olivares, although first recorded in the possession of his nephew Luis de Haro in 1647) is a unique record of what might be called favouritism in action. By this I mean that it graphically represents the favourite as protagonist in the conduct of the monarchy, while the king, reduced in size and relegated to the background, passively observes the action. Despite the protests of the opposition, the *Riding Lesson* leaves no doubt

that Olivares is still firmly in control of the situation. (However, a copy in the Wallace Collection, London, made after Olivares' dismissal, deletes the count-duke and, for that matter, the sovereigns as well.) It seems evident that Olivares wished to emphasize his *valimiento* and was convinced that forthright representation was again the best way to proceed.

The final work in this triad of visual arguments on behalf of the Olivares ministry is the best documented. In 1635, Juan Bautista Maino received final payment for his remarkable picture, the *Recapture of Bahía* (pl. 46), which was part of a series of twelve battle scenes executed for the Hall of Realms of the Buen Retiro. These paintings depicted the major victories of the reign of Philip IV and, by extension, constituted a defence of Olivares' policies.¹⁵ The Hall of Realms was not only the most important room in the palace; it was also the site of diverse spectacles and festivities. Therefore, Maino's picture was displayed in full view of the court and its message was perceptible by all.

The purpose of the *Recapture of Bahía* as it relates to Olivares is again unmistakably clear, although this time the artist has had recourse to symbolic language. Fadrique de Toledo, the victorious commander of the combined Spanish and Portuguese force which dislodged the Dutch from the Bay of All Saints in Brazil in 1625, addresses the kneeling Dutch soldiers. He points to a tapestry which depicts the king trampling personifications of Heresy and Treachery, while Olivares places his right foot on the chest of that *bête noire* of favourites, Discord. Minerva stands at the left and hands the king the palm of victory. She places a wreath of laurel, the symbol of virtue, on the monarch's brow, ably assisted by the bulbous figure of the favourite.

It is difficult to overestimate the sheer audacity of this composition. In his state papers, Olivares insistently downplayed the importance of his position with respect to Philip IV, often referring to himself as the 'king's faithful minister'. These three pictures seem to make his words so much empty rhetoric. Given the option to use allegory, no less valid a means of communication but certainly less direct, Olivares opted for naked narrative. Perhaps he was reacting to the fury and calumnies of his opponents, although the pictures were calculated to raise their tempers. In any case, these are the final volleys in the visual war of self-defence. Our last glimpse of the count-duke, the portrait by Velázquez of 1638, now in St Petersburg, unblinkingly shows the reality of seventeen years of exhausting labour in a losing cause.

Our final case, Cardinal Richelieu, is the most complex of all. Richelieu was the only one of our three ministers who successfully completed his ministry, defying both assassination and dismissal. Moreover, the imagery of Richelieu is far more extensive, varied and complex than that of Buckingham or Olivares. Perhaps another way to characterize the differences between Richelieu and his counterparts is to note that, whereas the history scenes and allegories made for the English and Spanish ministers have an *ad hoc* quality, those made for the French minister are more deliberate and systematic.

Even before discussing some of these works, it is worth considering why the Richelieu imagery is so markedly different in character.¹⁶ I would like to propose a number of explanations. Richelieu, to begin with, had received training in theology at the Sorbonne and was therefore schooled in rigorous systems of thought. He himself was the author of four religious treatises. I would also like to suggest that Richelieu's religious education imparted a heightened appreciation of imagery as a means of communication and persuasion. Beginning in the late sixteenth century, the Counter-Reformation church had reformed and revitalized the use of images as a means of instructing and inspiring the faithful, and it may be that Richelieu had absorbed those lessons.

More to the point, Richelieu was a patron of learning. In 1624, he became Protector of the Sorbonne, and during the 1630s he extended his patronage to the Académie Française, accepting its letters patent in 1635. It may be that these contacts with the world of learning and language led Richelieu to form a sort of 'Petite Académie', which concocted the recipes for his team of image-makers.

