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The seventeenth century saw the institution of monarchy at both its apogee and its nadir. The reign of Elizabeth is often considered its golden age and the republic its antithesis. But less than fifty years separated the two. There must have been individuals among the crowds who gathered to witness the execution of Charles I who had lined the same streets four decades before to watch Queen Elizabeth’s funeral procession. The State Papers as a single collection provides a unique picture of national affairs in this century of unprecedented change. As well as the official correspondence and publications of the monarchy, it includes a range of material documenting public reaction to it. As such it is a vital quarry for the study of the monarchy from to 1603 to 1714.

The accession of James I brought about some stark changes to both the concept and reality of kingship in England. Elizabeth I had been sovereign of England and Ireland and ruler of Wales, but only with the accession of the King of Scotland to the English throne were the nations of the British Isles brought together to form a political unit which would remain essentially unchanged until the 20th century. As Elizabeth entered her 69th year, her chief ministers entered into detailed discussions with her heir, James VI of Scotland, about his accession. A proclamation was agreed in advance so that only hours after the Queen’s death early in the morning of 24 March 1603, the English Privy Council declared James their rightful King. The Tudor dynasty had expired and the Stuart King of Scotland had taken the English crown with barely a murmur of opposition.

The accession itself was straightforward enough, but the question of the nature of the union was less so. James wanted full integration between his territories, to create one country out of several and to be the first monarch of the new kingdom of Great Britain. The matter was discussed at length in the two Parliaments and elsewhere, but was met with widespread suspicion. James did all he could to conjure up this new nation, calling himself king of Great Britain and inventing a new national flag, but the idea faltered in the face of almost universal opposition. Instead, like all his successors until 1707, he remained one king ruling several kingdoms.

As the lawyers and politicians argued, the reality of monarchy had already undergone a dramatic change: for the first time since the death of Henry VIII there was now a royal family again. When Queen Anne arrived at Windsor Castle accompanied by her children, she cut a striking contrast to her Virgin predecessor. The rites of passage of this large and growing family provided frequent opportunities for public ceremony, occasions as spectacular and splendid as anything the Tudor dynasty had hosted. These ran from the coronation itself to the installation of the Prince of Wales and marriage of Princess Elizabeth. The ceremonies delighted onlookers while the London economy roared with the conspicuous consumption the new court stoked. As well as the public processions and acts of worship, countless court spectacles were staged. The king regularly dined in public while the queen was an enthusiast for court performances known as ‘masques’ in which the royal family themselves participated. Many scripted by Ben Jonson and designed by Inigo Jones, these allegorical narratives were often elegant expositions of the glories and virtues of monarchy.

At the heart of much of the showmanship of early Stuart monarchy was unshakable self-belief: James I had a strong sense of the nature of kingship, something
he expressed in a series of political treatises. In *Basilikon Doron* ('The King's Gift'), his advice to his son, he exhorted Prince Henry to be grateful to God because ‘he made you a little God to sit on his Throne, and rule over other men’. This notion of ‘the divine right of kings’ – the belief that monarchs were appointed by and answerable to God alone – was uncontroversial (and the book a best-seller) in 1603. But come the 1640s it would be fundamentally and ferociously challenged.

The sudden and unexpected death of Prince Henry in 1612 meant that it was James’s shy second son, and not his precocious and carefully-groomed brother, who succeeded to the throne in 1625. Reserved and formal, the new king set about reforming the court: cracking down on financial abuses, enforcing strict rules of access within the royal apartments and re-establishing the household regulations of a century before. While Charles shared his father’s view of monarchy, he lacked his political instincts. Charles’s Scottish coronation was a case in point: as king of two kingdoms Charles I needed two coronations and so in 1633 set out for the land of his birth. The Scots, who maintained their separate political and religious institutions, favoured a low-church form of Protestantism. Charles, on the other hand was a high-church Anglican. Such was his devotion to his own faith, and headstrong determination to bend his subjects to his will, that he ignored the native Scottish coronation tradition and staged an essentially English coronation in Edinburgh – complete with candles, crucifixes and the sort of elaborate bowing and kneeling guaranteed to antagonise the Scots. Four years later, the same instinct led the king to try and impose an Anglican Prayer Book on the Scots – a disastrous miscalculation which would bring the King into armed conflict with his own subjects. The fury with which Charles greeted the Scots’ rejection of the new prayer book stemmed from his belief that it was, essentially, a rejection of his authority as king.

