



QUEENSHIP AND POWER

ROYAL WOMEN AND DYNASTIC LOYALTY

Edited by
Caroline Dunn and
Elizabeth Carney



Queenship and Power

Series Editors

Charles Beem

University of North Carolina, Pembroke
Pembroke, NC, USA

Carole Levin

University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE, USA

This series focuses on works specializing in gender analysis, women's studies, literary interpretation, and cultural, political, constitutional, and diplomatic history. It aims to broaden our understanding of the strategies that queens—both consorts and regnants, as well as female regents—pursued in order to wield political power within the structures of male-dominant societies. The works describe queenship in Europe as well as many other parts of the world, including East Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Islamic civilization.

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14523>

Caroline Dunn • Elizabeth Carney
Editors

Royal Women and Dynastic Loyalty

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Caroline Dunn
Department of History
Clemson University
Clemson, SC, USA

Elizabeth Carney
Department of History
Clemson University
Clemson, SC, USA

Queenship and Power

ISBN 978-3-319-75876-3

ISBN 978-3-319-75877-0 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75877-0>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018940697

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover credit: Azoor Photo / Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer International Publishing AG part of Springer Nature.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*For our colleagues and students in the history department
at Clemson University*

PREFACE

The starting point for this collection of articles was an international conference on the theme of “Dynastic Loyalties” hosted by the departments of history and political science of Clemson University, held in Greenville, South Carolina, April 8–9, 2016. The conference, the fifth in the Royal Studies Network’s annual “Kings and Queens” conference series, was the first held outside of Europe (thanks are due to Ellie Woodacre for initiating the Royal Studies Network and allowing us to host the conference). The conference offered 57 papers on topics spanning monarchies from the Ancient World of Greece and Rome to Twentieth-Century England, and ranged from North America to Nepal.

Since this collection appears as part of the series “Queenship and Power,” unlike the original conference, it concentrates on the role of royal women in issues of dynastic loyalty and disloyalty. The twelve papers in the collection range in time from the Hellenistic period to the nineteenth century CE. Most, but not all, deal with European dynasties.

“Kings and Queens 5: Dynastic Loyalties” was supported by the Clemson College of Architecture, Arts, and Humanities, Clemson University’s Office of the Vice-President for Research, and the Clemson Humanities Advancement Board, as well as by the departments of history and political science. It would not have been possible without the assistance of the members of those departments, history Masters students Katrina Moore and Lauren Martiere, and the undergraduate students enrolled in Caroline Dunn’s creative inquiry course: Alex Beaver, Jennifer Iacono, Cameron

Weekley, Polly Goss, Haskell Ezell, and Sarah Marshall. The history department staff, Sheri Marcus Long and Jeannette Carter, were invaluable in assisting with the conference, as were the members of the history department faculty.

Clemson, SC

Caroline Dunn
Elizabeth Carney

CONTENTS

1	Introduction: Royal Women and Dynastic Loyalty	1
	Caroline Dunn and Elizabeth Carney	
2	King's Daughters, Sisters, and Wives: Fonts and Conduits of Power and Legitimacy	19
	Waldemar Heckel	
3	From Family to Politics: Queen Apollonis as Agent of Dynastic/Political Loyalty	31
	Dolores Mirón	
4	Queens and Their Children: Dynastic Dis/Loyalty in the Hellenistic Period	49
	Walter Duvall Penrose Jr	
5	On the Alleged Treachery of Julia Domna and Septimius Severus's Failed Siege of Hatra	67
	Riccardo Bertolazzi	
6	Dynasty or Family? Tenth and Eleventh Century Norwegian Royal Women and Their Dynastic Loyalties	87
	Karl C. Alvestad	

7	Prince Pedro, A Case of Dynastic Disloyalty in Fifteenth Century Portugal?	99
	Ana Maria S. A. Rodrigues	
8	The Tragic Queen: Dynastic Loyalty and the ‘Queenships’ of Mary Queen of Scots	111
	Charles Beem	
9	Embodied Devotion: The Dynastic and Religious Loyalty of Renée de France (1510–1575)	123
	Kelly D. Peebles	
10	Queenship and the Currency of Arts Patronage as Propaganda at the Early Stuart Court	139
	Wendy Hitchmough	
11	Dynastic Loyalty and Allegiances: Ottoman Resilience During the Seventeenth Century Crisis	151
	René Langlois	
12	For Empire or Dynasty? Empress Elisabeth Christine and the Brunswicks	165
	Charlotte Backerra	
13	French Historians’ Loyalty and Disloyalty to French Monarchy Between 1815 and 1848	181
	Heta Aali	
	Index	191

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Heta Aali completed her Ph.D. degree in 2017 at the department of Cultural History at University of Turku. Her thesis is entitled “The Merovingian Queenship in Early Nineteenth-Century French Historiography.” She has published articles related to the themes of her thesis, for example one entitled “Fredegonde—Great Man of the nineteenth century” in *Les Grandes figures historiques dans les Lettres et les Arts*, (2013) and she has co-edited a book entitled *Memory Boxes, An Experimental Approach to Cultural Transfer in History, 1500–2000* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2014).

Karl C. Alvestad is currently a lecturer in history at the University of Winchester, where he earned his PhD with his thesis “Kings, Heroes and Ships: The Use of Historical Characters in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Perceptions of the Early Medieval Scandinavian Past,” which explored Norwegian political medievalism as part of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Norwegian nation building. His current research interests are early medieval Scandinavia’s political and cultural history, St. Olaf and political and cultural medievalism in Norway and the Norwegian diaspora.

Charlotte Backerra is a postdoctoral researcher of early modern European history and lecturer at the Institute of History of Technische Universität Darmstadt, having previously taught in Mainz and Stuttgart (Germany). Her projects cover premodern international relations, intelligence and espionage of European powers, historiography, and the role of dynasties in politics and culture. The title of her doctoral thesis was

“Vienna and London, 1727–1735. Factors of International Relations in the Early 18th Century”. She has co-edited a volume, *Transnational Histories of the “Royal Nation”* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), and is preparing another on “Confessional Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe” at the moment. The research her chapter is based on was carried out with the help of the University of Mainz.

Charles Beem is professor of history at the University of North Carolina, Pembroke. His publications include *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History* (2006), *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England* (2008), *The Foreign Relations of Elizabeth I* (2011), *The Name of a Queen: William Fleetwood’s Itinerarium ad Windsor* (2013), and *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History* (2014). He is also, with Carole Levin, the editor of the book series “Queenship and Power” for publishers Palgrave Macmillan. He is currently at work on the monograph *Queenship in Early Modern Europe*.

Riccardo Bertolazzi started to study ancient history at the University of Verona, where he obtained an MA in Classics in 2009. He has recently received a Ph.D. in Greek and Roman studies at the University of Calgary by defending a thesis dedicated to the political and cultural influence of the Roman Augusta Julia Domna. He is now a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Toronto. He has also published numerous articles on social and military matters related to Roman imperial history, with particular focus on epigraphic texts from the North African and Danubian provinces of the Roman Empire.

Elizabeth Carney is a scholar of classical and Hellenistic Greece, professor emerita at Clemson University. *Women and Monarchy in Ancient Macedonia* (University of Oklahoma Press, 2000) provided an overview of the role of women in Macedonia in the classical and Hellenistic period. She has also written monographs on Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great (Routledge, 2006) and Arsinoë II, a Ptolemaic queen (Oxford University Press, 2013), and is currently completing a study of Eurydice, mother of Philip II, and of her period in Macedonian history.

Caroline Dunn is a scholar of medieval Europe with a particular focus on women’s roles and social networks in late medieval England. She is associate professor of history at Clemson University. Her book, *Stolen Women in Medieval England: Rape, Abduction, and Adultery c. 1100–1500* (Cambridge University Press, 2012) offers the first comprehensive overview of women’s

experiences with ravishment, which ranged from forcible rape to consensual elopement and adultery, during the English middle ages. Professor Dunn's current research explores ladies-in-waiting in medieval England.

Waldemar Heckel was a professor of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Calgary from 1977 until his retirement at the end of 2013. He is now a research fellow of the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies at that university. He is the author of several books, including *The Last Days and Testament of Alexander the Great. A Prosopographic Study* (Steiner, 1988), *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander's Empire* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2006), *The Conquests of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), and *Alexander's Marshals. A Study of the Makedonian Aristocracy and the Politics of Military Leadership* (Routledge, 2016).

Wendy Hitchmough is Head of Historic Buildings and Research at Historic Royal Palaces. She is an art historian specializing in the art, architecture and design of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. She is the author of seven books including *C.F.A. Voysey* (Phaidon, 1995), *The Arts and Crafts Home* (Pavilion, 2000), and *Arts and Crafts Gardens* (V&A, 2005).

Renée Langlois is a graduate student at the University of Nevada Las Vegas who balances a professional career in financial services as a CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER™ at a top-ranking team at Ameriprise Financial. She is presently working on a comparative study of the sovereignty of the Ottoman *validé sultans* and the French Queen Regents during the early modern period. She presented initial stages of her work at the 2015 Kings & Queens IV Conference at the University of Lisbon and at the 2016 Western Ottoman Conference (WOW) at Berkeley. She plans to defend her thesis by fall of 2018 while working on a chapter for ARC Humanities/Medieval Press's Global Queenship volume.

Dolores Mirón is Professor in the Department of Prehistory and Archaeology and member of the Institute of Women's Studies at the University of Granada (Spain). Her research and publications have been developed within the field of Women's History in Classical Antiquity, and focused especially on topics concerning women's public agency and power, from her first works on Roman imperial cults to her studies on conflict management in Greece and on Hellenistic queens. Her current research is focused on women's agency and memory in Hellenistic architecture.

Kelly D. Peebles is Associate Professor of French at Clemson University. Her research focuses on sixteenth-century French literature and book history, particularly on women involved in the French Calvinist network. She is the editor and translator of Jeanne Flore's *Tales and Trials of Love*, vol. 33 of *The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe* (CRRS/Iter, 2014), and is currently working on an edition and study of letters, documents, and literary portraits related to Renée de France.

Walter Duvall Penrose Jr is an Associate Professor of History at San Diego State University. He is the author of *Postcolonial Amazons: Female Masculinity and Courage in Ancient Greek and Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford University Press, 2016). Walter has also published essays and journal articles on gender, sexuality, and disability in premodern history.

Ana Maria S. A. Rodrigues (MA University of Paris IV-Sorbonne, 1981; PhD University of Minho, 1992; “Agregação” University of Minho, 2002) is Full Professor at the University of Lisbon. Previously, she lectured at the University of Minho (1984–2002). She was also Deputy Coordinator of the National Commission for the Commemoration of the Portuguese Discoveries (1999–2002). She has taught courses in Medieval History and Gender History at graduate and postgraduate levels, and has supervised around twenty MA and PhD theses. Her recent research mainly concerns gender identities and medieval queenship.



CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Royal Women and Dynastic Loyalty

Caroline Dunn and Elizabeth Carney

Royal women—ancient, medieval, and early modern—played much more influential and diverse roles than merely marrying the king and producing the heir. As reigning queens, consorts, dowager queens, or sisters, daughters, or mistresses of kings, women in regal courts sometimes wielded official authority and often influenced politics, culture, and religion through informal channels. Recent scholarship has questioned the public/private and formal/informal dichotomies that largely gender public authority male and informal influence female. Yet we see examples in this volume of royal women governing as well as influencing royal actions through more discrete channels.¹ Even seemingly passive and private activities traditionally associated with women (bearing heirs, getting dressed by selected female courtiers) had official components that could generate loyalty to the dynasty.

Before the late 1970s, the role of women in monarchy (apart, perhaps, from that of regnant women) was often ignored, trivialized, or sensationalized. Biography was virtually the only way in which royal women appeared in political historiography. The development of women's history

C. Dunn (✉) • E. Carney
Department of History, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA

© The Author(s) 2018
C. Dunn, E. Carney (eds.), *Royal Women and Dynastic Loyalty*,
Queenship and Power, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75877-0_1

and later gender history began to change this situation, though many who studied women's history were uneasy about attention to female members of elites and, apart from that, the discovery or retrieval aspect of women's history initially dominated the field (i.e. the rediscovery of "lost" female figures).² Gradually greater comfort with combining political history and women's history, including theoretical analysis, and recognizing the complex nature of gender construction led to more multilayered analysis of royal women and their social and institutional contexts. Acknowledgment of the importance of female patronage in sustaining a dynasty has played a significant role in our understanding of the role of women in monarchy.³ The growing importance of court studies and the willingness of historians to employ additional methodologies or evidence (for instance, kinship or dynastic studies or arguments based on material culture) have also contributed to a new framework that begins with the fundamental assumption that royal women (and other members of a ruling dynasty) were part of monarchy rather than simply decorative accessories to it.⁴

The existence of the very series in which this volume appears—"Queenship and Power"—speaks to how widespread recognition of the importance of royal women has become and yet examination of the tables of contents of the volumes in the series reveals that most of the articles in these collections relate to medieval or early modern history; only a smattering of articles on ancient or modern monarchies, or on non-western monarchies, appear. This chronological/cultural distribution of the series reflects the general pattern of publication on royal women, particularly in Anglophone scholarship, at least until recently.

This is certainly not to claim that no monographs or collections looking at women and monarchy exist for other periods and cultures.⁵ Examinations in English of the role of women in individual Middle Eastern and Asian monarchies have appeared.⁶ For the ancient world, monographs or collections relating to women and monarchy, as in other fields, focused on the biographical until the beginning of this century.⁷ Remarkably, though four works have now been published that examine the broader role of Roman imperial women, none of these was written in English and no collection in any language examines the role of women in multiple ancient monarchies.⁸ Similarly, no general study of the part women played in either pharaonic or Ptolemaic Egyptian monarchy exists.⁹ In addition, comparatively little book-length scholarship has been devoted to the study of royal women from the second half of the nineteenth century to the current day.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that serious analysis of the role of women and monarchy began, or at least acquired momentum, with the study of women in medieval monarchy and early modern monarchy, very soon after the “invention” of women’s history. Pauline Stafford’s 1983 book-length study of early medieval queens is a very early example because she looked at royal women in an institutional and non-biographical way. Her treatment of the consequences of royal polygamy was particularly important.¹⁰ In the early 1990s, two critical collections examining the role of medieval and/or early modern royal women appeared.¹¹ After the beginning of the new century, a whole host of collections related to the relationship between women and monarchy began to appear.¹² Works with a biographical aspect began to pay more attention to the cultural and institutional context of the women on whom they focused.¹³ And a recent textbook introduces students to theories and practices of queenship across medieval Europe.¹⁴

One can only speculate as to why medieval and early modern studies have proved so critical, at least in English-language texts, for analyses of the roles of women and monarchy. Despite variations within this long period and across regions, generally greater relevant evidence is available for medieval/early modern monarchies than for ancient monarchies, although the same cannot be said about modern royalty. It is noticeable that conferences or panels played an important role in the formation of this subfield and meetings specific to these periods were therefore important. Discussions about royal women of the medieval and early modern eras seem consistently more comparative and self-aware than those for ancient or modern periods. It is not by chance that *Medieval Feminist Forum* recently published an entire issue largely devoted to the development and future of the field of women and monarchy.¹⁵

Still, perhaps the most important reason for the medieval/early modern focus of so much scholarship on royal women is that monarchy, especially in British and French history, was always understood as a central institution, whereas in ancient and modern history this has been less true. Ancient historiography tended to treat monarchy as an institution defined by an office, held by a series of individuals, rather than as the rule of one family, a tendency that delayed recognition of the role of dynasty in general, let alone female members of the dynasty. Greek historiography has long treated non-monarchic government as normative, focused more on the classical period, and especially on the relatively androcentric culture of

Athens. Greater attention to the Hellenistic period (one in which monarchy was dominant) and interest in court studies and the influence of other monarchic cultures (particularly the Persian) has finally led to change.¹⁶ The comparative dearth of work on Roman imperial women also relates to a denial of the importance of monarchy and dynasty, though in this case the denial was shared by ancient Roman sources, at least during the period of the Principate, when the pretense of a continued republic continued to be important in public life. The frequency of dynastic change and the prevalence of adoption (if only for a comparatively brief period) also complicates attempts at discussing the role of imperial women in anything other than a biographical way. In modern times, though monarchies persisted in considerable force until World War I and continue to exist today, historiography not infrequently tends to consign monarchy to the periphery of political history, often because the role of ritual and image-making in the politics of power has been ignored.¹⁷

Discussions that employ the specific term “dynastic loyalty” are rare, although biographies and political studies of monarchy often touch on the topic. Formation of dynastic identity and image via court and public ceremony, ritual (family and patriotic), and patronage often involved female members of a ruling dynasty and could generate dynastic loyalty.¹⁸ This collection assembles articles that explore the relationship between royal women and dynastic loyalty (and disloyalty), in diverse times and places. By covering an expansive chronological period (ancient to nineteenth century) and varied cultures and locations, the wider scope allows students and scholars to see the often-neglected roles played by women and to grasp patterns of formal and informal influence often disguised by narrower studies of government structures and officials. At the same time, these articles demonstrate the degree to which royal women’s involvement in issues of dynastic loyalty was shaped by the nature of specific monarchic institutions. This collection represents a selection of the broader conference that was its initial source; many other aspects of the topic could be pursued, though they are not addressed here. For instance, none of the articles in this collection examines the vocabulary of loyalty and disloyalty generated in a variety of cultures and monarchies, a topic that should prove fruitful for further research.

As wives and dowager queens, women could be central to the transmission and continuation of power. Palace women encouraged loyalty from both male and female courtiers and subjects at large, and at times provoked disloyal acts. Such discussions remain relevant today, when we consider

that many governments, even if not monarchies, remain susceptible or even open to informal influence on official governing channels—even (or particularly) by family members or those allied to them. Though “monarchy” literally means one person rule, distinguishing between the authority of the current ruler and that of other family members is difficult and, in practice, not always a distinction that was made or even desired.

In many of their activities, royal women displayed behavior that reflected gendered norms. Hellenistic queens acted as public benefactors, or *euergetai*, in a manner that generated loyalty and offers parallels with the traditional gender roles taken up by the mothers of Ottoman sultans who established charitable foundations to help the poor during an era of economic distress (see Chap. 3 by Dolores Mirón and Chap. 11 by Renée Langlois in this volume). Queens and female kin acted as intercessors between rulers and diverse members of the local community, helping to create and maintain ties of loyalty.¹⁹ They acted to reiterate familial and communal ties initially established by their marriages and to mitigate frictions between the families of their birth and of their marriage. When, however, their enemies perceived them not as intercessors but advocates, even if their advocacy was for peace, they were vulnerable to attack and charges of disloyalty.

Royal women also fell victim to the goddess/whore trope, whereby they were either praised for their model behavior or vilified for alleged sexual sins.²⁰ As we see in this collection, the queen’s role as producer of heirs was not her only role, but this remained a central characteristic of her position. To generate loyalty to the dynasty, the queens had literally to generate heirs to the dynasty. Their prolific maternity was important practically, and also for the dynastic image. The Hellenistic queen Apollonis not only produced heirs, but played a significant role in constructing the dynasty’s image as a harmonious, unified family. On the other hand, Roman Empress Julia Domna and Mary Queen of Scots were both accused of sexual impropriety; gender-based conventions in both the ancient and early modern worlds connected sexual dishonor with inability to rule and even with treachery.

Some articles in this volume pursue the theme of dynastic loyalty by focusing on individual royal women, several examine patterns within dynasties, and others consider what factors generate loyalty and/or disloyalty to a dynasty or individual ruler. Many royal women were born into one dynasty and married into another. Several authors thus explore the conflicts between the two dynasties and the ways in which divided loyalties

could benefit or disadvantage royal women. We see how female members of the dynasty, usually through marriage, transmitted power and generated loyalties. Although queens, especially medieval ones, were often praised as peace-weavers, marriage alliances could engender disloyalty as well as loyalty. Highlighting two key themes in contemporary higher education, “globalization” and “cross-cultural awareness,” the articles in this collection highlight how queens were among the earliest of historical immigrants who had to negotiate divided families and cultural differences (and sometimes renegotiate them).

Some royal women also bridged religious loyalty divides, at times having to choose between their loyalty to their dynasty and their loyalty to their god. Several papers demonstrate how royal women navigated religious tensions in Reformation-era Europe, while others document how queens and empresses in the ancient world garnered community loyalty through their promotion and protection of religious cults. Royal women’s devotion to their religious customs or, in the case of Renée de France, the new Protestant faith, were not solely motivated by mere opportunism, but helped generate loyalty to their rule or to their dynasty. On the other hand, religious values could provoke disloyal actions, or actions perceived as disloyal too, as in the cases of Mary Queen of Scots and Julia Domna.

In addition to religion, royal women fashioned loyalty through their patronage. The daughters and wives of kings played crucial roles in constructing the dynastic image and ensuring dynastic continuity through ritual propaganda. They demonstrated the legitimacy of the dynasty actively, through their patronage or in their active promotion of candidates during succession disputes, but also passively: at times the simple fact of their ancestry enhanced the prestige and legitimacy of the dynasty they married into. Royal women whose ethnic and cultural background differed from that of their husband’s dynasty were vulnerable to criticism as foreign or alien, but could also both promote and embody the unification of two cultures.

Most of the papers in this collection focus on queens, but even in that context there is thematic complexity to be recognized. Some queens, like Apollonis and Anna of Denmark, were consorts. Berenice II of Cyrene and Mary Queen of Scots were regnant queens in their own right, while in the Ottoman Empire Turhan served as regent (*validé Sultan*) for her son Mehmet IV. This book widens the focus beyond queens by including royal daughters, royal sisters, and royal aunts who never served as queens but who nevertheless wielded influence and generated loyalty for their dynasties.

After an initial comparative chapter by Waldemar Heckel (Chap. 2), the articles in this book proceed chronologically. Heckel examines “legitimacy” in royal families and the rules governing succession, particularly the role of the royal female as a conduit of power and legitimacy. He presents comparative material primarily from Hellenistic monarchies, medieval Norman and Angevin kingdoms, and Mexico. The practice of conferring legitimacy through levirate marriage (marriage to royal widows) documents how a woman might be excluded from official authority, but nevertheless remain important to the dynasty, once her husband “possessed” her family’s lineage.

The next three articles, dealing with Hellenistic and Roman monarchies, offer examples of more active promotion of loyalty by royal women. Dolores Mirón’s Chap. 3 explores the agency of Queen Apollonis, wife of Attalus I of Pergamon (a Hellenistic kingdom in western Turkey), in the construction of the dynastic image as a harmonious loyal family and in the establishment of bonds of loyalty between the monarchy and the cities it ruled. Apollonis was able to play this role in part because she was not of royal blood, but a citizen of Cyzicus. Cults dedicated to her in various cities after her death continued to venerate her as a good mother and the priesthoods and festivals established in her name bound the citizens to her financially and emotionally. Her own rebuilding of a sanctuary to Demeter, a mother goddess, also connected her to marriage and motherhood.

Chapter 4 by Walter Penrose explores conflict between mothers (as reigning queens, consorts, and dowager queens) and sons, demonstrating the causes and effects of unprecedented power obtained by women in the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties and warning us that no loyalties—even the bond between mother and child—are guaranteed. In such dynastic power struggles, women often played an equal part to men.

Riccardo Bertolazzi’s Chap. 5 demonstrates how Julia Domna, wife of the Roman Emperor Septimius Severus, retained loyalty to the elites and religious traditions of her native Mesopotamian region, both those inside the Roman Empire or those outside it. Her loyalty to the place and culture of her origin set her up for accusations of treachery and adultery made by her imperial rival, the praetorian prefect Plautianus, although she, her sons, and her family won this conflict in the end and eliminated him.

Dynastic leaders used family ties and marriage alliances to gain and maintain power through loyalty. Chapter 6 from Karl Alvestad is an analysis of the actions of two royal sisters, Astrid and Ingeborg Tryggvasdaughter, in eleventh-century Norway. It demonstrates that such loyalty might only

be ‘situational,’ that is, marriage as a strategy for gaining and sustaining loyalty sometimes worked to the king’s favor, but only when advantageous for the king’s female kin and their marital dynasties. When kings lacked sufficient kin to broker alliances, they introduced new ‘officials’ into dynastic power structures.

In Chap. 7, Ana Maria Rodrigues examines inter-familial conflict in fifteenth-century Portugal and the violence that occurs when divergent branches of the same dynasty compete for power and loyalty. Rodrigues analyzes these “tangled concepts of loyalty and honor” and considers times when one might justify rebellion. She concludes that royal women played a considerable role in reconciling estranged members of the dynasty.

Charles Beem’s Chap. 8 exposes the unique situation of Mary, Queen of Scots, whose life encapsulated the varied forms of queenship (consort, regnant, and dowager). She was expected both to rule her natal homeland of Scotland and preside as consort over her husband’s kingdom of France. Ultimately, Mary’s mother, as regent of Scotland, and later her Scottish husbands and her son James VI, ruled Scotland for most of her life. As seen elsewhere, kinship did not always generate allegiance, and the adult James’ acquiescence to the coup against his mother demonstrates filial disloyalty. Elizabeth I’s reluctance to execute Mary stemmed more from her worries about setting a precedent by executing a royal body than from their common Tudor heritage. Mary’s own loyalties were complicated too. As Beem argues, Mary prioritized her long-term dynastic ambitions over the execution of her royal office—she took loyalty to her dynasty’s imagined future too far and neglected the communal interests of the Scottish people.

Both Beem’s analysis of Mary and Kelly Peebles’s discussion of Renée de France in Chap. 9 highlight the consequences of the Protestant Reformation by exploring how religious loyalties complicated dynastic loyalties. Mary’s Catholicism contributed to conflicts with her Protestant Council and made her an obvious foil to Elizabeth of England, even if her politically-motivated insistence that she enjoyed a dynastic claim to the English throne contributed more to her downfall than her religious faith.

In contrast, Renée de France prioritized faith over dynasty, as Peebles demonstrates in her essay. Although she stressed her royal descent from the house of Valois-Orléans (opposed to the Valois-Angoulême branch inaugurated by her cousin Francis I), she became deeply involved in the Huguenot cause in France and promoted Protestantism even while her daughter was a leading Catholic courtier at the French court. Peebles demonstrates how

Renée was celebrated by several evangelical humanist authors as a model Protestant during the era of religious conflict, and herself stressed her religious virtue as a method of promoting the dynastic name.

Wendy Hitchmough's Chap. 10 highlights the importance of a queen's patronage in garnering loyalty, in this case the influence of Queen Anna's influence in creating a culture of enlightened patronage at the English court that celebrated the Stuart dynasty. Hitchmough argues not only for a link between visual culture and dynastic propaganda, which feted Stuart marriages, diplomatic choices, and the concept of divine monarchy, but also demonstrates how the choice of the classical style as a central visual identity for the new royal family of England created a design tradition that survived the Stuarts and their contemporary dynastic issues.

Chapter 11, by Renée Langlois, focuses on dynastic survival in a period of global crisis. She explores the authority of the Ottoman Sultan's mother as regent and how these *validé sultans* brokered marriages between royal daughters and elites both to promote loyalty and to acquire wealth needed to further protect the dynasty. In addition, royal women established philanthropic institutions—*waqf* foundations—that, as with the much earlier benefactress Queen Apollonis, helped generate loyalty the dynasty. The *validé Sultan* symbolized the continuity and fluidity of the dynasty during the seventeenth-century and helped legitimate the ruling family throughout the empire with their astute management of power and financial resources.

Also heavily engaged in the dynastic decisions concerning her daughters, Elisabeth Christine of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (mother of the better known Empress Maria-Theresa) sought to be a bridge between her natal Brunswick dynasty and husband's Hapsburg one. Unfortunately, as argued by Charlotte Backerra in Chap. 12, the War of Austrian Succession divided the two families, and the Empress Elisabeth Christine best serves as an example of the divided loyalties of royal women. The Hapsburg succession crisis occurred because Elisabeth Christine and her husband produced only daughters, and the conflict over the succession created dynastic tensions for the Empress Elisabeth Christine, thereby demonstrating how not producing heirs, particularly a male heir, is a problem for someone who is supposed to embody the dynasty and both convey and confer its legitimacy. Her reign serves as a kind of mirror image of Apollonis whose ability to produce male heirs successfully symbolized and embodied the Attalid dynasty.

Finally, Heta Aali's Chap. 13, which considers how nineteenth-century French historians wrote about much earlier Merovingian kings and queens,

reveals the historians' loyalties to the competing Bourbon and Orleans dynasties that ruled France during tumultuous era of revolution and restoration. By shaping stories about King Clovis and Queen Clothilde, in particular, the later historians Pierre-Denis of Peyronnet and Henri Martin demonstrated loyalty or disloyalty through their writings and promoted royalist, nationalist, bourgeois and sometimes revolutionary ideas. Aali's historiographical analysis reminds scholars that our views of the past cannot help but be colored by contemporary events and cultural mores.

"Queen" in English is a term applied to such a wide variety of royal women that it is nearly meaningless: it can refer to female rulers or co-rulers, to regents, and to widowed royal wives, but not to royal daughters. This volume addresses both "queens" and king's daughters, though it is important to note that many terms, embracing varying understandings of the role of women in hereditary monarchy, were employed by different cultures and dynasties, at various periods. In Ptolemaic Egypt, for instance, *basilissa* was title that might be given to a king's wife and to a king's daughter. Of course, many women moved from one category to another, whatever title they carried; in each category their connection to understandings of dynastic loyalty might differ.

Regnant and even co-regnant women were rare, but royal women were often involved in the articulation of dynastic continuity, most often via marriage, but sometimes, as mothers of child heirs, they might or might not function as regents as well. Royal widows could be powerful symbols of a dynasty during a transition between male rulers, but women in this position were also quite vulnerable, sometimes to violence and certainly to innuendo. Royal widows who remarried, even though the marriage was rarely their idea, could easily be understood as disloyal and might be alienated from their own children.

Differences in the nature of marriage affected the role of royal women in dynastic loyalty. Whereas in the ancient world, marriage (royal or not) was often terminated by divorce, divorce was far less common in Christian medieval and modern cultures, and certainly more controversial. This difference meant that since royal women in the ancient world often returned to the families of their birth, they remained part of those families to a greater degree, both formally and practically. A Hellenistic queen sometimes appears in inscriptions, though married, with only a title and a patronymic, and without any reference to a husband. More often, in documents, royal women employed both a patronymic and a reference to a husband. In the Greek world, particularly, diplomacy functioned in good part in terms

of real and fictional kinship and royal women could and did function as representatives of (for instance) the dynasty of their husbands to that of their fathers and brothers. Insults and threats to royal women might lead to the intervention of the birth family. Berenice II, daughter of Ptolemy II and sister of Ptolemy III, married Antiochus II, the ruler of Syria, and had a son by him, only to be threatened by another wife of Antiochus, who managed to kill Berenice and her son. Famously, Ptolemy III invaded Syria in order to avenge his sister Berenice. Intradynastic marriages in both ancient and early modern times complicated issues of dynastic loyalty: some Seleucid queens, for instance, were married to warring brothers and in Portugal we see a queen whose father and husband were at odds and only the death of one and the appearance of a common heir united the dynasties. Polygamy could, on the one hand, create dynastic struggles that pitted the children of one royal wife against those of another, each side calling upon the loyalty of followers (as happened in Argead Macedonia) or it could, as in the seventeenth-century Ottoman Empire, enable the *validé sultan* to weave together internal and external alliances via the marriages of the many sisters and daughters of sultans.

We see in this collection that religion could empower a royal woman and generate loyalty to her and the dynasty yet it could also complicate dynastic loyalty or even destroy it. Royal women often functioned as patrons of cults and communal institutions that embodied the traditional role of women in families. In the ancient world, they might build temples to mother goddesses or fund charitable institutions, or might even be deified themselves (often as protectors of marriage and family) and in the early modern period they might provide a variety of social services. Typically, such patronage inspired dynastic loyalty and brought the royal down to the popular level. But religious patronage by royal women could be complex. In the early modern world, after the advent of the Protestant Reformation, a woman such as Elisabeth Christine might have to change her religion when she married (not always with conviction) or cope with the consequences of the difference between her personal religious preference and that her country had embraced (thus Mary Queen of Scots' difficulties with the newly Protestant Scots). Julia Domna's loyalty to the cult of Ba'al (or Elagabalus) threatened to erode her husband's loyalty to her and her sons. Her birth family served as hereditary priests of this ancient cult and it was popular in the entire Mesopotamian area. Her continuing allegiance to it could have undermined her situation, but it also helped her to retain and possibly increase loyalty to her and her sons in the eastern part of the Roman Empire.

Finally, in periods when adult males were scarce, a royal woman might herself embody the dynasty, particularly if she had also produced male heirs, but even if she had not or if they were dead. One thinks of Elizabeth I of England and Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great, the sight of whom, after the death of Alexander, inspired an entire army to change sides. Not all ruling women were as successful, *vis* the tragedy of Mary, Queen of Scots. Yet whether serving as the font of dynastic authority or playing informal roles of child-bearer, patron, or religious promoter, royal women have been central to the issue of dynastic loyalty throughout the ancient, medieval, and modern eras.

NOTES

1. Jeroen Duindam, "The Politics of Female Households: Afterthoughts," in Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben, eds. *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting Across Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 367–9; Theresa Earenfight, "Where Do We Go from Here? Some Thoughts on Women and Power in the Middle Ages," *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51 (2015): 116–18.
2. Lois L. Huneycutt, "Queenship Studies Comes of Age," *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51 (2015): 11–12; Marie A. Kelleher, "What Do We Mean by 'Women and Power'?" *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51 (2015): 105–7.
3. See, for instance, Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Queenship in Britain 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002); Emily A. Hemelrijk, *Matrona Docta: Educated Women in the Roman Elite from Cornelia to Julia Domna* (London: Routledge, 2004); Siobhan Lambert-Hurley, *Muslim Women, Reform and Princely Patronage: Nawab Sultan Jahan Begam of Bhopal* (London: Routledge, 2007); Elizabeth Muir Tyler, *England in Europe: English Royal Women and Literary Patronage, c.1000–c.1150* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2017).
4. Theresa Earenfight, *The King's Other Body: Maria of Castile and the Crown of Aragon* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009); Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, *King and Court in Ancient Persia 559–331 BCE* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 2013); David Warren Sabean, Simon Teuscher, and Jon Mathieu, eds., *Kinship in Europe: Approaches to Long-Term Development (1300–1900)* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010); Marguerite Keane, *Material Culture and Queenship in 14th-Century France: The Testament of Blanche of Navarre 1331–1398* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

5. For example, Anne Walthall (ed.) *Servants of the Dynasty: Palace Women in World History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008) is a collection that skews the other way, with non-western royal and court women dominating and, perhaps because of that, it includes no articles on ancient royal women in the west. Jeroen Duindam's *Dynasties: A Global History of Power, 1300–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) is truly global in scope and comparative, but not specifically focused on royal women.
6. For instance, Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) and Ruby Lal, *Domesticity and Power in the Early Mughal World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
7. Kenneth Holm, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982) was an early outlier. Elizabeth Carney, *Women and Monarchy* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000); Elna Solvag, *A Woman's Place is in the House: Royal Women of Judah and Their Involvement in the House of David* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003); Judith Herrin, *Unrivalled Influence: Women and Empire in Byzantium* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013); Altay Cosmkun and Alex McAuley, eds., *Seleukid Royal Women: Creation, Representation and Distortion of Hellenistic Queenship in the Seleukid Empire* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2016) all speak to a change in this situation.
8. Hildegard Temporini-Gräfin Vitzthum, ed., *Die Kaiserinnen Roms, von Livia bis Theodora* (Munich: C.H. Beck Verlag, 2002) is a chronological survey of the topic, with different sections written by different authors. Christiane Kunst and Ulrike Riemer, eds., *Grenzen der Macht: Zur Rolle der römischen Kaiserfrauen* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002) is a collection of articles, as is Anne Kolb, ed., *Augustae. Machtbewusste Frauen am römischen Kaiserhof?* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010). Francesca Cenerini, *Dive e donne. Mogli, madri, figlie e sorelle degli imperatori romani da Augusto a Commodo* (Bologna: Angelini Editore, 2009) is a survey of imperial women.
9. Lana Troy, *Patterns of Queenship in Ancient Egyptian Myth and History* (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1986) is certainly relevant, though dated, but not really a study of women in Egyptian monarchy.
10. Pauline Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1983).
11. Louise Olga Fradenburg, ed., *Women and Sovereignty* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992) and John Carmi Parsons, ed., *Medieval Queenship* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993). Though it did not appear in print until 2002, Anne J. Duggan, ed., *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 2002), had its origins in a 1995 conference.

12. Too many have appeared to list them all, but some are: Campbell Orr, *Queenship*; Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline van Gent, eds., *Gender, Power and Identity in the Early Modern House of Orange* (London: Routledge, 2016); Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly and Adam Morton, eds., *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500–1800* (London: Routledge, 2016); Murielle Gaude-Ferragu, ed., Angela Krieger, trans., *Queenship in Medieval France, 1300–1500* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).
13. Two examples: Lois L. Honeycutt, *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 2003) and Penelope Nash, *Empress Adelheid and Countess Matilda: Medieval Female Rulership and the Foundations of European Society* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).
14. Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
15. "Beyond Women and Power: Looking Backward and Moving Forward," *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51.2 (2015), edited by Kathy Krause.
16. For example, see Rolf Strootman, *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires: The Near East after the Achaemenids, c. 330 to 30 BCE* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014).
17. Christiane Wolf, "Representing Constitutional Monarchy in Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Britain, Germany, and Austria," in *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy*, ed. Laurence Cole and Daniel Unowsky (New York: Berghahn Books 2007), 199–222.
18. Alice Freifeld, "Empress Elisabeth as Hungarian Queen: The Uses of Celebrity Monarchism," in *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy*, ed. Laurence Cole and Daniel Unowsky (New York: Berghahn Books 2007), 138–61 is a good example of this phenomenon. See also Liesbeth Gevers and Mirella Marini, eds., *Dynastic Identity in Early Modern Europe: Rulers, Aristocrats and the Formation of Identities* (London: Routledge, 2016); Campbell Orr, *Queenship*; Takashi Fujitani, *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).
19. For examples, see Lisa Benz St. John, *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 33–63; John Carmi Parsons, "The Intercessionary Patronage of Queens Margaret and Isabella of France," *Thirteenth-Century England* 6 (1995): 145–56; Paul Strohm, "Queens as Intercessors," in *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 95–120.

20. See Tracy Adams, "Powerful Women and Misogynist Subplots: Some Comments on the Necessity of Checking the Primary Sources," *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51 (2015): 69–81, *passim*; Una McIlvenna, "A Stable of Whores? The 'Flying Squadron' of Catherine de Medici," in Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben, eds. *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting Across Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 179–208.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Tracy. "Powerful Women and Misogynist Subplots: Some Comments on the Necessity of Checking the Primary Sources." *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51 (2015): 69–81.
- Benz St. John, Lisa. *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Broomhall, Susan, and Jacqueline van Gent, eds. *Gender, Power and Identity in the Early Modern House of Orange*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Campbell Orr, Clarissa, ed. *Queenship in Britain 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Carney, Elizabeth. *Women and Monarchy*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000.
- Cenerini, Francesca. *Dive e donne. Mogli, madri, figlie e sorelle degli imperatori romani da Augusto a Commodo*. Bologna: Angelini Editore, 2009.
- Coşkun, Altay, and Alex McAuley, eds. *Seleukid Royal Women: Creation, Representation and Distortion of Hellenistic Queenship in the Seleukid Empire*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2016.
- Duggan, Anne J., ed. *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 2002.
- Duindam, Jeroen. "The Politics of Female Households: Afterthoughts." In *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting Across Early Modern Europe*, edited by Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben, 365–370. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . *Dynasties: A Global History of Power, 1300–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Earenfight, Theresa. *The King's Other Body: María of Castile and the Crown of Aragon*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- . *Queenship in Medieval Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- . "Where Do We Go from Here? Some Thoughts on Women and Power in the Middle Ages." *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51 (2015): 116–131.
- Fradenburg, Louise Olga, ed. *Women and Sovereignty*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.

- Freifeld, Alice. "Empress Elisabeth as Hungarian Queen: The Uses of Celebrity Monarchism." In *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy*, edited by Laurence Cole and Daniel Unowsky, 138–161. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007.
- Fujitani, Takashi. *Splendid Monarchy: Power and Pageantry in Modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Gaude-Ferragu, Murielle, ed., Krieger, Angela trans. *Queenship in Medieval France, 1300–1500*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Geevers, Liesbeth, and Mirella Marini, eds. *Dynastic Identity in Early Modern Europe: Rulers, Aristocrats and the Formation of Identities*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Hemelrijk, Emily A. *Matrona Docta: Educated Women in the Roman Elite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Herrin, Judith. *Unrivalled Influence: Women and Empire in Byzantium*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Holum, Kenneth. *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California, 1982.
- Huneycutt, Lois L. *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 2003.
- . "Queenship Studies Comes of Age." *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51 (2015): 9–16.
- Keane, Marguerite. *Material Culture and Queenship in 14th-Century France: The Testament of Blanche of Navarre 1331–1398*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Kelleher, Marie A. "What Do We Mean by 'Women and Power'?" *Medieval Feminist Forum* 51 (2015): 104–115.
- Kolb, Anne, ed. *Augustae. Machtbewusste Frauen am römischen Kaiserhof?* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
- Kunst, Christiane, and Ulrike Riemer, eds. *Grenzen der Macht: Zur Rolle der römischen Kaiserfrauen*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002.
- Lal, Ruby. *Domesticity and Power in the Early Mughal World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Lambert-Hurley, Siobhan. *Muslim Women, Reform and Princely Patronage: Nawab Sultan Jahan Begam of Bhopal*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Llewellyn-Jones, Lloyd. *King and Court in Ancient Persia 559–331 BCE*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 2013.
- McIlvenna, Una. "'A Stable of Whores? The 'Flying Squadron' of Catherine de Medici." In *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting across Early Modern Europe*, edited by Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben, 179–208. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Nash, Penelope. *Empress Adelheid and Countess Matilda: Medieval Female Rulership and the Foundations of European Society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

- Parsons, John Carmi, ed. *Medieval Queenship*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993.
- . “The Intercessionary Patronage of Queens Margaret and Isabella of France.” *Thirteenth-Century England* 6 (1995): 145–156.
- Peirce, Leslie P. *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Solvag, Elna. *A Woman’s Place is in the House: Royal Women of Judah and Their Involvement in the House of David*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- Stafford, Pauline. *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers: The King’s Wife in the Early Middle Ages*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1983.
- Strohm, Paul. *Hochon’s Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Strootman, Rolf. *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires: The Near East After the Achaemenids, c.330 to 30 BCE*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014.
- Temporini-Gräfin Vitzthum, Hildegard, ed. *Die Kaiserinnen Roms, von Livia bis Theodora*. Munich: C.H. Beck Verlag, 2002.
- Troy, Lana. *Patterns of Queenship in Ancient Egyptian Myth and History*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1986.
- Tyler, Elizabeth Muir. *England in Europe: English Royal Women and Literary Patronage, c.1000–c.1150*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.
- Walthall, Anne, ed. *Servants of the Dynasty: Palace Women in World History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- Warren Sabean, David, Simon Teuscher, and Jon Mathieu, eds. *Kinship in Europe: Approaches to Long-Term Development (1300–1900)*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- Watanabe-O’Kelly, Helen, and Adam Morton, eds. *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500–1800*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Wolf, Christiane. “Representing Constitutional Monarchy in Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Britain, Germany, and Austria.” In *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy*, edited by Laurence Cole and Daniel Unowsky, 199–222. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007.



CHAPTER 2

King's Daughters, Sisters, and Wives: Fonts and Conduits of Power and Legitimacy

Waldemar Heckel

In the ancient and medieval worlds, the status of women to whom we generally apply the term “Queen,” varies considerably and is thus difficult to assess. Did they actually rule (Queens Regnant) or were they merely the wives of kings (Queens Consort)? And, in the latter case, how much power did they wield? Similarly, the Dowager Queen (or Queen Mother) might have real or merely symbolic authority, acting in some cases as a caretaker (but virtually always in tandem with a ruling council) until the heir reached the age of majority. Some women did, indeed, rule in their own right, even if they were forced on occasions to cede some power to a consort or council. The examples I have chosen vary with place and circumstance, but the one indisputable role of the royal female in the vast majority of cases is that of font or conduit of power and legitimacy. And it is in this capacity that our understanding of the authority of the “Queen” could be described (in negative terms) as blurred or (more positively) as nuanced. A comparative study can result in an interesting, though occasionally misleading, mosaic of the “Woman as Ruler” throughout the ages, since the circumstances of the examples used vary according to cultural and religious environment and the restraints of tradition and law.

W. Heckel (✉)
University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

This comparative study considers the position of women and their symbolic value as fonts of legitimacy.¹ The perceived legitimacy of the female, based on her position in the royal bloodline, empowers her “possessor” (if that is not too strong a term): the royal or aristocratic woman gives legitimacy to the exercise of power by a husband or even a series of husbands, who are in turn supported by an aristocratic faction. She is not merely a means to power but often essential to the attainment of it; for “heiresses,” whether they are officially (and legally) recognized as such or merely the *de facto* physical links between the previous king and the rulers that follow, are the currency of the legitimization process. This, of course, explains the importance of such marriages, which are more effective if the wife is either (1) a member of the ruling house—that is, a woman who gave legitimacy to the previous and now deceased ruler—or (2) the widow of a king descended from previous rulers who, although she herself was an “outsider,” was the mother of his child or children. In the latter case, the male is initially the conduit of legitimacy but the female, by virtue of producing the heir, enhances the status of her next husband.

LEVIRATE MARRIAGE INVOLVING OUTSIDERS AND INSIDERS

Daniel Ogden applied the term levirate marriage to “that type of marriage whereby one succeeds to a dead man’s position by marrying his widow: one steps into his shoes by stepping into his bed.”² Although this term has not been adopted by many scholars, I use it here for want of a better one. Some early cases of this type of marriage are difficult to assess: for example, although Gyges married the wife of Candaules,³ we do not know the exact relationship of Candaules’s unnamed Queen to the Lydian royal house or whether she was the mother of any children by Candaules. Even in the world of Greek saga, the importance of marriage to Penelope by her unwanted suitors could have been based both on her position as Odysseus’s “widow” (since he was presumed dead) and as the mother of the rightful heir, Telemachus. Curtius (9.2.6–7; cf. Diod. 17.93.3) tells the story of the second-last ruler of the Nanda dynasty in the Gangetic region. This man was a barber, who murdered the king and then married his wife and assumed the kingship. We may have doubts about the low origins of the usurper but the practice was clearly levirate marriage.⁴ Aegisthus’s assumption of Agamemnon’s widow may qualify as levirate marriage, but in this case Aegisthus had a legitimate claim to Argos and Mycenae as the

nephew of Atreus. Another case of strengthening a hereditary claim through levirate marriage, involving Ptolemy Physcon, is described by Justin (38.8.2–3):

In Egypt, King Ptolemy had died, and an embassy was sent to the Ptolemy who was king of Cyrene to offer him the throne, along with the hand of Queen Cleopatra, his own sister. This thought alone brought joy to Ptolemy: without a struggle he had gained his brother's kingdom, for which he knew his brother's son was being groomed both by his mother, Cleopatra, and by the leading citizens, whose support he enjoyed.⁵

Ptolemy Ceraunus, the first son of Ptolemy I by his wife Eurydice but passed over for the kingship in favor of the first son by Berenice, married Lysimachus's widow, his own half-sister Arsinoë, who was the mother of three of the late king's sons—sons who were clearly marked out as heirs to the kingdom. That Ceraunus had no intention of preserving Lysimachus's bloodline became apparent only after the marriage,⁶ and the destabilization of the kingdom as a result of Corupedium and the imminent Gallic threat worked to his advantage. Only briefly, however: for it was not long before Ceraunus's head was carried aloft, impaled upon the spear-tip of one of the victorious Gauls. In an earlier period, in the 360s, the apparent marriage of Eurydice and Ptolemy of Alorus (if this marriage actually happened), may have been of the same sort—though some have attempted to see this Ptolemy as a member of the Argead house. Although he ruled briefly as regent for Perdiccas III, his assassination has left historians with no clear idea of his intentions and regal aspirations.⁷

An interesting variant on levirate marriage can be found in Teotihuacán (in the Valley of Mexico):

Cotzatzitzin married Quauhizhuitzin, daughter of Nezahualpiltzintli, and they had only two daughters, who were Amaxolotzin and Teuhzihuatzin. Amaxolotzin inherited the territory. Amaxolotzin married Xiuhlolotzin and they had a son named Manahutzin; then Amaxolotzin died, and Xiuhlolotzin married his sister-in-law Teuhzihuatzin (*luego murió Amaxolotzin, y tomó a casar Xiuhlolotzin con su cuñada Teuhzihuatzin*)....⁸

In this case, rather than securing power by marrying a king's widow, the existing "ruler" felt it necessary to legitimize his position by marrying his dead wife's sister. The transmission of legitimacy could not be more clear. Manahutzin, the son by the first queen, was recognized as the legitimate heir, and ruled upon his father's death.