A final observation concerns a purely artistic matter. In Paris, unlike London or Madrid, there was a long tradition of printmaking, which was thriving as never before in the years of Richelieu's mandate. This gave him access to a potent means of disseminating his ideas and presenting himself to a public outside the realm of the court. Indeed, the number of engravings bearing the cardinal's message is as formidable as the prints are unstudied, compelling me to present a highly abridged and tentative account of this aspect of the Richelieu imagery.

The visual campaign on Richelieu's behalf did not really hit its stride until after 1630, when he consolidated his power. There is a group of representations clustered around the victories at the Isle of Ré and La Rochelle, which lack the subtlety of thought and refinement of execution of the later works. In one, for instance, a triumphant Louis XIII rides the ship of state across the waters to the Isle of Ré (pl. 47). Fortune is the sail and Richelieu is the pilot of the undersized craft. As for the battle itself, the most ambitious renderings are the monumental engravings by Jacques Callot, comprising six plates (plus borders) and published in 1631. No work better illustrates Richelieu's struggle for control in the late 1620s than one of these, the *Siege of the Citadel of the St Martin on the Isle of Ré*. Two preparatory drawings depict the king and the minister observing the course of the battle.¹⁷ In a third, they are joined by Gaston, while in the print itself Richelieu was erased; the shadowy traces of his figure are visible on the original copperplates, which are preserved in the Chalcographie of the Louvre.

Other prints of the 1620s are more successful, if not exactly subtle. The cardinal's appointment as *Surintendant de la Navigation et du Commerce* in 1627 occasioned an image of Richelieu placidly enthroned on a ponderous triumphal chariot, too heavy to skim over the water but making determined progress nonetheless. An allegory usually dated c. 1628 by Jean Ganière (pl. 48) shows

Richelieu protecting the fleur-de-lis while an eagle and lion, the Austrian and Spanish Habsburgs, are subdued and chained to a column. The laudatory inscription below begins with a blatant leading question – ‘Peut-on assez louer cet excellent ministre?’

During the 1630s, Richelieu began to put his house of images in order. He found his portraitist in Philippe de Champaigne, whose versions of the cardinal are now familiar. As Bernard Dorival has noticed, Champaigne’s portraits, with one exception (Chantilly, Musée Condé), depart from the traditional convention used to depict prelates, namely seated in a chair which is canted diagonally towards the picture plane.¹⁸ Instead they show the cardinal standing, swaddled in the opulent red *capa magna* of his dignity, with his right arm elegantly extended, holding his *biretta* in his hand (pl. 49). In Dorival’s reading of the pose, the artist seeks to express Richelieu’s dual condition as prelate and peer of the realm.

This typology was invented for one of the cardinal’s most ambitious projects, the Galeries des Hommes Illustres in the Palais Cardinal.¹⁹ In the gallery were displayed twenty-four portraits of famous men and one famous woman, eight painted by Simon Vouet, seventeen by Champaigne. Admission to this select circle was predicated on illustrious service to the monarchy, either as minister or as warrior. Three of the ministers, like Richelieu, were ecclesiastics – Abbé Suger; Georges, Cardinal d’Amboise; and Charles, Cardinal de Lorraine. However, it was only in the person of Richelieu that the ideals were conjoined – sage minister, pious cardinal, victorious warrior.

It was also during the 1630s that Richelieu employed the engraver Michel Lasne, who produced both portraits and allegorical compositions. The numerous allegorical glorifications by Lasne and others are an untapped goldmine, and here I can only scratch the surface with a small sample of this sophisticated imagery. While Lasne was often the engraver, the designs were produced by the leading artists of Paris – Champaigne, Claude Vignon, Simon Vouet, François Perrier and others – and were possibly devised by the learned men who enjoyed Richelieu’s patronage.

