Introduction: Counter-Reformation politics and the Caroline stage

Goe tell the Queene, it resteth in her powers
To helpe; the case is hers as well as Ours.[1]

'The course of the time here is so uneven and uncertaine that we know not our selves in what state we stand, our feares and hopes are in equall balance.'[2] So wrote Fr G. M. Muscott in September 1624, to Fr Thomas More in Rome, in a letter positively crammed with news regarding the imminent conclusion of the marriage treaty between Charles, Prince of Wales, and Henrietta Maria, Princess of France, youngest daughter of Henri IV and sister to Louis XIII. Reporting how 'the match with France is in great forwardnes, some say concluded', Muscott repeatedly returned to the crux of his anxiety, the impact on the English recusant community of this impending union between Prince Charles, England's Protestant heir apparent, and Henrietta Maria, a princess deeply imbued with the spirit of Counter-Reformation Catholicism.[3] Negotiations were swift moving. Muscott's narrative vividly highlights the flux of activity in a fleeting cameo of the Duke of Buckingham, with 'his trunckes . . . already at the customs house', hastily prepared to dash to France to conclude the alliance. More critically, Muscott rapidly reappraises the situation from an English Catholic perspective even within the letter itself: 'since the writing of this I understand . . . that the King [James I] is pleased at the insistence of the French ambassador to compassionate the poore afflicted state of catholikes'. Yet Muscott's uncertainty regarding the successful implementation of such a pledge is suggested by his frustrated observation: 'this mitigation will be some present comfort *yet I see not any solide foundations*'.[4] This book seeks to tease out these same 'feares and hopes' of English Catholics, from Henrietta

Maria's arrival in 1625 to the start of the English Civil War in 1642. By re-mapping contemporary understanding of Catholicism in the culture and drama of the period, Caroline theatre is revealed both as a space where the concerns of the English Catholic community are staged and as a shaping force in the survival of the tenaciously adaptable old faith.

Even before Henrietta Maria had set foot on *The Admiral*, the pride of the English fleet, to endure a notoriously stormy Channel crossing, her advent had been widely heralded by the Roman Catholic powers of Europe as a singular opportunity for England's return to the Catholic fold. Repeatedly Henrietta Maria was likened to the Esther of Old Testament history, that biblical figure who successfully pleaded with her non-Jewish husband King Ahasuerus to show clemency to her Jewish compatriots.[5] In a personal behest to his goddaughter Pope Urban VIII had urged Henrietta Maria to act as a 'parent' to the English Catholics and to be like 'Esther illa ellecti populi liberatrix' [Esther the liberator of the chosen people].[6] Similarly, Marie de Médicis, earnestly encouraged the figure of Esther upon her fifteen-year-old daughter: 'qui eut cette grace de Dieu d'estre la déffense et la deliverance de son peuple' [who had the grace of God to be the defender and deliverer of His people].[7] The ultimate Counter-Reformation hope was that once crowned, through Henrietta Maria's influence, Charles I would give succour to the similarly benighted Catholic community, leading to the reconversion of the nation to England's 'old faith'.

This book probes Henrietta Maria's advancement of her papal mission through an examination both of the Queen's self-presentation and of the drama emanating from her household. In a series of striking performances throughout her reign as Queen Consort, Henrietta Maria returned to, and reworked, her own vision of her responsibilities as a Counter-Reformation champion. As early as 1626, in an astonishing departure for English theatre history, Henrietta Maria audaciously enacted this ideal through her elite performance in the title role of Honorat Racan's *L'Artenice*. By 1635 her determination to follow her spiritual adviser Fr Bérulle's advice to engrave this mission 'en votre coeur, imprimez-le en votre esprit' [on your heart, to imprint it on your spirit] is suggested by the incredible spectacle which surrounded the inaugural Mass at her Capuchin chapel, the first purpose-built Catholic church in London since the Reformation.[8] Whilst, as late as 1640,

Henrietta Maria, suggestively sheathed in military armour, provocatively danced a bellicose variant of this role in *Salmacida Spolia*, the final court masque of Caroline rule. From a performance studies perspective, such queenly display is remarkable for its influence on the later, widespread emergence of women on the English stage.[9] But equally integral is the insight which such royal stagings allow into the anxieties and hopes of the English recusant community. The response of those Catholics, like Fr Muscott, to Henrietta Maria's blatantly public manifestation as their visible figurehead energises the texts of the focal dramatists of this book, James Shirley and William Davenant. Deftly picking up the gauntlet thrown down by the Queen in her own flamboyant performances, a fascinating staged dialogue becomes apparent between Henrietta Maria and her professed playwright 'servants': one which transcends and moves between playing spaces from the elite to the commercial theatres.