HEREDITY, ELECTION AND LEVIRATE MARRIAGE

A curious situation confronted the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the 1180s, where the combination of hereditary and elective rulership clashed with the rights of the *porphyrogenitus*. An individual described as *porphyrogenitus* (“born in the purple”) was a child born when the father was already established in the kingship. Herodotus (7.3) tells the story of the Spartan exile Demaratus, who persuaded Xerxes, at the time of Darius I’s death, that his was the better claim to the kingship, because

...by the time he had been born Darius had succeeded to the kingdom and was the supreme commander of Persia, whereas at the time of Artobazanes’ birth Darius was still a private citizen; and he should argue that it would therefore be neither right nor proper for preference to be given to anyone except him. Even in Sparta, Demaratus assured him, it was customary for the kingdom to pass to the younger son in cases where the elder sons were born before their father became king but the younger son was born after his accession.⁹

This argument was often used, with and without success, but in the case of those who championed the claims of Sibylla and Isabella—for, indeed, it is fair to say that the interests of faction superseded those of the “rivals” themselves—a complicated set of circumstances clouded the legality of the process. Amalric, the son of Fulk of Anjou and Melisende (eldest daughter of Baldwin II),¹⁰ had married Agnes of Courtenay in 1157, when he was a private citizen and his brother Baldwin III was king of Jerusalem. Baldwin was young and it was expected that he would produce heirs with his wife Theodora. But he died prematurely, leaving his brother as the obvious next in line to the throne. In order to succeed his brother, Amalric was required by the lords of the Kingdom to divorce Agnes.¹¹ The children of this marriage, Sibylla and Baldwin (the Leper), were nevertheless recognized as legitimate. Amalric married Maria Comnena, of the Byzantine royal family, in 1167. Their daughter, Isabella (born c.1171), was thus born “in the purple,” but an attempt in 1186 to place her on the throne (to rule with her husband, Humphrey IV of Toron) in preference to Sibylla and Guy of Lusignan, failed in part on account of Humphrey’s perfidy and loss of nerve.¹² Sibylla’s position was, however, complicated by the fact that, upon the death of her brother, she was Dowager Queen on the basis of the elevation of her son, Baldwin V, to the kingship. In this situation, her husband, Guy, who was not the king’s father, could not be,

and was not, regarded as king. The failure of Baldwin IV to produce an heir, combined with the fact that Sibylla was the legitimate (or legitimized) daughter of Amalric, gave legitimacy to Baldwin V. The child's death made Sibylla's status unclear. She had never been Queen (Regnant or Consort), since up to this point the kings had been her brother and her son respectively. Hence, strictly speaking, Guy's power was not based on levirate marriage. The dominant faction in Jerusalem—significantly, in the absence of their rivals, who were barred from the city—chose to recognize her as Queen and to accept Guy as their king.¹³ The excluded faction sought in turn to challenge Sibylla's legitimacy on the grounds that, although she had been legitimized after the divorce of her parents, she had been born before her father acceded to the throne.¹⁴ Her half-sister, Isabella, was thus touted as the rightful heiress as the child of "King" Amalric; there were no sons born to Amalric and Maria Comnena. Faction and the military needs of the kingdom sustained Sibylla and Guy until the events that followed the disaster at Hattin in 1187.

Conrad of Montferrat's marriage to Isabella was not by levirate (since the princess had not been married to the previous ruler) but in 1192, upon Conrad's death, Henry of Champagne married her and became (nominally, but not officially) king.¹⁵ It was only her fourth husband, Amalric of Lusignan, who took the title of King of Jerusalem. Isabella's role in the dynastic politics of the kingdom became necessary (and desirable) when her half-sister Sibylla died in 1190, having been predeceased by all of her children. Sibylla's unpopular husband found himself without an "anchor wife" and was thus ousted by his enemies, who pledged their allegiance to the successive husbands of Isabella.

A VARIANT ON LATERAL SUCCESSION. KING'S DAUGHTERS AND SISTER'S SONS

An instructive case of succession through a female who was not herself empowered by the process comes from the family of William the Conqueror, who during his lifetime recognized Robert Curthose as Duke of Normandy and earmarked William Rufus for the throne of England (1087). Upon the death of William Rufus, the kingdom was seized by Henry I, his youngest brother, who happened to be on the spot. Challenged by Robert, Henry defeated him and kept him in captivity for the rest of his life. And it is here we return to the critical role of the female as the conduit of power and yet a clear indication that the actual exercise of such power by a woman was not palatable and thus avoided.

Henry I married Edith-Matilda, daughter of King Malcolm of Scotland. She had the “political advantage” of being able to trace her descent back to the first Anglo-Saxon king, Cerdic, and was thus an Aetheling (a member of the ruling nobility). Ethnic claims could also contribute to legitimacy; certainly wives and their children were sometimes rejected on ethnic grounds.¹⁶ The children of Henry I and Edith-Matilda were a daughter named Matilda (best known as the “Empress” on account of her relatively brief marriage to the German king and Holy Roman Emperor, Henry V) and a son William, who was the designated heir and known by the epithet Aetheling or Adelin. As it turned out, in late 1120, William Adelin, who had already received the homage of the nobles of Normandy, died in the so-called White Ship disaster, along with many high-born individuals. Five years later the Emperor died and Matilda returned to her father’s realm. By 1128, she was married once more, this time to Geoffrey of Anjou (son of Fulk, who was now on the verge of marrying Melisende, the heiress to the Kingdom of Jerusalem). Matilda had been recognized in the previous year by Henry I and his nobles as heiress to the Kingdom of England. But promise and practice did not go hand-in-hand, particularly when one party to the agreement was no longer present. Upon the death of Henry I, his nephew, Stephen (son of Henry’s sister Adela and the disgraced Crusader, Stephen of Blois), engineered his own coronation. He was after all, Henry’s favorite nephew and, like Matilda, one of the grandchildren of William the Conqueror. Stephen had the further advantage of having his own brother, another Henry, the Bishop of Winchester, perform the coronation.¹⁷

Now this was all done despite the advantages of Matilda: she had the sworn oaths of Henry’s vassals that they would support her claim to the crown; she was in the direct line of descent; as a daughter of Edith-Matilda, she brought the Anglo-Saxon and Norman royal houses together; she had experience as a queen consort in Germany (indeed, she continued for the rest of her life to style herself *imperatrix*); and she had powerful relatives (albeit bastards) in the west of England. But her disadvantages became evident: the support that the nobles had given Henry I, they withheld from Matilda upon her father’s death; they clearly preferred the son of the Conqueror’s daughter to the daughter of William’s son. And it was probably no small factor that Matilda was married to the Count of Anjou and the Angevins were gaining power at the expense of the Normans, both in Europe and in the Holy Land.¹⁸ Although Geoffrey of Anjou was content to direct his energies toward Normandy, and there was no talk of Geoffrey

as King of England, it quickly became clear that Matilda's chief drawback was her sex. Even with considerable support in England, and the capture and imprisonment of Stephen, Matilda could make no headway. St Bernard, after the death of Matilda's father-in-law, was to tell his widow, Melisende of Jerusalem: "show the man in the woman; order all things ... so that those who see you will judge your works to be those of a king rather than a queen."¹⁹ But the advice was futile, and perhaps even misguided. The author of the *Gesta Stephani* regarded Matilda's actions in England as abandoning "the modest gait and bearing proper to the gentle sex." And yet Stephen's wife, Matilda (of Boulogne), was praised for being a steadfast queen consort and for working for the release of her husband.²⁰ Women were thus prized as transmitters of legitimacy and power but not welcomed when they sought to exercise the latter. When the whole fiasco came to a negotiated conclusion, Matilda's importance as a conduit was again recognized. She would not be Queen of England, but she would be the Queen Mother when her son Henry II succeeded Stephen. It was, as they say, "all in the family," but the path of succession followed the female bloodline.

Three epitaphs of women spanning more than sixteen hundred years may serve as a suitable conclusion to this discussion.

ἀνδρὸς ἀριστεύσαντος ἐν Ἑλλάδι τῶν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ
Ἰππίου Ἀρχεδίκην ἥδε κέκευθε κόνις,
ἦ πατρός τε καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀδελφῶν τ' οὕσα τυράννων
παίδων τ' οὐκ ἤρθη νοῦν ἐς ἀτασθαλίην.

Under this earth lies the daughter of Hippias, who was the greatest
Man of his time in Greece. Her name is Archedice.
Though her father, her husband, her brothers, her sons were all tyrants,
Her own mind stayed firm, free of presumptuous pride
(Thuc. 6.59)²¹

τῆς δὲ πατὴρ καὶ ἀνὴρ καὶ παῖς βασιλεῖς, καὶ ἀδελφοί,
καὶ πρόγονοι. κλήζει δ' Ἑλλὰς Ὀλυμπιάδα.

Her father, her husband, her son, and her brothers were kings,
As were her forefathers. Greece calls her Olympias.
(Plut. *Mor.* 747f-748a)

*Ortu magna, viro major, sed maxima partu
Hic jacet Henrici filia, sponsa, parens.*

Great by birth, greater by marriage, but greatest by motherhood,
Here lies the daughter, bride, and mother of Henry.

NOTES

1. Abbreviations of ancient authors, works, and collections of documents are those used by the Oxford Classical Dictionary; abbreviations of journals are those found in *L'Année Philologique*, available at http://www.annee-philologique.com/files/sigles_fr.pdf. The daughter of Pippin I, Begga, married Ansegisus son of Arnulf but the descendants were known as Pippinids. “This choice of names—one of the indicators that we have of collective identity—would seem to suggest that, until the late eighth century, the family thought of itself primarily as Pippinid, and thus by implication as descended through Begga, rather than Arnulfing and descended through Ansegisus” (Ian Wood, “Genealogy Defined by Women: The Case of the Pippinids,” in *Gender in the Medieval World. East and West, 300–900*, ed. Leslie Brubaker and Julia M.H. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 238. One of their sons was Pippin II. But this reflects the relative importance of the bride’s family as compared with that of the husband. It is common when such an imbalance occurs that the sons are named for the maternal grandfather. The role of the daughter is also to support her father’s interests and those of his family. This is surely the point of the decision of Xolotzin, the king of the Chichimecs, to give Teotihuacán to his sister, Tomeyauhtzin, whom he married to a local noble. Karen E. Bell, “Ancient Queens in the Valley of Mexico,” in *Ancient Queens. Archaeological Explorations*, ed. Sarah M. Nelson (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2003), 141) misses an important point when she calls this “a brother’s act of good will or affection, or both, [which] made his sister queen.” Similarly, Antiochus III married his daughter Cleopatra to the young Ptolemy V Epiphanes. Their son, perhaps tellingly, took the epithet *Philometor*. The subsequent prevalence of the name Cleopatra in the Ptolemaic royal house is also significant (in general, see John Whitehorne, *Cleopatras* (London: Routledge, 1994); for the propaganda and power as it relates to Ptolemaic women see Richard A. Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 101–59. Philip II chose to marry his daughter Cynnane to Amyntas IV, whom many considered the rightful heir to the Argead throne. In terms of dynastic stability, Philip gained more than Amyntas from this union. E.D. Carney (*Women and Monarchy in Macedonia* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000), 70) takes a less sinister view of Philip’s intentions (cf. Daniel Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death. The Hellenistic Dynasties* (London: Duckworth, 1999), 26). Cleopatra I and Cynnane, although they may have represented the interests of their respective fathers, were less inclined to support their brothers.
2. Ogden, *Polygamy*, xix.
3. Herodotus 1.11–12. W.W. How, *A Commentary on Herodotus*. Vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912), 59: “It is quite in accordance

with Eastern usage that the usurper should take the wife of his predecessor." But a usurper's position must be considered different from that of a successor who had the benefit of "election" (or at least support) by the power elite. See also Ogden *Polygamy*, 4. By contrast, Gonzalo Pizarro could have legitimized his position in his rebellion against the viceroy of Peru by marrying the Coya (the Inca heiress) but refused to do so because, by doing so, he would have become the champion of the oppressed natives at a time when the main cause of rebellion was the crown's insistence upon suppressing the rights of the conquistadors to exploit the Indian population.

4. Discussion in W. Heckel, *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander's Empire* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 271 s.v. "Xandrames." Even Alexander the Great, following the example of Darius I, strengthened the legitimacy of his rule by marrying women of the Achaemenid royal house—though in both cases the women were daughters rather than widows.
5. J.C. Yardley (trans.), *Justin, Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994), 243.
6. Justin 24.2; cf. Justin 38.8.3–4 for similar action by Physcon.
7. Ogden, *Polygamy*, 14–16; Carney, *Women*, 42–4; cf. Kate Mortenson "Eurydice: Demonic or Devoted Mother?" *Ancient History Bulletin* 6 (1992): 155–69.
8. Bell, "Ancient Queens," 140, from the manuscript "Los primeros Señores de Teotihuacán, y sus comarcas son los que siguen." For the importance of the female in Tenochtitlán (i.e. among the Aztecs) as "the transit through which rulership passed" see Susan D. Gillespie, *The Aztec Kings. The Construction of Rulership in Mexican History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1989), 98.
9. Herodotus, Robin Waterfield (trans.), *The Histories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); W.W. How, and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*. Vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912). How and Wells, *Commentary*, 2.125 observe: "Nothing is known otherwise of this alleged Spartan custom. ... The true reason doubtless was *the influence of Atossa ... as daughter of Cyrus and chief wife of Darius*" [emphasis added].
10. On Melisende see Hans Eberhard Mayer, "Studies in the History of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972): 93–183.
11. The marriage was pronounced illegitimate on grounds of consanguinity, though clearly the motive for annulling the marriage appears to have been to deprive the Courtenays (recently ousted from Edessa) of power in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. But see Bernard Hamilton, *The Leper King and His Heirs. Baldwin IV and the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 23–7.

12. See Hamilton, *Leper King*, 194–5, for the situation in 1183.
13. See Peter W. Edbury, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade. Sources in Translation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 154–5, from the Lyon *Eracles*.
14. Whether the claim that she was illegitimate was made at the time of her accession or later is unclear, although Mayer (“Melisende,” 100–2) writes: “She had been born from an illicit union and had been expressly legitimized by the church but from 1183 at the latest doubts were being expressed about this. The debate was a delicate one because what applied to her applied equally to her brother on the throne.” William of Tyre, writing before the succession crisis of 1186, states unequivocally that Sibylla was declared legitimate, but the Old French *Continuation of William of Tyre*, which favored the claims of Conrad of Montferrat who contrived to marry Isabella remarks that Baldwin IV “knew that Guy of Lusignan would not be suitable to govern or sustain the kingdom and *that his sister did not have any right to it (for when her mother separated from her father the children were not declared legitimate)*” (Edbury, *Conquest*, 14, emphasis added). At any rate, there was at the same time a suggestion that Raymond III of Tripoli was the legitimate heir (*plus dreit heir aparant*) since his mother was allegedly born when Baldwin II became king. According to Jonathan Riley-Smith (*The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem 1174–1277* (London: Anchor Books, 1973), 10), “a Genoese annalist ... wrote that he [sc. Raymond of Tripoli] claimed to represent a more legitimate line of the royal house of Jerusalem than did the holders of the crown, because his mother, Hodierna, had been born while her father, King Baldwin II, was ruling over Jerusalem and therefore had a better right than her sister Melisende, Baldwin IV’s grandmother, who had been born while Baldwin II was still Count of Edessa: an argument that was historically erroneous but was based on the concept of the *porphyrogenitus* and very similar to what we shall see proposed on behalf of Isabella of Jerusalem in 1183.” A similar attempt to delegitimize the claims of the Empress Matilda involved the rumor that her parents had not been legally married See Helen Castor, *She-Wolves. The Women who Ruled England Before Elizabeth* (New York: Harper Collins, 2012), 86.
15. Conrad had the support of King Philip of France, while Richard I favored Guy. But Conrad was also the brother of Sibylla’s first husband, William Longsword, and thus the uncle of Baldwin V.
16. Attalus’s remark about “legitimate heirs” (Ath. 13.557d–e; Plut. *Alex.* 9.7–8) may have implied that Alexander the Great was a “bastard” on account of his mother’s Epirote origins.
17. On Matilda and King Stephen see Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991) and, for broader issues, Marjorie Chibnall, “England and Normandy,

- 1042–1137,” in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 4, ed. David Luscomb and Jonathan Riley-Smith, 191–216 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). See also the popular but scholarly account of Castor, *She Wolves*, 39–127. On Robert Curthose, see Charles Wendell David, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920); William Robert Aird, *Robert Curthose. Duke of Normandy (c.1050–1134)* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008). On William Rufus, see Frank Barlow, *William Rufus* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000) and on Henry I, see C. Warren Hollister, *Henry I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).
18. See Hans Eberhard Mayer, “Angevins Versus Normans: The New Men of King Fulk in Jerusalem,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 133 (1989): 1–25.
 19. Cited by Chibnall, *Matilda*, 97, with n.28.
 20. Stephen’s wife is described as “forgetting the weakness of her sex and a woman’s softness, she bore herself with the valour of a man” (*Gesta Stephani*, cited by Castor, *She Wolves*, 106).
 21. Translations: Thucydides, Martin Hammond (trans.). *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); my own translation of Plutarch and the Matilda epitaph; see Chibnall, *Matilda*, 191 for other versions of the text.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aird, William M. *Robert Curthose. Duke of Normandy (c.1050–1134)*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008.
- Barlow, Frank. *William Rufus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Bell, Karen E. “Ancient Queens in the Valley of Mexico.” In *Ancient Queens. Archaeological Explorations*. Edited by Sarah M. Nelson, 137–149. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2003.
- Budin, S.L., and Turfa, J.M. (eds.). *Women in Antiquity: Real Women Across the Ancient World*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Carney, E.D. *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000.
- . *Arsinoë II of Egypt and Macedon: A Royal Life*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Castor, Helen. *She-Wolves. The Women who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*. New York: Harper Collins, 2012.
- Chibnall, Marjorie. *The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- . “England and Normandy, 1042–1137.” In *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 4. Edited by David Luscomb and Jonathan Riley-Smith, 191–216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- David, Charles Wendell. *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Edbury, Peter W. *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade. Sources in Translation*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.
- Gillespie, Susan D. *The Aztec Kings. The Construction of Rulership in Mexican History*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1989.
- Hamilton, Bernard. *The Leper King and His Heirs. Baldwin IV and the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hazard, Richard A. *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.
- Heckel, W. *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander's Empire*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- Herodotus, Robin Waterfield (trans.). *The Histories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Hollister, C. Warren. *Henry I*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Howe, W.W., and J. Wells. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. 2 Vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912.
- Luscombe, David, and Jonathan Riley-Smith (eds.). *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Mayer, Hans Eberhard. "Studies in the History of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972): 93–183.
- . "Angevins Versus Normans: The New Men of King Fulk in Jerusalem." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 133 (1989): 1–25.
- . "The Latin East, 1098–1205." In *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 4. Edited by David Luscomb and Jonathan Riley-Smith, 644–674. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Mortenson, Kate. "Eurydice: Demonic or Devoted Mother?" *Ancient History Bulletin* 6 (1992): 155–169.
- Nelson, Sarah M. (ed.). *Ancient Queens. Archaeological Explorations*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2003.
- Ogden, D. *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death. The Hellenistic Dynasties*. London: Duckworth, 1999.
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem 1174–1277*. London: Anchor Books, 1973.
- Thucydides, Martin Hammond (trans.). *The Peloponnesian War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Whitehorne, John. *Cleopatra*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Wood, Ian. "Genealogy Defined by Women: The Case of the Pippinids." In *Gender in the Medieval World. East and West, 300–900*. Edited by Leslie Brubaker and Julia M.H. Smith, 234–256. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Yardley, J.C. (trans.). *Justin, Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994.



From Family to Politics: Queen Apollonis as Agent of Dynastic/Political Loyalty

Dolores Mirón

The Hellenistic rulers of Pergamon, the Attalids, were renowned for family harmony and loyalty, and they cultivated a dynastic image of themselves as benefactors and protectors of cities.¹ Although other royal dynasties also sought to gain the favor of Greek cities,² and vaunted their families' virtues (authentic or not) as part of their virtues for the government,³ they did not do so in the same degree as the Attalids, who put these qualities at the very core of royal ideology, with features more related to the world of the *polis* than to that of monarchy.⁴

In this dynastic image, Queen Apollonis, wife of Attalus I, and mother of Eumenes II and Attalus II, played a central role. Literary and epigraphic sources presented her as an ideal woman according to traditional Greek values and praised her religious devotion and her virtues as a wife and mother.⁵ She was also honored by Greek cities, within or outside the kingdom.⁶ Modern historians have tended to treat her as a passive figure,

This paper is part of the background studies of the project “Género y arquitectura en la sociedad romana Antigua: matronazgo cívico en las provincias occidentales” (I+D FEM2014-53423-P), financed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness.

D. Mirón (✉)
University of Granada, Granada, Spain

used by her sons Eumenes and Attalus to highlight their own family virtues as mother-loving sons and loyal brothers.⁷ This was certainly an essential part of their self-representation, but, as we will see, Apollonis herself also participated in the construction of the dynastic image, and played an active role in promoting and maintaining bonds of friendship, gratitude, and loyalty between the monarchy and other political and social entities.

In her time, there were some precedents of queens with prominence in the public realm, but the public image and role of the Hellenistic *basilissa* (royal woman) were never really unified and completely consolidated.⁸ The development of a dynastic sentiment in Hellenistic monarchies was certainly tied to a reinforcement of the social status and public visibility of the queen.⁹ The Attalids' emphasis on family values, an emphasis that necessarily included both male and female members, must have contributed to Apollonis's central position in dynastic self-representation,¹⁰ but this is not the whole explanation.

Apollonis was the mother of four male children (Eumenes, Attalus, Philetaerus, and Athenaeus), a fact that not only guaranteed the dynastic continuity,¹¹ but surely also gave her prestige as a woman and a familial authority, prestige that could be transferred to the public realm. Public and private are intertwined in royal families, as they are "private" institutions within which the political system is reproduced. Much of what happens in a royal family, even if it does not have public visibility, has political relevance, starting with the very fact of giving birth and raising political leaders. Undoubtedly, Apollonis's prolific maternity was an important value for a dynasty that claimed to be a model of family virtues, but ancient information also points to her "domestic" authority. Her role as educator of her children was publicly celebrated,¹² and her influence on them could have been high, given that they were young when their father died.¹³ Moreover, for many years, including most of her long widowhood,¹⁴ Apollonis was the only woman of authority in the royal family.¹⁵

Ancient sources stress her role as a family-unifying force. A decree from Hierapolis (*OGIS* 308) emphasizes her harmonious relations with her husband, sons, and daughter-in-law. Polybius (22.20.3) praises her in similar terms, and states that she cherished her four sons with the most perfect kindness and affection up to her death. Plutarch (*Mor.* 480CD) says that "she always congratulated herself and gave thanks to the gods, not because

of wealth or empire,” but because of the harmony and loyalty shared among her sons. Moreover, the iconographic program of the Great Altar at Pergamon celebrates the dynasty and the queen mother.¹⁶ Although it is difficult to discern to what extent it was simply a constructed image, it was more likely based on reality, and Apollonis may well have been the main agent of harmony and loyalty within her family.

Unlike most Hellenistic queens, Apollonis had no royal blood, but was a plebeian (*demotes*) from the independent city of Cyzicus, in the Propontis (Polyb. 22.20.1–2). This does not mean that her marriage had no political connotations.¹⁷ When Attalus I married (*ca.* 223 BC),¹⁸ he had recently assumed the title of *basileus* (king), the first ruler in his dynasty to do so, was involved in a process of expansion of territory, and was trying to gain support from the *poleis* of Asia Minor. The image of a king marrying a citizen had the potential to affect positively his relations with Greek cities,¹⁹ especially *a posteriori*. But Attalus’s motives at that moment were likely more specific and direct: an alliance with Cyzicus through his union with a woman of the citizen elite.²⁰ Cyzicus was a wealthy and powerful city, in a strategic location,²¹ and this alliance, apart from facilitating his trade in the Black Sea region, supported his struggles against other powers (such as Macedonia, Bithynia, or Pontus), the invading Gauls and the threatening Seleucids, as the conflict with Achaeus was about to begin.²² In fact, friendship with Cyzicus had been sought by the Attalids ever since Pergamon became an independent power.²³ Cyzicus later served as an ally in the wars of the Attalids, such as those between Eumenes II and Pharnaces I of Pontus or between Attalus II and Prusias II of Bithynia (Polyb. 25.2.13; 33.13.1). Thus, the marriage of Attalus I and Apollonis would have helped to strengthen friendship bonds between the two powers, and likely, at the moment it was contracted, to establish a war alliance.²⁴

Beyond the mere fact of her marriage, Apollonis likely exercised some agency of her own in the relations between Cyzicus and Pergamon. In this regard, the presence of individual Cyzicenes at the court of Pergamon, some of them outstanding figures in the political and cultural realms, signifies.²⁵ So does the settlement of new marriage alliances, as in the case of the Pergamene Sosander, *syntrophos* (“brought up together”)²⁶ of Attalus II, who married a daughter of Apollonis’s nephew, Athenaeus of Cyzicus.²⁷ The Queen may well have been directly involved in attracting compatriots to court, in the relations between Cyzicus and Pergamon in general, and especially in new marriage bonds with her family. Personal bonds of friendship (*philia*), involving both men and women, were a major element in

Hellenistic diplomacy, particularly those between notables of the cities and members of the royal courts,²⁸ since they articulated bonds of friendship and loyalty between cities and monarchies. Also, bonds of kinship, mythical or real, played an active role in Greek diplomacy, since they generated the sentiment of belonging to the same family/community.²⁹

Apollonis went back to her homeland at least once (Polyb. 22.20.4–8; *Suda*, s.v. “Apollonias”). Polybius tells us that she toured the temples and the city, accompanied by her sons, who placed her between them and took both her hands, displaying gratitude and respect to their mother. This display of affection was applauded by the spectators, who recalled the story of the brothers Cleobis and Biton helping their mother to reach the temple of Hera (see Hdt. 1.31). In addition to viewing an attractive image of mother-loving sons, the people of Cyzicus would have been pleased to see how one of their most illustrious fellow citizens was treated. Apollonis’s wish to tour the city also could reveal a nostalgia for her homeland that linked the Cyzicenes emotionally to the rulers of Pergamon.

The specific motives of Apollonis’s visit to Cyzicus are unknown, but certainly it had a high symbolic significance in the relations between the city and the Attalids. Polybius says that the visit occurred after the peace signed by Eumenes II and Prusias I of Bithynia (183 BC), concluding a war that was likely fought in the regions neighboring to Cyzicus and in which this city could have been an ally of Pergamon.³⁰ Thus, the royal visit, probably occurring in the context of the victory celebrations, served as a gesture of esteem for a loyal and close ally. The visit also deepened their bonds of friendship and loyalty, especially at the time of the onset of a new war, this one against Pharnaces of Pontus.

After Apollonis’s death and deification, her sons built her a temple at Cyzicus. Its decorations are known from the epigrams collected in the third book of the *Palatine Anthology*.³¹ The decorations consisted of different mythological scenes relating to the theme of son–mother and brotherly love, among them the above-mentioned story of Cleobis and Biton. This direct evocation of the royal visit served to fix in the collective memory of the Cyzicenes their links with the Attalids through Apollonis.³² Thus, her temple at Cyzicus was a place of memory of the queen mother, as well as an affirmation of loyal relations both within the royal family and between Cyzicus and Pergamon. The expression of these ideas through an architectural monument commemorated the importance they had for the Attalids, and of their intention for these relations to last through the generations. One should recall that these bonds of friendship were also bonds

of kinship, so that political loyalty between Cyzicus and the Attalids also constituted dynastic loyalty.

Beyond this, the orderly and complex iconographic program of the temple, which included myths from around the Greek world, seemed to connect the free Greek cities with the monarchy of Pergamon, embodied by the mother.³³ In this sense, Apollonis not only linked the Attalids with Cyzicus, but also, through mythic and real kinships, with all the Greek cities, especially Ionian ones, since Cyzicus was as a colony of Miletus.³⁴

Another Ionian city, Teos, was also visited by Apollonis. Unlike Cyzicus, the relations of Teos with the Attalids fluctuated and sometimes conflicted. Like other cities of Asia Minor, in 218 BC Teos had to ally with Attalus I, under conditions that included the delivery of hostages and the payment of tribute.³⁵ In 204/3 BC, the city was liberated from the Pergamene power and the tribute by the Seleucid King Antiochus III, who declared Teos sacred, inviolable and free.³⁶ After having been an ally of Antiochus III in his war against Eumenes II and Rome, in 188 BC Teos, under the treaty of Apamea, was included in the kingdom of Pergamon.³⁷

Teos bestowed divine honors upon Apollonis after her death: priest-hoods were established (a priest of Aphrodite and Thea Apollonis Eusebes and a priestess of goddess Apollonis and Queen Stratonice); and a festival was founded involving the entire city, its civic and religious officers, and the performance of choruses of boys and girls.³⁸ Thus, these cults and the festival were an expression both of city cohesion and of loyalty to the Attalid dynasty, centered on the figures of the queens, especially Apollonis, now a divine patroness of marriage and community, of the royal family, and of the relations between city and monarchy.³⁹

In addition, Teos built a monument (probably an altar, as an annual sacrifice was stipulated) to Thea Apollonis Eusebes Apobateria “in the most conspicuous place” of an area that was likely the agora. Apobateria (“who disembarks”) was an epithet of divinities who were protectors of sailing,⁴⁰ and recalls the association of Apollonis with Aphrodite,⁴¹ but it also resembles similar epithets alluding to royal and imperial visits, and connected to royal and imperial cult.⁴² For example, when Demetrius Poliorcetes restored democracy in Athens, he was honored with an altar of Demetrius Cataibates, set up in the spot where he first descended from his chariot.⁴³ Thus, Apobateria likely alluded to a visit of Apollonis to Teos. On the specific circumstances of the visit we have no information, but probably it was related to the influential cults of Dionysus at Teos and their association with Attalid royal cult.⁴⁴ Apollonis, who was renowned for her piety,

could have played a significant role, possibly through religious gestures, in the creation of relationships of friendship and loyalty between royal power and Teos. As these relations were difficult and fragile, perhaps they needed the mediation of a kindly power, one less threatening than the King and his army. The commemoration of the visit through a monument expressed, at least at that time, the Teians' will to maintain lasting loyal relations with the Attalids, under the protection of the queen mother, who became part of the city's collective memory through the creation of religious institutions (priesthoods, festival, and altar).

Some years before, the Teians had honored Laodice, Antiochus III's wife,⁴⁵ and built a fountain-house named after her to express "gratitude in the present" and "create memory for the rest of time," and to be placed in a central place of the agora.⁴⁶ The honors of Laodice and Apollonis resemble each other⁴⁷ and it is possible that both queens acted similarly in regard to Teos. One can surmise a diplomatic/beneficent action on the part of each since this kind of agency was not unusual for a Hellenistic queen.⁴⁸ Although Antiochos presented Laodice as pious and a loving wife,⁴⁹ her image as a mother was not as central to royal self-representation as in the case of Apollonis.⁵⁰ Instead, Laodice intervened directly in the relationship between monarchy and cities: she received embassies, corresponded with citizen authorities, and made benefactions.⁵¹ She could have visited Teos along with her husband when he liberated the city: a Teian decree honoring the royal couple mentions her benefactions (*euergesia*).⁵² A fragmentary letter she sent to Teos⁵³ has similar language to that she addressed to the city of Iassos, communicating the creation of a foundation to provide dowries for poor women. She declared she intended this *euergesía* to be gratefully remembered by the beneficiaries and to generate goodwill towards their benefactor, who in turn would be encouraged to give new benefactions.⁵⁴ These are, on the other hand, the usual terms of the so-called "language of euergetism" in the Hellenistic period.⁵⁵

The correspondence between Eumenes II and a Carian city (probably Iasos) may indicate that Apollonis was also known as benefactress of cities (*Iasos* 6. *RC* 49). The King requested panhellenic recognition of the Pergamene festival of Athena Nicephoros, and he was explicitly identified in the city's reply to his request as "son of King Attalus and Queen Apollonis." The mention of filiation was infrequent in terms of an Attalid King, especially a reference to that of his mother, and we must infer that this exception had significance. Immediately afterwards, Eumenes is called "friend (*philos*), well-wisher (*eunous*) and benefactor (*euergetes*) of the people, like his

parents (*progonoi*),” so that Apollonis seems to share these attitudes. She may have made previous gestures of goodwill towards the city, an action that would have reinforced the request for the Pergamene festival. Apollonis seems to be occupying a similar place to Laodice regarding the relationship between monarchy and cities,⁵⁶ although the specifics of their actions could have differed.

Apollonis demonstrated her *energesia* in Pergamon, where she undertook the enlargement and remodeling of the sanctuary of Demeter.⁵⁷ As stated in her dedicatory inscription from the *propylon* (where she identified herself as *basilissa* without mentioning relatives), she dedicated the sanctuary “as a thanksgiving” to Demeter and Kore Thesmophoroi.⁵⁸ Given the character of these goddesses, this thanksgiving undoubtedly referred to Apollonis’s own motherhood. Being the mother of four male children, she celebrated, thus, her success both as a mother and as a queen, facilitating the continuity of the family on the throne. In fact, the entire sanctuary was a place of dynastic celebration through women. The temple and the altar of Demeter were erected by Philetaerus and his brother Eumenes on behalf of their mother, Boas,⁵⁹ and the *demos* (people) of Pergamon dedicated there a statue of Queen Stratonice,⁶⁰ who was often associated with Apollonis.⁶¹ Also, other non-royal women were honored publicly or privately in the sanctuary, the honors often celebrating their virtues as wives and mothers.⁶² Thus, the sanctuary became a place of collective and dynastic memory through women, portraying the dynasty as a harmonious loyal unit, its female members in solidarity with the other women and the entire community.

Although the sanctuary hosted various cultic activities, both individual and collective, in the Hellenistic period it was basically a *thesmophorion*.⁶³ The Thesmophoria was the most widespread female festival of the Greek world, and aimed to stimulate agrarian fertility and maternity, essential elements for the survival and continuation of the city. By her intervention, Apollonis benefited the whole community since she intended to attract divine favor for common prosperity and also increased the prestige of the city through architectural monumentalization. More particularly, she benefited women, as she provided them with a more comfortable and appropriate ritual space, favored their active participation in civic life, and stressed the significance of their cults by increasing the architectural prestige of the sanctuary. At the same time, she promoted traditional gender roles.⁶⁴ In this way, royal power created and strengthened the bonds of gratitude and loyalty between the dynasty and the community,

through the queens and the women of the benefited collective, by recognizing the significance of women in the construction of the city and its power relations.

The continuance of the city was thus connected to the continuance of monarchy, the harmonious exercise of dynastic power to gender order, and the joint action of the members of the royal family to solidarity between citizens and royal power. These ideas were also expressed through architecture. Apollonis's buildings fit to the paradigms of the so-called "Pergamene architectural style" that defined the monumental identity of the city,⁶⁵ and are harmoniously integrated in the urbanism created by the Attalids. Apollonis's intervention has been traditionally dated to the reign of Eumenes II, but recent research has proposed an earlier date, in the late third century,⁶⁶ making it prior to the great urban interventions of her sons. Therefore, Apollonis may have been participating, from an early date, in the creation of the architectural image of the city and the dynasty, as well as in the construction of her own image and memory.

In any case, Apollonis's intervention in the sanctuary of Demeter demonstrates her authority within the dynasty and her capacity for agency. Her authority and agency were likely also applied and recognized in the relationship between monarchy and cities. Actually, her actions can be understood as political acts, broadening the category of political action beyond the simple exercise of an office, even if these acts did not themselves exceed gender norms.⁶⁷ Her activity in the sanctuary of Demeter had clear political connotations, not only because it celebrated the dynasty and, thus, the political system of power, but also because, probably, it positively affected the consolidation of feelings of gratitude and loyalty from the people towards monarchy. The same assessment must be applied to her possible benefactions to other cities. As for her visits to cities, they were themselves diplomatic acts, regardless of Apollonis's specific activities in their course, but it would be too simplistic to think that she was there just to be exhibited. Her inclusion in royal visits also reasserted the equation of monarchy with the power of a family, so that the bonds of political loyalty promoted by them were essentially bonds of loyalty to a family.⁶⁸ Thus, Apollonis was an active (and undoubtedly conscious) part of the Attalid power apparatus, acting as agent of dynastic/political loyalty.

NOTES

1. Abbreviations of ancient authors, works, and collections of documents are those used by the Oxford Classical Dictionary; abbreviations of journals are those found in *L'Année Philologique*, available at http://www.annee-philologique.com/files/sigles_fr.pdf. This is, at least, the way they represented themselves, and were portrayed by ancient literature (mainly Roman or pro-Roman); the Attalids had in general good relations with Rome. On the image of the Attalids, see Erich Gruen, "Culture as Policy. The Attalids of Pergamon," in *From Pergamon to Sperlonga*, ed. N.T. de Grummond and B.S. Ridgway (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 17–31; Elizabeth Kosmetatou, "The Attalids of Pergamon," in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ed. Andrew Erskine (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 159–74; Peter Thonemann, "The Attalid State, 188–133 BC," in *Attalid Asia Minor*, ed. Peter Thonemann (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 1–47; Biagio Virgilio, *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo* (Pisa: Giardini, 1993). On the Attalid kingdom in general, R.E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983); Esther W. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1971). Particularly on their relations with the cities of Asia Minor, see the synthesis of Ivana Savalli-Lestrade, "Les Attalides et les cités grecques d'Asie Mineure au II^e siècle a.C.," in *Les cités d'Asie Mineure Occidentale au II^e siècle a.C.*, ed. Alain Bresson and Raymond Descat (Paris: De Boccard, 2001), 77–81.
2. See Rolf Strootman, "Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age," in *Political Culture in the Greek City After the Classical Age*, ed. Onno M. van Nijf and Richard Alston (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 141–53. The case of Antiochus III is illustrative; see John Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). On the king as benefactor, Klaus Bringmann, "The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism," in *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. Anthony W. Bulloch et al. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 8–25.
3. Jim Roy, "The Masculinity of the Hellenistic King," in *When Men Were Men. Masculinity, Power and Identities in Classical Antiquity*, ed. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon (London: Routledge, 1998), 111–35.
4. Kosmetatou, "Attalids"; Thonemann, "Attalid State," 30–44.
5. On Apollonis and her image, see Anne Bielman, "Régner au féminin. Réflexions sur le reines attalides et séleucides," in *L'Orient Méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée*, ed. Francis Prost (Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2003), 45–61; Dolores Mirón,

- “La reina Apolonis y Afrodita: divinidad, poder y virtud en la Grecia helenística,” in *Hijas de Eva. Mujeres y religión en la Antigüedad*, ed. Eduardo Ferrer and Álvaro Pereira (Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2015), 69–95; Herman Van Looy, “Apollonis reine de Pergame,” *Ancient Society* 7 (1976): 151–65; Virgilio, *Attalidi*, 44–52.
6. While living: Telmessus (Allen, *Attalid Kingdom*, 211–12, no. 7); Actolia (*IG IX,1* 1:179); Athens (*OGIS* 248); sanctuary of Apollo Claros in Colophon (*BCH* 30 [1906]: 349–58); Lydia (*TAM V*, 1 690); Pergamon (*OGIS* 292). After death: Hierapolis (*OGIS* 308); Metropolis (*IEphesos* 3048); Teos (*OGIS* 309); hinterland of Pergamon (Helmut Müller and Michael Wörrle, “Ein Verein im Hinterland Pergamons zur Zeit Eumenes’ II,” *Chiron* 32 (2002): 191–235).
 7. For example: Daniel Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death. The Hellenistic Dynasties* (London: Duckworth, 1999), 201–2; Thonemann, “Attalid State,” 30–44; Claude Vatin, *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l’époque hellénistique* (Paris: De Boccard, 1970), 100–7; Virgilio, *Attalidi*, 44–52.
 8. The literature on Hellenistic queens is nowadays immense. On the origin, significance, functions and image of the *basilissa*, see especially Stefano Caneva, “La face cachée des intrigues de cour,” in *Des femmes en action. L’individu et la fonction en Grèce antique*, ed. Sandra Boehringer and Violaine Sebillotte-Cuchet (Paris: EHESS, 2013), 87–100; Elizabeth Carney, “Being Royal and Female in the Early Hellenistic Period,” in *Creating a Hellenistic World*, ed. Andrew Erskine and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2010), 195–220; Id., *King and Court in Ancient Macedonia* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2015), 1–26; Ivana Savalli-Lestrade, “Il ruolo pubblico delle regine ellenistiche,” in *Historie. Studi offerti a Giuseppe Nenci*, ed. Salvatore Alessandri (Puglia: Congedo, 1994), 415–32; Id., “La place des reines à la cour et dans le royaume à l’époque Hellénistique,” in *Les femmes antiques entre sphère privée et sphère publique*, ed. Regula Frei-Stolba et al. (Bern: Peter Lang, 2003), 59–76.
 9. Savalli-Lestrade, “Place des reines,” 73.
 10. An aspect especially highlighted by Thonemann, “Attalid State,” 30–44.
 11. As is underlined by Polybius (18.41.10) concerning Attalus I. Until then, the Attalid rulers had been childless, and power passed from uncle to nephew. See Allen, *Attalid Kingdom*, 181–9.
 12. *OGIS* 308; 248 l. 41–6. On the education of Attalid princes, see Víctor Alonso, “La *paideia* del príncipe y la ideología helenística de la realeza,” *Gerión Anejos* 9 (2005): 185–204.
 13. Eumenes was around 25 years old, and Athenaeus around 18. Cf. Van Looy, “Apollonis,” 155–6.
 14. Polybius (20.22.3) says that she survived her husband for a long time. She died during the reign of Eumenes II, but the exact date is unknown. She

- was alive in 175/4 (*OGIS* 248, l. 56–7). In an inscription, dated in 168–164, from the hinterland of Pergamon she is mentioned as *thea*, so the latest date for her death is 164 BC (Müller and Wörrle, “Verein,” 194). She was probably alive in 166, the date proposed for an inscription from Andros that mentions the *basilissai*, necessarily Stratonice and Apollonis (before divinization and still alive) (*IG XII Suppl.* 250; François Queyrel, *Les portraits des Attalides* (Paris: De Boccard, 2003), 35).
15. There was only one other queen in Pergamon: Stratonice, daughter of Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia, initially wife of Eumenes II and later of Attalus II. Her first marriage occurred after 174, since she is not named in the documentation before this date. Cf. Helmut Müller, “Königin Stratonike, Tochter des Königs Ariarathes,” *Chiron* 21 (1991): 396–405, *contra* Allen, *Attalid Kingdom*, 200–6.
 16. In the Telephus frieze, the mother, Auge, played a key role; in the Gigantomachy frieze, female figures outnumber male, and there is a repeated representation of sons fighting alongside their mothers. See Burkhard Fehr, “Society, Consanguinity and the Fertility of Women,” in *Conventional Values of the Hellenistic Greeks*, ed. Per Bilde et al. (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1997), 48–66; François Queyrel, *L’Autel de Pergame* (Paris: Picard, 2005), 126–8.
 17. Modern historians have tended, nevertheless, to consider it a non-political marriage. Roger B. McShane (*The Foreign Policy of the Attalids of Pergamum* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), 26–7) denies its diplomatic effects, but at the same time reveals its positive effects on the relationship of Attalus I and the *poleis*. Thonemann (“Attalid State,” 38) speaks of “love-match;” and Ogden (*Polygamy*, 201) of “bourgeois marriage.” The “love-match” has been refuted convincingly by Michel Sève, “Cyziqie et les Attalides,” in *Cyziqie, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique*, ed. Michel Sève and Patrice Schlosser (Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d’Histoire site de Metz, 2014), 154–7.
 18. Van Looy, “Apollonis,” 153.
 19. McShane, *Foreign Policy*, 87–8.
 20. Sève, “Cyziqie,” 155–6.
 21. See especially Strabo’s description (12.8.11), and Michel Sève, *Cyziqie, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique*, edited by Michel Sève and Patrice Schlosser (Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d’Histoire site de Metz, 2014).
 22. See Allen, *Attalid Kingdom*, 58; Hansen, *Attalids*, 39; and especially Sève, “Cyziqie”.
 23. Philetaerus, founder of the dynasty, sought friendship with Cyzicus. *OGIS* 748; *CIG* 3660; Louis Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hekker, 1937), 201.
 24. Sève, “Cyziqie,” 156–7.

25. For instance, the historian Neanthes (Ath. 699d; *FHG* III, pp. 2–9, frag. 7) and the sculptor Stratonikus (Ath. 682b; Plin. *HN* 33, 55; 34, 84). See Madalina Dana, “Cyziqie, une cité au carrefour des réseaux culturels du monde grec,” in *Cyziqie, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique*, edited by Michel Sève and Patrice Schlosser (Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d’Histoire site de Metz, 2014), 203–5, 210; Hansen, *Attalids*, 375, 403–4. Among the *philoi* of the Attalid kings, the largest group, after the Pergamenes, could be from Cyzicus. See Ivana Savalli-Lestrade, “Courtisans et citoyens: le cas des philoi attalides,” *Chiron* 26 (1996): 153, n. 13. Cyzicene citizens were involved in diplomatic activities between Pergamon and Athens (*IG* II² 955). See Christian Habicht, “Athens and the Attalids in the Second Century BC,” *Hesperia* 59 (1990): 567–8.
26. Princes used to be brought up together with other boys. See Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos, “*Syntrophos*: un terme technique Macédonien,” *Tekmeria* 13 (2015–16): 57–70.
27. Polyb. 32.15.10; *OGIS* 331; *IPergamon* 248; *RC* 65–7. See Savalli-Lestrade, “Courtisans,” 160, n. 45.
28. See Elizabeth Carney, *Olympias, Mother of Alexander the Great* (London: Routledge, 2006), 50–1; Savalli-Lestrade, “Courtisans”; Strootman, “Kings,” 147–50.
29. See Christopher P. Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Lee E. Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010).
30. Hansen, *Attalids*, 39; Thonemann, “Attalid State,” 91.
31. On these epigrams and the temple, there is extensive research and intense debate. A lengthy analysis is beyond the aims of this paper. In my opinion, perhaps the most comprehensive study is Françoise-Hélène Massa-Pairault, “Il problema degli stilopinakia del tempio di Apollonis a Cizico. Alcune considerazioni,” *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia di Perugia* 19 (1981–82): 147–219. For the state of the question, see Queyrel, *Portraits*, 24–7; Sève, “Cyziqie,” 157–62.
32. On the mechanisms and forms of collective memory in the Greek world, see Simon Price, “Memory and Ancient Greece,” in *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*, ed. Beate Dignas and R.R.R. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 15–36.
33. Massa-Pairault, “Stilopinakia,” 189.
34. Strabo 14.1.6. In a letter thanking the Ionian League for the honors bestowed upon him, Eumenes II presents himself as “benefactor of all the Greeks,” and mentions his kinship with the Milesians through Cyzicus, i.e. through his mother (*OGIS* 763, l. 65; *RC* 52).
35. Polyb. 5.77.2–6. See Allen, *Attalid Kingdom*, 45–57; Peter Herrmann, “Antiochos der Grosse und Teos,” *Anadolu* 9 (1965): 100–5.