A characteristic example is the engraving by Lasne (pl. 50), designed by Champaigne, which commemorates the concession of the dukedom on 13 August 1631.²⁰ The cardinal, seated on a dais, receives a genuflecting woman, wearing an ermine-trimmed cloak, who probably represents France. She profers armour, the ducal crown and a swag of fruit, betokening prosperity. Behind stands a woman with a sail, referring to the superintendency of navigation. To the cardinal’s right is Minerva, while at one extreme is a woman holding a sword and the family coat-of-arms. As yet I have not discovered the significance of the figure at the right, holding jewels and accompanied by a lion. Flying in from the left is Fame, offering the ducal crown and a crown of laurel, while a companion, partly hidden in the clouds, blows the trumpet of fame, adorned with the coat-of-arms and the cardinal’s hat. At last, Richelieu had found an artist who could do him justice!

An engraving executed by Lasne and designed by Claude Vignon introduces us to an important category of Richelieu imagery, the illustrated frontispieces of doctoral theses presented at the Sorbonne. Here the marriage of image and erudition is consummated and emphasizes the distinctive characteristic of Richelieu's imagery. This engraving of 1635 (pl. 51), which adorned the thesis of Louis de Machault, prior of Saint-Pierre d'Abbeville, is particularly deft.²¹ It is hard to improve upon the economical description of the great eighteenth-century print connoisseur P. J. Mariette – 'Geniuses assembling the traits of the greatest ministers who have governed France in order to compose the portrait of Cardinal Richelieu'. The small portraits held by the genius at the right are those of Abbé Suger and Cardinal d'Amboise, two of the heroes in the Galerie des Hommes Illustres.

Without going into detail, but simply to provide a flavour of these remarkable inventions, we turn to Lasne's engraving of 1632 after a design of Abraham van Diepenbeck (pl. 52), in which Louis XIII defends himself with a shield decorated with the image of his minister, and another designed and executed by Grégoire Huret in 1639 (pl. 53), which depicts Robert de Sorbon paying homage to Richelieu as protector of the college he had founded. From the sky above, St Louis, first benefactor of the Sorbonne, bestows his blessing on the assembled company.²² And, in the background, one of the dark moments of academic life, the dissertation defence, is brought out into *plein air*. The candidate, Jean Chaillou, faces his examiners in front of the building sponsored by Richelieu, which however was still under construction at the time.

The spirit of the allegorical prints can equally be detected in paintings commissioned by Richelieu (as well as in medals). One of the most ingenious is Jacques Stella's *Liberality of Titus* (pl. 54), intended as a chimneypiece for the *cabinet du roi* at the Château de Richelieu, another site which displayed extensive visual panegyrics. In this composition, as John Elliott has explained, Louis XIII, dressed *à l'antique*, is Titus, distributing wooden balls to his subjects, which they can exchange for gifts of food and clothing.²³ Richelieu, swaddled in a toga, stands behind, directing the action.

More extraordinary still is a painting of 1634 by Claude Vignon (pl. 55), which is related to a series of twelve tapestries, executed for the Palais Cardinal. A complete analysis of the symbolism would require several paragraphs; not only the composition, which features Richelieu as Hercules, but also the margins are crammed with allusions to the titles, powers and virtues of the invincible cardinal.²⁴

Richelieu, the faithful, wise minister of state and conqueror of his enemies – the imagery tries to persuade us that the cardinal, unlike Buckingham and Olivares, had defeated his enemies abroad and silenced his detractors at home. However, the final major commission of Richelieu's life demonstrates that, for all his skill and success, the voices of dissent were not drowned out in the din of glory. They could be heard and had to be answered.

In 1640, as part of a programme to initiate a new school of court artists, Richelieu summoned Nicolas Poussin, the most renowned French painter of the day, to Paris, and in the next year commissioned him to paint two pictures for the Grand Cabinet of the Palais Cardinal. The first is a chimneypiece, *Moses and the Burning Bush* (pl. 56), which combines two passages from Exodus.²⁵ In Exodus 3: 1–10, the Lord appears to Moses in a burning bush and commands him to lead his people out of Egypt. In the second passage, Exodus 4: 1–3, Moses is bidden by God to cast a rod on the ground, which is turned into a serpent, a sign that he should persist in his mission despite the incredulity of the Israelites. In the context of the Palais Cardinal, the picture signifies that Richelieu is a French Moses, who will lead his reluctant people out of their misery and into the promised land.