However, any examination of early modern Catholicism provides the salutary reminder that the outlook of this Roman Catholic body was by no means uniform.[10] As Hillaire Belloc once remarked, in addition to the staunch recusant body there was a 'contemporary wide penumbra of Catholicism'.[11] In this book every effort has been made to consider the complexity of each grouping within this wider community: the aims of Queen Henrietta Maria are examined alongside the concerns of the laity and the clergy; the recusant's anxiety with the church-papist's unease.[12] Opinions documented range from a militant recusancy to a negotiated accommodation with the dominant Protestant state. Notably, this raft of Catholic mindsets is refigured in the texts and outlooks of James Shirley and William Davenant, both of whom were converts to Rome. Shirley's 1620s apostasy was independent from court Catholicism and displays both a militant recusant conviction and this faction's expectations of their Queen. Strikingly, in plays from *The Witty Fair One* (1628) to *The Bird in a Cage* (1633), Shirley consistently creates a heroine whose transforming virtue powerfully negates all impinging danger. In contrast to such ardour, Davenant's gradual conversion is shown to be fostered from within Henrietta Maria's court. Having eclipsed Shirley by 1634, at first Davenant celebrated the Queen's Counter-Reformation triumphs. Yet, by the late 1630s, Davenant's model of religious accommodation, proffered in *Love and Honour* (1634), conflicted with Henrietta Maria's growing inclination towards an

aggressive, international style of Catholicism, which Inigo Jones so spectacularly showcased in *Salmacida Spolia* (1640).

This powerful staging of the difficulties confronting English Roman Catholicism, in both the elite and the commercial theatres, deepens our understanding of Caroline drama as a vehicle which allows insight into wider social and political issues. As Martin Butler contends in his pioneering work *Theatre and Crisis: 1632–1642*, Caroline drama has been greatly misunderstood.[13] Once neglected and dismissed by the literary establishment as self-indulgent, through the revisionist forays of scholars such as Julie Sanders, current thinking rightly perceives Caroline theatre as directly engaging with problems of state, society and religion.[14] This book aims to further repatriate Caroline drama as an agent of change at a crucial moment in the history of early modern England by realerting readers to Shirley's and Davenant's challenging response to contemporary religio-political concerns.

Central to this undertaking is my development of Butler's recognition of drama which he terms as 'puritan' or in 'opposition' to the court of Charles I.[15] Puritanism was by no means the only religious force to articulate unease through drama, nor was Charles I the sole monarch addressed. Erica Veevers first established the substantial influence of Queen Henrietta Maria's court in her beautifully crafted *Images of Love and Religion*.[16] The translation of this feminocentric court culture on to the Caroline stage has recently been underscored by the fascinating researches of scholars such as Sophie Tomlinson and Karen Britland.[17] As this book confirms, the powerful staging of an 'oppositional' Catholicism, heightened by the unquestionable authority of the court of Queen Henrietta Maria, progressively widens Caroline theatre's sphere of engagement. Early modern Catholics themselves readily perceived the stage as a space where the religious and political concerns of the day could be scrutinised. In September 1636 Fr George Leyburn reported how the King, Queen and the Palatinate Princes were 'most gloriously received' during a visit to Christ Church College, Oxford. In remarkable detail, Leyburn recounted how after supper the royal couple were 'intertayned with a new comedy called, the Passions Calm'd or the Floating Iseland'.[18] Strikingly, Fr Leyburn specifically interpreted this staging from within the religio-political perspective of the play's conformist author, William Strode:

> represented [was] a king whos name was Prudentius (you may imagine our most prudent prince) and an Intellectus Agens, a person active and wise (you may imagine his Grace of Canterbury); by the passions you may understand the puritans, and all such as are opposit to the courses which our king doth run in his goverment.[19]

With a typically convoluted plot and bereft of its original context, *The Passions Calm'd* is a prime example of what the literary establishment would once have denigrated as escapist and alarmingly sycophantic in 1630s drama. Yet, as Fr Leyburn's review spotlights, Caroline theatregoers (or curious priests thirsty for second-hand theatrical titbits) perceived even the rarefied atmosphere of a university performance as a potentially serious arena for political debate.