36. Herrmann, "Antiochos," 33–6, 157–9; Ma, *Antiochos*, no. 17 and 19B.
37. See Donald W. Baronowski, "The Status of the Greek Cities of Asia Minor After 190 BC," *Hermes* 119 (1991): 455–6, n. 10.
38. *OGIS* 309; Robert, *Études*, 9–20.
39. These questions have been discussed at greater length in Mirón, "Apolonis," 82–90.
40. Mirella Romero, *Cultos marítimos y religiosidad de navegantes en el mundo griego antiguo* (Oxford: Hadrian, 2000), 84, 95.
41. On the epithet Apobateria and Apollonis's association with Aphrodite, see especially Louis Robert, "Nouvelles inscriptions d'Iasos," *Revue des études anciennes* 65 (1963): 314–16. On the marine nature of Aphrodite, see Denise Demetriou, "*Tes pases nautilies phylax*: Aphrodite and the Sea," *Kernos* 23 (2010): 67–89.
42. As *kataibates* ("who descends"), *epibaterios* ("who embarks") or *embaterios* ("who enters"). See Robert, *Études*, 314–16; Kenneth Scott, "The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes (II)," *AJPh* 49 (1928): 165.
43. Plut. *Demetr.* 10.4; Scott, "Deification," 164–6.
44. The Teian Dionysiac festival attained panhellenic character under the impulse of Antiochus III. From the mid-third century, Teos was also the headquarters of the influential Association of Dionysiac artists of Ionia and the Hellespont. See Jonathan R. Strang, "The City of Dionysos: A Social and Historical Study of the Ionian City of Teos" (PhD dissertation, State University of New York, 2007). Eumenes II, as previously had Antiochus III, favored the association, and united it to the Pergamene Association of Dionysus Cathegemon; both were fundamental for the development of Attalid ruler cult (*IPergamon* 163; *IG* XI 4, 1136 + 1061). See Allen, *Attalid Kingdom*, 103–4, 148–53; Hansen, *Attalids*, 421–5, 460–3; Brigitte Le Guen, "Kraton, Son of Zotichos: Artists' Associations and Monarchic Power in the Hellenistic Period," in *Greek Theatre and Festivals*, ed. Peter Wilson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 246–78. The cult of Dionysus Cathegemon was already important during the reign of Attalus I in connection with the royal family. See Beate Dignas, "Rituals and the Construction of Identity in Attalid Pergamon," in *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*, ed. Beate Dignas and R.R.R. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 135.
45. Herrmann, "Antiochos," 33–42; Ma, *Antiochos*, no. 17 and 18. On the cults of Antiochus and Laodice in Teos, see also Stefano G. Caneva, "Queens and Ruler Cults in Early Hellenism: Festivals, Administration, and Ideology," *Kernos* 25 (2012): 75–101; Angelos Chaniotis, "La divinité mortelle d'Antiochos III à Téos," *Kernos* 20 (2007): 153–71.
46. Ma, *Antiochos*, no. 18, l. 64–72.
47. As noted in Herrmann, "Antiochos," 61–2.

48. See Dolores Mirón, "Las 'buenas obras' de las reinas helenísticas: benefactoras y poder político," *Arenal* 18 (2011): 243–75; Savalli-Lestrade, "Ruolo".
49. *OGIS* 224, l. 5–7; *RC* 36. The Teian decree praises also her devotion towards the gods (Ma, *Antiochos*, no. 18, l. 73).
50. See Marie Widmer, "Pourquoi reprend le dossier des reines hellénistiques? Le cas de Laodice V," in *Egypte-Grèce-Rome. Les différents visages des femmes antiques*, ed. Florence Bertholet et al. (Bern: Peter Lang, 2008), 63–92. On the self-representation of the Seleucids as a harmonious family, see also Carney, "Being Royal," 205.
51. Gillian Ramsey, "The Queen and the City: Royal Female Intervention and Patronage in Hellenistic Civic Communities," *Gender & History* 23 (2011): 510–27.
52. Ma, *Antiochos*, no. 17, l. 39.
53. Ma, *Antiochos*, no. 19D.
54. *SEG* 26, 1226; Ma, *Antiochos*, no. 26A.
55. Alice Bencivenni, "The King's Words: Hellenistic Royal Letters in Inscriptions," in *State Correspondence in the Ancient World*, ed. Karen Radner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 155–8; Ma, *Antiochos*, 182–94.
56. Ma (*Antiochos*, 248–9) has noted that the Attalid kings had a way of relating with cities similar to Antiochus III, including the figure of the queen.
57. On the sanctuary in the Hellenistic period and the intervention of Apollonis, see Markus Kohl, "Le sanctuaire de Déméter à Pergame et son culte," *NAC* 38 (2009): 139–67; Dolores Mirón, "Maternidad, poder y arquitectura: la impronta de la reina Apolonis en el urbanismo de Pérgamo," in *Matronazgo y Arquitectura. De la Antigüedad a la Edad Moderna*, ed. Cándida Martínez and Felipe Serrano (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2016), 27–64; Cornelie Piok Zanon, "The Sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon: Architecture and Dynasty in the Early Attalid Capital" (PhD dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2009); Christine M. Thomas, "The Sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon: Cultic Space for Women and Its Eclipse," in *Pergamon Citadel of the Gods*, ed. Helmut Koester (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 277–98.
58. *AM* 35 (1910), no. 24. See Piok Zanon, *Sanctuary*, 141, who points out parallels with other donations of women. See also Anne Bielman, "Female Patronage in the Greek Hellenistic and the Roman Republican Periods," in *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*, ed. Sharon L. James and Sheila Dillon (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 238–48; Mirón, "Buenas obras".
59. *AM* 35 (1910): no. 22–3.
60. *BE* 1971, no. 538.
61. The decree of Hierapolis praises Apollonis's conduct towards her daughter-in-law. The queens had a joint priestess in Teos; also in Pergamon as *theai eusebeis* (*AM* 33 [1908]: 375–9).

62. Kohl, "Sanctuaire," 152–4; Thomas, "Sanctuary," 287–8.
63. As indicated by the epithet of Demeter and Kore, the votive deposits and the architectural configuration of the sanctuary. See Kohl, "Sanctuaire"; Piok Zanon, *Sanctuary*; Thomas, "Sanctuary".
64. It was not exceptional for a queen's *energesia* to be used for the benefaction of women or promotion of gender roles, as the above mentioned case of Laodice III in Iasos. See Mirón, "Buenas obras".
65. Piok Zanon, *Sanctuary*, 151–2. On the integration of the sanctuary in Pergamene urbanism and its meaning, Mirón, "Maternidad," 50–9.
66. Date proposed by Kohl ("Sanctuaire," 148–50); and Piok Zanon (*Sanctuary*, 136–44).
67. See the observations of Carney, *King*, 1.
68. See Carney, "Being Royal," 203.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, R.E. *The Attalid Kingdom: A Constitutional History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Alonso, Victor. "La *paideia* del príncipe y la ideología helenística de la realeza." *Gerión Anejos* 9 (2005): 185–204.
- Baronowski, Donald W. "The Status of the Greek Cities of Asia Minor After 190 BC." *Hermes* 119 (1991): 450–463.
- Bencivenni, Alice. "The King's Words: Hellenistic Royal Letters in Inscriptions." In *State Correspondence in the Ancient World*. Edited by Karen Radner, 141–171. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Bielman, Anne. "Régner au féminin. Réflexions sur le reines attalides et séleucides." In *L'Orient Méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée. Cités et royaumes à l'époque hellénistique*. Edited by Francis Prost, 45–61. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mireil, 2003.
- . "Female Patronage in the Greek Hellenistic and the Roman Republican Periods." In *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*. Edited by Sharon L. James and Sheila Dillon, 238–248. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Bringmann, Klaus. "The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism." In *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*. Edited by Anthony W. Bulloch et al., 8–25. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Caneva, Stefano. "Queens and Ruler Cults in Early Hellenism: Festivals, Administration, and Ideology." *Kernos* 25 (2012): 75–101.
- . "La face cachée des intrigues de cour. Prolégomenes à une étude des femmes royales dans les royaumes hellénistiques." In *Des femmes en action. L'individu et la fonction en Grèce antique*. Edited by Sandra Boehringer and Violaine Sebillotte-Cuchet, 87–100. Paris: EHESS, 2013.
- Carney, Elizabeth. *Olympias, Mother of Alexander the Great*. London: Routledge, 2006.

- . “Being Royal and Female in the Early Hellenistic Period.” In *Creating a Hellenistic World*. Edited by Andrew Erskine and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, 195–220. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2010.
- . *King and Court in Ancient Macedonia. Rivalry, Treason and Conspiracy*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2015.
- Chaniotis, Angelos. “La divinité mortelle d’Antiochos III à Téos.” *Kernos* 20 (2007): 153–171.
- Dana, Madalina. “Cyziq, une cité au carrefour des réseaux culturels du monde grec.” In *Cyziq, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique*. Edited by Michel Sève and Patrice Schlosser, 151–165. Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d’Histoire site de Metz, 2014.
- Demetriou, Denise. “*Tes pases nautilies phylax*: Aphrodite and the Sea.” *Kernos* 23 (2010): 67–89.
- Dignas, Beate. “Rituals and the Construction of Identity in Attalid Pergamon.” In *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*. Edited by Beate Dignas and R.R.R. Smith, 15–36. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Fehr, Burkhard. “Society, Consanguinity and the Fertility of Women. The Community of Deities on the Great Frieze of the Pergamum Altar as a Paradigm of Cross-cultural Ideas.” In *Conventional Values of the Hellenistic Greeks*. Edited by Per Bilde et al., 48–66. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1997.
- Gruen, Erich. “Culture as Policy. The Attalids of Pergamon.” In *From Pergamon to Sperlonga. Sculpture and Context*. Edited by N.T. de Grummond and B.S. Ridgway, 17–31. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Habicht, Christian. “Athens and the Attalids in the Second Century BC.” *Hesperia* 59 (1990): 561–577.
- Hansen, Esther W. *The Attalids of Pergamon*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1971.
- Hatzopoulos, Miltiades B. “*Syntrophos*: un terme technique Macédonien.” *Tekmeria* 13 (2015–16): 57–70.
- Herrmann, Peter. “Antiochos der Grosse und Teos.” *Anadolu/Anatolia* 9 (1965): 29–159.
- Jones, Christopher P. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Kohl, Markus. “Le sanctuaire de Déméter à Pergame et son culte.” *Numismatica e antichità classiche: quaderni ticinesi* 38 (2009): 139–167.
- Kosmetatou, Elizabeth. “The Attalids of Pergamon.” In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Edited by Andrew Erskine, 159–74. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
- Le Guen, Brigitte. “Kraton, Son of Zotichos: Artists’ Associations and Monarchic Power in the Hellenistic Period.” In *Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies*. Edited by Peter Wilson, 246–278. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Ma, John. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Massa-Pairault, Françoise-Hélène. "Il problema degli stilopinakia del tempio di Apollonis a Cizico. Alcune considerazioni." *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia di Perugia* 19 (1981–82): 147–219.
- McShane, Roger B. *The Foreign Policy of the Attalids of Pergamum*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.
- Mirón, Dolores. "Las 'buenas obras' de las reinas helenísticas: benefactoras y poder político." *Arenal* 18 (2011): 243–275.
- . "La reina Apolonis y Afrodita: divinidad, poder y virtud en la Grecia helenística." In *Hijas de Eva. Mujeres y religión en la Antigüedad*. Edited by Eduardo Ferrer and Álvaro Pereira, 69–95. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2015.
- . "Maternidad, poder y arquitectura: la impronta de la reina Apolonis en el urbanismo de Pérgamo." In *Matronazgo y Arquitectura. De la Antigüedad a la Edad Moderna*. Edited by Cándida Martínez and Felipe Serrano, 27–64. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2016.
- Müller, Helmut. "Königin Stratonike, Tochter des Königs Ariarathes." *Chiron* 21 (1991): 393–424.
- Müller, Helmut, and Michael Wörle. "Ein Verein im Hinterland Pergamons zur Zeit Eumenes' II." *Chiron* 32 (2002): 191–235.
- Ogden, Daniel. *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death. The Hellenistic Dynasties*. London: Duckworth, 1999.
- Patterson, Lee E. *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010.
- Piok Zanon, Cornélie. "The Sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon: Architecture and Dynasty in the Early Attalid Capital." PhD dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2009.
- Price, Simon. "Memory and Ancient Greece." In *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*. Edited by Beate Dignas and R.R.R. Smith, 15–36. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Queyrel, François. *Les portraits des Attalides*. Paris: De Boccard, 2003.
- . *L'Autel de Pergame. Images et pouvoir en Grèce d'Asie*. Paris: Picard, 2005.
- Ramsey, Gillian. "The Queen and the City: Royal Female Intervention and Patronage in Hellenistic Civic Communities." *Gender & History* 23 (2011): 510–527.
- Robert, Louis. *Études anatoliennes*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hekker, 1937.
- . "Nouvelles inscriptions d'Iasos." *Revue des études anciennes* 65 (1963): 298–329.
- Romero, Mirella. *Cultos marítimos y religiosidad de navegantes en el mundo griego antiguo*. Oxford: Hadrian, 2000.
- Roy, Jim. "The Masculinity of the Hellenistic King." In *When Men Were Men. Masculinity, Power and Identities in Classical Antiquity*. Edited by Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, 111–135. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Savalli-Lestrade, Ivana. "Il ruolo pubblico delle regine ellenistiche." In *Historie. Studi offerti dagli allievi a Giuseppe Nenci*. Edited by Salvatore Alessandri, 415–432. Puglia: Congedo, 1994.

- . “Courtisans et citoyens: le cas des philoi attalides.” *Chiron* 26 (1996): 149–181.
- . “Les Attalides et les cités grecques d’Asie Mineure au II^e siècle a.C.” In *Les cités d’Asie Mineure Occidentale au II^e siècle a.C.* Edited by Alain Bresson and Raymond Descat, 77–91. Paris: De Boccard, 2001.
- . “La place des reines à la cour et dans le royaume à l’époque Hellénistique.” In *Les femmes antiques entre sphère privée et sphère publique*. Edited by Regula Frei-Stolba, Anne Bielman, and Olivier Bianchi, 59–76. Bern: Peter Lang, 2003.
- Scott, Kenneth. “The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes (II).” *American Journal of Philology* 49 (1928): 217–239.
- Sève, Michel. “Cyziqie et les Attalides.” In *Cyziqie, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique*. Edited by Michel Sève and Patrice Schlosser, 151–165. Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d’Histoire site de Metz, 2014.
- Sève, Michel, and Patrice Schlosser, eds. *Cyziqie, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique*. Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d’Histoire site de Metz, 2014.
- Strang, Jonathan R. “The City of Dionysos: A Social and Historical Study of the Ionian City of Teos.” PhD dissertation, State University of New York, 2007.
- Strootman, Rolf. “Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age.” In *Political Culture in the Greek City After the Classical Age*. Edited by Onno M. van Nijf and Richard Alston, 141–153. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Thomas, Christine M. “The Sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon: Cultic Space for Women and Its Eclipse.” In *Pergamon Citadel of the Gods. Archaeological Record, Literary Description, and Religious Development*. Edited by Helmut Koester, 277–298. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Thonemann, Peter. “The Attalid State, 188–133 BC.” In *Attalid Asia Minor. Money, International Relations, and the State*. Edited by Peter Thonemann, 1–47. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Van Looy, Herman. “Apollonis reine de Pergame.” *Ancient Society* 7 (1976): 151–165.
- Vatin, Claude. *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l’époque hellénistique*. Paris: De Boccard, 1970.
- Virgilio, Biagio. *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, eredità, memoria*. Pisa: Giardini, 1993.
- Widmer, Marie. “Pourquoi reprend le dossier des reines hellénistiques? Le cas de Laodice V.” In *Egypte—Grèce—Rome. Les différents visages des femmes antiques*. Edited by Florence Bertholet, Ann Bielman, and Regula Frei-Stolba, 63–92. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008.



CHAPTER 4

Queens and Their Children: Dynastic Dis/Loyalty in the Hellenistic Period

Walter Duvall Penrose Jr

In a well-argued book, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: The Hellenistic Dynasties*, Daniel Ogden attributes the instability of the Hellenistic dynasties to “amphimetric strife.”¹ The term *amphimētor*, which is central to Ogden’s analysis, is defined by the Greek author Hesychius as “sharing the same father, but not the same mother.” Following Hesychius (s.v. *amphimētor*), Ogden understands “amphimetric strife” as the divisive competition, murder, and ultimately war which resulted from the children of a male monarch, born from different mothers, vying for the throne. Ogden argues that this unique factor caused the internal instability and weakening of the Argead and subsequent Hellenistic dynasties. (The Argead dynasty ruled over Macedon for several centuries up until the

I would like to thank Caroline Dunn and Elizabeth Carney for organizing the Kings and Queens V: Dynastic Loyalties conference at Clemson University from which this paper originated, and for their hard work editing this volume. I am particularly indebted to Professor Carney for her insightful comments that have greatly enriched this essay. All errors and inaccuracies are my own.

W. D. Penrose Jr (✉)
San Diego State University, San Diego, CA, USA

death of Alexander IV, Alexander the Great's son, in *ca.* 310 BCE; the Hellenistic dynasties were founded by the successors of Alexander and ruled over Macedon, Egypt, and parts of Western Asia.) Ogden further asserts that whereas "amphimetric disputes were common ... disputes between full siblings were rare."² While Ogden has attributed some strife to "exceptions" to the amphimetric pattern that he outlines, he largely understands full-sibling rivalry to be the result of brother-sister marriage in the Ptolemaic dynasty of Egypt, or of the queen mother favoring a younger son over an elder in disputes over the throne.³ In a 2011 essay, Ogden elaborates upon these ideas, giving more credence to other causes of "internecine murder," in particular the "unconventional marital and sexual arrangements" of "stepmother marriage" and the siring of illegitimate children, in addition to "sister marriage" and "amphimetric strife."⁴

In this paper, I would like to further expand upon Ogden's analysis, by arguing that yet another type of dynastic instability can be identified in the Hellenistic period. In a number of cases in the Hellenistic kingdoms, we find that there was also "metric" strife, that is to say conflict, murder, and war among mothers and their own sons.⁵ These dynastic disloyalties cannot be entirely explained by the fact that a queen mother supported a younger son over an elder one (though this is a pattern that does emerge), but must also be understood as part and parcel of the unprecedented power obtained by women in the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties. Women acted not only as regents, but also as kingmakers, co-rulers, and even effectively as sole rulers in several instances.⁶ Furthermore, while "amphimetric strife" caused by polygamy was commonplace within the Argead dynasty of Macedon, the decreasing frequency of polygamy among the later Macedonian and Hellenistic dynasties, coupled with (and probably as a result of) the increased power that royal women obtained made "amphimetric strife" less commonplace.⁷ In this essay, I will demonstrate that, due to their ability to assert themselves as co-rulers, to raise and command armies, and to channel native Egyptian precedents of strong royal women, Hellenistic queens played an increasingly central role in dynastic tensions, which, in turn, led to internecine murder and even war.

"Metric" strife can be identified in a number of cases, and has heretofore been downplayed. I will begin by discussing, briefly, Ogden's theory of amphimetric strife, noting the exceptions and "inversions" of that pattern as Ogden has delineated them. I will then briefly explore other trends in recent historiography that seek to explain dynastic dis/loyalties, succession crises, and the growing power of royal women in the Ptolemaic and

Seleucid dynasties. Finally, I will turn to the ancient sources, outlining my own theory of “metric strife” along with the reasons for its occurrence: the appointment of wives and mothers as co-rulers, the influence they thus garnered over military forces and subjects, as well as the fear which this power struck into their own children.

Ogden asserts that, among the Hellenistic dynasties, “virtually all the known intra-dynastic disputes and murders can be explained with reference to a simple set of ideas.”⁸ Ogden follows Elizabeth Carney’s astute observation that “[i]n a polygamous situation the mother of a king’s son is likely to form a political unit with him, the goal of which is his succession,”⁹ as well as Greenwalt’s claim that “polygamy’s de-stabilising tendency is a natural by-product of the production of many heirs, each with a built-in support group focused in the first instance on the offspring’s interest, and in the second on those of his mother and her family.”¹⁰ Building upon Carney and Greenwalt’s arguments, Ogden asserts that “the bonds of loyalty between full-sibling groups and their mother were particularly strong, with the children typically being more devoted to the mothers and full brothers on whom they could rely than to the fathers for whom they had to compete.”¹¹ Rivalry, or “amphimetric strife” existed among competing “mother and children groups” in such a polygamous setting.

The Ptolemies, Ogden tells us, addressed this issue by developing brother–sister marriage “to mark out a privileged union” from which an heir would be chosen.¹² Although this system worked for a short period, it “paradoxically culminated ... in a system of marital disputes which virtually constituted negative images of the amphimetric ones. Now the disputes were between the polyandrous brother-husbands of a single privileged queen, almost all of them Cleopatras.”¹³ While this may have been the case with Ptolemy VI and VIII, both of whom were married to Cleopatra II in succession, dynastic dis/loyalty among the other Ptolemies does not necessarily follow this pattern.

In contrast, Carney argues that the successors of Alexander the Great attempted to end dynastic strife by naming a particular heir as co-king while still alive.¹⁴ As the history of Ptolemaic succession illustrates, this policy worked with some success in the first several generations, but the naming of wives (sometimes sisters, sometimes not) as co-rulers, I would add, ultimately derailed even this system, at least in Egypt.¹⁵ Hazzard attributes the rise of woman-power among the Ptolemies to propaganda which changed the role of the ruler from a military to a civilian monarch.¹⁶

Building upon and revising Macurdy's 1932 analysis, Hazzard argues that Ptolemaic queens increasingly garnered power from the time of Arsinoë II to the reign of Cleopatra VII.¹⁷ Hazzard largely relies on Greek sources, as had Macurdy. Pomeroy notes that the Egyptian sources give us a different picture of the power of Arsinoë II and Berenice II, both of whom were designated pharaoh, and, from this perspective at least, could be considered as powerful as their husbands.¹⁸

Although their position was never as solid as their Ptolemaic counterparts, some Seleucid queens also gained much agency as regents and supported one of their sons over another.¹⁹ In fact, the disloyalty among mothers, their children, and full-siblings was such that Plutarch noted that among the Hellenistic dynasties, only the Antigonids were free from internecine crimes for several generations. "Among almost all of the other lines, there were many who murdered their children, and many others who murdered their mothers and wives; and as for the killing of brothers, just as geometers take their axioms for granted, this act was considered to be a common and recognized necessity for the safety of kings" (Plut. *Demetr.* 3.5, ed. Ziegler).²⁰

In the remainder of this essay, I will focus on three examples that illustrate strife between Hellenistic royal mothers and their children, although there are others.²¹ The first example of metric strife is the case of Berenice II and her sons Ptolemy IV and Magas. Berenice II had ruled the Cyrenaica (modern-day Libya) prior to marrying Ptolemy III of Egypt.²² She was the only surviving heir of her father, Magas, king of Cyrene (Justin 26.3.2, ed. Jeep.).²³ Berenice was a force with which to contend. Early in her reign as queen of Cyrene, Berenice ordered her guards to put her first husband, Demetrius the Fair, to death (Justin 26.3.3–8).²⁴

Berenice also proved her mettle as a general.²⁵ Hyginus relates that "once when Ptolemy, Berenice's father, was greatly terrified by the host of the enemy and sought to flee for his life, his daughter, who was accustomed to leaping on horseback, rallied the remainder of the army, destroyed the bulk of the enemy, and threw the rest into flight" (*Poet. Astr.* 2.24, ed. Viré). Although Magas of Cyrene was Berenice's father, she was called the daughter of Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II, as well as the sister of her husband, Ptolemy III, in official propaganda.²⁶ Furthermore, like her predecessor Arsinoë II, Berenice is called "the female Pharaoh" in demotic (Egyptian) texts.²⁷ While the level of equality these queens achieved with their husbands was unprecedented among Macedonian royal women, an assessment of their power must take into account the loyalty of subjects in

lands they ruled prior to their Ptolemaic marriages (and thus brought into the Egyptian fold upon marriage), in addition to that of their native Egyptian subjects.²⁸ Past precedents of women pharaohs, such as Hatshepsut, suggest that Egyptians were more likely than either Greeks or Macedonians to accept the power of a woman ruler.²⁹ That power, in turn, may explain why neither Arsinoë II nor Berenice II was subjected to polygamy by their co-rulers and husbands.³⁰

When her husband, Ptolemy III died, Berenice II and her younger son, Magas, were put to death by her eldest son, Ptolemy IV (Plut. *Cleom.* 33.3; Polyb. 5.34, 15.25.2). According to Polybius (5.36), Ptolemy IV's advisor, Sosibius, greatly feared Berenice's *tolma* [daring], and thus affected her destruction. Ogden does not discuss the tensions among Ptolemy IV, his mother Berenice, and his brother Magas. He merely notes that all of the known children of Ptolemy III were born of Berenice II, so "therefore there was no opportunity for legitimacy disputes of any kind." Perhaps there were not disputes about the "legitimacy" of these brothers, but there was full-sibling and "metric strife" nonetheless. While Plutarch (*Cleom.* 33) does suggest that Berenice favored Magas, he does not say that she attempted to catapult him to the throne, only that Ptolemy IV feared his brother and therefore had him killed:

For Ptolemy was afraid of his brother Magas, believing that Magas had a strong following among the soldiers owing to his mother's influence, and he therefore took Cleomenes (an exiled Spartan king) into his following and gave him a place in his privy council, all the while plotting to kill his brother.

Magas was not killed on the battlefield in an uprising, but rather was scalded to death in his bathtub, at the order of his elder brother, who had already become king (Pseudo-Plutarch *Proverb. Alexandr.* 13, ed. O Crusius).³¹ Polybius (15.25.2) suggests that Berenice II was killed immediately afterwards. Both Polybius (5.36) and Plutarch (*Cleom.* 33) focus upon Ptolemy IV and his "evil-minded" advisor, Sosibius' fear of Berenice, in addition to Magas, as the reason for their elimination.³²

This incident points to "metric strife" at its worst, as Ptolemy IV engaged in matricide. Berenice II may or may not have planned an uprising. While the full-sibling strife apparent here may fit into the pattern of exceptions to amphimetric strife outlined by Ogden (that of the queen mother supporting a younger son over an elder one), we have no solid evidence that Berenice II backed a younger son, only that the elder son

feared this. Polybius clearly indicates that Ptolemy IV had been crowned king, and, due to the influence of his evil minister Sosibius, killed his brother and mother due to fear. Ptolemy's fear of his mother as a rival was perhaps not unfounded; not only had she been proclaimed pharaoh, like her husband, it is clear that she held sway with the armed forces.³³ Not one but three sources point to the loyalty of both Cyrenaic and Egyptian troops to her; Berenice had eliminated one king, Demetrius the Fair, and could possibly (and probably should) have rid herself of another, despite the fact that he was her own flesh and blood.³⁴

My second example is drawn from the history of the Seleucid Dynasty, which ruled over Syria and other parts of West Asia after Alexander's death. Cleopatra Thea, a Ptolemaic Egyptian princess, became the queen of Seleucid Syria through marriage. She was married, in succession, to three Seleucid kings: Alexander Balas (r. 150–145 BCE), Demetrius II (r. 146–139, 129–126 BCE), and Antiochus VII Sidetes (r. 139–129 BCE). She married her third husband, Antiochus VII, her second husband Demetrius II's full brother, due to unusual circumstances; Demetrius II was captured by the Parthians and held in Parthia for ten years. She had two sons by Demetrius II, Seleucus V and Antiochus VIII Grypus, and another by Antiochus VII Sidetes, Antiochus IX Cyzenicus. When Antiochus VII attacked Parthia in 129, he was killed but Demetrius II was freed and returned to Syria.

Appian (*Syr.* 68) relates that Cleopatra Thea was angered by Demetrius II's marriage to a Parthian princess, Rhodogune, and therefore refused to resume her own marriage with Demetrius upon his return from Parthia (*Livy Epit.* 60; *Just.* 39.1.7).³⁵ The facts suggest that she also had managed to obtain a fair modicum of power for herself, ruling in Ptolemais (modern-day Akko, Israel), while her husband was confined to Antioch for the second period of his reign, 129–126 BCE. Being a Ptolemaic princess, it is perhaps not coincidental that her power-base was Coele-Syria/Palestine, a region which had been held by the Ptolemies from 301 to ca. 198 BCE.³⁶ Her grandmother, Cleopatra I of Egypt, had been a Seleucid princess who became queen of Egypt, so Seleucid blood ran through Cleopatra Thea's veins as well. In any event, Cleopatra Thea engineered the death of Demetrius II. After the citizens of Antioch rebelled against him, Demetrius II came to Ptolemais; Cleopatra Thea closed the gates and locked him out. Having no place to hide, he was killed by insurgents.

Cleopatra Thea then killed her oldest son, Seleucus V, with a bow and arrow after he assumed the throne, at least according to Appian (*Syr.* 69;

see also Livy epit. 60; Euseb. *Chron.* 1.257, ed. Schoene; Just. 39.1.9).³⁷ While Appian's tale seemingly turns Thea into an Amazon and may exaggerate her role in her son's death, there is no doubt that she was at least behind his execution even if she did not shoot him herself. Immediately afterwards, Thea may have briefly ruled solo, as a coin from 126/5 BCE depicts only her. On another coin dated to the same year, however, she is shown as regent with another son by Demetrius II, Antiochus Grypus.³⁸

A number of scholars thus suggest that Cleopatra Thea briefly assumed the sovereignty, striking coins in her own name.³⁹ Justin (39.1.9), however, notes that she established Antiochus VIII Grypus as king in name only, while retaining all of the power for herself. Both Appian (*Syr.* 69) and Justin (39.2) assert that as Grypus began to attain majority, she tried to poison him, but he made her drink the very poison that she had mixed for him.⁴⁰ On the one hand, the literary and numismatic evidence may suggest that Cleopatra Thea wished to rule alone, as she killed the elder and tried to kill the younger of her sons by Demetrius II. On the other hand, Cleopatra Thea did have a third son, who would later become Antiochus IX Cyzenicus. She may have ultimately wished to make Cyzenicus king, fearing that her sons by Demetrius II would take revenge upon her for engineering their father's demise, but the sources are silent on this matter.

As Antiochus IX Cyzenicus was the son of a different husband of Cleopatra Thea, the war which then ensued between Grypus and Cyzenicus might be better termed "amphipatric strife" than amphimetric. Again, it is difficult to fit this episode neatly into the pattern that Ogden delineates—Ogden himself notes that Cleopatra Thea's acts "violate the most fundamental rule of the dynastic principles that we have enunciated, that of the absolute devotion between mother and son."⁴¹ Ogden states this principle with less force in a 2011 publication, noting that "the individual mothers, their respective birth families and their respective children *typically* functioned as a cohesive group..." in a polygamous system.⁴² Nevertheless, Ogden is correct to note that Cleopatra Thea was the first of several Ptolemaic princesses who became powerful Seleucid queens.⁴³ The strife that occurred after Cleopatra's death between her sons, the half-brothers Antiochus Grypus and Antiochus Cyzenicus, provides an example of what Ogden describes as a "negative image" of amphimetric dispute.⁴⁴ Instead of a king with multiple wives and groups of children by each, we here see a queen at the center of power, with multiple groups of children by different husbands.

My final example will be drawn from the Ptolemies, but ultimately became a saga which is intertwined with the previously-mentioned strife between the Seleucid contenders Grypus and Cyzenicus. Like her Ptolemaic predecessor Berenice II, Cleopatra III was a force with which to contend. Her husband, Ptolemy VIII, had left her the option to decide which of her sons she would choose as co-ruler, either Ptolemy IX or X, but the people of Alexandria agitated for Ptolemy IX and he was appointed king (Paus. 1.9.1–2; Just. 39.3.1–2; Porph. *FGrH* 260 F 2.8).⁴⁵ Ptolemy IX was already married to his elder sister, Cleopatra IV, but Cleopatra III, perhaps in a bid to preserve her own power, forced Ptolemy to divorce Cleopatra IV and instead marry a younger sister, Cleopatra V Selene (Just. 39.3.2). Angered by her mother's decision, Cleopatra IV went to Cyprus and there raised an army (39.3.3). It has been suggested that she may have wished to march on Egypt to regain her place on the throne, but she received no help from her brother Ptolemy X, who was also exiled and now ruling Cyprus.⁴⁶ Therefore, Cleopatra IV decided to marry Antiochus IX Cyzenicus, the Seleucid contender, and to use her mercenaries to help him in his quest to defeat Antiochus VIII Grypus. Her decision would prove fatal. After routing Cyzenicus and putting him to flight, Grypus closed in on Antioch, where Cleopatra IV had remained (39.3.4–5). She took refuge in a temple. Grypus wished to spare her life, but his wife, her very own sister and yet another daughter of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra Tryphaena, demanded her sister's blood (39.3.6–10). Cleopatra IV was slaughtered (39.3.11).

Meanwhile, back in Egypt, Cleopatra III maneuvered Ptolemy IX's ouster, and invited her second son, Ptolemy X, to be co-ruler (Just. 39.4.1–2; Paus. 1.9.2; Porph. *FGrH* 260 F 2.8). When Ptolemy IX initiated a war against Cleopatra III and Ptolemy X in retaliation for his exile, she herself led troops to Ptolemais/Ake and took the city (Joseph. *AJ* 13.13.1–2).⁴⁷ She later struggled with her second son and co-ruler, Ptolemy X, however, and ultimately he assassinated her (Justin 39.4.3–6; Paus. 1.9.3). The source of the full-sibling strife between Ptolemy IX and X was, at its root, their mother, Cleopatra III. Cleopatra III also dethroned one of her daughters, Cleopatra IV, as mentioned above, ultimately causing strife between Cleopatra IV and another of her daughters, Cleopatra Tryphaena. The situation is complicated and cannot be entirely boiled down into a simple system of how particular relations among male dynasts were spoiled by the intervention of women (although this did occur),⁴⁸ but rather must be understood as a power-struggle in which women often played an equal part to men.⁴⁹

In conclusion, in addition to amphimetric strife and full-sibling rivalry, “metric strife”—dynastic disloyalty between royal mothers and their sons—plagued the Hellenistic dynasties with death and misfortune. I have outlined examples that illustrate intense strife between a queen and her offspring, and related dynastic disloyalties that occurred between full-siblings. Although the successors of Alexander sought to end dynastic strife by naming a son as co-ruler before their deaths, as women garnered power they became the co-rulers instead. Additionally, it is of interest that Cleopatra Thea, the Seleucid queen who murdered one of her sons and attempted to murder another, was of Ptolemaic origin. She was married to not one but three Seleucid kings. The “traffic in women,” between the two dynasties, to borrow Gayle Rubin’s words, gave Hellenistic queens power.⁵⁰ If they were not respected by their husbands, children, or subjects, this could invite invasion from their dynasty of origin.⁵¹ Women sought power, and in so doing engaged in combat, violence, and even murdered their own sons, or were murdered by them. Although I have focused on metric strife in this paper, the same can be said for full-siblings. Ogden’s “fundamental rule” of loyalty between a mother and her offspring, as well as that between full-siblings, does not entirely hold true for the Ptolemaic and Seleucid dynasties. Rather, it seems to be a model derived from Argead politics which cannot fully explain dynastic disloyalties of the Ptolemies and Seleucids. In the latter dynasties, as polygamy decreased and endogamy increased, the incredible power that women obtained, including their abilities to raise and command armies, obtain extensive landholdings, co-rule, and at times, even rule independently made them threats to their husbands, brothers, and especially sons and daughters. Simply put, there were no guaranteed loyalties in the Hellenistic kingdoms, not even those of mother and child. The process of eliminating rivals led to matricide, fratricide, and even the murder (or attempted murder) of one’s own sons by women.

NOTES

1. Abbreviations of ancient authors, works, and collections of documents are those used by the Oxford Classical Dictionary; abbreviations of journals are those found in *L’Année Philologique*, available at http://www.annee-philologique.com/files/sigles_fr.pdf. Daniel Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: The Hellenistic Dynasties* (London: Duckworth with Classical Press of Wales, 1999), *passim*.

2. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, x.
3. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, xiv.
4. Daniel Ogden, "The Royal Families of Argead Macedon and the Hellenistic World," in *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, ed. Beryl Rawson (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 92–107.
5. I first began to develop this idea in *Postcolonial Amazons: Female Masculinity and Courage in Ancient Greek and Sanskrit Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 222. This essay represents a significant expansion of my brief thoughts on "metric strife" presented therein.
6. I will discuss the possible, albeit brief, sole rule of Cleopatra Thea in the Seleucid kingdom below. Cleopatra I, II, and VII, as well as Berenike III and IV, stand out as examples of women who managed to rule Egypt, or part of it, alone. In many of these cases the women nominally had co-rulers (usually sons or younger brothers), so we must understand their sole power as situational rather than absolute. On these Ptolemaic queens and their power, see Grace Harriet Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1932), 145–70, 172–5, 180–223, 230–2; Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra* (Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1990), 23–8; R.A. Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), ix–x, 122–58.
7. On this trend in Macedon proper, see Elizabeth Carney, *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000), 228–32; on the decrease of polygamy and the increase of endogamy among the third-century Hellenistic dynasties, see Elizabeth Carney, *Arsinoë of Egypt and Macedon* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 4–5.
8. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, ix.
9. E. Carney "Foreign Influence and the Changing Role of Royal Macedonian Women," *Ancient Macedonia* 5 (1993): 320–1.
10. W.S. Greenwalt, "Polygamy and Succession in Argead Macedonia," *Arethusa* 22.1 (1989): 32–3; Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, xvi.
11. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, ix; see also Daniel Ogden, *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis, Sexuality* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2011), 112–13.
12. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, xi.
13. *Ibid.*
14. Carney, *Arsinoë of Egypt and Macedon*, esp. 4–5, 18.
15. Carney further notes that succession disputes still occurred with the naming of co-kings, but "now happened during the lifetime of the royal father, rather than after his death." *Ibid.*, 4.

16. Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy*, esp. 156.
17. Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens*, 6, 111–223, 230–2; Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy*, 102–59. See also Gunther Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, trans. Tina Saavedra (London: Routledge, 2001), 206.
18. Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 18–23. Carney (*Arsinoë*, 115) notes that Arsinoë's designation as the "King of Upper and Lower Egypt," a title ordinarily only held by male pharaohs, "even if posthumous" still identifies her as a ruler.
19. Hazzard (*Imagination of a Monarchy*, 101) argues that Argead and Seleucid royal women "had shown skill and courage" on several occasions, but "unlike Ptolemaic queens, never managed to solidify their positions of power or pass them down to other women, because such a political feat required the approval of other members of the court." Macurdy (*Hellenistic Queens*, 7) notes that among the Seleucids, "[o]nly in exceptional circumstances did a queen have the power of a king..."
20. Although the Antigonids were indeed free from dynastic disputes "for several generations" as Plutarch here notes, Ogden astutely observes that "[t]he coherence of the dynasty was undermined only when the meddling of Rome inflicted upon it a traditional amphimetric legitimacy dispute between Perseus and Demetrius," which had "devastating effects." See Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes, and Death*, xii; 171–98.
21. Several other examples come to mind that I do not have room to discuss here. The first is the matricide of Thessalonice, the last surviving known child of Philip II, by her son Antipater. See Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens*, 52–5; Elizabeth Carney, "The Sisters of Alexander the Great: Royal Relicts," *Historia* 37:4 (1988): 385–92; *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*, 153–9; Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, 53–7. The second is the so-called "fratricidal war" in which Antiochus Hierax, aided by his mother Laodice, fought against his full-brother Seleucus II for the Seleucid throne (Plut. *Mor.* 489a). See further Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, 131–2.
22. On Berenice's life and activities, see Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens*, 130–6; Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 20, 23; Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy*, 110–15; Dee Clayman, *Berenice II and the Golden Age of Ptolemaic Egypt* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014); Branko van Oppen de Ruiter, *Berenice II: Essays on Ptolemaic Queenship* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Penrose, *Postcolonial Amazons*, 210–15.
23. Justin's assertion that Berenice II's father was Magas is confirmed by Polybius (15.25.2), as well as an inscription on the Exedra of Thermos (*IG IX, I² 56c*). See Chris Bennett, "The Children of Ptolemy III and the date of the Exedra of Thermos," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 138 (2002), 141–5; Clayman, *Berenice II*, esp. 1–5, 30, 139; Oppen de Ruiter, *Berenice II*, esp. 1–2, 32.

24. Clayman notes that Justin probably drew upon Phylarchus of Athens as a source for the story of Berenice's ordering the execution of Demetrius. Although Polybius (2.56, 63) accuses Phylarchus of exaggeration and carelessness in his history, Callimachus's *Lock of Berenice* confirms that Berenice ordered the deed. *Berenice II*, 5.
25. See Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 20; Clayman, *Berenice II*, 33, 126, 141; Oppen de Ruiter, *Berenice II*, 34; Penrose, *Postcolonial Amazons*, 210–15.
26. Despite the fact that she was definitely the child of Magas, Berenice is identified as the daughter of Ptolemy II and Arsinoë II on official inscriptions, such as the Canopus decree (*OGIS* 56), and she is also called Ptolemy III's sister. This fictive kinship may have resulted from an adoption. It was used to shore up Berenice's authority while Ptolemy III was fighting in Syria, or was simply propaganda that furthered the Ptolemaic claim to Berenice II's dowry, the Cyrenaica. See further Chris Bennett, "Arsinoe and Berenice at the Olympics," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 154 (2005), 92; P.J. Parsons, "Callimachus. Victoria Berenices," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 25 (1977), 7–8; Clayman *Berenice II*, 114–15, 127–8; Oppen de Ruiter, *Berenice II*, 35–40. Berenice's marriage may have occurred before Ptolemy II's death, as Hyginus's account suggests, or, as it was written later, she may have ridden to battle with Ptolemy II while engaged to his son. See further Penrose, *Postcolonial Amazons*, 212; also Clayman, *Berenice*, 42; Oppen de Ruiter, *Berenice II*, 23–40.
27. P.W. Pestman, *Chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques*, *Pap. Lugd. Bat. XXIIA* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), 28; Jan Quaegebeur, "Ptolémée II en adoration devant Arsinoë II divinisée," *BIFAO* 69 (1970): 204–6; Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 19, 23; Branko F. van Oppen de Ruiter, "The Religious Identification of Ptolemaic Queens with Aphrodite, Demeter, Hathor, and Isis," (Ph.D. dissertation, City University of New York, 2007), 248, 463.
28. As suggested in my analysis of historiography on Ptolemaic queens above, the amount of power that both Arsinoë II and Berenice II had in Egypt has been a matter of controversy. See further Gabriella Longega, *Arsinoe II* (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1968), esp. 15, 83–95; Stanley Burstein, "Arsinoe II Philadelphos: A Revisionist View," in *Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Macedonian Heritage*, ed. W. Lindsay Adams and Eugene N. Borza (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982), 197–212; Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 16–23; Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy*, 81–100, 110–15, 154–9; Carney, *Arsinoë*, esp. 9, 89–95, 111–19. On Arsinoë's rule over cities and landholdings, which she probably brought into the Egyptian fold upon marrying Ptolemy II, see Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens*, 117–18; Carney, *Arsinoë*, 36–7. Like Arsinoë II,

- Berenice II brought a considerable dowry, the Cyrenaica, to her marriage with Ptolemy III. See further Clayman, "Berenice and her Lock," *TAPA* 141:2 (2011): 232; *Berenice II*, esp. 39–41; Oppen de Ruiter, *Berenice II*, esp. 38–9.
29. On the role of royal women in pre-Ptolemaic Egypt and its relationship to Ptolemaic woman-power, see Elaine Fantham, Helene Peet Foley, Natalie Boymel Kampen, H.A. Shapiro, and Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 138; Sally Ann Ashton, *The Last Queens of Egypt* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2003), esp. 6–13, 51, 141; Carney, *Arsinoë*, 7–9, 115; Penrose *Postcolonial Amazons*, 185, 186, 203–7.
 30. Ptolemy II had put aside his first wife, Arisinoë I, daughter of Lysimachus, prior to marrying his full sister Arsinoë II. Arsinoë II had furthermore insisted in marriage negotiations with Ptolemy Ceraunus and probably with Ptolemy II that they marry no other women besides herself (Justin 24.2.9). See further Carney, *Arsinoë*, 68–70.
 31. Clayman does note, however, that he had a "power base of his own" and had led an unsuccessful Ptolemaic invasion of Asia Minor in 223 (P. Haun. 6.1.19, 6.1.28–31). Clayman, *Berenice II*, 172.
 32. Carney argues that "[f]ear tended to be the driving force in succession struggles." *Arsinoë*, 23. In this case, fear was the driving force in eliminating potential rivals before such a struggle could occur.
 33. Heichelheim suggests that Berenice II was named co-ruler with her son after Ptolemy III's death. F.M. Heichelheim, s.v. Berenice (3), *OCD*2, 165. Similarly, Cary asserts that Berenice II held power over Ptolemy IV after his succession to the throne. M. Cary, *A History of the Greek World 323–146 B.C.*, 2nd edn (London: Methuen, 1951), 90.
 34. Justin 36.2; Hyginus *Poet. Astr.* 2.24; Plut. *Cleom.* 33 (all of which are discussed immediately above). A fourth possible extant source on this count is found in a fragment of Callimachus (fr. 388, ed. Pfeiffer), which mentions Berenice and appears to suggest that she is holding a weapon. See further Clayman, *Berenice II*, 33; Susan Stephens, "Battle of the Books," in *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, ed. Kathryn Gutzwiller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 241–2. Stephens questions the veracity of Berenice's martial prowess. If women today can make the rank of Ranger, why could a Hellenistic queen not have led troops?
 35. Carney notes that the motives of royal women are generally viewed by ancient historians as private, whereas the motives of royal men are attributed to public, political causes. *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*, 12.
 36. On Ptolemaic rule in Coele-Syria from 301 to ca. 198, see further Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy*, 105 n. 16, 123.

37. Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens*, 98, fig. 5a.
38. E.T. Newell, *Late Seleucid Mints in Ake-Ptolemais and Damascus* (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1939), 10–13 no. 7, 14 no. 9.
39. U. Kahrstedt, “Frauen auf antiken Münzen,” *Clio* 10 (1910): 279–80; Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens*, 98–9; Whitehorne, *Cleopatras*, 160–1; Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, 151, Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy*, 101. This assertion is based solely upon numismatic evidence. Berenice II is thought to have minted coins showing solely herself while her father was still alive, and continued to mint coins in her own name after becoming the queen of Egypt, yet she was married to Ptolemy III who was clearly king. See Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, 47 fig. 2.2; Clayman, *Berenice II*, fig. 1; Oppen de Ruiter, *Berenice II*, 39, 41–9.
40. Cf. Whitehorne, *Cleopatras*, 162–3; Bennett, “Ptolemaic Dynasty,” s.v. Cleopatra Thea, available at http://www.tyndalehouse.com/Egypt/ptolemies/thea_fr.htm (accessed August 18, 2016).
41. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, 151.
42. Ogden, *Alexander the Great*, 112–13, emphasis mine. It should be noted that, in the case of Cleopatra Thea, we are dealing with what may be polyandry, not polygyny, and this is a major contributing factor.
43. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, 147–52.
44. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, xi; see also 147–52.
45. As in the Argead dynasty, “internal and external bonds of *philia* (friendship or alliance)” were “critical to reaching the throne and then keeping it” among Hellenistic dynasts. Carney, *Arsinoë*, 23. The support of the Alexandrian aristocracy, in accordance with Carney’s observation, was critical to Ptolemy IX’s accession, despite Cleopatra III’s alleged preference for Ptolemy X. Ager asserts that, in giving Cleopatra III the choice of sons with whom to co-rule, Ptolemy VIII created a situation in which both sons “considered that they had a legitimate claim” to rule, which Cleopatra III in turn exacerbated by favoring the younger Ptolemy X. Sheila Ager, “The Power of Excess: Royal Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty,” *Anthropologica* 48 (2006): 165–86.
46. See Whitehorne, *Cleopatras*, 134–5.
47. See further E. Van’t Dack, W. Clarysse, G. Cohen, J. Quaegebeur, J.K. Winnicki, *The Judean–Syrian–Egyptian Conflict of 103–101 BCE: A Multilingual Dossier Concerning a “War of Sceptres”* (Brussels: Koninklijke Academie, 1989); Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, 208–10; Cédric Pillionel, “Les reines hellénistiques sur les champs de bataille,” in *Egypte–Grèce–Rome: les différents visages des femmes antiques*, ed. Florence Bertholet, Anne Bielman Sánchez, and Regula Frei-Stolba (Bern: Peter Lang, 2008), 122–3, 129, 137–8.
48. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death*, 84, argues that “the privileging of princesses as specially authorised bearers of the next generation had other

effects too: it delivered a great deal of power into the hands of princesses, and it completely undermined the hitherto reliable bonds of loyalty and cooperation between full siblings.”