The second picture (pl. 57), which was placed on the ceiling, indicates that the French people might have been less than willing to follow their great leader to salvation.²⁶ This is a composition with uncanny parallels to Rubens' *Glorification of the Duke of Buckingham* and Maino's *Recapture of Bahía*. Seated on a parapet are Discord, at the left, and Envy, at the right, the implacable enemies, it seems, of rule by favourite. Not surprisingly, all ends well, as Time carries the naked Truth aloft, proving that Richelieu's policies will be vindicated when seen from the lofty vantage point of history.

The apologetic images created by our three favourites – Richelieu's date from but a year before his death – are the other side of the coin of rule by favourite. The recto proclaims his glory, wisdom and power; the verso demonstrates that his hold on power was tenuous. I would argue that the imagery discussed here occupies a unique place in the history of seventeenth-century art precisely because of its apologetic, defensive character. Favourites wielded enormous power, but it was conditional on the monarch, invested by the ruler, not by God. Therefore, the favourites were open to criticism and vulnerable to attack if their policies failed or if they threatened the vested interests. This precarious state of affairs is expressed in the imagery and epitomized by that pregnant rhetorical question inscribed on the print by Jean Ganière dedicated to Richelieu – 'Peut-on assez louer cet excellent ministre?' This can be interpreted in two ways. Can the great minister be sufficiently praised? and Is sufficient praise ever enough? The insecurity of their position engendered an insatiable need for reassurance in the breasts of the ministers. They hung by a golden thread and this insecurity is woven into their imagery, which ultimately lacks the confidence of works commissioned by natural rulers, even when comparable rhetorical devices and symbolism are deployed.

Rule by favourite, the images tell us, was unnatural and therefore needed to be defended, not merely exercised. Richelieu was confident that he would be vindicated by the judgement of history, and to us his assumption appears to have been correct. However, from the vantage point of 1684, about halfway through the reign of Louis XIV, rule by favourite in France was being perceived in a negative light by the most powerful monarch of the time, as we see in a

conspicuous but overlooked verdict on the matter – the central compartment of Le Brun's ceiling decoration in the Galerie des Glaces of Versailles (pl. 58). The composition celebrates the decision of the young Louis XIV to rule without a favourite after the death of Mazarin in 1661.²⁷ This heroic act, which triumphantly reunites monarchy and governance, is applauded by the gods of Olympus while an inscription, clearly legible from the floor below, explains why they rejoice. It is an epitaph for the age of the favourite: 'Le roy gouverne par lui même.'