Such archival contextualisation is at the heart of this project which rests on the cusp of three areas of revisionist scholarship – those of early modern drama, history and religious history. Although my emphasis is on the drama of the period, the provocative historical insight of Christopher Haigh has been of especial influence; in particular his wise reminder that 'the Reformation was not an inexorable process, carried forward by an irresistible ideological force; it was a succession of contingent events'.[20] As Haigh stresses, the English Roman Catholic community was never completely destroyed: 'it fought back, reorganised itself, and survived'.[21] For those who remained loyal to the old faith, 1625 was a key moment in this process of endurance, a year stamped with all the hallmarks of a possible watershed. Henrietta Maria was not just a devout Roman Catholic but an agent for reform bringing with her, as Roger Lockyer comments, 'the self-confident and assertive attitudes of the Catholic Reformation' together with 'the richness of traditional Catholic worship, with all its musical and visual splendour'.[22] By contrast, for the godly Protestants, Henrietta Maria's arrival was deeply unsettling and her popish presence further fuelled the wider polemical debates which racked the established Church, in particular the contentious rise of Laudianism.[23] As John Bossy shrewdly observed, no account of post-Reformation England can 'make much sense if it does not take notice of the baffling fertility of the religious imagination of Englishmen'.[24] This particularly resonates in the fractured landscape of the turbulent years leading to Civil War. By no means supposing religion to be the sole cause on the

highway to Civil War, unquestionably, the deeply engrained threat of 'Popery' within the Protestant consciousness played a vital role in the war which was to rupture the English nation.[25] Religious belief in early modern England was not just about the trappings of doctrine or liturgy. Rather, as Kevin Sharpe observes in *Remapping Early Modern England*, religion should more properly be seen as 'a language, an aesthetic, a structure of meaning, an identity, a politics'.[26] In the stimulating atmosphere of Caroline theatre, Shirley's and Davenant's texts explore, and boldly represent, a 'politics' of English Catholicism.

This renewed interdisciplinary understanding of the integral importance of religious belief, which Fredric Jameson terms 'the master-code' of pre-capitalist society, has led literary scholars to re-evaluate the role which religion played in early modern culture.[27] Such critical sensitivity has stimulated an invigorating exploration of England's old faith, embodied by Alison Shell's masterful *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660*.[28] Despite Shell's urge for other scholars 'to join in the task of reclamation', in examining the Caroline stage at least, few have answered her call.[29] Perhaps, inevitably, the question of Shakespeare's religion has engulfed most critics' attention.[30] Similar concern has been bestowed on canonical figures such as Ben Jonson.[31] More elusively, Lisa Hopkins has investigated the possible links between John Ford and the old faith, seeing in the text's employment of food and blood a 'yearning' for the 'old Catholicism'.[32] Yet continued Catholic unease at this 'piecemeal Reformation' was a powerfully shaping discourse on the Caroline stage. By teasing out a Catholic 'identity' (expressed in contemporary letters, sermons, histories and even needlework) this book opens out Caroline theatre as a space which deftly explores the anxieties of English Catholics, a crucible which gives voice to an oppositional community's concerns.

Chapter 1 examines the public discourse of religion in Stuart England. Through key events such as the fall of the Blackfriars Room in 1623 and the notorious performances of Middleton's *A Game at Chesse* (1624), care is taken to delineate the spectrum of passionate religious beliefs within England. Far from being confined to arid polemical debates, these religious disputes spilled over into conflicting understandings of personal, cultural and political belief. Revealed within the core of these fierce debates is a nub of

Protestant unease regarding the persistent existence of the Roman Catholic community, which clung to every level of society. This chapter teases out both the Protestant apprehension and the Catholic expectation stimulated by Henrietta Maria's (troubling) arrival with her self-proclaimed mission of, at the very least, ameliorating the plight of those loyal to the old faith.[33] She was hailed as a second Esther by Catholic powers and the potency of this topos the potency of this topos swiftly percolated throughout society. As early as 1626, Queen Henrietta Maria boldly projected her own Counter-Reformation vision to an elite audience in an audacious performance of Racan's *L'Artenice*. Indeed the inherent power of this suggestively supplicant image was to become so indelibly etched within the wider public imagination that it even manifested itself in a retrospective seventeenth-century stump-work (see Figure 2, p. 38).