49. Macurdy, *Hellenistic Queens*, 5; Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*, 17–28; Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy*, 156–7; Penrose, *Postcolonial Amazons*, esp. 216–19.
50. Gayle Rubin, “The Traffic in Women: Notes on the ‘Political Economy’ of Sex,” in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 157–210.
51. Ptolemy III invaded Syria when his sister, Berenice Phernophorus, was abandoned by Antiochus II in favor of Antiochus’s first wife, Laodice. Unfortunately, he arrived too late, but set a precedent that later Seleucid kings must have taken into consideration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ager, Sheila. “The Power of Excess: Royal Incest and the Ptolemaic Dynasty.” *Anthropologica* 48 (2006): 165–186.
- Ashton, Sally Ann. *The Last Queens of Egypt*. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2003.
- Bennett, Chris. “Ptolemaic Dynasty,” s.v. Cleopatra Thea. Available at http://www.tyndalehouse.com/Egypt/ptolemies/thea_fr.htm. Accessed August 18, 2016.
- . “The Children of Ptolemy III and the Date of the Exedra of Thermos.” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 138 (2002): 141–145.
- . “Arsinoë and Berenice at the Olympics.” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 154 (2005): 91–96.
- Burstein, Stanley. “Arsinoë II Philadelphos: A Revisionist View.” In *Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Macedonian Heritage*. Edited by W. Lindsay Adams and Eugene N. Borza, 197–212. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982.
- Carney, Elizabeth. “The Sisters of Alexander the Great: Royal Relicts.” *Historia* 37:4 (1988): 385–404.
- . “Foreign Influence and the Changing Role of Royal Macedonian Women.” *Ancient Macedonia* 5 (1993): 313–323.
- . *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000.
- . *Arsinoë of Egypt and Macedon*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Cary, M. *A History of the Greek World 323–146 B.C.* 2nd ed. London: Methuen, 1951.
- Clayman, Dee. “Berenice and Her Lock.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 141:2 (2011): 229–246.

- . *Berenice II and the Golden Age of Ptolemaic Egypt*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Fantham, Elaine, Helene Peet Foley, Natalie Boymel Kampen, H.A. Shapiro, and Sarah B. Pomeroy. *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Greenwalt, W.S. "Polygamy and Succession in Argead Macedonia," *Arethusa* 22:1 (1989): 19–45.
- Hazzard, R.A. *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.
- Hölbl, Gunther. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. Translated by Tina Saavedra. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Kahrstedt, U. "Frauen auf antiken Münzen." *Klio* 10 (1910): 261–314.
- Longega, Gabriella. *Arsinoe II*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1968.
- Macurdy, Grace Harriet. *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1932.
- Newell, E.T. *Late Seleucid Mints in Ake-Ptolemais and Damascus*. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1939.
- Ogden, Daniel. *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: The Hellenistic Dynasties*. London: Duckworth with Classical Press of Wales, 1999.
- . "The Royal Families of Argead Macedon and the Hellenistic World." In *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Edited by Beryl Rawson, 92–107. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- . *Alexander the Great: Myth, Genesis, Sexuality*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2011.
- Oppen de Ruiter, Branko van. "The Religious Identification of Ptolemaic Queens with Aphrodite, Demeter, Hathor, and Isis." Ph.D. dissertation. City University of New York, 2007.
- . *Berenice II: Essays on Ptolemaic Queenship*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Parsons, P.J. "Callimachus. Victoria Berenices." *Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 25 (1977): 1–50.
- Penrose Jr., Walter. *Postcolonial Amazons: Female Masculinity and Courage in Ancient Greek and Sanskrit Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Pestman, P.W. *Chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques, Pap. Lugd. Bat. XXIIA*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Pillonel, Cédric. "Les reines hellénistiques sur les champs de bataille." In *Egypte–Grèce–Rome: les différents visages des femmes antiques*. Edited by Florence Bertholet, Anne Bielman Sánchez, and Regula Frei-Stolba, 117–145. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: From Alexander to Cleopatra*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990.

- Quaegebeur, Jan. "Ptolémée II en adoration devant Arsinoé II divinisée." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie Orientale* 69 (1970): 191–217.
- Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. Edited by Rayna R. Reiter, 157–210. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.
- Stephens, Susan. "Battle of the Books." In *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Edited by Kathryn Gutzwiller, 229–248. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Van't Dak, E., W. Clarysse, G. Cohen, J. Quaegebeur, and J.K. Winnicki. *The Judean-Syrian-Egyptian Conflict of 103–101 BCE: A Multilingual Dossier Concerning a "War of Sceptres"*. Brussels: Koninklijke Academie, 1989.
- Whitehorne, John. *Cleopatra*. London: Taylor & Francis/Routledge, 1994.



On the Alleged Treachery of Julia Domna and Septimius Severus's Failed Siege of Hatra

Riccardo Bertolazzi

Julia Domna, the first Syrian-born Augusta in Roman history (Emesa, CE 165 [ca.]–Antioch, 217), is certainly one of the most interesting women who lived at the imperial court in over three centuries of the Principate. Her constant presence at the side of her husband, Septimius Severus (145–211), and her son, Caracalla (188–217), and her exceptional prominence on artworks, inscriptions, and coins has attracted the attention of many scholars in both distant and recent times. Despite this, the majority of them have concentrated their attention on a—relatively—small number of topics, such as her alleged contribution to the “orientalization” of the Empire and her role as mother in the Severan family. Over a century ago, Alfred von Domaszewski identified Domna as the person responsible for the great diffusion of oriental cults and customs in Rome and the western provinces between the end of the second century and the beginning of the third.¹ During the following decades, however, the majority of scholars rejected this theory. Between the 1970s and 1980s,

I would like to thank Elizabeth Carney and Erica Filippini for their useful suggestions. Any remaining errors are mine alone.

R. Bertolazzi (✉)
University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

through the analysis of inscriptions, artworks, and coins, Kettenhofen and Ghedini stressed Domna's "Romanness" and her non-involvement in any initiative aimed at imposing "oriental" habits in the western part of the Empire.² Further studies on Domna's coins and inscriptions have investigated the importance of her figure in the dynastic propaganda of the Severan regime.³ More recently, Levick's biography and Langford's study of the use of Domna's maternal image by Severus to promote the dynasty have also addressed this topic.⁴ Levick and Langford, nonetheless, claimed that the political power of the Syrian Augusta could not have been as important as the great quantity of documentation about her might suggest. In my view, Domna's influence in public affairs has never been the subject of an exhaustive investigation. Although literary sources do not mention Domna very often, it is occasionally possible to detect allusions to the importance of her role at court. One of these is the accusation of treachery that, according to Aurelius Victor (*Caes.* 20.35), was brought against Domna during the reign of Septimius Severus:

Huic tanto domi forisque uxoris probra summam gloriae dempsere, quam adeo famose complexus est, uti cognita libidine ac ream coniuratiollis retentaverit.

The scandalous behaviour of his wife diminished the outstanding reputation of this man [i.e. Severus], who was so great at home and abroad, for he was so infamously attached to her that he retained her even after he had learned of her wantonness and when she was implicated in a conspiracy.⁵

Although Aurelius Victor wrote his lives of the Caesars a century and a half after the death of Severus, the authenticity of the information regarding Domna seems likely. In fact, it appears in the context of other documented facts about Severus, such as his interest in erudition (20.32), the existence of his autobiography (20.33), and the great attention he paid to legislative matters (20.34).⁶ The origin of these charges against Domna is normally attributed to C. Fulvius Plautianus, sole Prefect of the Guard since at least 197 and kinsman of Severus on his mother's side.⁷ The hatred of Plautianus for Domna is well documented by Cassius Dio, who alludes to the enmity between the Prefect and the Augusta on several occasions. Dio writes (76 [75].15.6), that "[Plautianus] often treated even Julia Augusta in an outrageous manner. He heartily detested her and was always abusing her violently to Severus. He used to conduct investigations into her conduct as well as gather evidence against her by inquiring amongst women of the nobility."⁸ Plautianus likely put a special emphasis on Domna's

alleged infidelity and treacherous behavior in his attacks against her in his conversations with Severus (σφοδρά αὐτὴν πρὸς Σεουήρον ἀεὶ διέβαλλεν). Our sources do not offer any clarification of the accusations of adultery. Such charges, however, were often leveled at imperial women, and these could have been a consequence of mere rumors.⁹ On the other hand, the accusation of treachery seems to be more serious and connected to specific events. Unfortunately, neither the work of Dio nor other accounts specify the origin of the enmity between Domna and Plautianus or the basis for the accusation of plotting against Severus. Yet the Augusta must have suffered serious hardships from the powerful Prefect of the Guard, since Dio (77 [76].4.4) reports that, when in 205 Caracalla eventually killed Plautianus, “this caused great joy to Julia.” Considering that the struggle between these two personalities should have represented one of the major court events during the rule of Septimius Severus, these two omissions by our sources acquire considerable relevance for both the study of this reign and for our understanding of the influence of Domna. In what follows I will therefore focus on the examination of these two issues.

THE ENMITY WITH PLAUTIANUS AND THE SIEGE OF HATRA

In his study of Plautianus, Grosso made some interesting observations regarding the possible motives for the hostility between Domna and the Prefect. According to Grosso, the frictions started during Severus’s second Parthian campaign, which took place during the years 197–198 in Syria and Mesopotamia.¹⁰ The *Historia Augusta* relates that, in this period, the young sons of Severus, Geta and Caracalla, developed a strong hostility towards the Prefect on account of his cruelty.¹¹ Severus had, in fact, entrusted Plautianus with the task of punishing those who, during the civil war of 194, had supported Pescennius Niger, the governor of Syria whom the Eastern legions had proclaimed emperor in 193. Notwithstanding, Plautianus took advantage of this situation to accumulate plunder during his stay in the Middle Eastern provinces.¹² This policy instigated the enmity of Domna, whose Syrian origin naturally connected her with the Syrian and Mesopotamian communities. Although she is not explicitly mentioned, she was probably behind the hostility of Caracalla and Geta towards Plautianus.

With this in mind, another episode could, in my view, be related to the power struggle between the Prefect and the Augusta. This is Severus’s second attempt to capture the caravan city of Hatra, which was located in

central Mesopotamia on the way to Ctesiphon, the Parthian capital. After a failed offensive in the first half of 198, the emperor decided to attack the city once again in the autumn of the same year.¹³ Dio (76 [75].12.1) says that the siege was almost at the point of being successful, since the soldiers managed to break through the outer wall and were impatient to storm the city. Severus, however, “checked them from doing so by ordering the signal for retreat to be clearly sounded on every side. For the place enjoyed great fame, containing as it did a vast number of offerings to the Sun-god as well as vast sums of money; and he expected the Arabians [i.e. the inhabitants of Hatra] to come to terms voluntarily, in order to avoid being forcibly captured and enslaved.”¹⁴ Severus’s decision allowed the Hatrenes enough time to repair the wall and also caused a revolt of the European contingents who were ordered to repeat the assault, as the city showed no intention of surrendering. After twenty days of siege, the emperor eventually returned to Syria (Dio 76 [75].3–5).

Now, during the reign of Severus, the decision to prevent soldiers from plundering a city in order to save its sanctuaries is quite unheard of. Only a few years before, in the course of the civil wars against Pescennius Niger and Clodius Albinus, the troops loyal to Severus had sacked important Roman cities such as Lugdunum (Herod. 3.7.7) and Byzantium (Dio 75 [74].14.3). Moreover, at the beginning of 198, the emperor allowed his soldiers to brutally plunder the capital of the enemy, Ctesiphon (Dio 76 [75].9.4; Herod. 3.9.11; *Sev.* 15.5).

The concern over the temples of a Sun-god is likewise strange. Although, during this period, reverses depicting solar themes are documented on his coinage, scholars have likened this evidence to similar coins struck by Trajan and Hadrian, thus suggesting a reference to Severus’s Middle Eastern campaigns and stay in the East rather than to a display of personal devotion.¹⁵ The only personality who could be strongly related to this cult is his wife, Julia Domna. She was, in fact, the daughter of Julius Bassianus, the chief priest of the god Elagabal, the solar deity that was worshipped in the Syrian city of Emesa (modern Homs).¹⁶ The hypothesis that Domna might have been somehow implicated in the failed sieges of Hatra is not completely new. According to Langford, during the first siege, the soldiers complained about the Augusta. Langford’s proof would be the words that, according to Dio (76 [75].10.2), a resentful tribune uttered by paraphrasing a verse from the *Aeneid*, “in order that Turnus may marry Lavinia, we are meanwhile perishing all unheeded.”¹⁷ Although the quotation may suggest a comparison between Domna and Lavinia, scholars have been unwilling to

accept this interpretation.¹⁸ *En passant*, however, Langford makes a reference to the religious background of the Augusta and its connection to the solar cult of Hatra as a possible cause of the grudge that the soldiers held.¹⁹

In my opinion, the relationship between Domna and the Hatrenes can be explored further. First of all, it is necessary to stress that people of Arab ethnicity populated both Emesa and Hatra.²⁰ It might be a coincidence, but in the work of Cassius Dio the same words, “Sun-god” (θεός Ἥλιος or just Ἥλιος), are used to refer to the Sun gods of both Emesa and Hatra (68.31.2; 79 [78].31.1), while Herodian utilizes θεός Ἥλιος with respect to the god of Emesa (5.3.4–5; 5.6.6–8). The use of the same expression indicates that, in the eyes of the ancient historians, the deities venerated in these cities were alike. The religious backgrounds of these cities might have been consequently quite similar, and at the same time not very different from that of other Syrian and Mesopotamian cities such as Palmyra and Edessa. Furthermore, until the late first century CE, a dynasty of priest-kings with numerous connections to other Middle Eastern kingdoms had ruled Emesa.²¹ Even after the city had passed under Roman rule during the reign of Antoninus Pius, the nobility of the city was still able to provide dynasts for other kingdoms. This is demonstrated by the fact that in 168 Lucius Verus put a Soaemus (whose name was typical of the Emesene nobility) on the throne of Armenia.²² Domna herself, who is called “noblewoman from the Orient” (*nobilis orientis mulier*) by the *HA* (*Alex.* 5.4), was almost certainly descended from the royal family of Emesa, which continued to maintain the monopoly of the priesthood of Elagabal after the inclusion of the kingdom in the Roman province of Syria.²³

As for Hatra, it is interesting to observe that a dynasty of priest-kings ruled the city from the second century CE to the first half of the third.²⁴ The most important civic deity was indeed a solar god, whose Semitic name was Maren, “our Lord.” He was also called Shamash on the coins struck by the city.²⁵ On more than one occasion, Dio mentions the protection that this deity would accord to Hatra (68.31.2; 76 [75].12.2), thus demonstrating that the Romans were well aware of this circumstance. After all, the cult of Shamash is well documented in Palmyra, where a *thiasos* (a religious guild or fraternity) was dedicated to the worship of this deity.²⁶ Shamash was also particularly popular in Emesa. The dynastic name of several rulers of this city was, in fact, *Sampsigeram*, which means “Shamash has decided.”²⁷ On the tetradrachms that the city struck for Domna and Caracalla during the reign of the latter, the Sun-god appears under an eagle wearing a drape and the usual radiate crown.²⁸

Therefore, in the court of Severus, Julia Domna is the character who was most likely related to the cults of Hatra, and to the aristocracy of this city. While describing the worshipping of Elagabal in Emesa, Herodian (5.3.4) says that this cult enjoyed great renown not only in the city but also in the neighboring regions. According to the historian, satraps and “barbarian kings” (βασιλεῖς βάρβαροι) were trying to outdo each other in sending rich gifts to the temple. The word βάρβαροι certainly applies to kings who were living outside the boundaries of the Roman Empire, such as the kings of Hatra. Hence, it is likely that the sovereigns of this city were among the kings who used to pay homage to the god of Emesa. Strong relationships between the Emesene aristocracy—to which Domna belonged—and the nobility of Hatra are in consequence highly probable.

The possibility that Plautianus had a role in the siege of Hatra appears to be something more than a mere supposition. According to Herodian (3.9.1), Severus decided to attack the city because its king, Barsemius, had supported Pescennius Niger during the civil war of 194. Since the *HA* says that the Prefect of the Guard had been entrusted with the specific task of punishing those who had supported Niger, and that he was taking advantage of this role to accumulate plunder, it is logical to expect him to have had some interests in an hypothetical sack of Hatra. At this point, Plautianus should have been well aware that Domna was hampering his plans by warning the emperor against treating Middle Eastern cities with excessive cruelty. Consequently, Plautianus may have accused her of favoring the enemies of Severus who had supported Pescennius Niger. In so far as Hatra was a kingdom that was not part of the Empire, the accusations brought against Domna were likely to include conspiracy with external enemies as well.

DOMNA AND THE CITIES OF THE EAST BETWEEN 197 AND 202

Numismatic evidence from a notable number of Middle Eastern cities indicates that relationships between Domna and these communities existed. A coin struck by the city of Laodicea ad Mare, in Syria, displays the bust of Severus on the obverse and the profile of Domna within a temple-like structure on the reverse.²⁹ This is the first time that an imperial woman appears on the coinage of Laodicea, and the legend ΑΥΓ ΔΟΜΝΑ ΤΥΧΗ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΕΩΣ (“Domna Augusta, Fortune of the metropolis”) clearly shows that she was considered the tutelary deity (*Tyche*) of

this city.³⁰ On account of its loyalty to the Severans during the civil war against Niger, Severus awarded Tyre the title of metropolis in 194, and between 197 and 198 the *ius Italicum* (exemption from the land tax and protection by the Roman law), along with the title of colony.³¹ This event was celebrated with the striking of new coins not only for Severus, but also for Domna. Both the emperor and the Augusta were in fact indicated as the re-founders of the city, as the reverses displaying a human figure in the act of plowing with oxen demonstrate.³² During the period from 197 to 202, when the imperial court resided in the East, other local communities dedicated coins to the Augusta. Considering that civic mints, unlike the imperial ones located in Rome, did not normally strike coins for each emperor/imperial woman, their issues honoring Domna certainly had the purpose of attracting her attention and benevolence. Paltos (Syria), which in 200 received permission from Severus to mint its own coinage, issued coins with the bust of Domna wearing the mural crown and others with the legend ΑΥΓ ΔΟΜΝΑ (ΤΥΧΗ) ΠΑΛΑΘΝΩΝ (“Domna Augusta [Fortune] of the Paltenians”).³³ Between 200 and 201, Eirenopolis (Cilicia) honored Domna with coins showing her on the obverse and the civic deity, Eirene, on the reverse.³⁴ Caesarea Panias (Palestine), in 199, struck a series of coins with the bust of Domna on the obverse and the image of Fortuna (*Tyche*) with scepter and cornucopia on the reverse.³⁵ Ascalon and Sebaste (Palestine) minted coins in honor of the Augusta between 200 and 202.³⁶ Tripolis (Syria) started to issue coins honoring Domna in 202, when the imperial family was about to leave for Rome.³⁷ Together with Severus, Domna also appears on the obverses of coins minted in Carrhae in Mesopotamia. On the reverses, the bust of the Augusta appears alone on the left, while the right side is occupied by a large lunar crescent.³⁸ This image might suggest the equiparation between Domna and the Mesopotamian moon-god Sin, the guardian deity of this city, who was particularly revered by Caracalla.³⁹

Inscriptions also show some evidence concerning how Syrian cities might have tried to capture not only the attention of the Augusta, but also the benevolence of her sister, Julia Maesa. The city of Berytus, which was punished by Severus for having sided with Niger, took particular care in paying homage to Domna. Her name is included in a dedication that a priestess of the imperial cult (*flaminica*), Sentia Magnia Saeophare, set up in honor of Severus, Caracalla, and Domna when the imperial family came to the East in 197.⁴⁰ More or less at the same time, or a little later, the city council of this city put up a statue dedicated to the Augusta in the forum.⁴¹

Another statue dedicated to Domna's sister Julia Maesa, from the forum of Palmyra, indicates that the inhabitants of this city also used to hold the relatives of the Augusta in high regard.⁴² The inscription on the statue base is unfortunately too general to provide a precise dating, but the expression 'Ιουλίαν Μαΐσαν, 'Ιουλίας Σεβαστῆς ἀδελφήν ("to Julia Maesa, sister of Julia Augusta") demonstrates that Domna was still reigning. Maesa, in fact, became Augusta only after the death of her sister, in 218, and from Dio (79 [78].30.3) we know that Maesa lived at court from early on in Severus's rule. Consequently there is a good chance that she accompanied Domna while the imperial court sojourned in the East.

Finally, it is significant that one of the best example of Domna's early portraits comes from Syria. This is a bronze head, now preserved in the Fogg Museum (Harvard Art Museums), which originally belonged to a life-size statue.⁴³ It was found at Salaminias, a small center located *ca.* 44 kilometers north-east of Emesa.⁴⁴ According to Hiesinger, who published this artefact, both the hairstyle and the somatic traits point to a date in the very last years of the second century, when Domna was present in Syria.⁴⁵ This circumstance suggests that images of the Augusta were at this time already widespread in this area, an evident sign of how locals were perceiving her importance and influence.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING SYRIAN

Although on coins and artworks Domna is normally represented as the traditional Roman imperial woman, it is occasionally possible to note that she did not completely abandon Syrian customs after becoming Augusta. This might suggest that, even when staying in Rome, the relationship with her fatherland and its communities was still strong. The most famous display of "Syrianness" is a panel on the Arch of the Money-Changers (*Arcus Argentariorum*) in Rome, the richly decorated arch that the guild of the money-changers set up to honor the imperial family. Here Domna is portrayed performing a sacrifice together with Severus. Though wearing the *palla*, the traditional dress of Roman matrons, the Augusta is displayed in a hieratic frontal pose and with her right hand raised with the palm turned outwards, a typical Near Eastern devotional posture, which appears on innumerable occasions on statues from Palmyra and Hatra.⁴⁶ When Caracalla married Plautilla, the daughter of Plautianus, Dio (77 [78].1.2), using a polemic tone, writes that the wedding banquet was "partly in royal and partly in barbaric style, receiving not only all the customary cooked

viands but also uncooked meat and sundry animals still alive.”⁴⁷ Considering that in Dio’s account of the Severan period the adjective “barbarian” always refers to Syrian customs (for instance, Elagabalus’s dress (80 [79].11.2), and the “barbarian” chants that Julia Maesa and Julia Soaemias were singing while praying to Elagabal (80 [79].11.1), it seems very likely that the banquet was partly in Roman and partly in Syrian style.⁴⁸

Finally, evidence suggests that Domna and her Syrian relatives who were living at court continued to worship their *deus patrius*, Elagabal. The husband of her sister Julia Maesa, C. Julius Avitus Alexianus, while holding a legateship in Raetia during the reign of Severus, set up an altar to the “Sun Elagabal, god of his fatherland” (*deus patrius Solis Elagabalus*).⁴⁹ In 199, a priest of the Sun Elagabal (*sacerdos Solis Elagabali*) is for the first time documented in Rome, where he set up an altar to honor this deity.⁵⁰ His name, Julius Balbillus, suggests an Emesene origin, and his acquaintance with freedmen of Severus and Caracalla indicates a certain affinity with the imperial household.⁵¹ These inscriptions come from a temple where other Oriental deities such as the Dea Syria, Astarte and the Palmyrenean gods were venerated.⁵² With good reasons, therefore, Chaussou has hypothesized that Balbillus came to Rome as a member of the entourage of Domna, and that he was in charge of the cult of Elagabal, a deity whom the Syrian members of the imperial house held in special regard.⁵³

CONCLUSION

If this reconstruction of the conflict between Plautianus and the Syrian Augusta is correct, the generic accusations of treachery against Domna that appear in the account of Aurelius Victor should be placed in a specific historical setting. Severus’s campaigns in Mesopotamia and the stay of the imperial family in the East for almost five years, from the middle of 197 to the beginning of 202, were the main context for the deterioration of the relationship between these two imperial characters. Plautianus accumulated riches by taking advantage of his task of prosecuting the opponents of Severus’s ex-rival, Pescennius Niger. The plundering of the Middle Eastern communities caused the hostility of Domna, whose Syrian origin and cultural background made her connections with Eastern elites strong. The failed attack on Hatra is, in my view, emblematic of this conflict. This caravan city was supposedly persecuted for having supported Niger, but it is reasonable to assume that the real objective of Plautianus, and of part of the army, was to seize its treasures, which were mainly offerings to a

famous deity venerated in the entire Syrian–Mesopotamian area. The fact that the emperor checked them from doing so might indicate that Domna’s concerns about the damages caused by the rapacity of Plautianus to the Middle Eastern cities had an impact on Severus’ decisions. The Prefect of the Guard, however, may have taken this event as an opportunity to accuse the Augusta of plotting with the enemies of Severus and the Empire.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AE</i>	<i>L’Année Épigraphique</i>
<i>BMC Galatia</i>	Warwick Wroth, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Galatia, Cappadocia and Syria</i> (London: British Museum, 1899)
<i>BMC Phoenicia</i>	George F. Hill, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia</i> (London: British Museum, 1910)
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
<i>IGLS</i>	<i>Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie</i>
Lindgren & Kovacs	Henry C. Lindgren, Frank L. Kovacs, <i>Ancient Bronze Coins of Asia Minor and the Levant from the Lindgren Collection</i> (San Mateo: Chrysopylon Publications, 1985)
<i>PIR</i> ²	<i>Prosopographia Imperii Romani</i> (2nd edn)
<i>SNG ANS</i>	Ya’akov Meshorer, <i>Sylloge nummorum Graecorum. American Numismatic Society, 6, Palestine–South Arabia</i> (New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1981)
<i>SNG Levante</i>	Edoardo Levante, <i>Sylloge nummorum Graecorum Switzerland. Cilicia</i> . (Berne: Crédit Suisse, 1986)
<i>SNG Levante–France</i>	Edoardo Levante, <i>Sylloge nummorum Graecorum. France, 2, Cilicie</i> . (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale. Cabinet des Médailles)

NOTES

1. Abbreviations of ancient authors, works, and collections of documents are those used by the Oxford Classical Dictionary; abbreviations of journals are those found in *L’Année Philologique*, available at http://www.annee-philologique.com/files/sigles_fr.pdf. Alfred Von Domaszewski, *Die Religion*

- des römischen Heeres* (Trier: Verlag der Fr. Lintz'schen Buchhandlung, 1895), 72–3.
2. Erich Kettenhofen, *Die syrischen Augustae in der historischen Überlieferung; ein Beitrag zum Problem der Orientalisierung* (Bonn: Habelt, 1979), 9–28, 75–143; Francesca Ghedini, *Giulia Domna tra Oriente e Occidente. Le fonti archeologiche* (Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1984), especially 185–93, with further references on the previous scholarly debate on this topic.
 3. Jane Fejfer, “The Portraits of the Severan Empress Julia Domna. A New Approach,” *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 14 (1985): 129–38; Susann Lusnia, “Julia Domna's Coinage and Severan Dynastic Propaganda,” *Latomus* 54.1 (1995): 119–40; Erica Filippini, “Il ruolo di Giulia Domna nell'ideologia imperiale. La documentazione numismatica,” *Società Donne & Storia* 4 (2008): 1–69; Anna L. Morelli, *Madri di uomini e di dèi. La rappresentazione della maternità attraverso la documentazione numismatica di epoca romana* (Bologna: Ante Quem, 2009); Erica Filippini, “‘Imagines aureae’: le emissioni in oro di Giulia Domna,” in *Oreficeria in Emilia Romagna: archeologia e storia tra età romana e medio-evo*, ed. Anna L. Morelli, and Isabella Baldini Lippolis (Bologna: Ante Quem, 2010), 79–96.
 4. Barbara Levick, *Julia Domna. Syrian Empress* (London: Routledge, 2007); Julie Langford, *Maternal Megalomania: Julia Domna and the Imperial Politics of Motherhood* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013).
 5. *Aurelius Victor: De Caesaribus*, translated by Harry W. Bird (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994). This information probably passed from Aurelius Victor to the *Historia Augusta* (hereafter *HA*) (*Sev.* 18.8): *Domi tamen minus cautus, qui uxorem Iuliam famosam adulteriis tenuit, ream etiam coniurationis* (“[Severus] was less careful in his home-life, for he retained his wife Julia even though she was notorious for her adulteries and also guilty of plotting against him” *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, translated by David Magie, vol. I (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921)). On Aurelius Victor as source for this section of the *HA*, see Anthony R. Birley “Further Notes on *HA* Severus,” in *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Genevense*, ed. Giorgio Bonamente, François Paschoud (Bari: Edipuglia, 1994), 34–6; André Chastagnol, *Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs romains des IIe et IIIe siècles, traduction par André Chastagnol* (Paris: Laffont, 1994), 305–6; Michel Festy, “Aurélius Victor, source de l' ‘Histoire Auguste’ et de Nicomache Flavien,” in *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Genevense*, ed. François Paschoud (Bari: Edipuglia, 1999), 123.
 6. On the correspondence of these facts to what is reported by other sources, see *Aurelius Victor*, 109. Aurelius Victor was probably gaining his informa-

- tion from the so-called *Kaisergeschichte*, a putative early-fourth-century historical work covering the period from the second century onward: see Harry W. Bird, *Sextus Aurelius Victor. A Historiographical Study* (Leeds: Cairns, 1984), 16–23; *Aurelius Victor*, xii–xiv.
7. Ghedini, *Giulia Domna*, 9–10; Levick, *Julia Domna*, 75–6. On Plautianus (PIR² F 554) in general, see Fulvio Grosso, “Ricerche su Plauziano e gli avvenimenti del suo tempo,” *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche. Rendiconti* 3 (1968): 7–58; Mireille Corbier, “Plautien, comes de Septime-Sévère,” in *Mélanges de philosophie, de littérature et d’histoire ancienne offerts à Pierre Boyancé* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1974), 213–18; Anne Daguet-Gagey, “C. Fulvius Plautianus, ‘hostis publicus’: Rome, 205–208 après J.-C.,” in *La “crise” de l’Empire romain de Marc Aurèle à Constantin: mutations, continuités, ruptures*, ed. Marie-Henriette Quet (Paris: Presse de l’université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2006), 65–94; Maria Letizia Caldelli, “La titolatura di Plauziano: una messa a punto,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 178 (2011): 261–72; Rafael González Fernández, and Pedro David Conesa Navarro, “Plauciano: la amenaza de la *domus* Severiana,” *Potestas* 7 (2014): 27–50; Sandra Bingham, and Alex Imrie, “The Prefect and the Plot: a Reassessment of the Murder of Plautianus,” *Journal of Ancient History* 3.1 (2015): 76–91. This is not the only case of negative propaganda against Domna preserved by fourth-century sources. Letta has attributed the story of her alleged incest with Caracalla (recorded by *Carac.* 10.1, *Caes.* 21.3, *Eutrop.* 8.20, and *Epit.* 21.5) to the propaganda of Macrinus, who during the civil war against Elagabalus (218) tried in this way to discredit the lineage of his rival. On the topic, see Cesare Letta, “Caracalla e Iulia Domna. Tradizioni storiografiche come echi di propaganda politica,” *Abruzzo* 23–28 (1985–1990): 521–9 (*contra* Gabriele Marasco, “Giulia Domna, Caracalla e Geta: frammenti di tragedia alla corte dei Severi,” *L’Antiquité Classique* 65 (1996): 129), and Caillan Davenport, *The Sexual Habits of Caracalla: Rumour, Gossip, and Historiography*, *Histos* 11 (2017): 75–100.
 8. *Dio’s Roman History*, translated by Earnest Cary, vol. IX (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, London: William Heineman, 1969). Καὶ οὕτω καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ὁ Πλαυτιανὸς αὐτοῦ κατεκράτει ὥστε καὶ τὴν Ἰουλίαν τὴν Αὔγουσταν πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ ἐργάσασθαι: πάντοτε γὰρ αὐτῇ ἤχθετο, καὶ σφόδρα αὐτὴν πρὸς τὸν Σεουήρον αἰεὶ διέβαλλεν, ἐξετάσεις τε κατ’αὐτῆς καὶ βασάνους κατ’εὐγενῶν γυναικῶν ποιοῦμενος. I preferred to translate βασάνους ... ποιοῦμενος with “inquiring” rather than “torturing”, which appears in Cary’s edition. In my view, crediting Plautianus with the power of torturing matrons from the high society of Rome does not sound very plausible.

9. Levick, *Julia Domna*, 76. Scholars have already stressed that accusations of sexual misconduct are a very popular topic in the accounts of Roman historians. Among the most famous cases are those of Julia the Elder, Valeria Messalina (María José Hidalgo de la Vega, "La imagen de 'la mala' emperatriz en el Alto Imperio: Mesalina 'meretriz Augusta'," *Gerión* (vol. extra, 2007): 395–410), and Faustina the Younger (Barbara Levick, *Faustina I and II: Imperial Women of the Golden Age* (London: Routledge, 2014), 80–2). In general, see also María José Hidalgo de la Vega, "Princesas imperiales virtuosas e infames en la tradición de la corte romana," in *Costruzione e uso del passato storico nella cultura antica*, ed. Paolo Desideri, Sergio Roda, and Anna Maria Biraschi (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2007), 387–410.
10. Grosso, "Ricerche," 14–15.
11. *Geta* 4.3–4: [*Geta*] ait: "tum plures ergo in civitate tristes erunt quam laeti, quod vicimus." Et obtinuisset eius sententia nisi Plautianus praefectus vel Iuvenalis institissent spe proscriptionum, ex quibus ditati sunt ("[Geta] remarked, 'Then there will be more in the state to mourn than to make merry at our victory.' And he would have carried his point, had not the prefect Plautianus, or rather Juvenalis, stood out against him in the hope of proscriptions, for which they became enriched." *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, translated by David Magie, vol. II (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924). The Juvenalis quoted in the passage should be identified with Flavius Juvenalis, who was Prefect of the Guard in 193 (*PIR*² F 300). According to an inscription from Rome (*CIL* VI 224), however, in 197 Plautianus was already the sole Prefect; on the topic see Grosso, *Ricerche*, 17–24. *Carac.* 1.7–8: *Antiochensibus et Byzantiis interventu suo iura vetusta restituit, quibus iratus fuit Severus, quod Nigrum iuverant. Plautiani odium crudelitatis causa concepit* ("It was at his plea [i.e. of Caracalla] that their ancient rights were restored to the citizens of Antioch and Byzantium, with whom Severus had become angry because they had given aid to Niger. He conceived a hatred for Plautianus because of his cruelty," *HA*).
12. *Sev.* 18.3–4: *In Syriam rediit, ita ut se pararet ac bellum Parthis inferret. Inter haec Pescennianas reliquias Plautiano auctore persequabatur* ("[Severus] returned to Syria in order to make preparations to carry on an offensive war against the Parthians. In the meantime, on the advice of Plautianus, he hunted down the last survivors of Pescennius' revolt," *HA*). According to Dio (77 [78].1.2), a part of Plautianus' enormous riches was paraded through the streets of Rome on occasion of the wedding between his daughter Plautilla and Caracalla, an event that took place soon after the imperial court had returned from the East.

13. On the chronology of these events, see Cesare Letta, "La dinastia dei Severi," in *Storia di Roma*, vol. II, 2 (Torino: Einaudi, 1991), 665; Anthony R. Birley, *The African Emperor: Septimius Severus*, 3rd edn. (London: Routledge, 1999), 130–2. On the siege of Hatra, see also Duncan Campbell, "What happened at Hatra? The Problem of the Severan Siege Operations," in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, ed. Philip Freeman and David Kennedy (Oxford: BAR Publishing, 1986), 51–8.
14. Cary, *Dio's Roman History*. Ἐκώλυσεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Σεουήρος τοῦτο πράξει, τορῶς πανταχόθεν τὸ ἀνακλητικὸν σημαίνῃναι κελεύσας: δόξα τε γὰρ τοῦ χωρίου ὡς καὶ πᾶμπολλα τὰ τε ἄλλα χρήματα καὶ τὰ τοῦ Ἥλιου ἀναθήματα ἔχοντος μεγάλη ἦν, καὶ προσεδόκησεν ἔθειλοντὶ τοὺς Ἀραβίους, ἵνα μὴ βίᾳ ἀλόντες ἀνδραποδισθῶσιν ὁμολογήσειν.
15. Clare Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices. Divine Ideology and Visualisation of Imperial Power in the Severan Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 241–5.
16. See Levick, *Julia Domna*, 6–22 with further references.
17. Langford, *Maternal Megalomania*, 42–4. The original verse is *Aen.* 11.371.
18. Emily Hemelrijk, review of *Maternal Megalomania: Julia Domna and the Imperial Politics of Motherhood*, by Julie Langford, *The Classical World* 108.1 (2014): 143.
19. Langford, *Maternal Megalomania*, 43–4.
20. On Emesa, see Richard Sullivan, "The Dynasty of Emesa," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* II 8 (1978): 198–219; Levick, *Julia Domna*, 6–22. See also Irfan Shahid, *Rome and the Arabs. A Prolegomenon to the Study of Byzantium and the Arabs* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1984), 41–2, 167. On Hatra, see Lucinda Dirven, "Aspects of Hatrene Religion: A Note on the Statues of Kings and Nobles from Hatra," in *The Variety of Local Religious Life in the Near East*, ed. Ted Kaizer (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 209–46 with further references there.
21. See Sullivan, "The Dynasty of Emesa."
22. Cesare Letta, "Dal leone di Giulio Alessandro ai leoni di Caracalla. La dinastia di Emesa verso la porpora imperiale," in *Studi in onore di Edda Bresciani*, ed. Sandro Filippo Bondi, Sergio Pernigotti et al. (Pisa: Giardini, 1985), 294.
23. According to the *HA*, Septimius Severus married Domna because her horoscope had predicted that she would marry a king (*Sev.* 3.9; *Geta* 3.1; *Alex.* 5.4). Levick (*Julia Domna*, 29) has observed that the family of Domna might have invented the story in order to present her in a more attractive light for pretenders. It seems nonetheless more plausible to attri-

- bute the horoscope to the fact that Domna could boast a royal ancestry, as noted by Letta ("Dal leone," 294). On the marriage between Domna and Severus, see also Danuta Okoń, "Mariage de Septime Sévère avec Julia Domna au fond des strategies matrimoniales des familles sénatoriales romaines à la charnière des II^e et III^e siècles," *Eos* 97 (2010): 45–62.
24. For a history of Hatra, see Han J. Willem Drijvers, "Hatra, Palmyra und Edessa. Die Städte der syrischesopotamischen Wüste in politischer, kulturgeschichtlicher und religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* II 8 (1977): 803–37; Stefan Hauser, "Hatra und das Königreich der Araber," in *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse*, ed. Josef Wiesehöfer (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998), 493–528; and Michael Sommer, *Roms orientalische Steppengrenze: Palmyra, Edessa, Dura-Europos, Hatra: eine Kulturgeschichte von Pompeius bis Diocletian* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005).
 25. John Walker, "The Coins of Hatra," *Numismatic Chronicle* 18 (1958): 167. Cf. also Dirven, "Aspects," 213–17 with further references.
 26. Javier Teixidor, *The Pantheon of Palmyra* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 64–7; Ted Kaizer, *The Religious Life of Palmyra: A Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002), 99–100, and 107–8.
 27. Teixidor, *The Pantheon*, 68.
 28. Michel Prieur and Karin Prieur, *A Type Corpus of the Syro-Phoenician Tetradrachms and Their Fractions from 57 BC to AD 253* (London: Chameleon Press, 2000), 116–17.
 29. *BMC Galatia* 81.
 30. Ghedini, *Giulia Domna*, 142; Eckhard Meyer, "Die Bronzeprägung von Laodikeia in Syrien 194–217," *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 37–38 (1987–1988), 68; Eva Christof, *Das Glück der Stadt: die Tyche von Antiochia und andere Stadttychen* (Bern–Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2001), 154–7; Levick, *Julia Domna*, 130–1 have already stressed this connection.
 31. On this topic, see Fergus Millar, "The Roman *Coloniae* of the Near East: A Study of Cultural Relations," in *The Greek World, the Jews, & the East. Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, vol. 3, edited by Fergus Millar, Hannah M. Cotton, and Guy M. Rogers (Chapel Hill: North Carolina Scholarship Online), 164–222.
 32. Julia Domna: *BMC Phoenicia* 370–1. Septimius Severus: *BMC Phoenicia* 367–8.
 33. *BMC Galatia* 1–2. See also Meyer, "Die Bronzeprägung," 68 n. 54; Christof, *Das Glück*, 155.
 34. *SNG Levante* 1613. It is interesting to know, however, that Eirenopolis had already dedicated coins to Domna between 195 and 196 (*SNG*

- Levante 1612; *SNG Levante*–France 2265), more or less when the imperial family was returning from Syria to Rome after the war against Pescennius Niger and the first Parthian campaign of Severus; see Letta, “La dinastia,” 655–9.
35. *SNG ANS* 867. With regard to previous imperial women honored by coins of Caesarea, only a type for Poppaea Sabina representing a *Tyche* within a temple is documented (*SNG ANS* 858).
 36. Ascalon: *SNG ANS* 732. Similar coins for Faustina Minor are also documented in this city (*BMC Palestine* 226; *SNG ANS* 730). Sebaste: *SNG ANS* 1079–80.
 37. *BMC Phoenicia* 78. No coins for previous imperial women are so far attested in this city. Tripolis struck coins for Severus a little later, between 203 and 204 (*BMC Phoenicia* 71).
 38. Lindgren & Kovacs 2559. Although the coin cannot be dated to a precise year, the fact that Severus awarded the city colonial status (Millar, “The Roman *Coloniae*,” 200) might suggest a dating to the Parthian campaign of 197–8.
 39. On the topic, see Ricci “Una conferma all’*Historia Augusta*; il dio Lunus,” *Studi Classici e Orientali* 32 (1983): 179–87; Olivier Hekster and Ted Kaizer, “An Accidental Tourist? Caracalla’s Fatal Trip to the Temple of the Moon at Carrhae/Harran,” *Anatolian Studies* 42 (2012): 89–107.
 40. *CIL* III 154. On the travels of Domna, see Marcella Bonello Lai, “I viaggi di Giulia Domna sulla base della documentazione epigrafica,” *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Università di Cagliari* 2 (1978–1979), 13–45 (travel to Syria in 197: 18–19) and Levick, *Julia Domna*, 35–56.
 41. *AE* 1950, 230. Since no other similar statue bases are so far documented for Severus, Caracalla or Geta, the statue for Domna was probably the only monument that was actually set up.
 42. *IGLS* XVII/1, 157.
 43. Object no. 1956.19.
 44. Ulrich W. Hiesinger, “Julia Domna. Two Portraits in Bronze,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 73 (1969): 39.
 45. Hiesinger, “Julia Domna,” 41–2.
 46. On the representation of Domna on the *Arcus Argentariorum* see Ghedini, *Giulia Domna*, 25–53. On the gesture and its importance in the Near East see Dirven, “Aspects,” 237–8, and Ghedini *Giulia Domna*, 33–5 with further references there.
 47. Cary, *Dio’s Roman History*. Εἰστιάθημεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῳ ἅμα, τὰ μὲν βασιλικῶς τὰ δὲ βαρβαρικῶς, ἐφθά τε πάντα ὅσα νομίζεται, καὶ ὡμὰ ζώντ᾽ τε ἄλλα λαβόντες.
 48. Riccardo Bertolazzi, “The Depiction of Livia and Julia Domna by Cassius Dio: Some Observations,” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum*

Hungaricae 55 (2015), 428–430. Dio, who was present at the event, says that the banquet took place at the imperial palace. This indicates that Plautilla had moved from her paternal home (her rich dowry was paraded through the forum) to the house of her groom, whose family had presumably organized the banquet.

49. *AE* 1962, 229 = *AE* 1962, 241.

50. *CIL* VI 708.

51. Eutyches, *Augg. lib.*, dedicated a statue to Balbillus, who is called “dearest friend” (*optimus amicus*), on January 1, 199 (*CIL* VI 2270). It is also worth noting that Balbillus was on good terms with the Vestal Virgins. He dedicated a monument to one of them, Numisia Maximilla, in 201 (*CIL* VI 2129), and to another one, Terentia Flavola, “for the many benefactions he had received from her” (*ob plura eius in se merita*) in 215 (*CIL* VI 2130). Finally, in 201 he set up a statue for the Prefect of the Corn Supply, Claudius Julianus (*CIL* VI 2130).

52. See François Chausson, “*Vel Iovi vel Soli*: quatre études autour de la Vigna Barberini: (191–354),” *Mélanges d’Archéologie et d’Histoire de l’école Française de Rome, Antiquité* 107.2 (1995), 686–91.

53. Chausson, “*Vel Iovi vel Soli*,” 698–701.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bertolazzi, Riccardo. “The Depiction of Livia and Julia Domna by Cassius Dio: Some Observations,” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 55 (2015): 413–432.
- Bingham, Sandra, and Alex Imrie. “The Prefect and the Plot: A Reassessment of the Murder of Plautianus.” *Journal of Ancient History* 3.1 (2015): 76–91.
- Bird, Harry W. *Sextus Aurelius Victor. A Historiographical Study*. Leeds: Cairns, 1984.
- . (trans.). *Aurelius Victor: De Caesaribus*. Liverpool: Liverpool Classical Press, 1994.
- Birley, Anthony R. “Further Notes on *HA* Severus.” In *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Genevense*. Edited by Giorgio Bonamente and François Paschoud, 19–42. Bari: Edipuglia, 1994.
- . *The African Emperor: Septimius Severus*. 3rd edn. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Bonello Lai, Marcello. “I viaggi di Giulia Domna sulla base della documentazione epigrafica.” *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Università di Cagliari* 2 (1978–1979): 13–45.
- Caillan Davenport, “The Sexual Habits of Caracalla: Rumour, Gossip, and Historiography,” *Histos* 11 (2017): 75–100.
- Caldelli, Maria Letizia. “La titolatura di Plauziano: una messa a punto.” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 178 (2011): 261–72.

- Campbell, Duncan B. "What Happened at Hatra? The Problem of the Severan Siege Operations." In *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*. Edited by Philip Freeman and David Kennedy, 51–58. Oxford: BAR Publishing, 1986.
- Chastagnol, André. *Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs romains des II^e et III^e siècles*. Paris: Laffont, 1994.
- Chausson, François. "Vel Iovi vel Soli: quatre études autour de la Vigna Barberini: (191–354)." *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'école Française de Rome, Antiquité* 107.2 (1995): 661–765.
- Christof, Eva. *Das Glück der Stadt: die Tyche von Antiochia und andere Stadttychen*. Bern–Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Corbier, Mireille. "Plautien, comes de Septime-Sévère." In *Mélanges de philosophie, de littérature et d'histoire ancienne offerts à Pierre Boyancé*, 213–18. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1974.
- Daguet-Gagey, Anne. "C. Fulvius Plautianus, 'hostis publicus': Rome, 205–208 après J.-C." In *La 'crise' de l'Empire romain de Marc Aurèle à Constantin: mutations, continuités, ruptures*. Edited by Marie-Henriette Quet, 65–94. Paris: Presse de l'université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2006.
- Dirven, Lucinda. "Aspects of Hatrene Religion: A Note on the Statues of Kings and Nobles from Hatra." In *The Variety of Local Religious Life in the Near East*. Edited by Ted Kaizer, 209–246. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Drijvers, Han Jan Willem. "Hatra, Palmyra und Edessa. Die Städte der syrischmesopotamischen Wüste in politischer, kulturgeschichtlicher und religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* II 8 (1977): 799–906.
- Fejfer, Jane. "The Portraits of the Severan Empress Julia Domna. A New Approach." *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 14 (1985): 129–138.
- Festy, Michel. "Aurélius Victor, source de l' 'Histoire Auguste' et de Nicomaque Flavien." In *Historiae Augustae Colloquium Genevense*. Edited by François Paschoud, 121–133. Bari: Edipuglia, 1999.
- Filippini, Erica. "Il ruolo di Giulia Domna nell'ideologia imperiale. La documentazione numismatica." *Società Donne & Storia* 4 (2008): 1–69.
- . "Imagines aureae": le emissioni in oro di Giulia Domna." In *Oreficeria in Emilia Romagna: archeologia e storia tra età romana e medioevo*. Edited by Anna L. Morelli, and Isabella Baldini Lippolis, 79–96. Bologna: Ante Quem, 2010.
- Ghedini, Francesca. *Giulia Domna tra Oriente e Occidente. Le fonti archeologiche*. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1984.
- González Fernández, Rafael, and Pedro David Conesa Navarro. "Plauciano: la amenaza de la *domus* Severiana." *Potestas* 7 (2014): 27–50.