As the kingdoms tumbled into civil war, all sides struggled to make sense of a state of affairs so at odds with all mainstream political theory. Charles insisted on the mores of monarchy despite the mud and mayhem of the civil war: his exiled court in Oxford was palatially lodged in a series of university colleges, ceremonial staff trailed around the battlefields and until his last days his every meal was served by servants on bended knee. In the end the trial and execution of Charles I was the work of a tiny group of men - who only achieved their ends by ‘purging’ parliament in December 1648 - and was regarded with horror by the vast majority of the English population. When the Prince of Wales wrote to the Parliamentary high command to plead for his father’s life, he argued what most people still fervently believed, that they could not take from the king ‘the royal dignity given him by God alone’.

Regardless, the regicide went ahead, the monarchy was dispensed with and the English republic came into being. The new vehicle of government was the Council of State, who’s declared first purpose was to prevent the return of the Stuart dynasty. While the institutions of royal government – the privy council, the exchequer and prerogative courts – were disposed of and crown lands and possessions put up for sale, the trappings of monarchy were not so easy to throw off. The conventions of international diplomacy required careful ceremony, which in turn necessitated ceremonial officers, buildings and furniture. The Council of State...
decided it needed to retain nearly all the principal royal palaces for its own use and soon raised the value of royal items it wished to retain from £10,000 to £50,000. Four years later government by committee ended and Oliver Cromwell was made head of state. He resisted suggestions that his title should be ‘king’, but he was nonetheless to be known as ‘His Highness the Lord Protector’ and within a week of his ceremonial investiture, preparations were underway for the Cromwell family to occupy the royal apartments at Whitehall. While the revolutionaries of 1649 had abolished the office of sovereign, a thousand years of kingship could not so simply be swept away.

In 1660, after two years of chaos, a battered and bruised country greeted the return of the monarchy with profound relief. Thanks to this conservative mood, the institution was restored on almost precisely the same terms as before the civil war. When Charles II was crowned on 23 April 1661, the Crown Jewels were new but the words were unchanged and he was recognised as God’s appointee. As had been the case in 1603, the advent of a new regime heralded a round of ritual events and made available a raft of lucrative court posts which delighted those whose lives they touched. Thousands flocked to Whitehall to see their king and were not disappointed. Unlike his father, Charles II had an easy manner and was an enthusiastic performer of public ceremony: he staged countless carefully-managed healing ceremonies, dined in public several times a week and attended services in the chapel royal every Sunday. Charles II had no appetite for reducing the splendour of the monarchy and the pre-civil war ritual calendar was reinstated in its entirety. To some amazement he even revived the old practice of providing formal meals for almost the entire royal household (something most European monarchies had long since abandoned) – though the sheer cost would soon force him reduce its scale.