Chapters 2 and 3 focus on James Shirley's texts from the period 1625 to 1633. Described by Gerard Langbaine as the 'Chief of the Second-rate Poets', with his works patronised by Ben Lucow as 'serviceable vehicles for theatre', James Shirley's dramatic legacy has been haunted by John Dryden's derisive jibes in *Mac Flecknoe*.[34] Scholarly attention has focused either on Shirley's social comedies, such as *Hyde Park* and *The Ball*, or his later plays.[35] This monograph exposes a more subversive force in Shirley's drama, crystallising the difficulties which recusants continued to face, despite the visible presence of their royal champion, and Shirley's key patroness, Queen Henrietta Maria. From examining contemporary reports a gap becomes apparent between Henrietta Maria's own staged ideal of her position as Queen Consort in *L'Artenice* and the English nation's perception of their Roman Catholic Queen. Perhaps, unsurprisingly, suspicion of the Queen's overt Popery alienated her from the dominant Protestant culture. Even rumours circulating about her first ill-fated pregnancy attributed blame to her 'coming back by water from this town, where she had been about her devotions, by reason of the Ember-week, the Monday before'.[36] Significantly though, nor was the Queen's mix of self-consuming French Roman Catholicism and frivolous contempt for the established Church wholly encouraging to the recusant community. Indeed by 1628 Catholic anticipation for, at the very least, religious toleration had been deflated, embodied by Wentworth's lucrative financial policy of compounding with recusants.[37] As

Christopher Wandesford, an Exchequer official, remarked, the 'Papists . . . hang down their Heads like Bulrushes and think themselves like Water spilt on the Ground'.[38]

Chapter 2 explores the circumstances surrounding Shirley's own apostasy, before mapping his engagement with the concerns of the English recusants in three plays from 1626 to 1629. In *The Witty Fair One* (1628) Shirley exposes how the exclusive language of the recusant community was being debased by society's fascination for all things pertaining to Henrietta Maria. In *The Wedding* (1629), through the powerful image of the Magdalene of Roman Catholic tradition, Shirley engages with the dual assault on the Catholic Church from Laudian and Puritan pamphlet literature.[39] Finally, in *The Grateful Servant* (1629) Shirley reminds Henrietta Maria of the possibilities imbued within the recusant imagination upon her arrival into England. With the death of Buckingham the Queen's own sphere of influence had significantly widened. Through the direct parallels evoked between Leonora and Henrietta Maria in *The Grateful Servant*, Shirley urges his royal patroness to reassume her role as both a reforming agent for the English nation and a potential force of salvation for English Catholics.

Chapter 3 delves into that central issue which beleaguered the recusant community, the problematic conception of a loyal English Roman Catholic. As the conformist commentator George Synge admitted: 'who knoweth not Papists have their kindes? There are Papists in faction, Papists in devotion', yet as he questioned, 'doe we acquit all, because we justifie some?'[40] In a series of plays between 1630 and 1633 Shirley stages this dilemma from within the recusant imagination. *Love in a Maze* (1631) dramatises the predicament of the temporiser caught between law and conscience. The recusant Edward Lechmere highlighted this impasse in his stern warning to the church-papist: 'you thinke you heare some tell you there is another waie but nice and ticklish: wherein those who speak, themselves durst not venture; because if it miscarrie, soul and bodie and heaven and all is lost'.[41] Through the steadfast figure of Yongrave, Shirley promotes the religious constancy which was so integral to contemporary Catholic writings. Within the recusant community at least, a staunch Catholic faith was by no means equated with inevitable treachery against the English nation. Rather, in *The Traitor* (1631), Shirley confutes the popish spectre of Protestant nightmare to suggest that the religious temporiser was

a greater threat to the security of the state. Deepening his exploration of this complex debate, *The Young Admiral* (1633) forcefully displays the real pain inflicted by the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy upon Catholic subjects. Significantly, on the Caroline stage at least, tensions are dissolved through the salutary, outside force of Rosinda who dispels the troubling issue of allegiance, and propels her future husband towards a life of virtue. Once more, Shirley can be seen to be urging Henrietta Maria to fulfil her own proselytising mission. Far from the sycophantic panegyric traditionally ascribed to Caroline drama, Shirley's texts consistently urge Henrietta Maria to achieve her tantalising potential. As the Queen's own bold performance in Walter Montagu's *The Shepherds' Paradise* suggests, by 1632, Henrietta Maria basked in her Counter-Reformation success, signified by the lavish ceremony for the laying of the foundation stone for her new purpose-built Capuchin chapel, and her growing sphere of influence which conspicuously embraced puritan and recusant alike.[42] Notably, in *The Bird in a Cage* (1633), through the figure of Eugenia who is roused from passive encagement to defiant zeal, Shirley overtly engages with the Queen's own complacency to reveal an undercurrent of disquiet within the recusant community.