- Grosso, Fulvio. "Ricerche su Plauziano e gli avvenimenti del suo tempo." *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche. Rendiconti* 23 (1968): 7–58.
- Hauser, Stefan R. "Hatra und das Königreich der Araber." In *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse*. Edited by Josef Wiesehöfer, 493–528. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998.
- Hekster, Olivier, and Ted Kaizer. "An Accidental Tourist? Caracalla's Fatal Trip to the Temple of the Moon at Carrhae/Harran." *Anatolian Studies* 42 (2012): 89–107.
- Hemelrijk, Emily. Review of *Maternal Megalomania: Julia Domna and the Imperial Politics of Motherhood*. *The Classical World* 108:1 (2014): 142–143.
- Hiesinger, Ulrich W. "Julia Domna. Two Portraits in Bronze." *American Journal of Ancient History* 73 (1969): 39–44.
- Kaizer, Ted. *The Religious Life of Palmyra: A Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002.
- Kettenhofen, Erich. *Die syrischen Augustae in der historischen Überlieferung; ein Beitrag zum Problem der Orientalisierung*. Bonn: Habelt, 1979.
- Langford, Julie. *Maternal Megalomania: Julia Domna and the Imperial Politics of Motherhood*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- Letta, Cesare. "Dal leone di Giulio Alessandro ai leoni di Caracalla. La dinastia di Emesa verso la porpora imperiale." In *Studi in onore di Edda Bresciani*. Edited by Sandro Filippo Bondi, Sergio Pernigotti, et al., 289–302. Pisa: Giardini, 1985.
- . "Caracalla e Iulia Domna. Tradizioni storiografiche come echi di propaganda politica." *Abruzzo* 23–28 (1985–1990): 521–529.
- . "La dinastia dei Severi." In *Storia di Roma*, Vol. II, 2, 639–700. Torino: Einaudi, 1991.
- Levick, Barbara. *Julia Domna. Syrian Empress*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Lusnia, Susann. "Julia Domna's Coinage and Severan Dynastic Propaganda." *Latomus* 54: 1 (1995): 119–140.
- Marasco, Gabriele. "Giulia Domna, Caracalla e Geta: frammenti di tragedia alla corte dei Severi." *L'Antiquité Classique* 65 (1996): 119–134.
- Meyer, Eckhard. "Die Bronzeprägung von Laodikeia in Syrien 194–217." *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 37–38 (1987–8): 57–92.
- Millar, Fergus. 2006. "The Roman *Coloniae* of the Near East: A Study of Cultural Relations." In *The Greek World, the Jews, & the East. Rome, the Greek World, and the East*. Edited by Fergus Millar, Hannah M. Cotton, and Guy M. Rogers, 164–222. 3 Vols. Chapel Hill: North Carolina Scholarship Online, 2006.
- Morelli, Anna Lina. *Madri di uomini e di dèi. La rappresentazione della maternità attraverso la documentazione numismatica di epoca romana*. Bologna: Ante Quem, 2009.

- Prieur, Michel, and Karin Prieur. *A Type Corpus of the Syro-Phoenician Tetradrachms and Their Fractions from 57 BC to AD 253*. London: Chameleon Press, 2000.
- Ricci, Adriana. "Una conferma all'Historia Augusta; il dio Lunus." *Studi classici e orientali* 32 (1983): 179–187.
- Rowan, Clare. *Under Divine Auspices. Divine Ideology and Visualisation of Imperial Power in the Severan Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Shahîd, Irfan. *Rome and the Arabs. A Prolegomenon to the Study of Byzantium and the Arabs*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Sommer, Michael. *Roms orientalische Steppengrenze: Palmyra, Edessa, Dura-Europos, Hatra: eine Kulturgeschichte von Pompeius bis Diocletian*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- Sullivan, Richard D. "The Dynasty of Emesa." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* II 8 (1978): 198–219.
- Teixidor, Javier. *The Pantheon of Palmyra*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Von Domaszewski, Alfred. *Die Religion des römischen Heeres*. Trier: Verlag der Fr. Lintz'schen Buchhandlung, 1895.
- Walker, John. "The Coins of Hatra," *Numismatic Chronicle* 18 (1958): 167–172.



Dynasty or Family? Tenth and Eleventh Century Norwegian Royal Women and Their Dynastic Loyalties

Karl C. Alvstad

In *ca.* 1016–1017 the lady Ingeborg, wife of Earl Rognvald of Gothland in Sweden and sister of the Norwegian King Olaf I Tryggvason, talked her husband into supporting a proposal that could create peace between her kinsman, King Olaf II Haraldsson of Norway, and her husband's kinsman, King Olof Skötkonung of Sweden.¹ The conflict between the two kings was based on the question of who should rule the border region between south-eastern Norway and south-western Sweden. Ingeborg choose to support the ambassadors from Norway and recommended a diplomatic engagement between Olaf II and King Olof's daughter Ingegerd to promote peace and mutual stability between the two kingdoms. This intervention contributed to a temporary peace between the two kings. The engagement was later broken when the conflict was re-ignited in 1017–1018 and Ingegerd was hastily married off to Yaroslav I of Kiev,² another strategic diplomatic match for the Swedish king since such diplomatic marriages lie at the core of the social and

K. C. Alvstad (✉)
University of Winchester, Winchester, UK

political networks of early medieval states.³ Snorri Sturluson suggests that when Ingeborg Tryggvasdaughter intervened in the political relationship between Olaf and Olof her actions were principally motivated by personal and familial interests.⁴ However, could her intervention then be interpreted as an “absolute” dynastic loyalty or just a political realism within “situational dynastic loyalty,”⁵ where peace between her ancestral kin and that of her husband would be beneficial to her at that specific time? Furthermore, is her intervention in the peace negotiations representative of familial and dynastic loyalties of royal women in the Scandinavian political landscape of the late tenth and early eleventh century?

This paper explores the relationship between elite women and their dynasties in Scandinavia in the early middle ages. To this end, it is fruitful to focus on Olaf II Haraldsson’s relationship with two of his female relatives, Ingeborg and Astrid Tryggvasdaughter, as well as Olaf II’s relationship with his wife, Astrid Olofsdaughter, sister of his previous fiancé, Ingegerd Olofsdaughter.⁶ Olaf II’s relationships with his female kin and wife is best understood in the context of early-medieval European political traditions, including the early eleventh-century political networks of Norway, as well as the contemporary changes to kingship in Norway in this period. For it can be argued that these relationships are integral to the political challenges experienced by Olaf II during his reign. The exchange of brides that these relationships represent was, like the exchange of gifts, crucial for the establishment of networks of loyalties and influence in the early middle ages.⁷ However, royal brides like Astrid and Ingeborg were not only “gifts” to their husbands, they were also reminders of the link between the family and Olaf I Tryggvasson, and intended as a tool for securing their loyalty. They also acted as ambassadors of Olaf I Tryggvason in their husbands’ homelands. Yet, the loyalties and interests of elite brides were not absolute, but rather situational and not always transferable. This fluidity became especially important in periods of conflict and political contests between different claimants to the crown, such as the later years of Olaf II’s reign.

Jenny Jochens postulated a significant difference in the politics of reproduction and succession between the continent and Norway. She observed that until the mid-thirteenth century Norway was plagued by instability and succession crisis due to a pursuit of male heirs through polygyny and extra-marital affairs which resulted in multiple male children who each could claim the realm.⁸ Simultaneously, she remarked, royal marriages of royal daughters to chieftains or to other kings were often

dictated by politics in attempts to create some semblance of stability.⁹ David Crouch demonstrated that marriages of daughters or sisters were part of a conscious dynastic policy in the Norman ducal family, whilst Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge identified a similar policy pursued by Alfred the Great.¹⁰ The political nature of such marriages was also observed by Sverre Bagge, who noted that within early medieval Scandinavian marriages, family ties (and to some extent political legitimacy and loyalty) counted in both the paternal and the maternal line.¹¹ Theresa Earenfight and Hans Jacob Orning both note, in their own ways, how elite and royal marriages in early and high medieval Europe were expressions of political realism and tools in the political consolidation of European kingdoms.¹² Earenfight highlighted the kind of agency a woman might demonstrate in such situations, but she also noted that sources for early medieval Scandinavia do not allow for extensive examination of queenship in the same way as sources permit for contemporary queens on the continent.¹³ However, there are similarities between Earenfight's observations about royal marriages and the elite relationships explored by Orning, who found that such relationships of family and friendship tied peripheral magnates and elites to the royal court and established diplomatic relations between kinship groups.¹⁴ This paper has therefore found it fruitful to undertake a comparative analysis of the roles and politics of elite marriages, exemplified by the Ladies Ingeborg and Astrid Tryggvasdaughter, and Queen Astrid Olofsdaughter, in early-medieval Norway.

Ingeborg and Astrid Tryggvasdaughter, and Olaf II Haraldsson all supposedly belonged to the Fairhair Dynasty, a dynasty that claimed to descend from King Harald I "Fairhair" Halfdansson (d. 933), who, according to Snorri Sturluson's *Heimskringla*, united Norway in 872.¹⁵ Although Snorri states that the sisters, Ingeborg and Astrid, and Olaf II, were related, he also notes that they belonged to different branches of the dynasty, with Harald Fairhair being their first common ancestor. The sisters' familial relationship to Olaf II is thus rather vague, and very little is known about the two sisters outside their respective episodes in the *Heimskringla*. This lack of evidence is common for early Norwegian history, and the assessment must therefore rely on circumstantial evidence and context to fill in the blanks. By seeing Ingeborg and Astrid through their marriages to Erling and Rognvald, it is therefore possible to assess their relationship with Olaf II. The marriage alliances represented in Astrid and Ingeborg's marriages to Erling and Rognvald were important political tools for kings like Olaf II Haraldsson. Astrid and Ingeborg's marriages were arranged to

cement loyalties and to prevent feuds and hostilities originally between Olaf I Tryggvasson and Erling and Rognvald, as well as between Olaf II Haraldsson and Erling and Rognvald.¹⁶ Sources such as rune stones and sagas suggest that Viking-Age women of a certain social and economic standing could exercise some power, and represented their own political interests even within their marriages, and especially in their widowhoods.¹⁷

Astrid Tryggvasdaughter is primarily known from her betrothal and marriage to Erling Skjalgsson in 996, when her brother Olaf I Tryggvason (d. 999/1000) gave her hand in marriage to Erling in exchange for Erling's conversion to Christianity.¹⁸ Alongside Astrid's hand in marriage, Erling also received the lordship of one-third of Olaf I's kingdom, a gift Olaf II confirmed in 1016 upon his conquest of Norway.¹⁹ Under Olaf I Tryggvason and the earlier kings of Norway, kingship was personal and the kingdom was held together through a network of family and friendship bonds. Among other reasons, the wish to establish such bonds drove Olaf I to espouse his sister to Erling, and drove Olaf II to confirm this bond with Erling. This corresponds to a pattern of similar diplomatic royal marriages known to have occurred throughout the middle ages.²⁰

Snorri's narrative suggests that when Olaf II acknowledged Erling's position in 1016 he also confirmed the familial and political relationship to Erling and Astrid. Although little is known about Astrid's personal relationship with her husband (or with other members of her kin), it can be suggested that her marriage to Erling was directly useful for Olaf I's political and religious project of unifying and converting Norway, as it gave him control over and direct ties to Erling, and with him his political base in the south-western part of Norway. Astrid became through this marriage an extension of the king, and the king's ambassador to the south-west of Norway. Her status as the king's sister and a chieftain's wife set her up to assume the politically and culturally semi-independent status that women in Norse society enjoyed, like a queen in her own household.²¹

Between Olaf I Tryggvason's death in 999/1000 and Olaf II's conquest of Norway in 1016, the territories of the Norwegian kingdom were split between the Swedish king, the Danish king, and the earls of Hladir.²² The sixteen year interregnum had left the chieftains to fend for themselves, during which time they had sought political and familial dominance over other each other as well as some sort of stability among themselves through marriage alliances that could counterbalance the Swedish and Danish influences in Norway. The presence of the illegitimate sons of previous generations of kings like Tryggve Olafsson, Olaf I Tryggvason's

son, also contributed to destabilizing the kingdom.²³ Although there is little evidence of extensive alliances supporting Tryggve when he invaded Norway *ca.* 1033, illegitimate royal sons would become, later on, a significant issue for Norwegian stability.

Astrid and her husband Erling played an integral part in a network of intermarried chieftains in the early eleventh century. Erling's sister was married to Sigurd Toresson, brother to Torir Hundr, a member of the powerful Bjarkoy family in Northern Norway, whilst Sigurd's sister Sigrid was first married to a distant cousin of the earls of Hladir, Olve Grjotgardsson, then later to Kalv Arnesson who, for a time in the late 1010s and early 1020s, was Olaf II's close friend and ally. Snorri indicates that these close familial relationships between the Bjarkoy family, Erling Skjalgsson, and the chieftains of Trondelag were initially an advantage for Olaf II when he conquered Norway in 1016, but later a challenge when he faced open rebellion led by members of these families in the late 1020s.²⁴

Olaf II could use his distant cousins, Astrid and Ingeborg, as tools to influence Erling and Rognvald when it would be mutually beneficial for them. It is conceivable that, like Ingeborg, Astrid acknowledged her kinship with Olaf II and sought to influence Erling to support Olaf II in the early years of Olaf II's reign. It is also plausible that Astrid and Erling would use her kinship to Olaf to influence the king and to preserve their own status and standing in a set of situation-based statements of loyalty to the king. Such a family link in Norse society created a bond of friendship, loyalty and honor between the members of both kinship groups, where members could be called upon to support and help each other when needed.

Snorri claims that Olaf II Haraldsson attempted to change the nature of the kingdom and the Norwegian kingship by introducing a new system of royal officials loyal to him to maintain royal authority throughout the kingdom. But Olaf II chose to not select his officials exclusively from the ranks of chieftains like Erling or his kin; instead he drew his men from all levels of society and thus challenged the existing political landscape of Norway.²⁵ This challenge seems to have been an attempt to institutionalize the monarchy, and to cement the fragmented realm into one kingdom through political institutions like the king's officers. This political methodology is similar to Philip Augustus's introduction of *baillis* in Normandy following his conquest of the province.²⁶ In both Olaf II's and Philip Augustus's case the intended effect was that officers would have had absolute loyalty to the king. For Olaf II this was much preferred, rather than

the situational loyalty which chieftains like Erling could display when their personal interests came in conflict with that of the king. This meant that Olaf would not be reliant on political marriages within the kingdom to retain influence and stability.

Unlike his kinsman Olaf I Tryggvason, Olaf II had no grown sisters he could marry off to leading chieftains to help secure his conquest of Norway in 1016, and this complicated his position. Although he himself could marry for political reasons, he lacked close family members who, as Astrid and Ingeborg had for Olaf I, could function as ambassadors and representatives of the king with near-to-absolute dynastic loyalty in the geographical periphery of the kingdom. It might have been to compensate for this that Olaf II introduced the new royal officials. By introducing these new officials Olaf established a political network with assumed absolute loyalty, but at the same time the new network undermined the existing relationships and loyalties as well as the existing ideas of kingship in Norway, by circumventing the personal bond between the king and his chieftains,²⁷ a bond often manifested and maintained in the earlier periods through royal marriages.²⁸

This change from the direct relationship between a king and his chieftains to a new governing system independent of familial relations, created tension between Olaf and the aristocracy, whose positions and incomes were threatened by this shift. As Olaf II consolidated his power in 1019, tension grew between him and Erling Skjalgsson, and at the same time a conclusive peace was negotiated between Olaf II and Olof of Sweden, resulting in Olaf II marrying Olof's daughter Astrid.²⁹ In the peace agreement between Olaf and Olof, Olaf II used his most precious commodity and resource to secure the peace: a diplomatic marriage. With his marriage to Astrid Olofsdaughter, Olaf II lost a key bargaining tool against the Norwegian chieftains; for Olaf could no longer offer a diplomatic royal marriage or strengthened familial ties to the king in exchange for loyalty. However, Astrid Olofsdaughter's marriage to Olaf II sealed the peace treaty with Olof of Sweden, and created stability on the south-eastern Norwegian border. Queen Astrid Olofsdaughter, like Astrid and Ingeborg Tryggvasdaughter, became through her marriage the joining-point between two families, drawing Olaf II into an extensive network of diplomatic alliances.³⁰ Later kings circumnavigated the issue of not being able to create internal diplomatic marriages by taking mistresses from the leading families,³¹ but there is no evidence in the sagas that Olaf II's mistress was a diplomatic choice.³²

It is conceivable that Ingeborg's intervention in 1016–1017 could have been an expression of her own political interests as well as those of her kin; such action by her would not have been abnormal in Viking age society but rather a statement of family loyalty and personal interest. But was her kinship to Olaf II of any use to him as representative of the dynasty, and how reliable was Ingeborg and Astrid Tryggvasdaughters' kinship as a political tool for Olaf II?

In Snorri's *Heimskringla*, the conflicts between Olaf II and the chieftains created an indirect competition between Olaf's and Erling's interests; as a result Astrid Tryggvasdaughter's kinship to Olaf II must have come in competition with Astrid's marital kinship with Erling as well as her own children's agnatic kin. Erling and Astrid's kinship-based loyalty to Olaf II must have become less significant to Erling and his kin following the political changes Olaf II instigated. Olaf's introduction of a service aristocracy in the provinces undermined the importance of familial links between the king and the chieftains and thus Astrid's marriage to Erling became less valuable to all parties involved, and Erling could be free to protect his and his kin's own interests. Yet this change and conflict of interest was not absolute, nor irreversible; instead, this conflict is an example of situational loyalty between the kin and king.³³ According to Snorri, Olaf acknowledged that Erling was the only man in the realm who could create peace and reconciliation between Olaf and the chieftains; instead of following his own advice Olaf lost the control over Norway and was exiled. The kinship between Olaf II and Astrid and the relationship embedded in this link could have allowed for reconciliation between Olaf II and Erling, if Erling had survived the conflict, but the murder of Erling in 1027 'struck Norway off his [Olaf's] hand'.³⁴

Snorri's narrative gives little evidence about the relationship between Olaf II and his wife, Astrid Olofsdaughter, apart from indicating that Astrid fulfilled her role as queen by being Olaf's wife, mother of his daughter Ulvhild, and also was his connection to the Swedish royal family. Astrid's role at the Olavian court and in the political landscape would probably have been significant since she offered him legitimacy and political stability on his eastern border. Unfortunately Snorri's narrative tell us very little about her life or interaction with Olaf and about Norwegian politics in this period, yet it was within her familial network that Olaf II sought refuge during his exile in 1028–1030.

In this context Ingeborg Tryggvasdaughter's intervention is best understood as part of her familial obligations towards Olaf II as well as a

statement of loyalty that was situationally advantageous to her, and thus representative of contemporary ideas of kinship and kingship. Simultaneously, the conflict between Olaf II and Erling Skjalgsson, and through him Astrid Tryggvasdaughter, illustrates how dynastic loyalty and kinship loyalty were dictated by the political situation surrounding the two members of the family. In the conflict between Olaf and Erling, Astrid and Erling chose to protect their own interests and the interests of their close kin, rather than unconditionally offering Olaf II support. In many ways, Erling and Astrid found few situational factors encouraging them to display loyalty to Olaf in this conflict. Both Astrid's and Ingeborg's marriages were designed to be useful for their close kin, primarily at the time of their wedding, since they tied their brother Olaf I to Erling and Rognvald in a politically useful network employed to counterbalance the growing Danish influence in Scandinavia.

However, these family and loyalty ties seems to have been representative of personal kingship and do not seem to have been automatically transferred from Olaf I to Olaf II at the time of the restoration of a Fairhair dynasty king in Norway in 1016. It is possible, however, that the personal and dynastic loyalties would have been transmitted vertically if Olaf I had been succeeded by his son Tryggve. The complex vertical kinship relationships between Olaf II and Olaf I's sisters resulted in a situation where absolute dynastic loyalties came into competition with the interests of Astrid and Ingeborg's children and the kin groups they had married into, resulting in a situation where these loyalties were negotiated by the circumstances of the episode, rather than being continuously present in the political landscape.³⁵ Astrid and Ingeborg's expression of situational loyalty to Olaf II can be seen as a manifestation of their choices between family and dynasty.

NOTES

1. Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume II: Olafur Haraldsson (The Saint)*, translated by Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 2014), 57–64. The distant kinship links between Ingeborg and King Olaf II Haraldsson will be discussed below.
2. Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume II*, 95.
3. Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 34.
4. Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume II*, 57.

5. Hans Jacob Orning, *Unpredictability and Presence: Norwegian Kingship in the High Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 250–6.
6. Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume II*, 93.
7. Sverre Bagge, *Cross and Sceptre: The Rise of Scandinavian Kingdoms from the Vikings to the Reformation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014), 18–20; Earenfight, *Queenship*, 37.
8. Jenny Jochens, “The Politics of Reproduction: Medieval Norwegian Kingship,” *American Historical Review* 92 (1987): 348.
9. Jochens, “The Politics of Reproduction,” 334.
10. David Crouch, *The Normans: The History of a Dynasty* (London: Hambledon, 2002), 23–7; Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge “Introduction,” in *Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and Other Contemporary Sources*, translated by Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 38.
11. Bagge, *Cross and Sceptre*, 16.
12. Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, 34; Orning, *Unpredictability and Presence*, 142.
13. Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, 118.
14. Orning, *Unpredictability and Presence*, 142.
15. Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume I: The Beginnings to Olaf Trygvason*, translated by Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 2011), 67–9.
16. Auður Magnúsdóttir, “Women and Sexual Politics,” in *The Viking World*, edited by Stefan Brink and Neil Price (London: Routledge, 2012), 42; Jenny Jochens, *Women in Old Norse Society* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 28.
17. Birgit and Peter Sawyer, *Medieval Scandinavia from Conversion to Reformation circa 800–1500* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 195, 198–9; Jochens, *Women in Old Norse Society*, 162–3.
18. Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume I*, 190; Sverre Bagge, *From Viking Stronghold to Christian Kingdom: State Formation in Norway c. 900–1350* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2010), 28; Claus Krag, *Aschehougs Norges Historie Vikingtid og rikssamling* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 2005), 136.
19. Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume II*, 48–9.
20. Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, 117.
21. Sawyer, *Medieval Scandinavia*, 194–5.
22. Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume I*, 232; Bagge, *From Viking Stronghold to Christian Kingdom*, 28.
23. Jochens, “The Politics of Reproduction,” 333.
24. Krag, *Aschehougs Norges Historie*, 200.
25. Krag, *Aschehougs Norges Historie*, 202.

26. John Baldwin, *The Government of Philip Augustus: Foundations of French Royal Power in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 221–2.
27. Orning, *Unpredictability and Presence*, 29.
28. Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe*, 120; Bagge, *Cross and Sceptre*, 21.
29. Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume II*, 57.
30. Krag, *Aschehougs Norges Historie*, 62.
31. Bagge, *Cross and Sceptre*, 21.
32. Sverre Bagge (*Cross and Sceptre*, 21) suggests a Scandinavian royal mistress could negotiate the political tension at the court and cement the loyalties of her family/kin to the king.
33. Hans Jacob Orning (*Unpredictability and Presence*, 113; 210; 250–6) has suggested that cases of such situational loyalties are evident among the peripheral magnates in high medieval Norway.
34. Sturluson, *Heimskringla Volume II*, 213.
35. Orning, *Unpredictability and Presence*, 113.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bagge, Sverre. *From Viking Stronghold to Christian Kingdom: State formation in Norway c. 900–1350*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2010.
- . *Cross and Sceptre: The Rise of Scandinavian Kingdoms from the Vikings to the Reformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Baldwin, John. *The Government of Philip Augustus: Foundations of French Royal Power in the Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Crouch, David. *The Normans: The History of a Dynasty*. London: Hambledon; 2002.
- Earenfight, Theresa. *Queenship in Medieval Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Jochens, Jenny. “The Politics of Reproduction: Medieval Norwegian Kingship.” *American Historical Review* 92 (1987): 327–349.
- . *Women in Old Norse Society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Keynes, Simon, and Michael Lapidge. “Introduction.” In *Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and Other Contemporary Sources*. Translated by Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge, 9–58. London: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Krag, Claus. *Aschehougs Norges Historie Vikingtid og rikssamling*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 2005.
- Magnúsdóttir, Auður. “Women and Sexual Politics.” In *The Viking World*. Edited by Stefan Brink and Neil Price, 40–48. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Orning, Hans Jacob. *Unpredictability and Presence: Norwegian Kingship in the High Middle Ages*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Sawyer, Birgit and Peter Sawyer. *Medieval Scandinavia: From Conversion to Reformation circa 800–1500*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Sturluson, Snorri. *Heimskringla Volume I: The Beginnings to Olaf Trygvason*. Translated by Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes. London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 2011.

———. *Heimskringla Volume II: Olaf Haraldsson (The Saint)*. Translated by Alison Finlay and Anthony Faulkes. London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 2014.



Prince Pedro, A Case of Dynastic Disloyalty in Fifteenth Century Portugal?

Ana Maria S. A. Rodrigues

Prince Pedro (b. 1392), the third son of the founder of the Portuguese Avis dynasty João I (r. 1385–1433), and Philippa of Lancaster (r. 1387–1415), died in 1449 in the battle of Alfarrobeira, fighting against his king and nephew Afonso V (r. 1438–1481), in whose name he had been the regent of the realm for almost a decade. The circumstances of both his death and his accession to the regency in 1438 were controversial among his contemporaries and still are today among historians of Portugal. Rita Costa-Gomes has recently pointed out that modern (pre)conceptions have considerably biased the debate, and suggested that more attention should be given to the perceptions and attitudes of those involved in the events.¹ In this chapter, I will use the many available sources for that period—Portuguese and Castilian chronicles as well as public and private letters, royal charters, instructions for ambassadors, wills and testaments, funerary monuments and others—to attempt to demonstrate that the conflict arose, among other things, because tangled conceptions of loyalty and honor coexisted in the political societies of the European monarchies at that period. However, dynastic interests

A. M. S. A. Rodrigues (✉)
University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

could recommend reconciliation, and royal women such as Isabel of Burgundy and Isabel, consort of Alfonso V, played considerable roles in bringing together the estranged members of the family.

The problem started in September 1438, when Pedro's elder brother Duarte of Portugal (r. 1433–1438) died suddenly of the plague. In his last will and testament, he entrusted the guardianship of their children and the regency of the realm to his wife Leonor of Aragon (r. 1428–1445) until their six-year-old son, Afonso, came of age.² The late fifteenth-century chronicler Rui de Pina stated that the king's brothers, especially Pedro, the eldest, resented not having been chosen as regents and tutors of the infant king;³ they felt humiliated to be ruled by a woman, especially by a foreign one.⁴

In fact, Leonor was the sister of numerous influential figures, including Alfonso V of Aragon (r. 1416–1458), Juan, king consort of Navarre (r. 1420–1479) and future sovereign of Aragon (r. 1458–1479), María (r. 1418–1445), wife of Juan II of Castile (r. 1406–1454), Enrique (1400–1445), master of the military order of Avis in Castile, and Pedro (c. 1400–1438), the younger.⁵ Between them, they controlled all the Christian kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula because Juan II of Castile was a weak king, always under the influence either of his favorite Álvaro de Luna or his wife and in-laws.⁶ This situation had already led to civil war and foreign intervention in Castile in 1425 and in 1429–1432. In 1438, Castile was again in the midst of a civil war.⁷ Given Leonor's dynastic ties to her natal family, Prince Pedro and his brothers feared that, under her regency, Portugal—which had only recently signed a peace treaty with its only neighbor⁸—would eventually become involved in Castilian politics.

In the *Cortes* (parliament) that gathered in November 1438 in Torres Novas to swear allegiance to the new king and approve the regency, the brothers of the deceased sovereign, supported by the delegates of the towns and part of the clergy and the nobility, managed to force a reluctant Leonor to share the regency with Pedro.⁹ For over a year, they ruled together with a growing distrust and antipathy for each other; eventually, Pedro had too much of it and left the court, retreating to his duchy of Coimbra.¹⁰

When the new *Cortes* was summoned to gather in Lisbon in December 1439, both Pedro and the Queen asked their partisans to come in arms, according to the chronicler Pina.¹¹ The people of Lisbon then started an insurrection against the dowager queen, an event quite similar to the so-called “revolution” of 1383–1385 that had put João I on the throne by

expelling another queen-regent, Leonor Teles (r. 1371–1384).¹² They elected Pedro as “governor” and “defendant” of the realm, as his father had been elected fifty years before, and he gladly accepted that election. Despite the opposition of the Queen’s supporters, delegates to the parliamentary assembly from other cities confirmed the decision taken by the people of Lisbon. They alleged that King Duarte had no right to designate a regent in his will because that right belonged only to the people gathered in *Cortes*.¹³ Yet they did not just deprive Queen Leonor of the regency; they also deprived her of the tutelage of her male children, alleging that being brought up by a woman would be harmful to them because they would become effeminate.¹⁴

For one more year, Queen Leonor stayed in Portugal trying to obtain military support from her Portuguese allies along with generating diplomatic pressure from her brothers and cousin, all in hopes of recovering the regency, but Pedro had her watched and ruined all her attempts. In December 1440, she decided to flee to Castile to be able to move freely and get the support she needed more easily.¹⁵ Despite her several attempts to swing the Castilian king and the Royal Council to her cause,¹⁶ she did not receive the help she expected and she died in Toledo five years later without having recovered her rulership nor having seen her children ever again.¹⁷

Meanwhile, Pedro, who had the child king in his power, started to rule to the benefit of his own lineage. In 1441 he organized the betrothal of Afonso V to his elder daughter Isabel (r. 1441–1455) and formed her household with the estates expropriated from Queen Leonor’s possessions.¹⁸ He made his elder son, also named Pedro, constable of Portugal in 1443 and the administrator of the Portuguese branch of the military order of Santiago in 1444.¹⁹ Within two or three years, he had replaced most of the royal officials who had been nominated by Queen Leonor with his own men, and distributed among them the moveable goods and estates that had been taken from those who remained loyal to her.²⁰

Yet Pedro also showed magnanimity to former partisans of the queen in order to make them support his government. He created new titles for a few of them: Vasco Fernandes Coutinho was made Earl of Marialva in 1440, his illegitimate half-brother Afonso became Duke of Braganza in 1442, and Sancho de Noronha became Earl of Odemira in 1446. He donated lands and rents to members of the lesser nobility.²¹ He even allowed the archbishop of Lisbon, Pedro de Noronha, to return from his exile in Castile and recover his belongings.²² So Leonor’s former supporters kept quiet, waiting for their revenge.

In January 1446, Afonso V turned 14 and Pedro organized a ceremony to surrender royal authority to him. Princes Henry (1394–1460) and Fernando (1433–1470) managed to convince the king to let his uncle keep on ruling because of his young age.²³ The Duke of Braganza and other former partisans of Queen Leonor advised him strongly against it, though, and as their influence on him grew stronger the king eventually asked Pedro to return full power to him.²⁴ The regent obeyed immediately and Afonso V issued a letter in July 1448 in which he thanked his uncle for having raised and educated him, and formally approving all of his acts of government.²⁵ Everything seemed to be fine, but as soon as Pedro retired to his duchy of Coimbra, the king started acting against him.

First, Afonso V launched an enquiry about the offices, castles, and estates that had changed hands after his mother had been forced to flee to Castile, ordering that those that had been unlawfully taken from their owners should be returned to them. Soon, Pedro's men were being replaced, all around the realm, by the king's men or members of the Braganza affinity. Secondly, the king forbade Pedro ever to return to court and also forbade his partisans to visit him in Coimbra.²⁶

Later, Afonso V asked Pedro to return to the king's armory the weapons that had been used during the last of the three interventions that the Portuguese army had made in Castile to help King Juan II and Álvaro de Luna to fight the brothers of late Queen Leonor. These weapons had been stored in Coimbra since May 1445, when the leader of the expedition, the regent's son, Constable Pedro, had come back from Castile.²⁷ The king possibly feared that Prince Pedro might use them against him. Pedro only reinforced his fears by refusing to comply since he felt he might need those weapons to defend himself from his opponents. At this point, Afonso V proclaimed Pedro a rebel because he did not obey Afonso's orders.²⁸

Queen Isabel attempted to mediate between her husband and her father but she wasn't successful, as neither of them was willing to listen, much less to agree to the other's arguments.²⁹ Eventually, in May 1449, Pedro decided to go to the royal court to defend his honor. He did not leave Coimbra alone, though: he took his troops with him and collected some more armed men in his way to Lisbon. Hearing this, the king went to meet him with the royal army. The two armies collided near the river Alfarrobeira and Prince Pedro was killed during the battle.³⁰

Rui de Pina's description of the events surrounding Prince Pedro's death has been recently subject to new and divergent readings. Based on the chapters in which the chronicler narrates the death pact of Pedro and

his friend the earl of Avranches, and their subsequent deaths, Tiago Faria has argued that these chapters should be seen as an attempt to present the Prince as a brave Christian knight, a member of the Order of the Garter who preferred to die defending his honor rather than to live an infamous life.³¹ Yet Pina also states that Pedro's corpse lay in the battlefield for a whole day and was carried during the night to a nearby house where it lay three more days among other corpses without any religious ritual.³² A later chronicler, Gaspar Dias de Landim, presents an even harsher version of the same events: Pedro's corpse remained three days in the battlefield, as was usually done to traitors, and was already putrefying and lacking some pieces, eaten by wild animals, when he was taken to the local church.³³ These statements, together with other evidence discussed below, made Rita Costa-Gomes suggest that Pedro's dead body might have been submitted to a ritual usually performed on tyrants' corpses that consisted not only of exposing their remains publicly but also of cutting off their noses, ears, fingers, toes, or even castrating them.³⁴ Was Prince Pedro then a loyal vassal unjustly accused or a tyrant?

Immediately after Pedro's death, King Afonso V dispatched ambassadors to several courts to give his version of the facts. They were instructed to say that after the death of King Duarte, Prince Pedro's actions were commanded by greed and hunger for power: he disrespected the last will and testament of the deceased; he committed several acts of perjury; he also disrespected the law of the kingdom that conceded to honest widows the right to raise their sons; he corrupted noblemen, clergymen, and townsmen to be elected regent at the *Cortes* of Lisbon, for which occasion he also mobilized an army to pressure the Parliament by military means. Therefore, the regency had been seized by tyranny instead of by just means, and Pedro's march to Lisbon at the head of an army was the proof that his goal was, once again, to get the support of the city to overthrow the king and seize the throne. Thus, his death in Alfarrobeira had been a result of divine justice.³⁵

We know that these explanations were not easily accepted by Pedro's ally Juan II of Castile, and even less by Isabel, the duchess of Burgundy, Pedro's sister. She sent an ambassador to Portugal, the Dean of Vergy, Jean Jouffroy, to request that the Prince should not be accused of treason nor deprived of a Christian burial next to his parents in the royal pantheon of Batalha; and that his wife and children would not lose their inheritance.³⁶ In fact, Afonso V had already imprisoned Pedro's son Jaime, who had participated in the battle. Since Pedro, as Constable, had fled to

Castile, the king had confiscated this office and seized the administration of the Order of Avis,³⁷ granting it to Prince Henrique.³⁸ The monarch had also expropriated the duchy of Coimbra and all of Pedro's other estates, leaving his widow and his younger children in difficult economic conditions. Additionally, after the Duchess of Burgundy's agent expressed her requests, Afonso V had the mortal remains of Prince Pedro removed to the royal castle of Abrantes to prevent them from being taken out of his custody.³⁹

After his first speech, Jean Jouffroy gave three other *orationes*, each of them contesting the arguments the Portuguese court had used to reject his requests. As the court's responses have not survived, we can only reconstruct them from Jouffroy's point of view. In his second speech, he asked once more for Afonso V to revoke the measures taken against his uncle, especially the accusation of treason, suggesting that the king had been ill-advised but still had time to mend his error.⁴⁰ In response to the argument that a king should never change his word, the Dean of Vergy asserted that insisting upon the error would be a greater fault, as the king would be forever tied to a false statement.

It was in his third speech that Jouffroy made a more detailed defense of Prince Pedro's actions.⁴¹ Using biblical examples as well as justifications from Roman, canon, and feudal law, he demonstrated that the king had mistreated his uncle on a number of occasions, thus giving Pedro the right to take up arms against him to defend his honor. As a result, Prince Pedro's rebellion should be forgiven, he should be cleared from blame, and his mortal remains should be properly buried. His wife and children, whom Jouffroy demonstrated were equally blameless, should recover their titles, offices and possessions.

Jouffroy's fourth and final speech concentrated on the battle of Alfarrobeira and the death of Prince Pedro.⁴² He imputed this death not to the king, who had not ordered an opening of hostilities, but to an envious and violent faction.⁴³ Those jealous of Prince Pedro's virtues and good fortune were the true instigators of the war because of their calumnies and plots. Therefore, Afonso V could withdraw the accusation of disloyalty towards his uncle without being blamed in return for his unlawful death.

Despite his rhetorical talent and his ability in handling civil and ecclesiastical law, the Dean of Vergy did not succeed in his mission to Portugal. His undertaking was not a complete failure, though: he successfully arranged the departure of three of Pedro's children to Burgundy. There, they were protected by their aunt Isabel, Pedro's sister, who provided for

their future: she negotiated the marriages of João to Charlotte of Lusignan, heir to the throne of Cyprus, and Beatriz to the duke of Clèves; she also had Jaime made cardinal by the pope.⁴⁴

The other members of Pedro's family were taken care of by Queen Isabel, Pedro's daughter. Shortly before these unfortunate events occurred, she had summoned her sister Filipa to the court to raise and educate her, and to arrange for her marriage, as queens were expected to do for their courtiers' daughters.⁴⁵ In her last will and testament, dated the day before she gave birth to her first son, in January 1451, Isabel made Filipa her heir and asked the king to protect her mother and her younger sister Catarina, who were still dependent on the charity of others. She also founded a convent in Lisbon for the order of the canons of St. John the Baptist and begged her husband to allow her father to be buried there.⁴⁶

Isabel's first baby died within a short period, but, fortunately, she did not, so the queen spent the following years attempting to restore the honor of her father and to recover her family's wealth. In 1452, when she gave birth to her second child, Princess Joana, she obtained Afonso V's forgiveness for those among her father's followers who were not of noble birth.⁴⁷ The following year, at her special request, her mother received the lordship of the towns of her dower, Montemor-o-Novo and Tentúgal,⁴⁸ and the rents of the military order of Avis were restored to her brother Pedro, although he was not still allowed to return to Portugal.⁴⁹ At some imprecise date, she also obtained the secret transfer of her father's bones to the monastery of St. Eligius, in Lisbon.⁵⁰

In May 1455 Isabel gave birth to another male child who, against all expectations, did not die in the following weeks.⁵¹ It was only after this most welcome event that she managed to convince her husband that his son and heir should not have a notorious traitor for grand-father. Afonso V then allowed the Queen and Prince Henrique to organize a solemn removal of the mortal remains of Prince Pedro from the monastery of St. Eligius to the Founder's Chapel in the monastery of Batalha where he was buried for the last time in the presence of the King, the Queen and the whole court.⁵² His rehabilitation was complete.

A few days later, in December 1455, Isabel died at the age of 23 from bleeding, possibly as a consequence of the difficult delivery of Prince João.⁵³ She was also solemnly buried in the monastery of Batalha, in a provisional tomb where she awaited the death of her husband.⁵⁴ In January of the following year, Afonso V had his mother's bones solemnly brought from Castile and also had her entombed with his father, Duarte, in Batalha.⁵⁵

Death reunited in the dynastic pantheon a family that had been torn apart by the ambitions and hatreds of the living. Thanks in part to the interventions of Pedro's sister, Isabel of Burgundy, and Pedro's daughter, Portugal's queen, the accusations of disloyalty against him were withdrawn and forgotten, though the duchy of Coimbra was not re-installed. Thus the triumph of the Braganza family was complete and they became so powerful that within a generation they would threaten the throne itself.⁵⁶

NOTES

1. Rita Costa-Gomes, "Alfarrobeira: The Death of the Tyrant?" in *Death at Court*, ed. Karl-Heinz Spieß and Immo Warntjes (Wiesbaden: Harrassovitz Verlag, 2012), 140–1.
2. This last will and testament is now missing but we know some of its clauses through chronicles and other documents. See, for instance, Rui de Pina, *Chronica do Senhor Rey D. Affonso V*, in *Crônicas de Rui de Pina*, ed. M. Lopes de Almeida (Porto: Lello & Irmão Editores, 1977), 590.
3. Duarte's legitimate surviving siblings were Pedro, Henrique, Isabel (married to the duke of Burgundy), João and Fernando. However, Fernando was held as a hostage in Morocco after the defeat of the Portuguese army in Tangiers in 1437 and did not take part in any of the events we will analyze in the following pages. He eventually died there in 1443.
4. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 591.
5. On them, see Eloy Benito Ruano, *Los infantes de Aragón* (2nd ed., Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 2002).
6. On this king, see Pedro Andrés Porras Arboledas, *Juan II rey de Castilla y León (1406–1454)* (Gijón: Trea, 2009).
7. On this tormented period in the history of Castile, see Luis Suárez Fernández, "Los Trastámaras de Castilla y Aragón en el siglo XV (1407–74)," in *Historia de España*, edited by Ramón Menéndez Pidal (4th ed., Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1986) XV, 69–153.
8. A truce had put an end to the war between the two monarchies in 1411, but only in 1431 was a permanent peace treaty signed in Almeirim. Paz Romero Portilla, *Dos monarquías medievales ante la modernidad. Relaciones entre Portugal y Castilla* (Coruña: Universidade da Coruña, 1999), 65–82.
9. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 602–3. The text of the agreement reached in the *Cortes* is published in *Monumenta Henricina* (Coimbra: Comissão Executiva das Comemorações do V Centenário da Morte do Infante D. Henrique, 1964) VI, n. 96, 264–79.
10. Humberto Baquero Moreno, *A batalha de Alfarrobeira. Antecedentes e significado histórico* (Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, 1979) I, 25–34.

11. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 616–19.
12. The bibliography on the events of 1383–1385 is overwhelming; on the Lisbon insurrection, see Valentino Viegas, *Lisboa a força da revolução (1383–1385)* (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 1985), 66–90.
13. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 638–9.
14. Ana Maria S.A. Rodrigues, *Leonor de Aragão* in *As tristes rainhas: Leonor de Aragão, Isabel de Coimbra* (Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores, 2012), 200–1.
15. Moreno, *Alfarrobeira*, 69–96.
16. Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, *Crónica del Serenísimo Príncipe Don Juan, segundo rey deste nombre en Castilla y en León* in *Crónicas de los reyes de Castilla*, edited by Cayetano Rosell (Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1877), 582–606; Pedro Carrillo de Huate, *Crónica del Halconero de Juan II*, edited by Juan de Mata Carriazo (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2006), 404–33.
17. Except for Princess Joana, whom she had taken with her in her Castilian exile; Rodrigues, *Leonor de Aragão*, 234–6.
18. Rodrigues, *Isabel de Coimbra* in *As Tristes Rainhas*, 280–5.
19. Luís Adão da Fonseca, *O condestável D. Pedro de Portugal* (Porto: Instituto Nacional da Investigação Científica, 1982), 29–34.
20. Moreno, *Alfarrobeira*, 99–133.
21. Mafalda Soares da Cunha, “Estratégias senhoriais na regência do infante D. Pedro,” *Estudos Medievais* 9 (1988), 283–4.
22. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 679.
23. Saul António Gomes, *D. Afonso V* (Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores, 2009), 81.
24. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 698–9.
25. *Monumenta Henricina IX*, n. 185, 294–7.
26. Moreno, *Alfarrobeira*, 327–32.
27. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 708.
28. Pedro also prevented the duke of Braganza from crossing the duchy of Coimbra with his retinue to reach the court to which he had been summoned by the king. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 708–26.
29. Ana Maria S.A. Rodrigues, “Between Husband and Father: Queen Isabel of Lancaster’s Crossed Loyalties,” *Imago Temporis. Medium Aevum* 3 (2009), 214.
30. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 739–47.
31. Tiago Alexandre Viúla de Faria, “Pela ‘Santa Garrotea’: Ofício cavaleiresco nas vésperas de Alfarrobeira,” in *XIV Colóquio de História Militar: Portugal e os Conflitos Militares Internacionais. Actas* (Lisbon: Comissão Portuguesa de História Militar, 2005) II: 61–86.
32. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 749.
33. Gaspar Dias de Landim, *O infante D. Pedro* (Lisbon: Biblioteca de Clássicos Portugueses, 1892) III: 116–17.

34. Costa-Gomes, "Alfarrobeira," 144–6.
35. These were the arguments stated in the instructions given to the ambassador sent to Castile. These instructions are published in *Monumenta Henricina X*, n. 49, 71–9 and were translated to English by Rita Costa-Gomes, "Alfarrobeira," 153–8.
36. Jean Jouffroy's four Latin speeches were edited, translated to Portuguese and studied by Manuel Francisco Ramos, "*Orationes* de Jean Jouffroy em favor do infante D. Pedro (1449–1450 – Retórica e Humanismo Cívico)" (PhD dissertation, University of Porto, 2006).
37. Fonseca, *D. Pedro*, 62–3.
38. *Monumenta Henricina X*, n. 50, 79–81.
39. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 758.
40. Ramos, *Orationes*, 139–73.
41. Ramos, *Orationes*, 175–249.
42. Ramos, *Orationes*, 251–75.
43. Likewise, in Pina's account, the battle started "*per caso e sem deliberação*" (by hazard and without deliberation) and the material author of Prince Pedro's death remains unknown. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 745–7.
44. Monique Sommé, *Isabelle de Portugal, duchesse de Bourgogne. Une femme au pouvoir au XV^e siècle* (Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1988), 77–88.
45. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 755.
46. António Caetano de Sousa, *Provas da História Genealógica da Casa Real Portuguesa*, edited by M. Lopes de Almeida and César Pegado, vol. II-I (Coimbra: Atlântida, 1946), 61–4.
47. Moreno, *Alfarrobeira*, 618–19.
48. Humberto Baquero Moreno, "Isabel de Urgell e a política do seu tempo," in *A Mulher na Sociedade Portuguesa: Visão Histórica e Perspectivas Actuais*, vol. 2 (Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, 1986), 421.
49. Fonseca, *D. Pedro*, 78–9.
50. Rodrigues, *Isabel de Coimbra*, 314–16. Queen Isabel had already been responsible for the first burial of her father in the church of Alverca, according to an anonymous eulogy of her father. "Panegírico do Infante D. Pedro," ed. Luís Silveira, *Ocidente* XXIV-79 (1944), 217.
51. In fact, he lived to succeed his father in 1481 as King João II of Portugal (r. 1481–1495).
52. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 770–1. His wife, Isabel of Urgel, was also buried there after she died in 1469, thus leaving empty the funerary monument she had commissioned for herself in Coimbra cathedral during the years in which a solemn burial was denied to her husband.
53. Pina, *D. Affonso V*, 771.

54. Queen Isabel was entombed in the Chapel of the Rosary in 1456 and King Afonso V in the Chapter House of the Monastery in 1481. They were transferred to the funerary monument in the Founder's Chapel, where they lie today, in the twentieth century. Saul António Gomes, "João Eanes Rabuço e o túmulo de D. Afonso V e de D. Isabel," in *Vésperas Batalhinas. Estudos de História e Arte* (Leiria: Magno, 1997), 253–5.
55. They were entombed in a funerary monument at the base of the main altar while the chapel King Duarte had commissioned for them was under construction. In fact, the building was never completed and in the beginning of the twentieth century their conjugal tomb was transferred to what is now known as the "Imperfect Chapels" of the monastery of Batalha.
56. On the plot of the duke of Braganza against King João II, see Humberto Baquero Moreno, "A conspiração contra D. João II: o julgamento do duque de Bragança," *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português* 2 (1970), 47–103.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benito Ruano, Eloy. *Los infantes de Aragón*. 2nd ed. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 2002.
- Carrillo de Huate, Pedro. *Crónica del Halconero de Juan II*. Edited by Juan de Mata Carriazo. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2006.
- Costa-Gomes, Rita. "Alfarrobeira: The Death of the Tyrant?" In *Death at Court*. Edited by Karl-Heinz Spieß and Immo Warntjes, 135–158. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- Cunha, Mafalda Soares da. "Estratégias senhoriais na regência do infante D. Pedro." *Estudos Medievais* 9 (1988): 269–290.
- Faria, Tiago Alexandre Viúla de. "Pela 'Santa Garrotea': Ofício cavaleiresco nas vésperas de Alfarrobeira." In *XIV Colóquio de História Militar: Portugal e os Conflitos Militares Internacionais. Actas*. Volume II, 61–86. Lisbon: Comissão Portuguesa de História Militar, 2005.
- Fonseca, Luís Adão da. *O condestável D. Pedro de Portugal*. Porto: Instituto Nacional da Investigação Científica, 1982.
- Gomes, Saul António. "João Eanes Rabuço e o túmulo de D. Afonso V e de D. Isabel." In *Vésperas Batalhinas. Estudos de História e Arte*, 253–6. Leiria: Magno, 1997.
- . *D. Afonso V*. Lisbon: Temas e Debates, 2009.
- Landim, Gaspar Dias de. *O infante D. Pedro*. 3 Volumes. Lisbon: Biblioteca de Clássicos Portugueses, 1892.
- Monumenta Henricina*. 14 Volumes. Coimbra: Comissão Executiva das Comemorações do V Centenário da Morte do Infante D. Henrique, 1960–74.