The years immediately after the Restoration saw the monarchy enjoy an almost unprecedented level of popularity; inevitably this did not last. A series of natural disasters – plague and the Great Fire of London - and the humiliation of the English fleet being burned in harbour by the Dutch, all tainted the regime’s reputation, while tales of the king’s promiscuity damaged his personal glory. The real test for the restored monarchy, however, would come in the late 1670s with the fall-out from the conversion to Catholicism of the King’s brother, James - something which, in a fiercely Protestant world, was enough to destabilise the whole regime. Stringent anti-Catholic legislation was soon being introduced in Parliament culminating in a radical attempt to remove James, Duke of York from the succession. Determined to prevent what he saw as an assault on the hereditary nature of monarchy itself, the King saw off this challenge with a combination of shady political manoeuvering and steely personal resolve. After the defeat of the Exclusion Bill he dissolved Parliament never to call it again. The years which followed saw a new imperiousness in his style of kingship. Regulations for the royal household were tightened up, musicians started to play rousing music during the royal rising and retiring rituals and incense was burned in the palace chapels. The king cracked down ferociously on town corporations, and anyone who was allowed before him to protest was required to remain on his knees throughout the audience. While in the early years of the reign the monarchy was unquestionably based in London, Charles II increasingly withdrew from the
volatile metropolis: first to Windsor Castle and then to Winchester where he commissioned Christopher Wren to build a magnificent new palace. It seems likely he intended to use Winchester as his cousin the King of France used Versailles, as a counterpoint to the politically febrile capital; but just as the lead was being rolled out on the roof, Charles II died.

Charles’s defence of his brother’s right to the throne him was so successful that James, Duke of York, succeeded painlessly on 6 February 1685. In some respects James II was a modernising monarch. While Charles II had fought against any moves to reduce the size of the royal household, James - anticipating money would be in short supply - undertook a wholesale reform: a staggering 400 of the 1,000 court posts were abolished. But this would not be his legacy to the English monarchy. At his coronation on 23 April 1685 the communion service was quietly dispensed with on the flimsy pretext of saving time. In reality, the problem here - and throughout the reign - was one of how a Catholic king could rule a Protestant country. James’s efforts to enable English Catholics to work and worship freely were viewed with suspicion and then outright hostility by his subjects. Catholicism was inextricably linked to royal absolutism in the popular mind, and James lacked the political ability to persuade people that absolute monarchy was not his goal. As the birth of a son in June 1688 raised the spectre of a Catholic dynasty, a group of powerful English made contact with James’s son-in-law, William of Orange, offering their support should he invade.

On 5 November 1688 William of Orange landed a vast fleet in the south-west of England and by Christmas day James II was in France and the kingdom was his. Exactly what had happened constitutionally was the subject of much discussion. But the fact remained that what Charles II had fought against in 1679-81 - the notion that subjects could chose their king - had come to pass. James was deemed to have abdicated and Parliament explicitly ‘offered’ the throne to William and his Stuart wife, Mary.

The monarchy was different after 1690. A series of pieces of legislation sought to limit its powers - important among which was the Bill of Rights passed in December 1689, while the coronation oath, which remains almost unaltered today, included a new pledge that the sovereign should govern according to statutes in Parliament. For the first and only time England had two sovereigns, as to lessen the appearance of a foreign invasion Mary reigned jointly with her husband - though William alone was to exercise executive authority. But in other ways the monarchy under William and Mary was very much in the traditional Stuart mould; the household reforms instituted by James II were revoked wholesale and (despite the claims of court preachers) court life resumed much of the traditional calendar of social and ceremonial events, even after Mary’s death in 1694. In 1698 when Whitehall Palace burned, the long-standing arrangement whereby the royal family and the offices of state occupied the same complex came to an end. In architecture as in politics, sovereign and state were no longer indivisible.

With Whitehall gone, William’s sister-in-law Queen Anne (1702-1714) lived mainly at St James’s Palace, usually assigned to the heir to the throne. Here she brought the habits of a consort to the role of sovereign. Notably ‘drawing rooms’ were now staged in the sovereign’s suite and became the main social-political gathering; it would remain central to royal life for two
hundred years. But the royal apartments were no longer unrivalled as the geographical centre of politics, as satellite powerbases sprung up among the new urban palaces in London’s west end.

A century after James I’s accession the issue of the nature of the union between England and Scotland returned. Come the early 18th century, politicians north and south had their own reasons for favouring a greater degree of integration. After 1688 the English government feared the Scots would chose a Jacobite king, while the Scots found themselves on the brink of bankruptcy from which English cash and trade concessions could rescue them. On 2 January 1707 the Scottish Parliament voted itself out of existence. Though still separate in law and church, the two kingdoms had become one and Great Britain had come into being.
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