Chapters 4 and 5 examine Davenant's plays and masques from the period 1634 to 1640. Shirley himself believed that it was his refusal to flatter which most likely led to his displacement by William Davenant from the coveted position of Henrietta Maria's preferred dramatist. To an even greater extent than James Shirley, the texts of Davenant have been adversely affected by the stigma attached to Caroline drama. Attention has focused either on Davenant's comedies or on his later works.[43] Chapter 4 establishes Davenant's own gradual leaning towards Rome as a product of the highly charged religious atmosphere of the Caroline court, where the rise of a fashionable Roman Catholicism was paralleled by the growth of Laudianism. The recusant polemicist Matthew Wilson observed with much satisfaction, by 1633, 'Calvinism, once a darling in England' was 'at length accounted Heresie: yea a little lesse then Treason, men in word and writing using willingly the once feareful names of Priests and Altars'.[44] By the mid-1630s the possibility of religious reconciliation (however misplaced) had led more moderate Catholics such as the Benedictine leader, Leander Jones, and the celebrated Franciscan, Christopher Davenport, to

anticipate the long awaited chimera of a reunion between Rome and the established Church of England. However, as militant recusants continued to caution, the established Church, 'desireth much a Reconciliation with the Church of Rome but in a *particular waye of its owne which will not easily be avoided*'.[45] In 1635 Davenant staged two versions of this politically charged negotiation. In *The Temple of Love*, in collaboration with Inigo Jones, he celebrated the Queen's Counter-Reformation success on the elite Whitehall stage. However in *Love and Honour*, in the charged space of the commercial stage, through a series of striking textual doublings, Davenant suggests an alternative to the Queen's ideal of Protestant capitulation, one of mutual compromise.

Chapter 5 continues to mark the growing creative shift between Henrietta Maria and her playwright servant, William Davenant. The years 1637 to 1640 witnessed the climax of the flourishing revival of Catholicism within Henrietta Maria's court. The arrival of her *devôt* mother, Marie de Médicis, and the strong influence of the Papal agent, George Con, impelled the Queen towards an international, extreme style of Catholicism. Such an adamant Roman Catholic stance disrupted earlier cherished (if rather naive) hopes of possible conciliation, and exacerbated the mounting anxiety in Scotland, regarding the combined threat to the Scottish Kirk of Popery and Laudianism. In *The Fair Favourite* (1638) Davenant boldly counsels against the Queen's confrontational attitude. Performed in the tense cultural moment of the Scottish crisis, notably, the Queen of *The Fair Favourite* is a force who seeks to mediate between the divided parties of a fractured kingdom. With Henrietta Maria openly rallying English Roman Catholics to Charles I's standard, such an assertion from within the Queen's household, by a playwright often dismissed as sycophantic, is surprising. However in a wry reflection of Davenant's own obscuring of James Shirley, this dramatic model of queenly arbitration was itself rapidly overshadowed by the spectacular staging of *Salmacida Spolia* (1640). Through the striking appearance of Henrietta Maria as an Esther in Amazon costume, Inigo Jones brilliantly visualised the Queen's defiantly, militant Roman Catholic fervour. Far from building bridges as Martin Butler once argued, this final masque pushes Charles I towards a more oppositional position, a progression which Davenant commemorates with notable unease.[46]

Ultimately, as this book concludes, the very discussion (outside Whitehall) of the drama of the Queen's household signifies the cultural agency of Shirley's and Davenant's texts. Significantly, in *Messallina the History of the Roman Empresse* (1640), the Nonconformist playwright Nathanael Richards directly attacked what he perceived to be the menace of his own papist Queen through an overt engagement with, and inversion of, tropes closely associated with Henrietta Maria's known theatrical preferences. In the volatile political climate of the early 1640s the spectre of the recusant as one of traitorous intrigue was firmly re-entrenched in the Protestant imagination; an absolute volte-face which returned the English Catholic community to the uncertainty of their situation pre-1625. Yet, as Henrietta Maria's letters and actions during the 1640s confirm, she continued to perceive herself as the defender of English Catholics. Above all, as her almoner, the Bishop of Angoulême, reminded her French compatriots in 1645 – and as this book explores through the energy and vibrant debate of Caroline theatre – Henrietta Maria wished to be remembered as a Roman Catholic Queen who 're-established, and made to flourish again the Catholic religion in England'.[47]