- Moreno, Humberto Baquero. "A conspiração contra D. João II: o julgamento do duque de Bragança," *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português* 2 (1970): 47–103.
- . *A batalha de Alfarrobeira. Antecedentes e significado histórico*. 2 Volumes. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra, 1979.
- . "Isabel de Urgell e a política do seu tempo." In *A Mulher na Sociedade Portuguesa: Visão Histórica e Perspectivas Actuais*. Volume 2, 415–25. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, 1986.
- "Panegírico do Infante D. Pedro." Edited by Luís Silveira, *Ocidente* XXIV-79 (1944): 205–17.
- Pérez de Guzmán, Fernán. *Crónica del Serenísimo Príncipe Don Juan, segundo rey deste nombre en Castilla y en León*. In *Crónicas de los reyes de Castilla*. Edited by Cayetano Rosell, 273–695. Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1877.
- Pina, Rui de. *Chronica do Senhor Rey D. Affonso V*. In *Crónicas de Rui de Pina*. Edited by M. Lopes de Almeida, 577–881. Porto: Lello & Irmão Editores, 1977.
- Porras Arboledas, Pedro Andrés. *Juan II rey de Castilla y León (1406–1454)*. Gijón: Trea, 2009.
- Ramos, Manuel Francisco. "Orationes de Jean Jouffroy em favor do infante D. Pedro (1449–1450)—Retórica e Humanismo Cívico." PhD dissertation, University of Porto, 2006.
- Rodrigues, Ana Maria S.A. "Between Husband and Father: Queen Isabel of Lancaster's Crossed Loyalties," *Imago Temporis. Medium Aevum*, 3 (2009): 205–218.
- . *As tristes rainhas: Leonor de Aragão, Isabel de Coimbra*. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores, 2012.
- Romero Portilla, Paz. *Dos monarquías medievales ante la modernidad. Relaciones entre Portugal y Castilla*. Coruña: Universidade da Coruña, 1999.
- Sommé, Monique. *Isabelle de Portugal, duchesse de Bourgogne. Une femme au pouvoir au XV^e siècle*. Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1988.
- Sousa, António Caetano de. *Provas da História Genealógica da Casa Real Portuguesa*. Edited by M. Lopes de Almeida and César Pegado. 12 Volumes. Coimbra: Atlântida, 1946–1954.
- Suárez Fernández, Luis. "Los Trastámaras de Castilla y Aragón en el siglo XV (1407–74)." In *Historia de España*. Edited by Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Vol. XV, 1–378. 4th ed. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1986.
- Viegas, Valentino. *Lisboa a força da revolução (1383–1385)*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 1985.



CHAPTER 8

The Tragic Queen: Dynastic Loyalty and the ‘Queenships’ of Mary Queen of Scots

Charles Beem

Over the course of her tumultuous and ultimately tragic career, many of the momentous decisions made by Mary Queen of Scots were motivated by dynastic concerns. As the only surviving legitimate issue of King James V of Scotland and his French consort Mary (or Marie) of Guise, Mary became queen regnant at the age of six days upon her father’s death (December 14, 1542).¹

Thus, the first phase of Mary’s queenship was that of a royal minor resident in Scotland. As the font of royal power, control of the person of the monarch was vital for the stability and legitimacy of any minority regime; dowager queen Mary of Guise worked tirelessly to retain custody of her daughter for the first six years of her life, moving her to the safety of Stirling Castle in July 1543, where she was crowned two months later. For the next few years Guise shuffled around various Scottish fortresses in response to a plethora of both domestic and foreign attempts to take physical possession of her daughter. In 1548, at the age of five, Mary was transported to France, where she would live for the next thirteen years,

C. Beem (✉)

University of North Carolina at Pembroke, Pembroke, NC, USA

while her mother remained in Scotland to safeguard her daughter's rights, one of the most important dynastic tasks she could perform as the mother of an under-age queen regnant.²

In the meantime, Mary's prospective father-in-law, Henri II of France, integrated Mary into the intimate lives of the French royal family, while Mary's Guise relatives, Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, and Francis, Duke of Guise, emerged as major players in French domestic and foreign affairs. While Mary had Scottish attendants, including a group of young aristocratic women known as the "Four Marys," and was tutored in various aspects of Scottish culture, her queenly training was for the role of French consort, rather than Scottish regnant.³

Mary's training as a consort reflected the dynastic expectation that her future husband would rule both France and Scotland. The marriage treaty, signed shortly before their April 1558 wedding, in which Mary granted her husband the Dauphin Francis the Scottish crown matrimonial (thus vesting the Scottish crown in the house of Valois) confirmed this expectation. In July 1559, Mary's husband Francis II ascended the French throne, after Henri II died in a jousting accident, which inaugurated the next phase of Mary's queenship, as consort of France. But Francis, never robust, died on December 5, 1560, leaving Mary an eighteen-year-old dowager queen of France as well as the sole proprietor of the Scottish crown. After the accession of the under-age Charles IX, and the accompanying ascendancy of dowager queen Catherine De Medici, as well as the death of her own mother, Mary made the fateful decision to return to Scotland to actually rule as a queen regnant.⁴

During the period of Mary's residence in France, Scotland had undergone a full-blown Calvinist Reformation.⁵ As regent, Mary of Guise had compromised with the Protestant Lords of the Congregation in order to retain her power and safeguard her daughter's sovereign rights. By the time she died in July 1560, the Protestant Lords, whose ostensible leader was Mary's illegitimate half-brother James Stewart (later Earl of Moray), had taken effective control over the Scottish government. They negotiated the withdrawal of French forces and an accord with England, the Treaty of Edinburgh, that, in the long term, put Scotland on the path to becoming a Protestant ally of England.⁶ The Lords also arranged the terms of Mary's return as Queen of Scotland, in which she agreed to accept the political legitimacy of the Protestant ascendancy in return for her right to worship as a Roman Catholic.

For six years, from 1561 to 1567, Mary attempted to rule Scotland. Landing in Leith on 19 August 1561, Mary was initially greeted enthusiastically by the subjects of a kingdom that had not seen its monarch for twelve years. Mary was not particularly concerned with formulating and executing policy; she rarely attending council meetings, and when she did so she remained a mostly passive participant doing her needlepoint. Her initial royal council was heavily weighted with the Protestants who had taken control of the kingdom during the final phase of the Scottish Reformation. They had negotiated the Treaty of Edinburgh, which Mary refused to ratify because it required her to renounce her English succession rights. In an age when religious dogmatism was the rule, Mary's relative pragmatism towards her Protestant nobility was heavily influenced by her own dynastic ambitions for the English throne.⁷

Mary's claim to the English throne derived through her grandmother, Margaret Tudor, Henry VIII's elder sister.⁸ Soon after her return to Scotland, Mary dispatched William Maitland of Lethington to England to negotiate with Queen Elizabeth I on her English succession rights. In these actions, Mary prioritized the dynastic aspects of her queenship over the execution of her royal office, viewing her queenship primarily as an estate to be managed, rather than an office to be wielded.⁹ In Mary's eyes, the English kingdom represented a heritable estate that no earthly law could deprive her of; her queenship remained focused on estate planning, not only for herself but for her as yet unborn children. Thus Mary's eventual second marriage had significant repercussions upon the English succession, as Elizabeth continued to decline to either marry or allow the English Parliament to name an official successor.

Nevertheless, it took Mary three and a half years after she arrived in Scotland to take a second husband. Elizabeth's probable motivation behind the chain of events that led to Mary's second marriage continues to vex historians. In 1564, Elizabeth suggested to Mary that she marry royal favorite Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, in exchange for official recognition of her English succession rights. As dynastically motivated as she was, Mary never seriously considered marrying Leicester. Not wishing to antagonize Elizabeth, however, Mary was willing to listen, but Dudley was not, nor was Elizabeth actually prepared to provide any surety for Mary's succession rights, so the plan fell through.

A year earlier, however, Elizabeth had written to Mary asking her to allow Matthew Stewart, Earl of Lennox, to return to Scotland after a long English exile. Lennox was a Catholic, married to Margaret Douglas,

daughter of Margaret Tudor by her second husband, Archibald, Earl of Angus, with whom he had two sons, Henry, Lord Darnley, and Charles, both with a hereditary claim to the English throne. In early 1565 Elizabeth granted Darnley permission to go to Scotland to join his father, despite the fact that, like his father, he was Catholic.¹⁰ As some historians have argued, if Elizabeth did favor Mary as her eventual heir, a marriage with Darnley would unite two rival British claims, as Darnley was both Scottish and English, while preventing a Catholic continental match. In July 1565 Mary, aged 22, and Darnley, aged 19, were married with Catholic rites.

The Darnley marriage was a disaster, the first of a series of costly mistakes that ultimately cost Mary her Scottish throne. Scholars who argue that Mary's downfall was the result of her sexual appetites point out how Mary fell quickly and very publicly in love with Darnley.¹¹ It is difficult to avoid the interpretation that Darnley's attractions were primarily physical and dynastic. Yet on paper the marriage worked for Mary on a variety of levels. As a sovereign queen, Mary was free to choose her own husband; she was undeniably in love and may have hoped for a companionate marriage, creating her husband Duke of Albany and granting him the courtesy title of king. Darnley's royal Stewart and Tudor blood also reinforced Mary's own hereditary claims, affording their joint heirs an enhanced claim to both the English and Scottish thrones. But the Darnley marriage created a wide body of dissension, upsetting the fragile equilibrium within the Scottish Protestant nobility that Mary had established in the first years of her personal reign, causing Moray, her illegitimate half-brother, to rebel and flee to England.

At the same time, Mary's Italian secretary David Rizzio was widely perceived as having undue influence over the queen, while Mary had quite visibly grown disenchanted with her husband. Her refusal to grant him the crown matrimonial that her first husband had enjoyed created a public relations nightmare that called into question the Queen's own chastity. By these actions, Mary effectively isolated herself politically, an isolation that resulted in the plot to murder Rizzio led by Lords Ruthven, Morton, and Lindsay, one that included Darnley himself.¹² But following Rizzio's vicious murder within her private apartments (March 9, 1566), a heavily pregnant Mary rallied, wooing back Darnley before managing her escape from Edinburgh. Mary returned a week later with an army commanded by the Protestant magnate James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell, reconciling with Moray while Ruthven, Morton and Lindsay fled to England, which was fast becoming the refuge for anti-Marian Scots. In June 1566, Mary

give birth to the future James VI, fulfilling the fundamental dynastic duty of queenship, a feat not lost on Elizabeth, to whom Mary had dispatched James Melville to bring the news. Melville reported Elizabeth saying, "the Queen of Scots was lighter a fair son, while she was but barren stock."¹³

Mary's dynastic achievement coincided with renewed attempts in England to get Elizabeth to designate an heir. However, Mary squandered her momentary tactical strength through her involvement in a bewildering chain of events that ultimately led to her deposition. Mary's council, including lords Moray, Maitland, Bothwell, and Huntly, were united only in their mutual desire to be rid of Darnley, to whom Mary had outwardly reconciled. Whether Mary actually consented to the plot to kill Darnley can never be proven conclusively. In the aftermath of Darnley's murder on February 10, 1567, Mary endured the loss of her queenly honor that proved crucial in her fall from power and grace in Scotland and England. She was widely perceived as colluding with the lead suspect, the Earl of Bothwell, who was acquitted in a private prosecution on April 12.¹⁴ These events caused Moray to break with Mary and flee to England, while, on April 24, Bothwell took custody of Mary, willingly or not, while she was on her way from Stirling Castle to visit her son. Whether Bothwell raped her or she consented, an already pregnant Mary married him on May 15 with Protestant rites.

It is impossible to say what Mary's actual motivations were in this sordid and inexplicable chain of events, whether she had fallen in love with Bothwell, the usual trope deployed, or wished to protect the legitimacy of any further children, or whether she simply desired a powerful ally to help her rule a decidedly fractious kingdom.¹⁵ But the result was that the murder of the hitherto universally despised Darnley provided the pretext for efforts to depose the Queen and replace her with her infant son. On June 15, a group of Scottish nobles, the Confederate Lords, successfully defeated Mary and Bothwell's forces at Carberry Hill, and imprisoned the Queen on Loch Leven. On July 24 Mary was compelled to abdicate her throne in favor of her one-year old son. Soon after she miscarried twins. At the same time, many of her subjects appeared convinced of her guilt in Darnley's death.

However, through the assiduous use of her charm, Mary engineered her escape from imprisonment. But following the defeat of her Scottish military forces, Mary made the fateful decision to flee to England in May 1568, presumably to gain assistance from the still heirless Elizabeth. But Mary's presence in England was complicated and unprecedented. On the one

hand, Elizabeth could hardly countenance the deposition of an anointed queen. Nonetheless, Elizabeth's advisors argued that a pro-English minority regime in Scotland that would raise James VI as a Protestant was in England's best interests.¹⁶ Mary's presence in England as a Catholic alternative to Elizabeth amid increasing religious polarizations across Europe made Mary a potentially dangerous figurehead for Catholic conspiracies. Because of these factors Mary was taken into protective custody, much as she had been as an infant queen. In the final phase of her queenship, as an exiled and imprisoned dowager queen, she was shuffled around to various fortified residences in the midlands and north of England.

But the imprisonment of a sovereign queen on foreign soil needed to be justified. Moray's discovery of the so-called "Casket Letters," which allegedly proved Mary's guilt in Darnley's murder, provided the pretext for a commission of inquiry to examine Mary's possible guilt which met from October 1568 to January 1569. Mary refused to recognize the authority of the commission insisting that she, as a sovereign queen, was not subject to English law.¹⁷ The authenticity of the letters is impossible to ascertain, although scholars still try,¹⁸ and Elizabeth refused to either vindicate or condemn her, and assigned her to the custody of George Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, and his wife Bess of Hardwick at Tutbury Castle, where Mary lived off and on for a decade and a half.

But Mary's mere presence in England was destabilizing. English Catholics considered her a viable alternative to Elizabeth, while Mary herself considered a marriage with the proto-Catholic Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, Elizabeth's cousin. Internationally, continued violence between Catholics and Protestants in Europe, as the Calvinist Dutch revolted against the Catholic Philip II, and the French Wars of Religion paralyzed France, was aggravated by the revolt of the Northern Earls in 1569. The earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland attempted to depose Elizabeth and replace her with Mary, placing Mary in exactly the same position as Elizabeth had endured during her sister Mary I's reign, as a religious alternative to the current occupant of the throne, one resident in England.¹⁹ While the revolt was crushed, and the principals, including Norfolk, were eventually executed, Pope Pius V issued the bull *Regnans in Excelsis* in early 1570, which declared Elizabeth a heretic and released her subjects from their allegiance to her.

It was within the context of this volatile domestic and international situation that Mary continued her quest to gain support to free herself from imprisonment and restore her to her Scottish throne. Elizabeth had

initially supported this idea in 1569, but the Moray minority regime soundly rejected it. The notion of Mary being restored to Scotland and ruling jointly with James VI was an idea that was intermittently floated until 1585. In hindsight, however, it is hard to escape the conclusion that by 1570 Elizabeth and her ministers had decided that Mary's incarceration would be indefinite. Elizabeth softened the blow by allowing Mary to enjoy the trappings of her queenship, observing royal protocol and dining ostentatiously, maintaining the pretense of an estate that was at variance with the reality of her incarceration. Living within the relative bubble of her isolation, Mary became willing to entertain all manner of strategies to achieve her objectives. While no foreign governments ever came close to coming to her defense or offering her help, Mary did not lack for private individuals both in England and in Europe willing to include her in their plots to dethrone Elizabeth.

The first of these, a plot by Florentine banker Roberto Ridolfi, aimed to depose Elizabeth and replace her with Mary, who would be married to the Duke of Norfolk.²⁰ In September 1571, the diligence of Elizabeth's spy network exposed the plot and its confederates, including John Leslie, Bishop of Ross, Mary's chief agent, who made a full confession under threat of torture. Lacking explicit proof of Mary's guilt, which Mary herself hotly denied, Elizabeth was reluctant to proceed judicially against Mary, despite the ferocity of the 1571 parliament's calls for her blood, and refused to ratify a parliamentary statute barring her from the throne. For the next twelve years Mary endured her continued imprisonment, although the fortified residences she lived in offered less than healthy environments which eventually took a toll on her health, already subject to stress-induced maladies. During this period the Marian party in Scotland was driven into oblivion by successive minority governments, which raised James VI to believe his mother was complicit in his father's death.²¹ As James entered his teenage years, he displayed no real desire to help his mother in any way, much less to share his throne with her, and finally in 1585 he rejected all plans to bring her back to Scotland.

Mary also suffered collateral damage as foreign plotters placed her at the center of their Catholic fueled conspiracies. The uncovering of the Throckmorton plot of 1583, which involved English Catholics in collusion with the Spanish ambassador and a murder plot by William Parry, resulted in an even more strict confinement, at Chartley Hall in Staffordshire, along with an equally stricter jailer, the Puritan Amyas Paulet. As international tensions increased, particularly with Spain, Elizabeth's councilors spearheaded

the creation of the Bond of Association, a form of lynch law that stated that any individual who attempted to assassinate Elizabeth should be executed.²²

Although Mary herself subscribed to the bond, she remained cut off from the outside world, existing in a fantasy world as Elizabeth's spymaster Francis Walsingham concocted a scheme to entrap her. Creating a system where he could monitor her secret correspondence, Walsingham produced evidence that Mary had given her consent to the Babington Plot, uncovered in September 1586, which was yet another plot to kill Elizabeth and replace her with Mary.²³ Soon after Mary was arrested and removed to Fotheringay Castle in Yorkshire, where in October she was tried under the Statute for the Queen's Safety, which was essentially the Bond of Association enacted as law.

Thus the final phase of Mary's queenship, the one she wished left for posterity, was that of the martyred queen. Throughout the last twenty years of her life, Mary deployed the trope of plausible deniability for all the crimes she was accused of, from Darnley's murder to the Babington Plot, the same strategy Elizabeth also employed to distance herself from Mary's fate. As she had during the inquest over the Casket letters, Mary refused to recognize the authority of any legal tribunal in England to try her. Nevertheless, she offered a spirited defense at her trial, denying the charges, as she had done so many times in the past. Although Mary had been convicted and sentenced to death, Elizabeth hesitated, waiting until February 1, 1587 to sign the warrant, which members of Elizabeth's Privy Council spirited up to Fotheringay, allegedly without Elizabeth's knowledge, so she could later deny that she had authorized its deployment. Confronted with the news of her impending execution on February 7, after Paulet had refused a suggestion from Elizabeth to have her killed, Mary had less than twenty-four hours to prepare herself for her final moments as a queen, which she invested with the visual trappings of Catholic martyrdom.²⁴

From our modern perspective, Mary was much more a martyr to the dangers inherent in regnant queenship in early modern Europe. While in Scotland she attempted to wield a male-gendered kingly prerogative through the rubric of queen consortship, focusing on the dynastic aspects of her crown at the expense of shoring up the authority of her office, a policy which eventually cost her Scottish throne. As an exiled dowager queen, her desire to escape from her confinement was inseparable from her continued dynastic ambitions, making her queenship a high-profile

danger to Elizabeth's. Despite the many attempts to rehabilitate her historical reputation, or feminist attempts to emphasize the formidable challenges to her queenship, the Mary Queen of Scots story remains a cautionary tale of a woman who lost control over her queenship. While the issue of her supposed guilt in her alleged crimes remains a thorny topic not attempted in this essay, Mary's inability to control perceptions about her queenship proved her downfall not only to contemporaries but to posterity as well. Ultimately, she traded her queenly honor and her womanly virtue, two qualities essential to a successful queenship, for political expediency and a desire to escape imprisonment that led to plots that encompassed Elizabeth's death. Try as they may, neither scholars, nor novelists, nor filmmakers will ever free Mary Queen of Scots from the trope of the tragic queen.

NOTES

1. John Guy, *"My Heart Is My Own": The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Fourth Estate, 2004), 16.
2. Pamela E. Ritchie, *Mary of Guise in Scotland, 1548–1560: A Political Career* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell, 2004).
3. John Leslie, *History of Scotland*, edited by Fr. E.G. Cody and William Murison, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1889–95), 2: 311; Antonia Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969), 36–69.
4. While still in France, Mary requested from English Ambassador Nicholas Throckmorton a safe conduct through England, which Elizabeth initially refused, because Mary had declined to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh, which recognized Elizabeth's right to the English throne. *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth* (hereafter *CSP, Foreign, Eliz.*), edited by Joseph Stevenson, 23 vols. (London: HMSO, 1836–1950), 4: 154.
5. Alexander F. Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation—Its Epochs, Episodes, Leaders, and Distinctive Characteristics* (Minneapolis: Fili-Quarian Classics, 2010); Gordon Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).
6. The text of the treaty is printed in *Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots, 1547–1603* (hereafter *CSP, Scotland*), ed. Joseph Bain (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1898), 442–4.
7. See Jenny Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Story of Failure* (London: George Philip, 1988).

8. See Mortimer Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1973), 74–5, 99.
9. Jenny Wormald (*Mary Queen of Scots*) argues along similar lines concerning Mary's inadequacies as a ruler.
10. *CSP, Foreign, Eliz.*, 7:264.
11. James Melville, *Memoirs of Sir James Melville*, edited by A. Francis Steuart (New York: Dutton, 1930), 92, Caroline Bingham, *Darnley: A Life of Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, Consort of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Constable, 1995), 101.
12. Sir James Melville tried to warn Mary of the plot, to no avail. See Melville, *Memoirs*, 104, 113.
13. Melville, *Memoirs*, 131.
14. Elizabeth lambasted Mary's decision to marry Bothwell shortly after the marriage. *CSP, Scotland*, 2: 336.
15. The classic twentieth-century "romantic" interpretation of Mary and Bothwell's relationship is Stefan Zweig, *Mary, Queen of Scotland and the Isles*, translated by Edna and Cedal Paul (New York: Viking, 1935).
16. Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots*, 151–4.
17. A.E. MacRobert, *Mary Queen of Scots and the Casket Letters* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
18. McRobert, *Mary Queen of Scots*.
19. Sir Cuthbert Sharp, *The Rising in the North: The 1569 Rebellion: Being a Reprint of the "Memorials of the Rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland"* (Durham: J. Shotton, 1975).
20. Francis Edwards, *The Marvellous Chance: Thomas Howard, Fourth Duke of Norfolk, and the Ridolphi Plot, 1570–1572* (London: Hart Davis, 1968).
21. The Protestant George Buchanan, who served as tutor to the youthful James VI of Scotland, was a particularly harsh "historical" critic of Mary Queen of Scots. See George Buchanan, *The Tyrannous Reign of Mary Stewart*, translated by W.A. Gatherer (Edinburgh: The Edinburgh University Press, 1959).
22. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth*, edited by Robert Lemon (London: Longman, Green, Roberts, Longman and Green, 1865), 210.
23. John Hungerford Pollen, *Mary Queen of Scots and the Babington Plot* (Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable, 1922).
24. See Jayne Elizabeth Lewis, *The Trial of Mary Queen of Scots: A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bingham, Caroline. *Darnley: A Life of Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, Consort of Mary Queen of Scots*. London: Constable, 1995.
- Buchanan, George. *The Tyrannous Reign of Mary Stewart*. Trans. W.A. Gatherer. Edinburgh: The Edinburgh University Press, 1959.

- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, 1581–1590.* Edited by Robert Lemon and Mary Anne Everett Green. London: Longman, Green, Roberts, Longman, Green, 1865.
- Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth.* Edited by Joseph Stevenson. 23 Vols. London: HMSO, 1836–1950.
- Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots, 1547–1603.* Edited by Joseph Bain. Edinburgh, H.M. General Register House, 1898.
- Donaldson, Gordon. *The Scottish Reformation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Edwards, Francis. *The Marvellous Chance: Thomas Howard, Fourth Duke of Norfolk, and the Ridolphi Plot, 1570–1572.* London: Hart Davis, 1968.
- Fraser, Antonia. *Mary Queen of Scots.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969.
- Guy, John. "My Heart Is My Own": *The Life of Mary Queen of Scots.* London: Fourth Estate, 2004.
- Leslie, John. *History of Scotland.* Edited by Fr. E.G. Cody and William Murison. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1889–95.
- Levine, Mortimer. *Tudor Dynastic Problems.* London: Allen and Unwin, 1972.
- Lewis, Jayne Elizabeth. *The Trial of Mary Queen of Scots: A Brief History with Documents.* New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.
- MacRobert, A.E. *Mary Queen of Scots and the Casket Letters.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Melville, James. *Memoirs of Sir James Melville.* Edited by A. Francis Steuart. New York: Dutton, 1930.
- Mitchell, Alexander F. *The Scottish Reformation—Its Epochs, Episodes, Leaders, and Distinctive Characteristics.* Minneapolis: Fili-Quarian Classics, 2010.
- Ritchie, Pamela E. *Mary of Guise in Scotland, 1548–1560: A Political Career.* East Linton, Scotland, Tuckwell, 2004.
- Sharp, Sir Cuthbert. *The Rising in the North: The 1569 Rebellion: Being a Reprint of the 'Memorials of the Rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland.'* Durham: J. Shotton, 1975.
- Warnicke, Retha. *Mary Queen of Scots.* London: Routledge, 2006.
- Wormald, Jenny. *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure.* London: Trafalgar Square, 1992.
- Zweig, Stefan. *Mary, Queen of Scotland and the Isles.* Translated by Edena and Cedal Paul. New York: Viking, 1935.



CHAPTER 9

Embodied Devotion: The Dynastic and Religious Loyalty of Renée de France (1510–1575)

Kelly D. Peebles

Mes amys, j'ay changé ma dame:
Une autre a dessus moy puissance,
Née deux foyz, de nom et d'ame,
Enfant de roy par sa naissance,
Enfant du ciel par congnoissance
De celuy qui la sauvera:
De sorte, quand l'autre sçaura,
Comment je l'ay telle choysie,
Je suis bien seur qu'elle en aura
Plus d'aise que de jalousie.¹

[My friends, I've changed my allegiance: another woman reigns over me. She was twice born, in name and in spirit. Child of a king by birth, child of heaven by belief in the one who will redeem her. Because of this, when the other woman learns of how I chose this particular one, I am certain that she will feel more ease than jealousy.]²

K. D. Peebles (✉)
Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA

Writing the above poem from the court of Ferrara in 1535, where he sought refuge from religious persecution after the *Affaire des Placards*, court poet Clément Marot juxtaposes his former and current patrons. Both women—Marguerite d'Angoulême, queen consort of Navarre through her marriage to Henri d'Albret, and Renée de France, Duchess of Ferrara through her marriage to Hercule d'Este—were sisters of French king François I, the former by blood and the latter by marriage. Renée's elder sister, Claude de France, had become queen consort on François's accession in 1515, but it was their father whom François succeeded. As the daughters of King Louis XII and Anne de Bretagne, Renée and Claude were not eligible to inherit the throne, but as *filles de France* they were influential in the political and cultural arenas of sixteenth-century France and throughout western Europe, just as was their contemporary and sister-in-law, Marguerite de Navarre. The marriages of all three women forged dynastic alliances. Their patronage promoted artistic and literary production. Their kinship offered them an opening for crafting diplomatic relationships between the courts within which they were born and into which they were married. And their familial kinship was further strengthened by a shared religious conviction.

During the early sixteenth century, evangelical humanism, an effort to reform the Catholic church from within, was gaining ground among courtly circles.³ As Jonathan Reid notes, Marguerite de Navarre, who protected numerous evangelicals from persecution and promoted the dissemination of heterodox ideas through her patronage of artists, authors, and theologians, was generally acknowledged as a symbolic leader for religious reform.⁴ As suggested by the epigraph, “De Marot sorty du service de la Royne de Navarre et entré en celluy de Madame de Ferrare” [On Marot's leaving the service of the Queen of Navarre and entering into that of Madame of Ferrara], Renée took on a similar role in Ferrara. Following her 1528 marriage to Hercule d'Este, she indeed welcomed Marot and reformed theologian Jean Calvin (under the pseudonym of Charles d'Espeville) at her court following the 1534 *Affaire des Placards*.⁵ Charmarie Blaisdell explains that Calvin, as well as his successor Theodore Beza, recognized the potential political clout of French noblewomen and corresponded with many in order to broaden the Calvinist network.⁶ Thus, much as Marguerite before her, Renée represented a potential unifying symbolic leader of the reform movement in France due precisely to her social and political connections as a French princess.

This chapter examines literary portrayals of Renée de France that focus on two distinguishing elements of her persona: her family and her faith. In addition to selections from Marot's poetry written at her court, I also consider Antoine Couillard's 1561 *La Bienvenue de Renée de France* and an epistle by Theodore Beza (known as Théodore de Bèze in French), with which he prefaces his 1566 edition of Jean Calvin's *Recueil des Opuscules*. Couillard's work, a festival pamphlet commemorating her return to France, is a lengthy poem praising Renée's royal lineage, regal character, and beneficial influence. Beza's prefatory epistle celebrates her as an example of Calvinist doctrine and discipline. In all of these works, Renée embodies specific political and religious qualities. I argue that by embellishing their works with her public persona, these authors effectively create an emblematic structure, a preponderant cultural phenomenon of sixteenth-century France, which noted emblematics scholar Daniel Russell describes as "a short motto [...] coupled with a figure to express an individual ideal or project."⁷ While emblems often were gathered into printed collections, such as Andrea Alciato's wildly popular *Emblemata* of 1531, Russell also explains that "it is sometimes heuristically fruitful to characterize similarities between emblematic structures and the artistic composition or rhetorical organization of other cultural artefacts as examples of 'applied emblematics'."⁸

In fact, Marot effectively theorizes the creation and function of emblems in another poem written at Renée's court, "Complainte à la Royne de Navarre du mal traitement de Madame de Ferrare par le Duc, son Mary" [Complaint to the Queen of Navarre about the poor treatment of Madame of Ferrara by the Duke, her husband]. This poem, along with the above-cited epigraph and several dozen others, was included in a presentation manuscript that Marot offered to the Constable of France, Anne de Montmorency, in 1538, following his return from Italy and abjuration of heresy. Here, Marot alludes to the representational power of emblems as concrete reminders of abstract ideas. The poet speaks of a letter received from his former patron Marguerite and explains how he relies on it to soothe his sorrow over their geographical separation. He writes:

Et aussy tost que desespoir menace
 Mes yeulx de plus ne veoir ta clere face,
 Lors force m'est que de ta lettre face
 Mon escusson.⁹

[And as soon as despair threatens never again to let my eyes see your shining face, then must I transform your letter into my coat of arms.]

For the poet, Marguerite's letter represents her person in a place where she is not physically present. It allows him to flesh out his imagination, rendering visible the invisible. By adopting her letter as his heraldic symbol (*escusson*), he conflates three discrete entities—the poet, the letter, and Marguerite—into one sign with two coordinated functions. First, the symbol becomes a visual trigger for self-edification, reminding him of his personal devotion to Marguerite. She is his inspiration and, in a sense, his savior, for she has the power to influence his personal safety and his professional activity. Second, the symbol publicly identifies the poet as Marguerite's devotee, for heraldic markers efficiently signal group identity.¹⁰ Marot thus writes himself into her family of followers, a family to which Renée also belongs.

In the epigraph with which this chapter opens, the poet transfers his allegiance to Renée, all while insisting that this gesture in fact sustains his loyalty. Through the anaphoric emphasis of lines four and five (the repetition of “enfant de”), he verbally and visually calls attention to her family ties and her religious faith by exploiting the double meaning of her name: Renée's physical birth perpetuates the Valois bloodline, while her spiritual rebirth immortalizes her soul. Due to these qualities, the poet's shift in allegiance demonstrates not a betrayal, but a facile transfer of his devotion, a reaffirmation of his loyalty to Marguerite, which itself constitutes a sort of rebirth. The two women are sufficiently alike that their particular qualities blur into a shared generality.

Though Marot frequently displays his flair for polysemy in his vast body of work, his playful exposition of Renée's name also maintains continuity with her own personal motto: *Di Real Sangue Nata / In Christo Sol Renata* [Born of royal blood, reborn through Christ alone].¹¹ Boldly embossed in black lettering on the ivory calfskin of her book bindings, her motto serves as a textual reminder of her physical person and of the abstract notions of dynastic loyalty and religious faith. Renée's motto and Marot's poem implicitly urge the reader to imagine her physical presence. To complement the words with her fleshed-out image is to create an emblematic structure, much as the poet achieves with his repurposing of Marguerite's letter. Renée's persona, her name, and her motto collide into a mutually affirming construction that embodies, or enlivens, her internal devotion. As Daniel Russell explains, the pairing of image and descriptive

text found in emblems “charges [...] figures from a dead rhetoric with vivid associations upon which the reader can build further associations at will.” In other words, although Marot’s poem and Renée’s motto both convey a meaningful message without the patron’s imaginary presence, their combined effect “support[s] and illuminate[s].”¹² The child of a king is specifically the youngest daughter of Louis XII. The child of God is the woman whom, according to Beza in the preface discussed below, Calvin converted to the reformed religion. This first aspect of Renée’s motto (her royal birth), as well as the adjectival meaning of her name (reborn), are further expounded in a text published by Antoine Couillard, a pamphlet commemorating her return to France.

*DI REAL SANGUE NATA: RENÉE’S ROYAL PARENTAGE
AND REGAL CHARACTER IN ANTOINE COUILLARD’S
LA BIENVENUE... (1560)*

“[...] I saw her arrival. The king and the entire court went out to greet her, and they received her with the greatest of honor, as was her due,” so writes notorious memoirist Pierre de Bourdeille, sieur de Brantôme, of Renée’s 1560 arrival in the city of Orléans after a nearly thirty-year absence from France.¹³ Over forty years earlier, in 1517, court poet Pierre Gringore writes of her sister Claude’s triumphal entry into Paris following her coronation as queen consort: “Dame d’honneur, princesse de bon aire, / Plaine de grace, amour et charité, / Bien venue soyes, ta venue nous doit plaire.”¹⁴ [Most honorable lady, gently-born princess full of grace, love, and charity, may you feel welcome; your arrival certainly pleases us.] Speaking from the audience’s perspective, the poet acknowledges Claude’s royal lineage and good character and refers to the benefit of her arrival (*venue*) in Paris, where its citizens strive to make her feel welcome (*bienvenue*). A subgenre of the royal entry, a *bienvenue* commemorated the return of a noble after a prolonged absence.¹⁵ Both *bienvenues* and triumphal entries were highly suggestive publicity events, designed carefully to reinforce the monarch’s status, political aims, and personal character, often through a feast of visual opportunities, such as the conspicuous display of personal emblems.¹⁶ As Leah Chang notes, pamphlets commemorating the festival entries textualize “both pageantry and political relations under the guise of an objective account.” But she also explains that they “perform a balancing act” by encouraging specific interpretations of and associations with the real-life participants.¹⁷

Antoine Couillard, Seigneur du Pavillon, textualizes Renée's arrival in Orléans in his 1561 *La Bienvenue de treshaulte, tresillustre, & tresexcelente Princesse, ma Dame Renée de France, Duchesse de Ferrare & de Chartres, Comtesse de Gisors, & Dame de Montargis*.¹⁸ In this poem of thirty-six stanzas, each made up of six pentameter verses, the first third of the poem traces her royal genealogy, from her parents through the reigning king, Charles IX. The poet then pauses for a stanza to contemplate the Queen Mother, Catherine de Médicis, who at the time was mourning the very recent and unexpected deaths of her husband, Henri II, followed by her son, François II.¹⁹ The poet writes:

Princesse dolente
 Pere & filz lamente
 Regente en grand cure,
 Tient le Roy en main,
 Et de cueur humain
 Nostre bien procure.²⁰

[Dolorous princess, who grieves for the father and the son, this regent with great care holds the king in her hand and with a kind heart oversees our wellbeing.]

The poet attenuates his mild praise of the regent with an anagram printed in the margin directly alongside this verse. Set off in a rectangular frame to further accentuate his statement, the poet rearranges the letters spelling "Catherine de Médicis" to state: "ne tache d'ici mesdire," that is, "take care not to speak ill of her here." The poet then turns his attention to Renée and devotes the remaining twenty-three stanzas to praising her virtue and describing the relationship between the public and its royal princess. France in general, and the town of Orléans in particular, rejoice in her largesse and perceive her presence as an unfathomable generosity, a heaven-sent salve for their troubles. Near the poem's end, Couillard offers another anagram alongside two explanatory stanzas:

Peuple qui attendois
 Renée de Vallois
 Si long temps destournée:
 Voy donc si son renom
 Convient à ce beau nom
 Realle sui donnée.

Voilà son nom tourné
 Qui nous est retourné.
 O heureuse journée
 Pour toute nostre France
 Esloignée de souffrance
 Puis qu'ell' nous est renée.²¹

[People who were waiting for Renée de Valois, so long distanced from us, see now if her renown corresponds to this beautiful name: she gives of herself regally. There you have the name transformed of she who has returned to us. Oh, happy day for all of France; we suffer no longer because she has returned.]

Again set in a rectangular frame, the poet's anagram "Realle sui donnée," formed of the letters spelling "Renée de Vallois," presents a startling contrast between the queen mother and the dowager duchess of Ferrara. While one must exercise caution around Catherine, Renée regally—as befitting a princess—dedicates herself to the French people. The anagrams cull out specific qualities and set them apart in a visual gesture that facilitates the reader's interpretation, much as the conspicuous signs of a *bienvenue* expedite the public's understanding of the courtly ritual and the monarch's character. The anagrams juxtapose two senior women at the French court and hint at a potential source of friction by alluding to Catherine's jealous protection of her power and Renée's self-effacement for the good of France. As the poet parades Renée through his stanzas with multiple iterations of and variations on her name, the reader is progressively written into a community of followers through repeated use of "we" and "our." This developing community rallies around the image of its long-distanced and much-beloved princess, a woman who epitomizes the purest and highest virtue. She is, as the poet writes, a "mirouer pur & clair / de toute vertu" [an unblemished and crystal-clear mirror of all virtue].²² In sum, Renée's return is sincerely welcome (*bienvenue*), for it incites a veritable renaissance that affords the city of Orléans—and by extension all of France—a second chance, the opportunity to set aside grief (presumably for the recently deceased kings) and to rejoice in the return of its morally exemplary princess. The poet insists that all problems have been resolved due to Renée's intervention: "[...] tout a esté / red-uict soubz ta main."²³

Renée did, indeed, become a symbolic leader of sorts after her return to France. Although Couillard does not specify the type of leadership that Renée offers, her correspondence with Jean Calvin and Theodore Beza suggests that she was deeply involved in the Huguenots' struggle for religious freedom, that is, the work of the Calvinist network in France.

*IN CHRISTO SOL RENATA: RENÉE'S CALVINIST EXEMPLARITY
IN BEZA'S PREFATORY EPISTRE (1566)*

In a letter written to Renée in 1566, Theodore Beza explains why he had dedicated his edited collection, published earlier that year, of Jean Calvin's *Recueil des Opuscules* to her. His primary motive, he writes, was to offer her up as an example, both for her and for posterity to consider: "ma principale intention a esté [...] de vous proposer pour exemple tant à vous mesmes qu'à la posterité."²⁴ Beza continues to exhort Renée to remain steadfast in her faith, never to deviate from or falter on her path to salvation. And he presses his future readers, those whose will to lead may not yet match their power to do so, to follow just as constantly and assuredly in her footsteps.²⁵ He positions Renée as a trailblazer, though he acknowledges the difficulty she faces at court, where she risks being duped by hypocrites claiming to be, yet not acting as, upstanding defenders of the faith. She is in danger of committing such hypocrisy herself, Beza fears, if she allows her maternal affection to cloud her good judgment.²⁶ Beza closes this letter by encouraging her to accept the public role that he recommends with an audacious devotion, "une sainte hardiesse," because the precarity of the "true religion" requires it, and her royal status grants her "meilleures enseignes," that is, greater facility for self-promotion than is available to most. By dedicating the work to Renée and by describing her carefully as an "exemple" and "enseigne," the latter referring to an identifying mark or symbol, Beza creates an emblematic structure much in the way we observed in Marot's poetry. Her actions inspire, and her image unifies.

In his 1566 epistolary preface, Beza describes his collection of Calvin's writings as a substitute for the recently deceased theologian. Purportedly intended to mitigate Renée's, and the entire reformed community's, acute pain from this loss, the book also serves to represent the virtues and ideas of this "saint personnage" in physical form. In other words, the book embodies for future reference Calvin's potentially ephemeral thoughts. In the absence of their late leader, the book functions, Beza specifies, "comme un corps." It serves to deter "aucune heresie" by means of reproducing Calvin's vivid arguments, supported by the solid

testimony of the holy scripture, “fermes tesmoignages de l’Ecriture sainte.”²⁷ Thus, Beza proposes a use for this book that is strikingly similar to that of the consistories, the primary governing bodies of the reformed churches in Geneva and throughout France. The consistories rebuked miscreants for violations of the church’s rigorous principles of discipline and appropriate devotional practices. As Thomas Lambert and Isabella Watt point out, discipline was an essential pillar of Calvin’s theology.²⁸ Through the consistory records, the detailed testimony of the accused and their accusers, we find rich examples of how the Reform was received among the population, and of what was expected of one’s friends, family, and neighbors.²⁹ Raymond Mentzer explains that members of each local reformed church’s consistory “shouldered heavy responsibility for monitoring proper behavior.” To exercise that responsibility, “they watched over the congregation, ensuring that the faithful lived and worshiped according to acceptable religious and moral standards.”³⁰ Interestingly, Mentzer suggests that Beza, along with his Scottish counterpart John Knox, emphasized the necessity of discipline even more rigorously than did Calvin, considering it an instrument for promoting virtue and punishing sin.³¹

It is as a model of Calvinist behavior that Beza speaks of Renée. In his epistolary preface, Beza cites several reasons for choosing her as dedicatee of this edited collection. First of all, he is aware of how greatly Calvin revered her, having played a role in her religious instruction and in her confirmation to the reformed doctrine. Beza effectively traces Renée’s religious “parentage” in much the same way that Couillard and Marot trace her royal lineage. Renée represents, in a sense, Calvin’s living legacy. Beza then speaks of Calvin’s habit of choosing dedicatees for his published works based on their appropriateness as living examples to the greater reformed church: “je say aussi quelle estoit sa coustume à consacrer ses livres au nom des personnes qu’il desiroit proposer en exemple à toute l’Eglise de Dieu.” [I also know that it was his custom to dedicate his books in the name of people whom he wished to put forward as examples to all of God’s church.] Beza then describes precisely what he identifies in Renée’s behavior as exemplary. He writes:

Finalement, je ne dissimuleray jamais comme je me sens infiniment obligé tant en mon particulier pour tant d’honneur et de faveur qu’il vous a pleu me faire durant ces derniers troubles et depuis, qu’en general pour l’assistance que tant de povres fideles ont receuë de vous, ayant encores plus fait pour les garentir de l’extreme cruauté de leurs ennemis.³²

[Finally, I will never conceal how I feel infinitely grateful to you, as much for the great honor and favor you showed me during and since these last troubles, as for the assistance that so many of poor faithfuls received from you, for you have done so much to protect them from the extreme cruelty of their enemies.]

Thus, it is in her actions—her care for religious refugees and support of Calvinist pastors practicing in France—that Beza recognizes a true believer. And it is through her actions that Renée stands to inspire others. Beza, like Couillard, acknowledges Renée’s regal behavior and, as if also acknowledging her personal motto, closes his preface by stating that not only are her deeds worthy of the daughter of an honorable king, but also worthy of the daughter of God, her eternal king: “digne d’une telle Princesse, non seulement fille de Roy, et d’un tel et si debonaire Roy que vous estes, mais aussi fille de ce grand Dieu et Roy eternal.” Due to her dual identities, which uniquely position her to serve as a visible example, Beza chooses to follow that very example. In a self-effacing gesture, Beza elides his presence in favor of Renée’s: “me trouvant trop povre et foible [...] j’ay fait comme ceux qui empruntent d’autrui pour s’acquitter.”³³ [Judging myself to be too poor and weak, I did as do those who borrow from someone else in order to unburden themselves.]

Renée de France’s own words best represent how she shaped her legacy to highlight her loyalty to her family and to her faith. Dictating her last will and testament to Daniel Toussaint, sieur de Beaumont, she laments the religious turmoil of the still-raging Wars of Religion and urges her children to consider their own power to serve as examples: “as for the rest, having had the honor to be so closely related to the French crown, I confess before God that my deepest disappointment and regret in this world has been to witness it torn apart by these horrifying disputes [...]. The most beneficial legacy that I could possibly leave them is God’s grace [...] may they be models of perfect love and examples of all virtue so that their family name will forever be commendable and embody an uncommon generosity.”³⁴

NOTES

1. Clément Marot, *Recueil inédit offert au Connétable de Montmorency en mars 1538*, ed. François Rigolot (Geneva: Droz, 2010), 204.
2. All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated. I have not attempted to replicate the meter and rhyme of poetry, but only to give an approximation of the message. I thank Gabriella Scarlatta for her thoughtful feedback on this and other translations in this essay. Any translation errors are my own.