Notes

1. Charles Richard Cammell, *The Great Duke of Buckingham* (London, 1939), pp. 372–85. His list is expanded and refined by David Piper, *Catalogue of Seventeenth-Century Portraits in the National Portrait Gallery, 1625–1714* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 39–42.
2. Roy Strong, *William Larkin, vanità giacobite* (Milan, 1994), p. 112.
3. Reproduced and discussed by Arthur Wheelock et al., *Anthony van Dyck* (Washington, DC, 1990–1), pp. 124–6.
4. Gregory Martin, 'Rubens and Buckingham's "fayrie ile"', *Burlington Magazine*, 108 (1966), pp. 613–18, esp. p. 614; Frances Huemer, *Portraits I*, Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, pt 19 (London, 1977), pp. 57–61; Julius Held, *The Oil Sketches of Peter Paul Rubens: A Critical Catalogue*, 2 vols (Princeton, 1980), i, pp. 393–4; Hans Vlieghe, *Rubens' Portraits of Identified Sitters Painted in Antwerp*, Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, pt 19 (London, 1987), pp. 66–7.
5. Martin, 'Rubens and Buckingham', p. 614; Held, *Oil Sketches*, p. 394; Vlieghe, *Rubens' Portraits*, pp. 64–6.
6. Martin, 'Rubens and Buckingham', pp. 614–17; Held, *Oil Sketches*, i, pp. 390–3.
7. Cited by Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (London and New York, 1981), p. 323.
8. Cited by Martin, 'Rubens and Buckingham', p. 617.
9. Oliver Millar, 'Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck', *Burlington Magazine*, 96 (1954), pp. 36–8; J. Richard Judson, *Gerrit van Honthorst: A Discussion of his Position in Dutch Art* (The Hague, 1959), pp. 181–3.
10. Antonio Martínez Ripoll, "El Conde Duque con una vara en la mano", de Velázquez, o la praxis olivarista de la Razón de Estado torno a 1625, in *La España del Conde Duque de Olivares* (Valladolid, 1990), pp. 45–74.
11. Held, *Oil Sketches*, i, pp. 398–9.
12. Cited in *ibid.*, p. 399.
13. Carmen Garrido Pérez, *Velázquez: Técnica y evolución* (Madrid, 1992), pp. 309–19.
14. Michael Levey, *Painting at Court* (London, 1971), p. 142; Enriqueta Harris, 'Velázquez's Portrait of Prince Balthasar Carlos in the Riding School', *Burlington Magazine*, 118 (1976), pp. 266–75; Jonathan Brown and J. H. Elliott, *A Palace for a King: The Buen Retiro and the Court of Philip IV* (New Haven and London, 1980), p. 255. John F. Moffitt, 'The Prince and the Prime Minister: The Site and Significance of Velázquez's Equestrian Lesson of Prince Balthasar Carlos', *Studies in Iconography*, 12 (1988), pp. 90–120, argues inconclusively that the setting is the Picadero of the Madrid Alcázar.
15. Brown and Elliott, *A Palace*, pp. 141–92, for the Hall of Realms; pp. 84–90, for the Recapture of Bahía.
16. For an introduction to the grossly understudied Richelieu imagery, see Jacqueline Melet-Sanson, 'L'Image de Richelieu', in *Richelieu et le monde de l'esprit* (Paris, 1985), pp. 135–47, and the catalogue entries on pp. 307–18.
17. Roseline Bacou, 'Callot, Louis XIII et Richelieu au siège de Ré', *Revue du Louvre et des Musées de France*, 30 (1980), pp. 254–6.
18. Bernard Dorival, *Philippe de Champaigne, 1602–1674: la vie, l'œuvre et le catalogue raisonné de l'œuvre*, 2 vols (Paris, 1976), ii, p. 113.

19. Bernard Dorival, 'Art et politique en France au XVIIe siècle: la Galerie des Homme Illustres du Palais Cardinal', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français*, Année 1973 (1974), pp. 43–60.
20. Tony Souval, 'Deux œuvres peu connues de Philippe de Champaigne', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 57 (1961), pp. 181–2.
21. Paola Pacht Bassani, *Claude Vignon, 1593–1670* (Paris, 1992), pp. 281–3.
22. For the prints of the prolific Huret, see Emmanuelle Brugerolles and David Juillet, 'Grégoire Huret, dessinateur et graveur', *Revue de l'Art*, 117, no. 3 (1997), pp. 9–35.
23. J. H. Elliott, *Richelieu and Olivares* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 169.
24. Pacht Bassani, *Claude Vignon*, pp. 276–8.
25. Humphrey Wine and Olaf Koetsier, *Fransk Guldalden: Poussin og Claude og maleriet i det 17. arhundredes Frankrig* (Copenhagen, 1992), pp. 180–7.
26. Pierre Rosenberg, *Nicolas Poussin, 1594–1665* (Paris, 1994), pp. 296–8.
27. For an explanation of the iconography, although without reference to its significance for the imagery of the favourite, see Robert W. Berger, *Versailles: The Chateau of Louis XIV* (University Park and London, 1985), p. 54.