Notes

1 Francis Quarles, *Hadassa: Or the History of Queene Ester* (London: 1621), reprinted in Quarles, *Divine Poems: Containing the History of Jonah. Ester. Job. Sions Sonets. Elegies* (London: 1630), p. 131.
2 AAW/A18, G. M. Muscott to T. More, 23 September 1624, p. 363.
3 *Ibid.*
4 *Ibid.*, my emphasis.
5 Susan Wiseman explores the figure of Esther in Civil War women's petitions: see *Conspiracy and Virtue: Women, Writing, and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 45–9.
6 'Bref de Nostre Saint Pere le Pape Urbain VIII a Madame s'en allant en Angleterre l'exortant a remettre la Religion Catholique en ces pays dont elle a esté bannie', December 1624, Kings MSS, 135, sigs 527r–530v, sig. 528v. See also Henrietta Maria's letter to Pope Urban VIII in Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria, Including Her Private Correspondence With Charles the First* (London: Richard Bentley, 1857), pp. 7–10.

7 François Albert Duffo, *Henriette-Marie de France, Reine d'Angleterre, 1609–1669*, (Paris: 1935). See also Quentin Bone, *Henrietta Maria, Queen of the Cavaliers* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972), p. 37.
8 Pierre de Bérulle, 'Élévation sur Sainte Madeleine', in Joseph Beaude, Michel Join-Lambert and Rémi Lescot (eds), *Pierre de Bérulle: Oeuvres Complètes*, 5 vols (Paris, Oratoire de Jésus: Les Editions du Cerf, 1996), vol. 3, pp. 407–94, p. 414. All subsequent references are to this edition and appear in the text.
9 Alison Findlay, Stephanie Hodgson-Wright and Gweno Williams, *Women and Dramatic Productions, 1550–1700* (Harlow: Longman Pearson, 2000); Clare McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court 1590–1619* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002); Sophie Tomlinson, *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
10 John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community, 1570–1850* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1975). See also Anne Dillon, *The Construction of Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1535–1603* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2002).
11 Brian Magee, *The English Recusants: A Study of the Post-Reformation Catholic Survival and the Operation of the Recusancy Laws* (London: Burns, Oates and Co., 1938), p. xi.
12 A church-papist was an abusive term for those English Catholics who outwardly conformed to the established Protestant Church yet inwardly remained Roman Catholics. For further discussion see Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodridge: The Royal Historical Society, The Boydell Press, 1993).
13 Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis: 1632–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). For a typical dismissal of Caroline drama see Clifford Leech, *Shakespeare's Tragedies, and Other Studies in Seventeenth Century Drama* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1950), pp. 159–81.
14 Julie Sanders, *Caroline Drama: The Plays of Massinger, Ford, Shirley and Brome* (Plymouth: Northcote House Publishers, 1999); Matthew Steggle, *Richard Brome: Place and Politics on the Caroline Stage* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004); Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (eds), *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006). See also David Lindley, *The Court Masque* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984); J. R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (eds), *Theatre and Government Under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1993); Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theatre in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

15 Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, p. 2.

16 Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

17 Karen Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Tomlinson, *Women on Stage*.

18 AAW/A28, George Leyburn to Farrington (E. Bennett), 3 September 1636, p. 523.

19 *Ibid.*

20 Christopher Haigh (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 6.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 9.

22 Roger Lockyer, *The Early Stuarts: A Political History of England, 1603–1642* (London: Longman, 1989), p. 297.

23 For scholarly insight into these controversies see Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Michael Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

24 Bossy, *Catholic Community*, p. 5.

25 Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1990). See also Caroline M. Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983); Peter Lake, 'Anti-Popery: the Structure of a Prejudice', in Richard Cust and Anne Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603–1642* (Harlow: Longman Group, 1989), pp. 72–106.

26 Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 12.