3. For a general discussion of evangelical humanism, also known as Christian humanism, see Charles Nauert, "Marguerite, Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Growth of Christian Humanism in France," in *Approaches to Teaching Marguerite de Navarre's Heptaméron*, ed. Colette H. Winn (New York: Modern Languages Association, 2007), 38–43. Charmarie Jenkins Blaisdell notes that French noblewomen, who tended to be highly educated in the humanist tradition, were particularly drawn to this movement, for it granted them unmediated access to God and allowed them to discuss theology, sing hymns, and read Scripture. "Calvin's Letters to Women: The Courting of Ladies in High Places," *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 13.3 (1982), 68.
4. On Marguerite's role and the Navarrian network, see Jonathan Reid, *King's Sister—Queen of Dissent. Marguerite de Navarre (1492–1549) and Her Evangelical Network* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), in particular Volume One. See also *A Companion to Marguerite de Navarre*, ed. Gary Ferguson and Mary McKinley (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
5. On the political motivations of Renée's marriage and the Italian Wars, see Gabriel Braun, "Le Mariage de Renée de France avec Hercule d'Este: une inutile mésalliance. 28 juin 1528," *Histoire, économie et société* 7.2 (1988), 147–68.
6. Blaisdell points out that Renée maintained a correspondence with Calvin until the latter's death in 1564. In fact, he wrote more frequently and for a longer period of time to Renée than to any other noblewoman. She explains: "Calvin became Renée's personal connection with the Reform, and she became a key individual in the objectives of his French policy." Blaisdell, "Calvin's Letters," 68–70, 79.
7. Daniel Russell, *The Emblem and Device in France* (Lexington, KY: French Forum Publishers, 1985), 7.
8. Russel, *The Emblem*, 191.
9. Marot, *Recueil inédit*, 216–17.
10. Here, I borrow Laurent Hablot's description of the two functions of an emblem: "les deux principales fonctions de ces nouveaux signes sont, d'une part, l'expression de soi, à travers le contenu symbolique de l'emblème, et d'autre part, la réunion de fidèles, rassemblés par le partage de cette figure." "Les Princesses et la devise. L'Utilisation politique des devises et des ordres de chevalerie par les femmes de pouvoir à la fin du Moyen Âge," in *Femmes de pouvoir et pouvoir des femmes dans l'Occident médiéval et moderne*, ed. Armel Nayt-Dubois and Emmanuelle Santinelli-Foltz (Valenciennes: Presses Universitaires de Valenciennes, 2009), 2.
11. Whether Marot's poetic illustration inspired Renée's adoption of the motto or vice versa, it is difficult to determine, as we have few remaining artifacts from Renée's life. As much of Renée's library was burned during the inquisition, we now know of a single printed book bound in ivory-colored calfskin leather with her motto boldly emblazoned in black on its

- front and back covers. On this volume, see Tammaro di Marinis, "Legatura artistica fatta per Renata di Francia, duchessa di Ferrara," *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* 39 (1964): 373–4. And on Renée's library, see Rosanna Gorris-Camos, "La Bibliothèque de la duchesse: de la bibliothèque en feu de Renée de France à la bibliothèque éclatée de Marguerite de France, duchesse de Savoie," in *Poètes, princes & collectionneurs. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Paul Barbier-Mueller*, ed. Nicolas Ducimetière et al. (Geneva: Droz, 2011), 473–525.
12. Russell, *The Emblem*, 7.
 13. Jules Bonnet dates her arrival as 7 November, citing the correspondence of Venetian ambassadors at the French court. "Retour de la Duchesse de Ferrare en France. Septembre–Octobre 1560," *Bulletin historique et littéraire de la société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français* 27 (1878), 494. Brantôme's original French reads: "J'ay ouy dire, et le tiens de bon lieu, que, lorsque le Prince de Condé fut mis en prison à Orléans, du temps du petit Roy François, elle arriva de Ferrare deux jours aprez, et la vis arriver. Le Roy et toute la Court estant allez au devant, et receue aveq' ung très-grand honneur, comme il luy appartenoit. Elle fut fort triste de ceste prison, et dict et remonstra à feu Monsieur de Guyse, son gendre, que quiconques avoit conseillé au Roy ce coup avoit failly grandement, et que ce n'estoit peu de chose de traitter un Prince du sang de ceste façon." *Recueil des Dames, poésies et tombeaux*, ed. Étienne Vaucheret (Paris: Gallimard, 1991), 176.
 14. Pierre Gringore, *Les Entrées royales à Paris de Marie d'Angleterre (1514) et Claude de France (1517)*, ed. Cynthia J. Brown (Geneva: Droz, 2005), 171.
 15. For example, Antoine Fumée greets Henri III on his 1574 return from Poland after the death of his brother, Charles IX. *Panegyrique pour la bien venue et retour du Tres-Chrestien Henry, Roy de France & de Pologne* (Paris: Nicolas Chesneau, 1574), 14, available at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k1320340.r> (accessed 1 June 2016). Natalie Zemon Davis places the term within the broader context of gift-giving, noting that "there were words that identified things as gifts on special occasion. For example, *legs* was the legacy made in one's will; [...] *sa bienvenue*, a welcoming feast given by oneself to colleagues at the time of one's arrival at or advancement in a new position or post." *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000), 14.
 16. Cynthia J. Brown, "Introduction," *Les Entrées royales* by Pierre Gringore," 24–5, 48–9.
 17. Leah Chang, "Spectacle, Sublimation, and Civic Pride in Scève's 'L'Entrée de la Roïne,'" *Romance Quarterly* 54.2 (2007), 124.
 18. Antoine Couillard was a minister of justice, perhaps a *greffier* (court clerk), as he published a manual of formulae and procedures for those holding this office, *Les Quatres Livres du Seigneur du Pavillon les Lorriz, sur les procédures civiles & criminelles, selon le commun stil de France & Ordonnances royaux pour l'instruction des Greffiers* (Paris: Jehan Longis, 1554). Couillard

- also was embroiled in a debate on judicial astrology, publishing a satirical refutation of Nostradamus, *Les contredicts aux faulces et abusifves propheties de Nostradamus et autres astrologues* (Paris: Charles L'Angelier, 1560). The latter contains a series of poems ostensibly written by Couillard and Clément Marot's son, Michel Marot, in which Renée is mentioned briefly. On Couillard and astrology, see Luc Racaut, "A Protestant or Catholic Superstition? Astrology and Eschatology During the French Wars of Religion," in *Religion and Superstition in Reformation Europe*, ed. Helen Parish and William G. Naphy (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 154–69.
19. Henri II died in Paris in July 1559, after a jousting accident. François II died in Orléans in December 1560, likely due to an ear infection.
 20. Antoine Couillard, *La Bienvenue de treshaulte, tresillustre, & tresexcellente Princesse, ma Dame Renée de France, Duchesse de Ferrare & de Chartres, Contesse de Gisors, & Dame de Montargis. Par le Seigneur du Pavillon pres Lorriz* (Paris: Annet Briere, 1561), A3v, available at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k8571651?rk=21459;2>, accessed 1 June 2016.
 21. Couillard, *La Bienvenue*, A6.
 22. Couillard, *La Bienvenue*, A5v.
 23. Couillard, *La Bienvenue*, A5v.
 24. *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*. Tome VII (1566), ed. Hippolyte Aubert et al. (Geneva: Droz, 1973), 294.
 25. *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, 294.
 26. Renée's eldest daughter, Anne d'Este, was the widow of the Catholic stalwart François de Guise and an important figure at the French court. In the letter, Beza speaks of an incident involving Anne, who was by then remarried to Jacques de Savoie, Duc de Nemours et du Genevois. Beza alleges that Anne had mistakenly reported to her mother that pastors in Geneva had been turning people away from their sermons. He urges Renée not to believe this report. See Bèze, *Correspondance*, 295. Although Anne's late husband was a prominent figure of the Catholic faction during the Wars of Religion, contemporaries at the French court noted her sympathy for the Huguenots, for she was raised and educated among Calvinist courtiers and scholars at her mother's court in Ferrara. Following the death of François de Guise, their eldest son, Henri, also rose to prominence in the Catholic League. He and his brother, Louis, Cardinal de Guise, were assassinated by Henri III in 1588. Huguette Leloup-Audibert, *Les dernières Dames de Montargis au temps des guerres de religion. Renée de France (1510–1575) Anne d'Este (1531–1607)* (Châtillon-Coligny: Éditions de l'Écluse, 2010), 70–3, 112–27.
 27. Théodore de Bèze, *Recueil des opuscles. C'est à dire. Petits Traictez de M. Jean Calvin. Les uns reveus et corrigez sur le Latin, les autres translatez nouvellement de Latin en François* (Geneva: Baptiste Pinereul, 1566), *2r.
 28. Thomas A. Lambert and Isabella M. Watt, introduction to *Les Registres du consistoire de Genève. Tome I* (Geneva: Droz, 1996), xiii.

29. Lambert and Watt, *Les Registres*, xv–xvii.
30. Raymond Mentzer, “Order in the Church,” *Christian History* 71 (2011), 17.
31. Lambert and Watt, *Les Registres*, 17.
32. Bèze, *Recueil*, *4v.
33. Bèze, *Recueil*, *5r.
34. The original French reads as follows: “Au reste aiant eu cet honneur d’appartenir de si près à la couronne de France, je proteste devant Dieu que mon plus grand ennui et regret en ce monde, a esté de la voir troublée de confusions si horribles [...] la plus avantageuse succession que je leur puis laisser c’est la grâce de ce bon Dieu [...] qu’en parfait amitié et exemple de toute vertu, ils fassent en leur maison perpétuer la mémoire d’une générosité illustre et toujours recommandable.” Emmanuel Rodocanachi, *Une Protectrice de la réforme en Italie et en France. Renée de France Duchesse de Ferrare* (Paris: Ollendorff, 1896), 553–4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bèze, Théodore de. *Recueil des opuscules. C’est à dire. Petits Traictez de M. Jean Calvin. Les uns reveus et corrigez sur le Latin, les autres translatez nouvellement de Latin en François*. Geneva: Baptiste Pinereul, 1566.
- . *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*. Tome VII (1566). Edited by Hippolyte Aubert, Henri Meylan, Alain Dufour, Claire Chimelli, and Mario Turchetti. Geneva: Droz, 1973.
- Blaisdell, Charmarie Jenkins. “Calvin’s Letters to Women: The Courting of Ladies in High Places.” *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 13.3 (1982): 67–84.
- Bonnet, Jules. “Retour de la Duchesse de Ferrare en France. Septembre–Octobre 1560.” *Bulletin historique et littéraire de la société de l’histoire du Protestantisme français* 27 (1878): 481–495.
- Bourdeille, Pierre de, sieur de Brantôme. *Recueil des Dames, poésies et tombeaux*. Edited by Étienne Vaucheret. Paris: Gallimard, 1991.
- Braun, Gabriel. “Le Mariage de Renée de France avec Hercule d’Este: une inutile mésalliance. 28 juin 1528.” *Histoire, économie et société* 7.2 (1988): 147–168.
- Chang, Leah. “Spectacle, Sublimation, and Civic Pride in Scève’s ‘L’Entrée de la Roïne.’” *Romance Quarterly* 54.2 (2007): 124–135.
- Couillard, Antoine. *La Bienvenue de treshaulte, tresillustre, & tresexcellente Princesse, ma Dame Renée de France, Duchesse de Ferrare & de Chartres, Comtesse de Gisors, & Dame de Montargis. Par le Seigneur du Pavillon pres Lorriz*. Paris: Annet Briere, 1561. Available at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k8571651?rk=21459;2>.
- David, Natalie Zemon. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000.
- Ferguson, Gary, and Mary McKinley (eds.). *A Companion to Marguerite de Navarre*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- Fumée, Antoine. *Panegyrique pour la bien venue et retour du Tres-Chrestien Henry, Roy de France & de Pologne*. Paris: Nicolas Chesneau, 1574. Available at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k1320340.r>.
- Gorris-Camos, Rosanna. "La Bibliothèque de la duchesse: de la bibliothèque en feu de Renée de France à la bibliothèque éclatée de Marguerite de France, duchesse de Savoie." *Poètes, princes & collectionneurs. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Paul Barbier-Mueller*. Edited by Nicolas Ducimetière, Michel Jeanneret, Jean Balsamo, and Jean Paul Barbier-Mueller, 473–525. Geneva: Droz, 2011.
- Gringore, Pierre. *Les Entrées royales à Paris de Marie d'Angleterre (1514) et Claude de France (1517)*. Edited by Cynthia J. Brown. Geneva: Droz, 2005.
- Hablot, Laurent. "Les Princesses et la devise. L'Utilisation politique des devises et des ordres de chevalerie par les femmes de pouvoir à la fin du Moyen Age." *Femmes de pouvoir et pouvoir des femmes dans l'Occident médiéval et moderne*. Edited by Armel Nayt-Dubois and Emmanuelle Santinelli-Foltz, 163–76. Valenciennes: Presses Universitaires de Valenciennes, 2009.
- Lambert, Thomas A., and Isabella M. Watt (eds.) *Les Registres du consistoire de Genève. Tome I*. Geneva: Droz, 1996.
- Leloup-Audibert, Huguette. *Les dernières Dames de Montargis au temps des guerres de religion. Renée de France (1510–1575) Anne d'Este (1531–1607)*. Châtillon-Coligny: Éditions de l'Écluse, 2010.
- Marinis, Tammaro di. "Legatura artistica fatta per Renata di Francia, duchessa di Ferrara." *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* 39 (1964): 373–374.
- Marot, Clément. *Recueil inédit offert au Connétable de Montmorency en mars 1538*. Edited by François Rigolot. Geneva: Droz, 2010.
- Mayer, Claude A. "Le Départ de Marot de Ferrare." *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance*. 18.2 (1956): 197–221.
- Mentzer, Raymond. "Order in the Church." *Christian History* 71 (2011): 16–20.
——— (ed.). *Les Registres des consistoires des Églises réformées de France—XVIe–XVIIe siècles. Un inventaire*. Geneva: Droz, 2014.
- Nauert, Charles. "Marguerite, Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Growth of Christian Humanism in France." In *Approaches to Teaching Marguerite de Navarre's Heptaméron*. Edited by Colette H. Winn, 38–43. New York: Modern Languages Association, 2007.
- Racaut, Luc. "A Protestant or Catholic Superstition? Astrology and Eschatology During the French Wars of Religion." *Religion and Superstition in Reformation Europe*. Edited by Helen Parish and William G. Naphy, 154–69. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Reid, Jonathan. *King's Sister—Queen of Dissent. Marguerite de Navarre (1492–1549) and Her Evangelical Network*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Rodocanachi, Emmanuel. *Une Protectrice de la réforme en Italie et en France. Renée de France Duchesse de Ferrare*. Paris: Ollendorff, 1896.
- Russell, Daniel. *The Emblem and Device in France*. Lexington, KY: French Forum Publishers, 1985.



Queenship and the Currency of Arts Patronage as Propaganda at the Early Stuart Court

Wendy Hitchmough

History determines that royal palaces are commissioned and owned by the monarch, and James I is widely accepted as the client for the Banqueting House in Whitehall, London, with Inigo Jones, Surveyor of the King's Works, as his architect. However, Inigo Jones arrived at court in the service of the queen consort, Anna of Denmark. The building was designed to house the spectacular court masques that she had revived and presided over with Jones as the creator of extraordinary stage scenery, costumes and special effects. Anna of Denmark's agency, and the ways in which the ephemeral arts of theatre, music, and dance could influence and reflect court politics, are now as invisible as the seventeenth-century brick core behind the stonework of the Banqueting House elevations. Nevertheless, these hidden histories are as integral to the building's purpose and importance as its masonry structure.

W. Hitchmough (✉)

Head of Historic Buildings & Research, Historic Royal Palaces,
Hampton Court Palace, UK

The Banqueting House has an iconic status as an architectural jewel and a monument to the Stuart dynasty. It was one of the most influential buildings in England when it was first completed in 1622 and it is justifiably celebrated as an Inigo Jones masterpiece, “the first truly Palladian building to go up in England.”¹ Only a handful of buildings by Jones have survived and the Banqueting House may be seen to have established the creative role of the architect in England as an artist, in the Renaissance sense of the word. Designers and architectural historians revere it. Successive generations of leading architects have repaired and adapted the fabric of the building as a consequence of its prominence and its ownership by the Crown. Sir Christopher Wren adapted the interior after the Great Fire of London to provide a much-needed chapel. Sir John Soane replaced the roof and recreated the crumbling stone façade in the nineteenth century. James Wyatt respectfully substituted an annex at the north end of the building to house a new staircase. The building is still owned by the Crown and today it is managed as a heritage site by Historic Royal Palaces. Its layers of architectural significance have been meticulously analyzed and explored through above-ground archaeology and archival research to support the conservation of the building as it approaches its 400-year anniversary.² Alongside these material investigations the historiography of the building has been reconsidered. Innovative digital interpretations have represented some of the lost histories of the building, locating it as the last surviving element of the great Tudor Palace of Whitehall.³ As a monument to vanished and transgressive histories it offers further avenues for research and interpretation.

As works of art, buildings and their interiors can serve as emotional and intellectual gateways to the multiple narratives that help us to understand the present through an analysis of the past. Palaces, in particular, hold a place in the public imagination and that position can change dramatically in response to current events. Kensington Palace, for example, served as a vessel for the nation’s grief after the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, in 1987. The gilded palace gates and the ocean of bouquets banked up against them became an emotionally charged interface between the monarchy and the populace. A similarly spontaneous and overwhelming public engagement occurred in 2014 in response to Historic Royal Palaces’ *Blood Swept Lands and Seas of Red* installation at the Tower of London. Again it was the cumulative effect of ordinary people coming, quite literally in their millions, that created an extraordinary phenomenon in which ritual and propaganda combined with a creative installation to satisfy a national

desire to mark the centenary of the outbreak of the First World War. Images of Queen Elizabeth II in the Tower moat filled with thousands of poppies, each representing a life lost in battle, were beamed around the world, and they chimed with a public consciousness of her role, throughout her long reign, as the nation's leader in Remembrance Day ceremonies. The Tower of London, with its thousand-year history as a fortress, an armory and a royal palace, became a monument not only to the First World War, but to all wars. Its significance, as an iconic building, flexed and metamorphosed into something new.

That fluid relationship between the iconic power of royal palaces and the nation's memory, its sense of its own identity, is particularly pertinent to the narratives that the Banqueting House represents. It was designed as visual propaganda amidst the preparations for a controversial European union. Protracted political negotiations for the marriage of Prince Charles to the Infanta of Spain appeared to be poised on the brink of success when the first Stuart banqueting house burned to the ground in January 1619. Its replacement was immediately authorized as an elegant addition to the Tudor Palace of Whitehall. More than double the size of the great hall there, it was designed as a magnificent venue for wedding festivities which would draw together royal guests from the great powers of Europe and beyond.⁴ Its Classical vocabulary and its location at the interface between the enclosed palace courtyards and Tudor apartments, and the public thoroughfare that is now Whitehall, evoked memories of an earlier, ephemeral structure on that same site. Queen Elizabeth I entertained the Duke of Anjou and his Embassy in a spectacular banqueting house constructed, according to the chronicles, in just three weeks and three days less than forty years earlier, on the footprint of Jones's building.⁵ If history had taken a different turn it would have housed their wedding celebrations. Inigo Jones's design reflected the extravagant proportions and the swags of fruit and foliage that distinguished this Elizabethan banqueting house. But where the first structure on the site had been formed of 30 great masts, over 40 feet high, with canvas walls painted on the outside to look like stone and festooned with real pomegranates, grapes and other exotic fruit and vegetables, spangled with gold, Jones's designs were carved in stone.

The liminality of Jones's Banqueting House relates directly to its associations with queenship and marriage. Its decorative language and location bridges the Tudor and Stuart dynasties. Queen Anna of Denmark was the first queen consort in England since the death of Catherine Parr in

1548. Henry VIII's wives, after Katherine of Aragon, had been of noble rather than royal descent and Anna of Denmark was acutely aware of her independent authority as a royal princess. She was the daughter of King Frederick II of Denmark and the elder sister of his successor, Christian IV. In her gallery at Oatlands Palace her own full-length portrait hung alongside those of four Danish princes and, in an overt comparison, it was immediately adjacent to "The picture of Queen Elizabeth."⁶ Elizabeth's long reign, preceded by that of her half-sister Mary, had disrupted the conventions of queenship at the English court, and Anna of Denmark, although consort rather than regnant, harnessed the legacy of these powerful queens and exerted her own influence through the arts. She recreated the role of queen consort. Many of her portraits, and those of her elder son Henry Frederick, were composed to invite comparison with images of their Tudor forbears.⁷ However, her patronage also promoted innovation and reflected a sophisticated dialogue with European courts.

Anna of Denmark was born in 1574 and spent her early childhood with her maternal grandparents in Güstrow in Germany, where she was joined by her brother Christian.⁸ She was 15 when she married James VI of Scotland and 28 when she was crowned Queen of England. Within a year she had revived and transformed the tradition of court masques as a vehicle for lavish spectacles in which she and her Ladies of the Bedchamber performed.⁹ The first of these, *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, staged at Hampton Court Palace in January 1604, coincided with peace negotiations with Spain. Each taking the part of a goddess, the Queen and her Ladies were dressed in loose mantles and petticoats, recognizable to the court as having been made from "embroidered satins and cloth of gold and silver, for which they were beholden to Queen Elizabeth's wardrobe."¹⁰ These classical goddesses descended from a mountain and made offerings at an altar in a Temple of Peace. Anna of Denmark represented Athena, the Greek goddess of wisdom and patron of the arts. The new Queen, restyling the garments of her predecessor, literally redressed old enmities between Britain and Spain. The goddesses then danced before the court and the Spanish and Polish Ambassadors, with the Queen's favorite, Lucy Harington, Lady Bedford, taking the Spanish Ambassador as her partner in a galliard.¹¹

The designer for this first masque is unconfirmed but by the following year Inigo Jones had recently returned from Christian IV's court in Denmark and was established as the visual intelligence responsible for staging the Queen's masques. Jones had trained as a painter. His early travels

are undocumented but they are believed to have included France, Germany and Italy before his arrival in Denmark in 1603 with the 5th Earl of Rutland.¹² Danish court culture at the affluent court of Christian IV was strongly influenced by that of the Imperial court in Prague and by the French “ballet de cour.”¹³ Jones’s theatrical designs for Anna of Denmark may have signaled the alliance through marriage of their two countries, adapting the tradition of Elizabethan and Henrician court revels and masques to incorporate the Classical and international references of Danish visual culture. The Queen asserted her Danish identity and allegiances throughout her reign. Although she lacked the financial resources to emulate the scale of her brother’s architectural patronage, the effect of her refurbishments at Somerset House, after it was designated for her use, combined with an elaborate court entertainment there in 1617, prompted the King to announce that henceforth it should be known as Denmark House.¹⁴

The Stuart court was polycentric. The court masques and royal celebrations for which Inigo Jones provided extravagant Classical guises and allusions brought together the distinct and at times divergent courts of the King, his Queen, and the Prince of Wales. Masque texts by Ben Jonson and others, which were published for greater dissemination, made topical references to the personalities and intrigues of court, most of which are now opaque.¹⁵ They enabled members of the royal family and their courtiers to assume the roles of goddesses and gods, of heroic mythological and fictional characters. In doing so they tested the boundaries between Absolute monarchy and divinity, between the representation of the Renaissance characteristics of princely rule and their personification. They also challenged constraints that prohibited female performance, effectively casting the most influential women at court on stage. Although there was a clear distinction between these courtly masquers who appeared as visions and danced, and more lowly professionals and musicians who sang and spoke, Anna of Denmark’s masques further scandalized the faint hearted through their immodest costumes.¹⁶ The letter writer John Chamberlain described the Queen’s costume in *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* as “not so much below the knee but that we might see a woman had both feet and legs, which I never knew before.”¹⁷

Portraits perpetuated and consolidated court memories of masques and their powerful messages. A painting of Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford, in a masque costume by Inigo Jones, celebrated her prestigious position at the Queen’s court, dancing at her side in numerous early masques.¹⁸ It is believed to show her costume in Ben Jonson and Inigo

Jones's masque, *Hymenai*, staged in 1606 to celebrate the wedding of Frances Howard to the Earl of Essex. Jonson described Jones's costumes as "the most true impression of a celestial figure" but Harington's ankles, clad in orange stockings, were more earthly in their conspicuous exposure.¹⁹

Jonson and Jones collaborated on masque productions for the Stuart court for over 25 years. In spite of their famously disputatious relationship, their work spanned the courts of Anna of Denmark, James I and VI, and those of their sons, Henry and Charles.²⁰ They established a distinctive aesthetic identity for the Stuart dynasty and, as two of the seventeenth century's greatest creative forces, they ensured that the texts and designs for this obscure, elitist art form would be of enduring interest long after the political subtleties of their productions as commentaries on current affairs could have been fully appreciated. Jones designed a Classical, triumphal arch and a great rock for the set of a spectacle by Ben Jonson when Christian IV arrived in England in July 1606 and rode with the King to be entertained at Theobalds. His experience as a theatrical designer, with its emphasis on dramatic effect and revelation, on buildings as backdrops and as sets against which the drama of monarchy could be played out, was fundamental to his creative development as an architect. He was a conjurer, creating visions and impressions. His Classical vocabulary became more assured after 1613 when he accompanied Princess Elizabeth (daughter of James I and Anna of Denmark) and her new husband through the courts of Europe to their new home in Heidelberg. He continued on to make an extended tour of Italy and to study the architecture of Andrea Palladio in the company of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, and his wife Alatheia, one of Anna of Denmark's fellow masquers and closest companions.

One of Inigo Jones's accounts, presented after Anna of Denmark's death in March 1619, describes the breadth of her patronage with three quite separate and yet interconnected projects that he was designing concurrently for her in 1616. Both the Queen's House at Greenwich Palace and a Great Gate at her hunting palace in Surrey, Oatlands, appropriated the visual—and European—language of Classicism.²¹ The third project was a masque at Denmark House for which the designs and text are now lost but it may be assumed that they projected the same Classical aesthetic. The Great Gate, too, is now lost but the account for the mason's work and a drawing by Jones both correlate with an accurate depiction of the gate in an innovative portrait of Anna of Denmark painted by Paul van Somer and dated 1617.²² It marked the boundary between the Queen's hunting ground and the new vineyard and garden that she created at her Tudor

palace. Inventories for Oatlands describe the painting hanging in one of two exquisitely furnished galleries that she refurbished there: "In ye gallery next ye vineyard her Mats owne picture, wth her horse by her, done at large."²³ It presents the Queen in hunting dress, fashionably styled with buttoned sleeves in homage to a Spanish vogue. An owl perched in the tree at her side references Minerva and her wisdom and enlightened patronage. As a satellite palace, the Queen entertained ambassadors at Oatlands and dined with them in her galleries where paintings of "Jupiter and ye gods feasting and Diana & her maydes viewing their quarry of red deere, hares, conyes etc" reinforced the relationship between her Absolute status and the day's earthly activities.²⁴

The porosity of boundaries between divinity and royalty, between permanence and temporality, is exemplified in the artistic culture of Anna of Denmark's court. Her interest in the material culture of Italy and the Continent signaled a more open exchange with political powers across the Channel. Classical mythology and extravagant spectacles performed for the King and court, for the most influential audience in the country, synthesized the performing arts with architecture and the rituals of monarchy. But they also codified the foreign policy that conflated international alliances with royal marriage. Inigo Jones's design for the Banqueting House anticipated a union between England and Spain. It was the last building that he designed in Anna of Denmark's lifetime. She died in March 1619 before the plans were completed and the cost of her funeral, as a state occasion with a catafalque also designed by Jones, may have compromised the ambitions of his design.

Prince Charles extended his mother's patronage of Jones and Jonson and became England's greatest royal collector. His "marriage to Spain" was still in prospect when the Banqueting House opened with *The Prince's Masque*, *The Masque of Augurs* in 1622 and the following year the elevation for the building was used as a set for Ben Jonson's *Time Vindicated to Himself and His Honours*. It is also represented as a setting for a full-length portrait of James I by Paul van Somer.²⁵ In the event, however, Charles married the French princess Henrietta Maria and another powerful queen consort, Marie de Medici, became his mother-in-law. The celebrated artist, Peter Paul Rubens completed the *Marie de Medici* cycle of twenty-four monumental, allegorical paintings exalting her life, and installed at the Palace of Luxembourg in time for their wedding, and in 1629 Rubens was commissioned to immortalize James I in the series of ceiling paintings for which the Banqueting House is now most renowned.

The King is depicted grasping the arm of an allegory for Justice while the figure of Victory holds a wreath above his head and Jove's eagle transports him up to the heavens.

The power of material culture to epitomize the political and familial allegiances of its owners was not lost on Charles I's detractors. In 1643 the aptly-named Sir John Clotworthy MP marched with a troop of parliamentary soldiers to Somerset House where he forced entry into Queen Henrietta Maria's chapel and smashed a Rubens crucifixion to pieces with a halberd. As a vehement anti-papist he objected to the Queen's overt Catholicism, but the Rubens also represented the elite extravagance and divine aspirations surrounding the royal family. The Banqueting House was consciously selected as the setting for Charles I's execution six years later, and the Rubens ceiling would have been the last work of art that he looked upon before stepping out of the exquisitely proportioned Banqueting Hall onto a scaffold and his death. Inigo Jones lived to see the Banqueting House elevation appropriated by the Commonwealth as visual propaganda for its own cause. Popular prints and paintings pictured the Banqueting House again and again as a backdrop to the bloody execution. The architectural details were corrupted and bastardized. The visual language that Jones had developed for the Stuart dynasty through his masque designs and costumes, his ceremonial gateways and buildings, and the paintings by van Somer and Rubens that had brought an international sophistication to the service of the English Crown, had not been lost on the populace. In every one of those prints and paintings the set for the King's execution was unmistakably Classical.

NOTES

1. Roy Strong, *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), 57.
2. Jane Spooner, "The Banqueting House, Whitehall: Conservation Management Plan," (Internal Report, Historic Royal Palaces, 2015); Simon Thurley, *Whitehall Palace. An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240–1698* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press in association with Historic Royal Palaces, 1999), 82.
3. Adrian Murphy, "The Lost Palace: Using Technology to Create a Previously Impossible Visitor Experience," *Museums & Heritage Advisor*, 17 December 2015, available at <http://advisor.museumsandheritage.com/features/the-lost-palace-using-technology-to-create-a-previously-impossible-visitor-experience/>, accessed 17 February 2018.
4. See Thurley, *Whitehall Palace*, 82.

5. Raphael Holinshead, *The Third Volume of Chronicles* (1587), quoted in Howard Colvin, ed., *The History of the King's Works, Vol. IV, 1485–1660, Part II* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1982), 320.
6. "An Inventory of hir Mats owne stuffe in Oatelands taken ye day after her remove from there being the 7th of October 1617" East Sussex Record Office, Glynde MS 320.
7. Wendy Hitchmough, "'Setting' the Stuart Court: Placing Portraits in the 'Performance' of Anglo Spanish Negotiations," submitted to *Journal of the History of Collections*, January, 2018.
8. See Leeds Barroll, *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England. A Cultural Biography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).
9. Clare McManus (ed.), *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Clare McMnus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court (1590–1619)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 3.
10. Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 15 January 1604, in *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603–1624 Jacobean Letters*, edited by Maurice Lee (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1972), 55.
11. Ibid. See also Nadine Akkerman, "The Goddess of the Household: The Masquing Politics of Lucy Harington-Russell, Countess of Bedford," in *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting Across Early Modern Europe*, edited by Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014), 287–309.
12. John Harris, Stephen Orgel, and Roy Strong, *The King's Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court* (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1973), 17.
13. Lisbet Grandjean, "Christian IV and Drama," Council of Europe. European Art Exhibition 1988: Denmark, *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe* (Kobenhavn: Foundation for Christian IV, 1988), 142.
14. Thurley, *Somerset House*, 36. John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, March 8, 1616/17, "The king dined that day with the queen at Somerset house, which was then new christned and must hence forward be called Denmark house," *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I: 1611–18* (London: Longman, 1858), 422, 514.
15. David Lindley, ed., *Court Masques: Jacobean and Caroline Entertainments, 1605–1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995). See also James Knowles, "Introduction: 'Friends of All Ranks'? Reading the Masque in Political Culture," in *Politics and Political Culture in the Court Masque*, edited by James Knowles (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 1–20.
16. Clare McManus, "When Is a Woman Not a Woman? Or, Jacobean Fantasies of Female Performance (1606–1611)," *Modern Philology* 105:3 (2008): 437–74.

17. "Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain," 55.
18. Attributed to John de Critz, *Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford*, undated, 213.4 × 129.5 cm, The Duke of Bedford, Woburn Abbey, reproduced in Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones and the Theatre of the Stuart Court* (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet Publications Ltd, 1973), 104.
19. Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones and the Theatre of the Stuart Court* (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet Publications Ltd, 1973), 111.
20. See Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, 2–3; D.J. Gordon, "Poet and Architect," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 12 (1949): 152–78.
21. "J. Jones Surveyor at Greenwich and Oatlands," London: The National Archives. Exchequer: Works and Buildings 351/3389.
22. Paul van Somer, *Anne of Denmark*, 1617, 265.5 × 209 cm, Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 405887, and Inigo Jones, 'Oatlands Palace, Weybridge, Surrey: Design for Gateway to the Vineyard', Royal Institute of British Architects, RIBA 22803.
23. *An Inventory of hir Mats*.
24. *An Inventory of hir Mats*.
25. Paul van Somer, *James I and VI*, c.1620, 227 × 149.5 cm, Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 404446.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akkerman, Nadine. "The Goddess of the Household: The Masquing Politics of Lucy Harington-Russell, Countess of Bedford." In *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting Across Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben, 287–309. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014.
- "An Inventory of hir Mats owne stuffe in Oatlands taken ye day after her remove from there being the 7th of October 1617." East Sussex Record Office, Glynde MS 320.
- Barroll, Leeds. *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England. A Cultural Biography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I: 1611–18*. London: Longman, 1858.
- Colvin, Howard (ed.). *The History of the King's Works, Vol. IV, 1485–1660, Part II*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1982.
- Gordon, D.J. "Poet and Architect." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 12 (1949): 152–178.
- Grandjean, Lisbet. "Christian IV and Drama." Council of Europe. European Art Exhibition 1988: Denmark, *Christian IV and Europe: The 19th Art Exhibition of the Council of Europe*. Kobenhavn: Foundation for Christian IV, 1988.
- Harris, John, et al. *The King's Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court*. London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1973.

- Hitchmough, Wendy. "‘Setting’ the Stuart Court: Placing Portraits in the ‘Performance’ of Anglo Spanish Negotiations." Submitted to *Journal of the History of Collections*, 2018.
- Jones, Inigo. "J. Jones Surveyor at Greenwich and Oatlands." London: The National Archives. Exchequer: Works and Buildings 351/3389.
- . "Oatlands Palace, Weybridge, Surrey: Design for Gateway to the Vineyard." Royal Institute of British Architects, RIBA 22803.
- Knowles, James. "Introduction: ‘Friends of All Ranks’? Reading the Masque in Political Culture." In *Politics and Political Culture in the Court Masque*. Edited by James Knowles, 1–20. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Lee, Maurice (ed.). *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain 1603–1624 Jacobean Letters*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1972.
- Lindley, David (ed.). *Court Masques: Jacobean and Caroline Entertainments, 1605–1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- McManus, Clare. *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court (1590–1619)*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- (ed.). *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- . "When Is a Woman Not a Woman? Or, Jacobean Fantasies of Female Performance (1606–1611)." *Modern Philology*, 105:3 (2008): 437–474.
- Murphy, Adrian. "The Lost Palace: Using Technology to Create a Previously Impossible Visitor Experience." *Museums & Heritage Advisor*, 17 December 2015. Available Online at www.advisor.museumsandheritage.com/features/the-lost-palace-using-technology-to-create-a-previously-impossible-visitor-experience/.
- Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones and the Theatre of the Stuart Court*. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet Publications Ltd, 1973.
- Somer, Paul van. *Anne of Denmark*, 1617, 265.5 × 209 cm, Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 405887.
- . *James I and VI*, c.1620, 227 × 149.5 cm, Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 404446.
- Spooner, Jane. "The Banqueting House, Whitehall: Conservation Management Plan." Internal Report, Historic Royal Palaces, 2015.
- Strong, Roy. *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Thurley, Simon. *Whitehall Palace. An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240–1698*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press in association with Historic Royal Palaces, 1999.
- . *Somerset House: The Palace of England’s Queens 1551–1692*. London: London Topographical Society, 2009.



Dynastic Loyalty and Allegiances: Ottoman Resilience During the Seventeenth Century Crisis

Reneé Langlois

Global cooling, famine, disease, civil unrest, war, floods, and severe economic strain marked almost a hundred years of crisis across the globe that reached its height during the seventeenth century. In reaction to these severe conditions, beginning in the 1620s, population numbers around the world fell dramatically; by the end of the seventeenth century, an estimated one-third of the population of the world had perished, causing a profound transformation in the global demographic landscape.¹ What sets this century apart is the degree to which historians can correlate climate change and conflict throughout the world. The seventeenth century witnessed multiple imperial collapses, as various empires and states proved unable to recover from the damage they endured.²

For the Ottoman Empire, one of the most dominant states on the global stage during the early modern era, the “Seventeenth Century Global Crisis” generated similar conditions, including extreme climate change, perpetual military conflicts, and violent outbreaks of rebellion. Despite these challenging conditions, the Ottoman Empire endured, only collapsing at the

R. Langlois (✉)
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV, USA

end of the First World War. Therefore, this analysis will examine the key factors that allowed the Ottoman Empire to effectively navigate the challenging instability of this ecological, political, and economic crisis. Moreover, since there was a heightened participation of women in Ottoman politics also throughout this period, it will demonstrate the ways that the royal women of the imperial harem fought for Ottoman survival, and became major contributors to the empire's resilience.

The study of environmental impacts on world history has been an emerging field over the past twenty years. Humans throughout centuries have frequently been subjected to the unpredictability of environmental events and catastrophes of nature, and environmental history identifies the agency that climate, geography, and other physical factors can have on human societies. However, scholars disagree on how to interpret environmental history, with some thinkers like Jared Diamond arguing that natural forces are undeniably responsible for human history, thus believing in collapse theory,³ while others, like environmental social scientists W. Neil Adger and Katrina Brown, suggest resilience theory, an adaptive cycle wherein societies ultimately absorb disturbances.⁴

Earlier periods of history have also presented evidence of climate disruptions reshaping the trajectory of human history. For example, Eric Cline tries to bridge the aforementioned ideological divide by advancing "complexity theory." In reexamining the mysterious collapse of the Bronze Age, he identifies a persistent series of climactic and human-induced events that created what he calls a "multiplier effect," thus reframing our understanding of the process.⁵

For the Middle East, environmental history can be extremely helpful in framing a set of events. Because of the two regions' aridity, the Middle and Near East are notably subject to changes in local and global weather patterns. Peter Christensen believes that historians should take environmental elements into consideration to better understand the decline of "power and population", since the harsh environment of the Middle and Near East has increased the challenges people and rulers face in maintaining long-term growth and development.⁶ Additionally, Ronnie Ellenblum's recent work on the ecological change of the Eastern Mediterranean argues that climate change has been overlooked by scholars, and can help to explain the rise of nomadic powers, the collapse of organized bureaucracies, and the accelerated spread of religion that is apparent throughout the Mediterranean during the eleventh century.⁷ Similarly, by reexamining the seventeenth century through a climactic or ecological lens, historians can

gain additional insight into the Ottoman case. However, in using climate as a unit of analysis, one has to be careful not to fall into the reductionist trap of employing it to explain everything, as any observed transformation or change is rarely, if ever, monocausal. The effects of climate and geography on civilizations, though real, still have to be considered within the cultural, social, and political contexts that surround the circumstance, and allowance has to be made for human response.⁸

While several regions of the world were also busy navigating the challenging seventeenth-century crisis, the Ottoman case study is an important one because of the complex geopolitical environment and extensive territories its rulers governed. By the middle of the sixteenth century, the Ottomans controlled more than 30 percent of Europe and 50 percent of the Mediterranean, an area which incorporated one million subjects.⁹ The intersection of the “Little Ice Age” and the “General Crisis” has been identified as a critical juncture in the history of the Ottoman Empire. Climate change and natural disasters caused a vicious cycle of demographic and agricultural contraction. A severe drought in Egypt devastated the food supply on which Istanbul was dependent, which led to a wave of plague and epidemic disease. Environmental conditions caused villages to be abandoned, and, significantly, in central Greece, Bulgaria, and Macedonia, household numbers dropped by half.¹⁰ In what has been termed “The Great Flight,” peasants migrated to find more favorable circumstances, many settling in cities, which quickly became overpopulated.¹¹ This mass migration left Ottoman society wracked with a rural labor shortage, coupled with an inability to raise adequate taxes.

Like the rest of the globe, this epoch for the Ottomans was also a century of intense, continuous conflict; at one point, the Ottoman Empire was spending 75 percent of its annual budget on prolonged, unprofitable wars.¹² Furthermore, advances in military technology demanded continual investment. Making matters worse, properly provisioning Ottoman armies became increasingly difficult as cold weather patterns dramatically reduced agricultural production and domesticated animal populations.¹³ From the 1590s, when the Ottoman crisis first began, the empire witnessed only ten years of peace until the end of the seventeenth century, and the constant warfare placed a relentless strain on Ottoman resources, driving the empire to the brink of bankruptcy.¹⁴

It was also during this period that centralized authority became increasingly unstable, as ten different sultans and sixty different Grand Viziers (the position of Grand Vizier in the Ottoman Empire was analogous to

prime minister) came and went over the course of the seventeenth century. The empire experienced two unprecedented regicides, which triggered power struggles between different military factions within the capital.

As a consequence, in the midst of the seventeenth-century crisis, new sources of political legitimacy and of money were urgently needed to save the Ottoman Empire from collapse. The empire navigated this period of crisis by constructing an enduring dynastic loyalty through novel policies of marriage-brokering and networking, changes in the system of economic administration, a growth of charitable patronage, and new forms of political leadership; all of these innovations ultimately contributed to the survival of the Ottoman imperial house and dynastic system. Although the response of the Ottomans to the crisis was not entirely effective, the tactics they employed enabled them to survive the crisis, albeit emerging in a weakened position.

One significant survival strategy, matrimonial politics, was used to create intricate networks of power by matching the highest-ranking officials to Ottoman princesses. By tying these governing elites to the royal family, the ruling house cemented their allegiance to the dynasty and reduced the likelihood that the governing elites would seek to gain greater power and autonomy in their own right.

An established form of Ottoman matrimonial politics already existed, but what was distinctive during the seventeenth century was the increased number of arranged serial marriages, brokered largely by the *validé sultan* (the queen mother of the reigning sultan).¹⁵ Daughters, granddaughters, aunts, and sisters of the sultan and queen mother during this time were betrothed at an earlier age, and throughout their lifetime might often marry multiple times. These royal women helped the sultanate reinforce control over the most powerful elites in Istanbul and throughout the empire.¹⁶ Records reveal that the *validé sultan* Kösem wrote a letter to Grand Vizier Hafiz Ahmed Pasha encouraging a marriage alliance with one of her daughters. The letter stated: “[w]henever you’re ready, let me know and I’ll act accordingly. We’ll take care of you right away. I have a princess ready. I’ll do just as I did when I sent out my Fatma.”¹⁷ Kösem’s daughter, Ayşe Sultan (d. 1656), was married then, for her third time, to Hafiz Ahmed Pasha. Rejecting the state’s offer of marriage into the royal family was tantamount to treason, so statesmen could not decline a proposed match. Another example of these serial marriages, albeit an unhappy one, is that of the provincial governor (and former Grand Vizier) Melek Ahmed Pasha to Fatma Sultan (d. 1670) in 1662—the princess’s seventh

marriage at the age of 61—a marriage intended to retain Melek's service and resources within the empire. Another of Kösem Sultan's (d. 1651) daughters, Gevherhan Sultan (d. 1660), was also married several times, and three of the statesmen she was matched to were granted the position of Grand Vizier.¹⁸

In another instance of matrimonial politicking, the *validé sultan* Turhan (d. 1683) brokered a marriage between Ayşe Sultan, Kösem's daughter, who, by then, had five prior marriages, and Ibşir Mustafa Pasha (d. 1655), a rebellious Ottoman statesman who was leading uprisings in Anatolia. By brokering this match, Turhan's intention was to quell the rebellion and secure the loyalty of the disgruntled statesman by tying him to the imperial family. Ibşir Mustafa Pasha was promoted to the office of Grand Vizier, a position he held for less than seven months before his assassination in the capital, the culmination of a plot that had been carefully planned by Turhan.¹⁹

Episodes like this illustrate how the seventeenth century witnessed multiple outbreaks of intense rebellion and banditry in the provinces. One way the empire overcame these challenges was to negotiate the loyalty of rebellious leaders, and, oftentimes, convert them to loyal subjects by giving them titles or elite status. In military campaigns, they would transform rivals into allies. For example, in 1653, to end a conflict with a rebel faction headed by the aforementioned Ibşir Mustafa Pasha, 59,000 former rebel soldiers were incorporated into the Ottoman standing army.²⁰ Karen Barkey asserts that in the seventeenth century the empire was able to secure the loyalty of rural populations, regional elites, and bandits through the unique mechanisms of co-option, incorporation, and bargaining, which helped to preserve its hold on centralized power during this tumultuous period.²¹ These policies created a robust network of allegiances secured to the imperial household and also preserved the imperial power structure by limiting the ability of other groups to build up more power than the sultanate.

To prevail against economic challenges, the Ottoman Empire developed its fiscal strategies over time, which helped it to stabilize the realm. Ottoman finance ministers were able to alter their systems of tax levying to keep up with monetary pressures by expanding tax farming. For example, the *avariz*, or household tax, was auctioned in order to provide crucial immediate capital.²² Finance ministers also imposed new taxes on certain personal goods, while the sale of elite public offices and mandatory tributes from religious communities emerged as other avenues to generate

necessary resources.²³ The sale of tax farms gave the empire the direct capital that it needed to deal with the deficits plaguing the treasury, while simultaneously giving the elites motivation to seek the sultan's favor.²⁴ Although the restructuring of fiscal policies came at a crippling price, it did, for a while, contribute to the preservation of the empire.

Additionally, marriage alliances were often a way to secure financial capital and military resources, since many of the statesmen being tied to the imperial household brought with them men, money, and arms.²⁵ Marrying princesses to wealthy elites also helped to defray the extraordinary costs of maintaining the many royal households within the imperial household, which brought some relief to the financial pressures bearing down on the empire.²⁶

To offset the burdens their policies imposed, the Ottomans endeavored to ease the social pressures that were distressing the capital and other major cities in the empire through patronage and acts of charity. Imperial women played a vital role during this period, taking the lead in promoting public works for the increasing urban populations. Royal Ottoman women often established *wagf* foundations, endowments of property sanctioned under Islamic law to be held in trust and used for a charitable or religious purpose.

While these royal establishments were hardly novel by the seventeenth century, the grand Ottoman complexes—which could serve the daily needs of a community—demonstrated an ambition well beyond the norm.²⁷ The Çinili Camii Mosque, built by Kösem Sultan and opened in 1640, is a good example.²⁸ It was constructed in the Üsküdar neighborhood, and the *külliye*, or complex of buildings, included a *madrassa*, primary school, *hamam*, and a public fountain. All these functions significantly contributed to the social and economic wellbeing of this important district in Istanbul. Even more impressive was the Yeni Cami Mosque complex, completed by Turhan Sultan in 1665. It incorporated a mosque, primary school, public fountains, and a bazaar, institutions which dramatically increased the economic prosperity of the Eminönü neighborhood.²⁹

Moreover, soup kitchens became an essential element of the Ottoman landscape during the crisis. Amy Singer observes that “[t]he power to feed fed power.”³⁰ The benefaction of these imperial complexes was extremely important during a time when the realm was struggling with food shortages. Evliya Çelebi, a famed gentleman-adventurer and explorer, praised these *imarets* extravagantly: “there is nothing like our enviable institutions. May the beneficence of the House of Osman endure until the end of

days.”³¹ Moreover, patronage and philanthropy in this period were not apolitical; in fact, the two were intentionally coupled to boldly promote the power of both the royal family and the benefactress, as there was reciprocation of loyalty expected in the patronage of good works. After the murder of *validé sultan* Kösem, Mustafa Naima, an Ottoman bureaucrat and historian, hailed her as a generous benefactress who used her “amassing of wealth” to benefit the dynasty.³² Peirce comments that, “the role of individual charity was vital in the development and the survival of the Ottoman civilization.”³³ These examples demonstrate that patronage reconfirmed the power of the dynasty, while charity helped to reinforce the loyalty of its subjects by providing for their basic needs.

The empire aimed to secure authoritative leadership in response to the hierarchical instability precipitated by a pattern of inexperienced, or even child sultans. To help fill the void that had opened up, the *validé sultan* became a leading figure representing the dynasty and began to operate independently of the reigning sultan, as her extensive experience gave her the opportunity to develop her own political structure that included her own cadre of advisors and a retinue loyal specifically to her.³⁴ Furthermore, her position came to symbolize stability and flexibility in an era when frequent leadership changes could destabilize the empire. Royal women seem to have provided the steadiness that royal males could not.

Several powerful queen mothers took on a prominent role in preventing the dynasty from collapse. Perhaps the most critical figure, reigning at the peak of the Ottoman crisis, was Turhan, *validé sultan* and regent to her 9-year-old son, Mehmed IV, who ruled by her side until her death. The young *validé* proved to be a shrewd politician, able to develop an interwoven network of power.³⁵ Additionally, the official correspondence of the early 1650s, written by the Grand Vizier, was predominantly addressed to the queen mother, illustrating her direct involvement in governmental affairs and ability to chart a course for the empire.³⁶

New forms of political legitimacy were also needed in the important position of Grand Vizier. For that reason, Turhan endorsed the transfer of political and military power to Köprülü Mehmed Pasha (d. 1661), in September 1656.³⁷ Because Turhan did not have any daughters to leverage for a strong *damad* (imperial son-in law) alliance, she selected Köprülü as a proven military leader who exuded experience and competence.³⁸ Their symbiotic relationship relied on their mutual confidence in and dependence on the restoration of stronger central authority.³⁹ With Turhan’s backing, the fierce 80-year-old vizier imposed order by

executing treasonous individuals, exiling disruptive religious leaders, and manipulating the various military factions so that each would act as a check upon the other.⁴⁰

Tying Köprülü into her inner network was an act of great strength and understanding of Ottoman power politics, and not what some mistake for “the weakness of her sex.”⁴¹ With the new grand vizier managing state politics, Turhan was then able to shine in her role as *validé sultan*, providing a heightened legitimacy to the Ottoman dynasty as a symbol of continuity, while also becoming one of the most prolific architectural patrons of the period.⁴² The alliance between the Ottoman dynastic house and the Köprülü viziers provided the stability that was needed to preserve the dynasty itself during the most challenging years of the crisis.

In accordance with Parker’s analysis, the calamities brought by the “Little Ice Age” and the “General Crisis” subsided with improved weather conditions, policy adaptations, and a reduced population.⁴³ Nevertheless, by the end of the seventeenth century the empire at large was decisively weakened. The need for fiscal stability required decentralization in political authority to the provinces, reduced resources meant a decline in international trade, and the empire’s overall range and power was diminished. Although, the extreme measures the Ottomans took demonstrate that their dynasty was determined on its survival, the empire would face a longer recovery period than the states and empires of Western Europe.⁴⁴

Applying an environmental lens to history allows historians to rethink the place of various actors and institutions of the past, and in this case, to better understand their strategies and tactics. Sam White observes that, “in order to understand the empire’s successes, crises, and transformations, historians must take into account the ecological conditions of the early modern Near East....”⁴⁵ Such an approach enables historians to escape previous interpretations grounded in political decline and corruption. After reexamining this period in Ottoman history, historians have shifted their perspective from narratives of “decline” toward one that emphasizes transformation, or responses to crisis.

