



1999

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. 1650

Antonio Feros

University of Pennsylvania, aferos@sas.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/history_papers

 Part of the [European History Commons](#), [Fine Arts Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation (OVERRIDE)

Feros, Antonio. (1999.) "Images of evil, images of kings: the contrasting faces of the royal favourite in early modern political literature, c.1570-c.1650", in John H. Elliott and Laurence Brockliss (Eds.), *The World of the Favourite*, pp. 205-222. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Images have been removed due to copyright restrictions.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/history_papers/18
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

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. 1650

Abstract

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. 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 (favcston in England and Alvaro de Luna in Spain).

Disciplines

European History | Fine Arts | History | History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology

Comments

Images have been removed due to copyright restrictions.

*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-

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. Mártir 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 Frenship'. 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*.' 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 Péréfixe, 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 Furió 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, fols 17-19.
15. Jean Bodin, *Les Six Livres de la République*, ed. Christiane Frémont, 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 Principes*, 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), fols 26v–27v.
26. Juan Pablo Mártir Rizo, *Norte de Principes* (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. Maria Luisa Doglio (Palermo, 1993), p. 35; Malvezzi's book was translated into Spanish in 1635 and into English in 1647.
28. José Lainez, *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-Eliaenae: The Familiar Letters of James Howell*, ed. Joseph Jacobs (London, 1892), p. 138.
31. Howell, *Epistolae Ho-Eliaenae*, 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. 305–7.
36. See, for example, Etienne Thuau, *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 Factions 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 Ceroyski (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.