27 Fredric Jameson, 'Religion and Ideology: A Political Reading of *Paradise Lost*', in Francis Barker *et al.* (eds), *Literature, Politics and Theory* (London: New Accents, 1986), pp. 35–56, p. 39. See also Achsah Guibbory, *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton: Literature, Religion and Cultural Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier (eds), *Religion, Literature and Politics in*

Post-Reformation England, 1540–1688 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama Under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Arthur F. Marotti, *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999); Debora K. Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997).

28 Alison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 20.

29 *Ibid*.

30 Dympna Callaghan, 'Shakespeare and Religion', *TP*, 15 (2001), 1–4; Beatrice Groves, *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare, 1592–1604* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007); Velma Richmond, *Shakespeare, Catholicism and Romance* (New York: Continuum, 2000); Richard Wilson, *Secret Shakespeare: Studies in Theatre, Religion and Resistance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).

31 T. Wilson Hayes, 'Ben Jonson's Libertine Catholicism', in William P. Shaw (ed.), *Praise Disjoined: Changing Patterns of Salvation in Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991).

32 Lisa Hopkins, *John Ford's Political Theatre* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), p. 75.

33 Green, *Queen's Letters*, Henrietta Maria to Urban VIII, 6 April 1625, p. 9.

34 Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets, 1691* (Menston: Scolar Press, 1971), p. 474; Ben Lucow, *James Shirley* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981), p. 8; James Kinsley (ed.), *The Poems and Fables of John Dryden* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), pp. 238–43. For a comprehensive Shirley bibliography see Ruth K. Zimmer, *James Shirley: A Reference Guide* (Boston Mass.: G. K. Hall, 1980).

35 Ira Clark, *Professional Playwrights, Massinger, Ford, Shirley and Brome* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1992); Rosemary Gaby, '"Of Vagabonds and Commonwealths": *Beggars' Bush*, *A Jovial Crew* and *The Sisters*', *SEL*, 34 (1994), 401–24; Richard J. Hodson, 'Caroline Town Comedy, 1628–1642' (PhD dissertation, University of York, 2000); Sanders, *Caroline Drama*.

36 Letter from Mr Beaulieu to Sir Thomas Puckering, 20 May 1628, Thomas Birch (ed.), *The Court and Times of Charles the First*, 2 vols (London: Henry Colburn, 1848), 1, p. 355.

37 K. J. Lindley, 'The Lay Catholics of England in the Reign of Charles I', *JEH*, 27 (1971), 199–221.

38 Alan Dures, *English Catholicism, 1558–1642: Continuity and Change* (Harlow: Longman Group, 1983), p. 73.
39 See Robert Butterfield, *Maschil: Or, a Treatise to Give Instruction, Touching the State of the Church of Rome Since the Councell of Trent* (London: 1629), p. 134.
40 George Synge, *A Rejoynder to the Reply Published by the Jesuits Under the Name of William Malone* (Dublin: 1632), pp. 6–7.
41 Edward Lechmere, *A Reflection of Certaine Authors That Are Pretended to Disavow the Churches Infallibilitie in Her Generall Decrees of Faith* (Douai: 1635), sig. *4v.
42 Walter Montagu, *The Shepheard's Paradise: A Comedy Privately Acted Before the Late King Charls by the Queen Consort's Majesty, and Ladies of Honour* (London: 1659).
43 Janet Clare, *Drama of the English Republic 1649–60* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002); Howard S. Collins, *The Comedy of Sir William Davenant* (Paris, The Hague: Mouton, 1967); Robert Shore, '"Lawrels for the Conquered": The Dilemmas of William Davenant and Abraham Cowley in the Revolutionary Decades of the Seventeenth Century' (PhD Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1994); Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
44 Matthew Wilson, *A Direction to be Observed by N. N. If Hee Meane to Proceede in Answering the Book Intituled Mercy and Truth, Or Charity Maintained by Catholiks* (printed secretly in England: 1636), p. 23.
45 AAW/A28, *Short Instructions: Instruction for the Agent at Rome, 1635*, p. 25.
46 Martin Butler, 'Politics and the Masque: *Salmacida Spolia*', in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (eds), *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 59–74.
47 *A Warning to the Parliament of England, in an Oration Made to the General Assembly of the French Clergy at Paris, by M. Jaques de Perron, Bishop of Angoulême, and Grand Almoner to the Queen of England* (London: 1647), in Green, *Queen's Letters*, pp. 292–5, p. 295.