The Ottomans faced many challenges that grew out of the global crisis of the seventeenth century, but their endurance and survival must be credited to their flexibility and adoption of successful strategies. The two principles that added to the staying power of the realm were that all lands and all office holdings were completely under the sultan’s discretion to distribute at will.⁴⁶ Additionally, Barkey holds that Ottoman success was due to its ability to utilize intermediaries.⁴⁷ We can compare the Ottoman

Empire to two other gunpowder empires, (empires that early on advanced the use of gunpowder, giving rise to their military innovation and successes): the Safavid and Mughal dynasties. Both rapidly declined or collapsed in the eighteenth century.

Douglas Streusand argues that Ottoman survival was based on a reformed tax system, a new provincial elite, and a transformed military structure.⁴⁸ I would add that one of the critical aspects of Ottoman adaptation was that the dynasty developed effective strategies for constructing and maintaining allegiance. The Ottomans devised novel ways to draw people in and tie them to the imperial household, a practice which could be considered a primary example of climate resilience. Female agency played a decisive role in the empire's durability, as royal women were strategically matched with statesmen to "cement alliances" within the empire itself.⁴⁹ The role of the *validé sultan* provided a constant representation of political legitimacy, and these notable women were staunchly loyal and instrumental in fortifying devotion to the dynasty through their grand acts of charity and patronage. Their human response to the crisis illustrates their distinctive role as strong protectors of the empire. Their ability to step onto the political stage with such effect during this time clearly intersected with the crisis unleashed by climate change, although additional research will be required in order to determine whether the conditions brought on by the crisis were the primary catalyst for the emergence of strong and visible female agency during this epoch.

NOTES

1. "The General Crisis" was a label used to explain widespread conflict and instability throughout the seventeenth century. In 1959, an article by Hugh Trevor Roper titled "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century" helped coin the term. Geoffrey Parker's book (*Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013)) is a comparative study that places the chaos of the seventeenth century in a global perspective.
2. During the seventeenth century, China experienced the collapse of the Ming Dynasty, which had lasted more than three hundred years. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth also never recovered from the crisis. See Parker, *Global Crisis*, 115–84.
3. Jared Diamond, *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed* (New York: Penguin Group, 2011), 10–20.

4. Climate resilience theory analyzes how systems adapt to change, stemming from ecological or climate change, that evolves in a beneficial way to the system. See Donald R. Nelson, W. Neil Adger, and Katrina Brown, "Adaptation to Environmental Change: Contributions of a Resilience Framework," *The Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 32 (2007): 395–419.
5. Eric Cline, *1177 B.C.: The Year Civilization Collapsed* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015), xv–xviii, 10–11.
6. Peter Christiansen, *The Decline of Iranshahr: Irrigation and Environment in the Middle East, 500 BC–AD 1500* (New York: I.B. Tauris, revised 2016), 1–8.
7. Ronnie Ellenblum, *The Collapse of the Eastern Mediterranean: Climate Change and the Decline of the East, 950–1072* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
8. Sam White, *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 13.
9. Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 143.
10. Parker, *Global Crisis*, 188.
11. White (*Climate of Rebellion*, 140–62) examines the drought that afflicted the Ottoman Empire during the 1590s in his chapter titled "The Great Drought."
12. Parker, *Global Crisis*, 33.
13. White, *Climate of Rebellion*, 97–9.
14. In 1580, 60 silver coins could be converted into one gold coin, but at the height of the crisis in 1640 it took 250, a 416 percent increase in the value of gold. Parker, *Global Crisis*, 71–3.
15. Leslie P. Peirce, "Beyond Harem Walls: Ottoman Royal Women and the Exercise of Power," in *Gendered Domains: Rethinking Public and Private in Women's History*, edited by Dorothy O. Helly and Susan M. Reverby (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), 53. Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 145.
16. Peirce, "Beyond Harem Walls," 45.
17. Peirce, *Imperial Harem*, 148.
18. The three Grand Viziers were Öküz Mehmed Pasha (d. 1619), Topal Recep Pasha (d. 1632), and Abaza Siyavuş Pasha (d. 1656). Pierce, *Imperial Harem*, 105.
19. Mustafa Naima, *Tarih-i Naima*, 6 vols. (Istanbul, 1280/1863–4), 6: 4–99.
20. Parker, *Global Crisis*, 227. Robert Dankoff, *The Intimate Life of an Ottoman Statesman, Melek Ahmed Pasha, (1588–1662: As Portrayed in Evliya Çelebi's Book of Travels)* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 107–166.

21. Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 178–81.
22. Parker, *Global Crisis*, 197–8. The *avariz* tax was levied upon all adult males, Muslim and non-Muslim. For more detailed information, see: Douglas Streusand, *Islamic Gunpowder Empires: Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2010), 127.
23. Parker, *Global Crisis*, 198.
24. For a more detailed account of the changing *timar* system to tax farming, see Streusand, *Islamic Gunpowder Empires*, 126–30. For a more detailed account of the extension of tax farming after the seventeenth century, see Barkey, *Empire of Difference*, 229–35. Tax farms are cited by Ottoman historians as a main cause of the eventual future paralysis and decay of centralized power, partly by creating a new regional, elite class that gained power. In my opinion, the Ottomans did not have many alternative ways to raise capital in the seventeenth century if they wanted to survive this crisis.
25. Dankoff, *Intimate Life of an Ottoman Statesman*, 32.
26. Peirce, *Imperial Harem*, 146.
27. Amy Singer, *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence: An Imperial Soup Kitchen in Jerusalem* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 72. Singer argues that the *waqf* foundations were rooted in Muslim, Byzantine, and Turco-Mongol traditions.
28. Kösem's name boldly marks the entrance. On the entrance is also an inscription by the poet Himmet: "Her exalted Majesty the *valide sultan* always performed glorious act of charity out of the sincere love of God. She built this congregational mosque and had its many estates endowed to support it. Divine guidance assisted her in her acts of charity..." Howard Crane, trans., *Garden of the Mosques: Hafız Hüseyin Al-Ayvansarayî's Guide to the Muslim Monuments of Ottoman Istanbul* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 491; Lucienne Thys-Şenocak, *Ottoman Women Builders: The Architectural Patronage of Hadice Turhan Sultan* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 89.
29. Thys-Şenocak, *Ottoman Women Builders*, 187. This act of patronage also helped to silence the religious fanatics, because it Islamicized a Jewish neighborhood.
30. Singer, *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence*, 142.
31. Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 1. Kitap: Istanbul (Istanbul: Yapi Kredi Yayinlari, 1996).
32. Naima was writing about the factionalism that led to Kösem's death. See Lewis V. Thomas, *A Study of Naima* (New York: New York University Press, 1972), 101.
33. Peirce, *Imperial Harem*, 218.
34. Parker asserts (*Global Crisis*, 186) that "[t]he sultan's mother was the most powerful woman—and often the most powerful person—in the empire."

35. To help seize her role as *validé sultan*, Turhan allied herself with the chief black eunuch of the Imperial Harem at the time, Süleyman Agha. During her early years in office she allied herself with leading men in all areas of the state, including Koca Kasım Ağa, Turhan's trusted steward in architecture, who was also involved in politics and was an important player in the promotion of Köprülü Mehmed Pasha. Peirce, *Imperial Harem*, 144, 254.
36. Marc David Baer, *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 61. Topkapi Palace Museum Archive, Arzlar (Writs) E., 7002/I through E, 7002/86.
37. For an explanation of the Grand Vizier position and how it was used to help balance weak sultans, see: Parker, *Global Crisis*, 201.
38. Naima, *Tarih-i Naima*, 6:213–14. According to Naima, the meeting between *validé sultan* Turhan and Köprülü was formal in nature. The new Grand Vizier Köprülü, before he agreed to take office, required the following: that the sultan would fulfill all of the vizier's requests; that the vizier would have control over all state and military appointments and any dismissals; and that no slander would be expressed about his person. This reveals that the new vizier wanted and needed Turhan's support and protection to be able to restore order without worrying that he would be removed from office in the process, since she potentially would have had the power and connections to do so. The political dynasty of the Köprülü grand viziers, which he founded, would continue until the beginning of the eighteenth century.
39. Turhan's only issue was Mehmed IV, and she was the only *validé sultan* during this period who did not have any daughters, something which could have increased the difficulty of finding a strong and trustworthy figure to fill the position of grand vizier. Peirce, *Imperial Harem*, 257.
40. According to Naima, after a renewed Sufi–Kadizadeli conflict, Mehmed Köprülü exiled three of the main *ulema* (religious elite), including Ustuvani, Turk Ahmed, and Divane Mustafa. Thomas, *Study of Naima*, 108–10.
41. See further Peirce, *Imperial Harem*, 256–7.
42. Turhan not only built grand mosque complexes but her first commission was two fortresses, the Seddülbahir and Kumkale, positioned on both sides of the Dardanelles for protection from Venetian forces. Thys-Şenocak argues (*Ottoman Women Builders*, 5) that by building defensive structures, something no other queen mother had done, Turhan was illustrating that she was a strong and powerful defender of the Ottoman Empire.
43. Parker, *Global Crisis*, 209–10, 587–90.
44. White asserts (*Climate of Rebellion*, 12) that arid or semi-arid regions usually experience a longer recovery period than other climactic zones. See also Parker, *Global Crisis*, 210.

45. White, *Climate of Rebellion*, 298.
46. Burbank and Cooper, *Empires in World History*, 139.
47. Barkey, *Empire of Difference*, 9–15.
48. Streusand, *Islamic Gunpowder Empires*, 296–7.
49. Maria Pendani, “Safiye’s Household and Venetian Diplomacy,” *Turcica* 32 (2000): 28.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baer, Marc David. *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Barkey, Karen. *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Burbank, Jane, and Frederick Cooper. *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Çelebi, Evliya. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 1. Kitap: Istanbul. Istanbul: Yapi Kredi Yayinlari, 1996.
- Christiansen, Peter. *The Decline of Iranshahr: Irrigation and Environment in the Middle East, 500 BC–AD 1500*. New York: I.B. Tauris, Revised 2016.
- Cline, Eric. *1177 B.C.: The Year Civilization Collapsed*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Crane, Howard, trans. *Garden of the Mosques: Hafız Hüseyin Al-Ayvansarayî’s Guide to the Muslim Monuments of Ottoman Istanbul*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Dankoff, Robert. *The Intimate Life of an Ottoman Statesman, Melek Ahmed Pasha, (1588–1662: As Portrayed in Evliya Çelebi’s Book of Travels)*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Diamond, Jared. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. 2nd edn. New York: Penguin Group, 2011.
- Ellenblum, Ronnie. *The Collapse of the Eastern Mediterranean: Climate Change and the Decline of the East, 950–1072*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Naima, Mustafa. *Tarih-i Naima*. 6 vols. Istanbul, 1280/1863–4.
- Nelson, Donald R., W. Neil Adger, and Katrina Brown. “Adaptation to Environmental Change: Contributions of a Resilience Framework.” *The Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 32 (2007): 395–419.
- Parker, Geoffrey. *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Peirce, Leslie P. “Beyond Harem Walls: Ottoman Royal Women and the Exercise of Power.” In *Gendered Domains: Rethinking Public and Private in Women’s History*. Edited by Dorothy O. Helly and Susan M. Reverby, 40–55. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

- . *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Pendani, Maria. "Safiye's Household and Venetian Diplomacy." *Turcica* 32 (2000): 9–32.
- Singer, Amy. *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence: An Imperial Soup Kitchen in Jerusalem*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Streusand, Douglas. *Islamic Gunpowder Empires: Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2010.
- Thomas, Lewis V. *A Study of Naima*. New York: New York University Press, 1972.
- Thys-Şenocak, Lucienne. *Ottoman Women Builders: The Architectural Patronage of Hadice Turhan Sultan*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Topkapi Palace Museum Archive, Arzlar (Writs) E. 7002/I through E. 7002/86.
- White, Sam. *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.



CHAPTER 12

For Empire or Dynasty? Empress Elisabeth Christine and the Brunswicks

Charlotte Backerra

Historical research of the last few decades has proven the vital importance of female members of monarchies in premodern Europe, both as female sovereigns in their own rights, and as regents, mothers, diplomats, and politicians in an age of dynastic rule.¹ Most studies focus on the British Isles, France, Italy, or the Iberian kingdoms. The women of the imperial family, the Habsburgs residing in Vienna or Prague, only recently became a subject of general analysis.² Very few have been of enough interest for a complete monograph. Most are only mentioned in smaller articles or chapters, as examples for certain types of dynastic politics associated with them.³

This chapter is based on a paper given at the conference “Kings & Queens 5: Dynastic Loyalties” in Greenville, SC, USA, on April 8, 2016. I thank Caroline Dunn and Elizabeth Carney for the possibility of taking part in the conference and to publish this study, and the audience, especially Charles Beem, for their helpful and supportive comments. My participation was thankfully made possible by a conference grant of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

Ch. Backerra (✉)
Institute of History, TU Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany

For Empress Elisabeth Christine (1691–1750), the wife of Emperor Charles VI (1685–1740) and the mother of Maria Theresa (1717–1780), there exists nearly no scholarly work on her role as empress. The research on her life and person can be divided into two strands: in the nineteenth century, she was first seen as a prominent example for the recatholization politics in the Holy Roman Empire during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century.⁴ Even in the 1970s, an unpublished Ph.D. thesis devotes roughly two-thirds of its pages to this topic.⁵ Lately, a second approach to Elisabeth Christine as a widow has drawn more interest, looking at her years as a widow specifically and the practices of imperial widowhood in general.⁶ This chapter will focus on her role as a dynastic actor for the Habsburgs and her natal dynasty, the Guelphs.

Empress Elisabeth Christine was born in 1691 as a princess of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, one branch of the Guelph dynasty. She became part of the Habsburg imperial family in 1707, and empress four years later. As empress and—after 1740—dowager empress, she served for nearly forty years until her death in 1750. These were defining decades for the Habsburg dynasty, as they laid the foundations for the major European power called “Austria-Hungary” in the nineteenth century.⁷ Besides her responsibility as wife and mother, Elisabeth Christine functioned as a dynastic bridge between her natal dynastic branch of the Guelphs and the Habsburg dynasty. The resulting divided loyalty was expected in dynastic marriages. But to fulfill functions for two ruling houses could be a challenge, as in times of conflict questions of loyalty often meant to stand between the two houses. Elisabeth Christine’s divided loyalty was tragically emphasized during the War of the Austrian Succession, when members of her two families fought against each other.

Beginning with Elisabeth Christine’s wedding to the future Emperor Charles VI, this chapter shows her responsibilities as empress and princess of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel in four areas: (1) Elisabeth Christine’s support for her husband’s reign; (2) her role as a dynastic mother; (3) her dynastic networking; and (4) her role as bridge to her natal dynasty by offering support for her grandparents, parents, and other family members.

RELIGIOUS CONVERSION FOR A DYNASTIC ALLIANCE

In early modern Europe, marriages were the focus of dynastic politics. It was expected that ruling families would start looking for brides or bridegrooms for their children as soon as they were old enough to walk. Normally, nei-

ther sons nor daughters were asked for their preferences. Parents, grandparents, or other members of the house looked for suitable spouses according to rank, power, religion, or other interests to further their own dynasty.⁸

At the turn of the eighteenth century, the Guelphs of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel were just one branch of the oldest ruling house in Germany.⁹ To achieve at least a similar status compared to the other branches of the same family, Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel needed support from the highest level in the Holy Roman Empire. The younger branch of Brunswick-Lüneburg had just gained the status of an electorate of the empire, and its duke was expected to eventually succeed to the English throne according to the Act of Settlement of 1701.¹⁰ One princess of the sibling-branch Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel-Bevern, Amalia Wilhelmine (1673–1742), was married to Emperor Joseph I (1678–1711, r. 1705–1711).¹¹ The empress's uncle, the Duke Anton Ulrich of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1633–1712), saw his grand-daughter Elisabeth Christine (the empress's niece) as the perfect wife for the emperor's younger brother Charles (1685–1740, r. 1711–1740).¹² In the midst of the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–1714), Charles was trying to hold the throne of Spain as the Habsburg candidate for the kingdom and needed a suitable wife to secure his new Spanish dynasty, especially considering that his rival Philip V, the French candidate for the Spanish throne, had already married in September 1701.¹³ At the same time, the Habsburgs wanted to further their influence in the northern part of the Holy Roman Empire. The imperial court had tried to gain more influence in Northern Germany since the late seventeenth century and dynastic unions were seen as a useful tool to strengthen this policy.¹⁴ But these plans were challenged by Elisabeth Christine's religious faith. Herself a Lutheran Protestant, she was not willing to meet the prerequisite for marrying into the deeply devoted Catholic Habsburg family: converting to the Roman Catholic Church. Elisabeth Christine told her grandfather that since she had sworn during her confirmation to remain Lutheran, her conscience would not allow her to change her religion.¹⁵

Eventually, her grandfather the duke, himself a convert to Roman-Catholicism, found theologians willing to coerce her into converting. Over the course of four years, they convinced her to believe that the differences between Protestant and Catholic theological teachings were insignificant.¹⁶ In letters to her grandfather, the princess pointedly stated that the conversion was a way of “doing a great favor for my house [the dynasty].”¹⁷ After her conversion, Elisabeth Christine showed in letters that she had not abolished her Protestant belief system, but rather added Catholic parts to it.

Helpful to her in this regard was the contemporary preference for Jansenism in Vienna.¹⁸ After the successful profession of her Catholic faith in 1707, Elisabeth Christine was betrothed and married by proxy to Charles, who was at the time simply King Charles III of Spain, thus finalizing the dynastic alliance between the Habsburgs and a further branch of the Guelphs.

REGENT AND ADVISOR

Elisabeth Christine arrived in Barcelona in 1708 and proved to be a beautiful, charming, and well-educated princess, as well as a true helpmate to her husband. Charles first of all saw her beauty: “Queen so beautiful, very content.”¹⁹ Later, he praised her “sensible rule” and her fortitude, resolution, and conduct in times of war and turmoil when acting as his regent.²⁰ In over thirty years of marriage, Elisabeth Christine showed herself to be very loyal to her husband Charles, King of Spain and later Emperor Charles VI, usually successfully fulfilling the expectations placed upon her as a dynastic wife.

In 1711, Charles was elected emperor after his brother’s death. He left his wife, Elisabeth Christine, in Spain, to hold the kingdom in his name as regent, and to represent the dynasty as well as his claims to the Spanish throne. Executing his will as the general governor for Spain, she was very successful and showed great talent for ruling. One contemporary said:

Everyone, who is dealing with Her Majesty [Elisabeth Christine] in such affairs [i.e. state business] or is a member of the Privy Council, is astonished and greatly amazed regarding the great comprehension shown by Her Majesty on all occasions. [...] and there will be no lack of attention and accuracy on the part of Her Majesty to maintain the affairs in these territories during the King’s [Charles] absence.²¹

But in 1713, the Habsburg court and its allies had to leave Spain. Charles’s English allies had made peace with his French adversaries; to have the same man as emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and as king of Spain was not acceptable: it would threaten the balance of power, a concept gaining influence in European politics in the early eighteenth century. After the English retreat, the Habsburgs’ security could not be guaranteed. In 1713, Elisabeth Christine came to Vienna as the new reigning empress. She had to find her role in ceremonies and at court in general

next to the two dowager-empresses—the emperor’s still-living mother as well as his widowed sister-in-law, her fellow Guelph princess Amalia Wilhelmine—and the emperor’s unmarried sisters. But already in 1715, Elisabeth Christine was described as the unopposed center of the female court in Vienna.²² Charles seemed to have supported her: by publishing the Pragmatic Sanction in 1713, he placed his line—therefore also his wife—before that of his brother or his father, in terms of succession as well as ceremony.²³

However, Elisabeth Christine was not openly concerned with politics. A widely-cited source states that Charles VI did not want to involve females in affairs of state,²⁴ but there are indications that Elisabeth Christine advised her husband. The two of them routinely had private lunches and passed at least some hours in the evenings alone or only with other members of the close family.²⁵ Decisions concerning personnel seem to have sometimes been influenced by the empress’s networks connecting her to the high nobility at court. According to some views, her influence grew in the last five years of Charles’s reign, even though no specifics are known from current research.²⁶

MOTHERHOOD

The other important aim of a dynastic marriage was children, preferably sons, to continue the line of succession for the ruling dynasty. Elisabeth Christine did not get pregnant during her time with Charles in Spain. After her arrival in Vienna, she was under much pressure to prove her fruitfulness: it took three years for her to give birth for the first time, but then four children arrived in 1716, 1717, 1718, and 1724. However, the only son, the first-born Leopold (1716), suddenly died after two months. Of the three daughters, the third-born Maria Amalia (1724–1730) died at age 6. Therefore, only two of her daughters, the arch-duchesses Maria Theresa (1717–1780, r. 1740–1780) and Maria Anna (1718–1744), lived into adulthood. The empress, as well as the court physicians and priests, employed every method known at the time, but there were no further pregnancies. Frequent pilgrimages to pray for Marian support, spa visits, as well as questionable early modern fertility treatments proved unsuccessful. But diplomats at the imperial court frequently reported the hope that the empress might be pregnant.²⁷

As mother, Elisabeth Christine was responsible for the religious and moral instruction of her daughters, as well as their education in languages,

court ceremonies, dances, and female activities. As far as is known, she followed her mother-in-law's example in taking an active role in setting schedules and plans, as well as finding supporting personnel to guide the arch-duchesses. And furthermore, she took an active part in the discussion concerning their prospective bridegrooms.

As early as 1713 (before any of his children were born), in the so-called Pragmatic Sanction, Charles VI had determined and enforced rules of inheritance stating preference for his own children. Sons would inherit first, next in line were any future daughters, before any issue of his elder brother, the late Emperor Joseph. As a consequence, every female of his line took precedence over the emperor's mother, sister-in-law, or sisters.²⁸ Therefore, the sonless status of the emperor—apart from any personal pain it caused him and the empress²⁹—was of no consequence within the dynasty, though it caused international problems because of the rich inheritance which could be gained by marriage to the arch-duchess. The fight for guarantees and support of the inheritance law determined the international relations of the 1720s and 1730s. At the same time, the choice of Maria Theresa's future husband was a matter of European as well as dynastic politics. The other European powers wanted to prevent an overly powerful future Austria, while the emperor wanted to decide matters by himself. Elisabeth Christine was absolutely set against a Spanish prince, a possibility discussed by Charles and the Spanish royal court in the 1720s.³⁰ The eventual son-in-law, Francis Stephen, the duke of Lorraine and Bar, was the favorite of both parents, but he had to abdicate his dukedom (in exchange for Tuscany) to get international support.³¹ In spite of all these international diplomatic provisions, after the death of Charles VI, the question of the Pragmatic Sanction eventually led—together with the Prussian King Frederic II's aim to expand his territories and power by conquering Silesia—to the so-called War of the Austrian Succession, which lasted for eight years from 1740 to 1748. In the end, Maria Theresa's succession and rule over the Habsburg hereditary territories was accepted, at the cost of Silesia and the Prussian ascendancy.³²

NETWORKING

Another key duty of a princess was correspondence with female members of other ruling houses. After 1731, Elisabeth Christine could combine this duty with the renewal of contacts within her natal dynasty. Emperor Charles VI and King George II of Great Britain, who was a Guelph and at

the same time prince elector of Brunswick-Lüneburg in the Empire, had concluded the Treaty of Vienna. This was to be the basis for a renewed alliance between the two powers. Through a private correspondence with Queen Caroline of Great Britain and a regular exchange of gifts, Elisabeth Christine supported the new international and dynastic alignment with Great Britain and the Guelphs of that branch of the dynasty.

The exchange of “letters of friendship” began with an expressed verbal invitation of Elisabeth Christine to the queen, which was vocalized during talks between the imperial chancellor and the British envoy in Vienna. The Chancellor said, apparently quoting the empress,

[...] nothing could contribute more to the cementing the Union between the two Courts, and the two Branches of Brunswick, than such an affectionate intercourse between two Princesses, who had equally the affairs of Europe, and the interests of their families at heart, and who resembled each other in so many distinguished Talents and Qualities.³³

Queen Caroline responded by sending a private letter to the empress. This first letter was hand-delivered by the British envoy to Empress Elisabeth Christine in a private audience, while further letters were sent through normal diplomatic channels.³⁴ During this audience, after the British diplomat delivered the first letter, the empress “expressed the tenderest sentiments of regard and friendship for Her Majesty, the King, and all the Royal Family” and spoke fondly of her past meetings with the British king and queen—when they were only crown prince and princess of electorate of Brunswick-Lüneburg and she was a princess of the house of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel. She wanted to secure “the Union between the two Families: That nothing had ever given her so transcendent a joy, as to see that union established, which, she hoped, would now be the easier maintained [...]” She and Emperor Charles had “perfect regard, esteem and friendship for Her Majesty in particular, and for the King and all the Royal Family.”³⁵

Elisabeth Christine here presented herself as a member of her natal dynasty, but nevertheless, her status as the highest-ranking female Habsburg was the basis for this contact. By reminding Queen Caroline of past meetings as members of one dynasty, she found a common ground both in their personal lives and in their family backgrounds. At the same time, she helped to maintain a vital alliance with Great Britain as one of the major European powers at the time.

SUPPORTING THE NATAL DYNASTY

The last point to address is Elisabeth Christine's support for her natal dynasty. After her marriage, the male members of her birth family started to ask her for support, to be supplied with imperial money or territories.³⁶ Part of the dynastic alliance was their support for the emperor and imperial politics wherever possible. But she was their point of contact for any material profits and was supposed to influence her husband in that regard. In addition, Elisabeth Christine supported princesses and princes of her natal dynasty. She took part in the negotiations for marriages of princes and princesses of the Wolfenbüttel branch of the Guelphs. One example was a possible match with the Hohenzollern–Prussian dynasty. In 1733, Elisabeth Christine encouraged a double marriage between the Prussians and the Guelphs of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel-Bevern. The Prussian crown prince, later King Frederick II, married her namesake and niece, Elisabeth Christine of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel-Bevern. The Prussian princess Philippine Charlotte was in turn married to Duke Charles of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel-Bevern. It was expected that these marriages, supported by the imperial couple, would help to bring together the three houses of Habsburg, Prussia, and Brunswick.³⁷ This was not too successful for the Habsburgs, as, from the 1740s onwards, the Prussians and the Guelphs would form a Protestant alliance in opposition to Habsburg in the northern part of the Empire.

As the most senior woman of the Empire, Empress Elisabeth Christine also had access to many persons in power and could act as a patron for appointments and posts at the imperial court as well as in the imperial government and military system. Some of her nephews made their careers in the Habsburg and imperial forces. But this dynastic help was problematic as it stopped as soon as there were serious conflicts of interests. Even the long-running and established alliance supported by the patronage of Elisabeth Christine could not prevent the fact that members of her birth dynasty and her new dynasty were on opposite sides during the next great European war. An example was Prince Ferdinand of Wolfenbüttel, a personal favorite and nephew of Elisabeth Christine. He was a protégé of the emperor and the empress and often stayed at the imperial court in Vienna in the 1730s. When he came of age, there was no military post for him because of a reduction of the imperial forces. Consequently, he joined forces with the emperor's ally and became a Prussian officer.³⁸ But after the death of Emperor Charles VI and the

succession of Maria Theresa as queen of Hungary and Bohemia and ruler of Austria in 1740, the new Prussian King Frederick II led the fight against Maria Theresa in order to secure prosperous territories, formerly under the rule of the Habsburgs, for his own kingdom. In this War of the Austrian Succession, Prince Ferdinand of Wolfenbüttel fought for the Prussian king against Elisabeth Christine's own daughter. Ferdinand stayed in close contact with his aunt through frequent letters. After one failed attempt, he was, however, not willing to help try to make peace between his Prussian employer and his relatives in Vienna.³⁹

After Elisabeth Christine had helped to keep the connection to the Guelph dynasty over decades, this relationship became thus a burden during the last ten years of her life. Her daughter Maria Theresa, fighting to stay in power in all Habsburg territories after her father's death in 1740, did not see her aunts and uncles of the Guelph dynasty as anything else but potentially dangerous enemies, a view she found proven by those allied with her Prussian adversary.⁴⁰ As a consequence, Elisabeth Christine withdrew from these dynastic politics in the last years of her life.

CONCLUSION

Elisabeth Christine's dynastic politics are an example of the divided loyalties of royal women in an age of monarchical rule. Expected to be a bridge between two dynasties, the empress fulfilled her role by supporting her birth family and its members. At the same time she helped her husband as a regent in Spain and an advisor in Vienna; her networking successfully assisted her husband's politics. She gave the Habsburgs' Austria its future ruler in her daughter Maria Theresa. On the other hand, her failure to provide a son stressed not only the empress personally, but also the dynasty as a whole. Her support for the Guelphs of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel was essential for that family, but ultimately proved problematic for her eldest daughter, Maria Theresa, during the War of the Austrian Succession. This chapter has shown Elisabeth Christine as an example of the well-known role of women in dynastic relations by highlighting her active participation in European dynastic connections. It revealed her personal evolution from a loyal princess to her natal dynasty to an actively performing empress, with positive and negative results for the dynasties related to her. And finally, this case study adds to the research on empresses of the Holy Roman Empire in the early modern period, emphasizing, aside from personal rule, the sphere of influence of women of the highest-ranking European family.

NOTES

1. Clarissa Campbell Orr (ed.), *Queenship in Europe, 1660–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Clarissa Campbell Orr (ed.), *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002). For an example of an early modern princess, see Judith P. Aikin, *A Ruler's Consort in Early Modern Germany: Aemilia Juliana of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt*, *Women and Gender in the Early Modern World* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).
2. Bettina Braun, Katrin Keller, Matthias Schnettger (eds.), *Nur die Frau des Kaisers? Kaiserinnen in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2016).
3. Maria Theresa was one of the few female rulers in Western history to be deemed worthy, even in the nineteenth century, of a full-length biography. See Alfred von Arneth, *Maria Theresa's erste Regierungsjahre*, 3 Vols. (Vienna: Braumüller, 1863–1865). For articles or chapters on empresses see (among others) Charles W. Ingrao and Andrew L. Thomas, "Piety and Power: the Empresses-Consort of the High Baroque," in *Queenship in Europe, 1660–1815*, edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr, 107–30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Charles W. Ingrao, "Empress Wilhelmine Amalia and the Pragmatic Sanction," *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 34 (1981): 331–41; Hildegard Leitgeb, "Frauen am Kaiserhof zur Zeit des Prinzen Eugen: Einfluß und Bedeutung der Kaiserinnen Eleonora Magdalena Theresa, Amalie Wilhelmine und Elisabeth Christine," in *Prinz Eugen und das barocke Österreich*, edited by Karl Gutkas, 65–72. (Vienna: Niederösterreichisches Landesmuseum, 1986).
4. Wilhelm Hoeck, *Anton Ulrich und Elisabeth Christine von Braunschweig-Lüneburg-Wolfenbüttel. Eine durch archivalische Dokumente begründete Darstellung ihres Übertritts zur römischen Kirche* (Wolfenbüttel: Verlag der Holle'schen Buch-, Kunst- und Musikalien-Handlung, 1845).
5. Gerlinde Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines von Braunschweig-Lüneburg-Wolfenbüttel (Gemahlin Kaiser Karls VI. und Mutter Maria Theresas)," (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Vienna, 1975). Other biographical articles are merely summaries of those studies: Ferdinand Spehr, "Elisabeth Christine," in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 6 (1877): 11–12, available at http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/artikel-IADB_pnd122035143.html, accessed 23 April 2018; Volker Press, "Elisabeth Christine," in *Die Habsburger: ein biographisches Lexikon*, edited by Brigitte Hamann (Munich: Piper, 1988), 88–90.
6. Michael Pölzl, "Kaiserin-Witwen in Konkurrenz zur regierenden Kaiserin am Wiener Hof 1637–1750: Probleme der Forschung," *Wiener Geschichtsblätter* 67:2 (2012): 165–89; Michael Pölzl, "Der Witwenstand von fünf Kaiserinnen am Wiener Hof (1637–1750)," in *Frühneuzeitforschung*

- in der Habsburgermonarchie: Adel und Wiener Hof—Konfessionalisierung—Siebenbürgen*, edited by István Fazekas et al. (Vienna: Institut für Ungarische Geschichtsforschung, 2013), 51–70. Michael Pölzl, “Die Kaiserinnen Amalia Wilhelmina (1673–1742) und Elisabeth Christine (1691–1750): Handlungsspielräume im Spannungsfeld dynastischer und persönlicher Interessen,” in *Nur die Frau des Kaisers? Kaiserinnen in der Frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Bettina Braun et al. (Vienna: Böhlau, 2016), 175–92.
7. Michael Hochedlinger, *Austria’s Wars of Emergence: War, State and Society in the Habsburg Monarchy 1683–1797*, *Modern Wars in Perspective* (London: Longman, 2003); for the time of Charles VI, see William O’Reilly, “A Life in Exile: Charles VI (1685–1740) between Spain and Austria,” in *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II*, edited by Philip Mansel and Torsten Riote (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 66–90, as well as the author’s own doctoral thesis *Wien und London, 1727–1735. Internationale Beziehungen im frühen 18. Jahrhundert* (in preparation, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018).
 8. Heinz Duchhardt, “The Dynastic Marriage,” *EGO: European History Online*, available at <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/european-networks/dynastic-networks/heinz-duchhardt-the-dynastic-marriage>, accessed 10 September 2016; Anne-Simone Knöfel, *Dynastie und Prestige: die Heiratspolitik der Wettiner* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009); Veronica Baker-Smith, “The Daughters of George II: Marriage and Dynastic Politics,” in *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837*, edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 193–206.
 9. Hans-Georg Aschoff, “Die welfischen Territorien und ihre Fürsten zwischen 1636 und 1714,” in *Reif für die Insel—Das Haus Braunschweig-Lüneburg auf dem Weg nach London*, edited by Jochen Meiners (Dresden: Sandstein, 2014), 49–58.
 10. Ralf Busch, “Georg Wilhelm, Wilhelm III. und Celles Rolle im Rahmen der Sukzession des Welfenhauses,” in *Reif für die Insel—Das Haus Braunschweig-Lüneburg auf dem Weg nach London*, edited by Jochen Meiners (Dresden: Sandstein, 2014), 167–70; Georg Schnath, *Geschichte Hannovers im Zeitalter der neunten Kur und der englischen Sukzession 1674–1714. Vol. 4: Georg Ludwigs Weg auf den englischen Thron: Die Vorgeschichte der Thronfolge 1698–1714* (Hildesheim: Lax, 1982).
 11. Volker Press, “Amalie Wilhelmine,” in *Die Habsburger: ein biographisches Lexikon*, edited by Brigitte Hamann (Munich: Piper, 1988), 49–50.
 12. Körper, “Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines,” 30–1.
 13. Matthias Schnettger, *Der Spanische Erbfolgekrieg 1701–1713/14* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2014), 67.
 14. Christof Römer, “Niedersachsen im 18. Jahrhundert (1714–1803),” in *Geschichte Niedersachsens. Vol. 3.1: Politik, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft von der Reformation bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Christine van den Heuvel and Manfred von Boetticher (Hanover: Hahnsche, 1998), 229–36.

15. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 61.
16. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 36–44, 62–5, 182–225.
17. Cited from Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 258 [original in German]. All translations are the author's.
18. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 258–9, 283–91.
19. Entry for July 28, 1708, Diary of Charles (VI), quoted in Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 299 [original in German].
20. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 302–3.
21. "[...] und befinden sich alle diejenige, welche solche affaires mitt Sr. Maytt. tractiren oder mebra von der junta del Estado seindt, erstaunet und in der größten verwunderung über die große comprehension, so Ihro Maytt. bei allen vorfälligkeiten verspüren lassen, [...] und wirdt es gewiß an Ihro Maytt. sorgfalt und obsicht nicht erfehlen, daß die sachen in hiesigen landen bey abwesenheit des Königs nicht aufrechterhalten werden." Imhoff to Anton Ulrich, Barcelona, 10 October 1711, NStAW [State archive of Lower Saxony, Wolfenbüttel, Germany], 1 Alt 24/266, quoted in Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 308.
22. There is an interesting account of the empress's central role at court written by the wife of a British diplomat, who visited Vienna in 1716. Lady Mary Montagu to Lady Mar, Vienna, Sept 14 1716 O.S., in *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Vol. 1*, edited by Robert Halsband (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 265–9.
23. Wilhelm Brauneder, "Die Pragmatische Sanktion als Grundgesetz der Monarchia Austriaca von 1713 bis 1918," in *Recht und Geschichte: Festschrift Hermann Baltl zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by Helfried Valentinitz (Graz: Leykam, 1988), 73–4.
24. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 354–7, 361. "[...] but because she knows that the emperor abhors it, she does not involve herself in affairs of state," Berkentin to Christian VI, King of Denmark, Vienna, 15 November 1730, TKuAK 74 [original in German], quoted in Klaus Müller, *Das kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen im Jahrhundert nach dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648–1740)*, Bonner historische Forschungen 42 (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1976), 232, fn. 303. See also Carlo Morandi (ed.), *Relazioni di ambasciatori sabaudi, genovesi e veneti (1693–1711). Vol. 1*, Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea 1 (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1935), 117.
25. Karl Ludwig von Pöllnitz, *Mémoires de Charles-Louis Baron de Pöllnitz, contenant les Observations qu'il a faites dans ses Voyages et le Caractère des Personnes qui composent les principales Cours de l'Europe. Volume 1* (Liège: Demen, 1734), 290.
26. Müller, *Das kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, 232, fn. 303; Max Braubach, "Eine Sartire auf den Wiener Hof aus den letzten Jahren Kaiser Karls VI," in

- Diplomatie und geistiges Leben im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert: Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, edited by Max Braubach (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1969), 400–1.
27. Waldegrave to Townshend, private, Vienna, May 13, 1728, London: The National Archives (hereafter TNA), SP 80, 62, f. 183v–184.
 28. Gustav Turba, *Die Grundlagen der Pragmatischen Sanktion. Band 2: Die Hausgesetze*, Wiener Staatswissenschaftliche Studien 11.1 (Leipzig: Deuticke, 1912), 161–3; Gustav Turba (ed.), *Die Pragmatische Sanktion: Authentische Texte samt Erläuterungen und Übersetzungen* (Vienna: k.k. Schulbücher-Verlag, 1913), 52.
 29. Körper, “Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines,” 345.
 30. Körper, “Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines,” 359.
 31. Renate Zedinger, *Hochzeit im Brennpunkt der Mächte: Franz Stephan von Lothringen und Erzherzogin Maria Theresa* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1994). After the death of Francis Stephen’s father and his accession to the dukedom in 1729, the imperial court went into deep mourning. This, together with the frequent conferences and meetings with the emperor and his ministers, were seen as signs of an unofficial engagement. Waldegrave to Townshend, Vienna, May 7, TNA, SP 80, 64, f. 194–195v, citation f. 195; Waldegrave to Tilson, Vienna, November 12, 1729, TNA, SP 80, 65, f. 252–252v. After a visit of the Duke to the British court affirmed the support of the British king and queen as Guelphs for this marriage in 1731, the imperial ministers openly spoke about Francis Stephen as the future husband of Maria Theresa, Robinson to Harrington, most private, Vienna, February 09, 10, 11, 1732, TNA, SP 80, 85, s.f. The couple married on the last Sunday before Lent, 12 February, 1736, Robinson to Harrington, P.S., Vienna, February 15, 1736, TNA, SP 80, 120, s.f.
 32. Reed Browning, *The War of the Austrian Succession* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993).
 33. Robinson to Harrington, private, Vienna, June 16, 1731, TNA, SP 80, 75, s.f. For a broader analysis of the renewed relations between the courts of Vienna and London in the early 1730s see the author’s forthcoming *Vienna and London*, *op. cit.*
 34. The letters are mentioned in the diplomatic correspondence, see Robinson to Tilson, Vienna, August 26, 1731, TNA SP 80, 78, s.f.; Robinson to Tilson, Vienna, March 17, 1732, TNA, SP 80, 86, s.f.; Harrington to Robinson, London (Whitehall), April 29, 1732, TNA, SP 80, 87, s.f.; Robinson to Delafaye, Vienna, June 02, 1732, TNA, SP 80, 88, s.f.; Robinson to Tilson, Vienna, January 25, 1736, TNA SP 80, 120, s.f.; Wasner to Sinzendorff, London, June 18, 1737, HHStA [Vienna, State Archives], StA England 72, s.f. However, none of these letters could be found in the British or Austrian national archives; any indication to their whereabouts would be very welcome.
 35. Robinson to Harrington, Vienna, July 22, 1731, TNA, SP 80, 77, s.f.

36. This was especially true for her father. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 324–38.
37. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 341–5.
38. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 343.
39. Arneth, *Maria Theresia*, 245–6.
40. Körper, "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines," 353.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aikin, Judith P. *A Ruler's Consort in Early Modern Germany: Aemilia Juliana of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt*. Women and Gender in the Early Modern World. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.
- Arneth, Alfred von. *Maria Theresia's erste Regierungsjahre*, 3 Vols. Vienna: Braumüller, 1863–1865.
- Aschoff, Hans-Georg. "Die welfischen Territorien und ihre Fürsten zwischen 1636 und 1714." In *Reif für die Insel—Das Haus Braunschweig-Lüneburg auf dem Weg nach London*, edited by Jochen Meiners, 49–58. Dresden: Sandstein, 2014.
- Backerra, Charlotte. *Wien und London, 1727–1735. Internationale Beziehungen im frühen 18. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018 (in preparation).
- Baker-Smith, Veronica. "The Daughters of George II: Marriage and Dynastic Politics." In *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*, edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr, 93–106. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Braubach, Max. "Eine Sartire auf den Wiener Hof aus den letzten Jahren Kaiser Karls VI." In *Diplomatie und geistiges Leben im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert: Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, edited by Max Braubach, 385–436. Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1969.
- Braun, Bettina, et al., eds. *Nur die Frau des Kaisers? Kaiserinnen in der Frühen Neuzeit*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2016.
- Brauner, Wilhelm. "Die Pragmatische Sanktion als Grundgesetz der Monarchia Austriaca von 1713 bis 1918." In *Recht und Geschichte: Festschrift Hermann Baltl zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by Helfried Valentinitzsch, 51–84. Graz: Leykam, 1988.
- Browning, Reed. *The War of the Austrian Succession*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Busch, Ralf. "Georg Wilhelm, Wilhelm III. und Celles Rolle im Rahmen der Sukzession des Welfenhauses." In *Reif für die Insel—Das Haus Braunschweig-Lüneburg auf dem Weg nach London*, edited by Jochen Meiners, 167–70. Dresden: Sandstein, 2014.

- Duchhardt, Heinz. "The Dynastic Marriage." *EGO: European History Online*. Available at <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/european-networks/dynastic-networks/heinz-duchhardt-the-dynastic-marriage>.
- Halsband, Robert (ed.). *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Hochedlinger, Michael. *Austria's Wars of Emergence: War, State and Society in the Habsburg Monarchy 1683–1797*. Modern Wars in Perspective, London: Longman, 2003.
- Hoeck, Wilhelm. *Anton Ulrich und Elisabeth Christine von Braunschweig-Lüneburg-Wolfenbüttel. Eine durch archivalische Dokumente begründete Darstellung ihres Übertritts zur römischen Kirche*. Wolfenbüttel: Verlag der Holle'schen Buch-, Kunst- und Musikalien-Handlung, 1845.
- Ingrao, Charles W. "Empress Wilhelmine Amalia and the Pragmatic Sanction." *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 34 (1981): 331–341.
- Ingrao, Charles W., and Andrew L. Thomas, "Piety and Power: the Empresses-Consort of the High Baroque." In *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*, edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr, 107–30. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Knöfel, Anne-Simone. *Dynastie und Prestige: die Heiratspolitik der Wettiner*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2009.
- Körper, Gerlinde. "Studien zur Biographie Elisabeth Christines von Braunschweig-Lüneburg-Wolfenbüttel (Gemahlin Kaiser Karls VI. und Mutter Maria Theresias)." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Vienna, 1975.
- Leitgeb, Hildegard. "Frauen am Kaiserhof zur Zeit des Prinzen Eugen: Einfluß und Bedeutung der Kaiserinnen Eleonora Magdalena Theresia, Amalie Wilhelmine und Elisabeth Christine." In *Prinz Eugen und das barocke Österreich*, edited by Karl Gutkas, 65–72. Vienna: Niederösterreichisches Landesmuseum, 1986.
- Morandi, Carlo (ed.). *Relazioni di ambasciatori sabaudi, genovesi e veneti (1693–1711)*. Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea 1, Bologna: Zanichelli, 1935.
- Müller, Klaus. *Das kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen im Jahrhundert nach dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648–1740)*. Bonner historische Forschungen 42, Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1976.
- O'Reilly, William. "A Life in Exile: Charles VI (1685–1740) between Spain and Austria." In *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II*, edited by Philip Mansel and Torsten Riotte, 66–90. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Orr, Clarissa Campbell, ed. *Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

- , ed. *Queenship in Europe, 1660–1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Pöllnitz, Karl Ludwig von. *Mémoires de Charles-Louis Baron de Pöllnitz, contenant les Observations qu'il a faites dans ses Voyages et le Caractère des Personnes qui composent les principales Cours de l'Europe. Vol. 1*. Liège: Demen, 1734.
- Pözl, Michael. "Kaiserin-Witwen in Konkurrenz zur regierenden Kaiserin am Wiener Hof 1637–1750: Probleme der Forschung." *Wiener Geschichtsblätter* 67:2 (2012): 165–189.
- . "Der Witwenstand von fünf Kaiserinnen am Wiener Hof (1637–1750)." In *Frühneuzeitforschung in der Habsburgermonarchie: Adel und Wiener Hof—Konfessionalisierung—Siebenbürgen*, edited by István Fazekas et al., 51–70. Publikationen der ungarischen Geschichtsforschung in Wien 7, Vienna: Institut für Ungarische Geschichtsforschung, 2013.
- . "Die Kaiserinnen Amalia Wilhelmina (1673–1742) und Elisabeth Christine (1691–1750): Handlungsspielräume im Spannungsfeld dynastischer und persönlicher Interessen." In *Nur die Frau des Kaisers? Kaiserinnen in der Frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Bettina Braun, Katrin Keller, and Matthias Schnettger, 175–92. Vienna: Böhlau, 2016.
- Press, Volker. "Amalie Wilhelmine." In *Die Habsburger: ein biographisches Lexikon*, edited by Brigitte Hamann, 49–50. Munich: Piper, 1988.
- . "Elisabeth Christine." In *Die Habsburger: ein biographisches Lexikon*, edited by Brigitte Hamann, 88–90. Munich: Piper, 1988.
- Römer, Christof. "Niedersachsen im 18. Jahrhundert (1714–1803)." In *Geschichte Niedersachsens. Vol. 3.1: Politik, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft von der Reformation bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Christine van den Heuvel and Manfred von Boetticher, 221–346. Hanover: Hahnsche, 1998.
- Schnath, Georg. *Geschichte Hannovers im Zeitalter der neunten Kur und der englischen Sukzession 1674–1714. Vol. 4: Georg Ludwigs Weg auf den englischen Thron: Die Vorgeschichte der Thronfolge 1698–1714*. Hildesheim: Lax, 1982.
- Schnettger, Matthias. *Der Spanische Erbfolgekrieg 1701–1713/14*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2014.
- Spehr, Ferdinand. "Elisabeth Christine." In *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. Vol. 6, 1877, 11–12. <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz56823.html#adbcontent>, accessed 23 April 2018.
- Turba, Gustav. *Die Grundlagen der Pragmatischen Sanktion. Band 2: Die Hausgesetze*. Wiener Staatswissenschaftliche Studien 11.1, Leipzig: Deuticke, 1912.
- (ed.). *Die Pragmatische Sanktion: Authentische Texte samt Erläuterungen und Übersetzungen*. Vienna: k.k. Schulbücher-Verlag, 1913.
- Zedinger, Renate. *Hochzeit im Brennpunkt der Mächte: Franz Stephan von Lothringen und Erzherzogin Maria Theresia*. Vienna: Böhlau, 1994.



French Historians' Loyalty and Disloyalty to French Monarchy Between 1815 and 1848

Heta Aali

The aim of this chapter is to examine how early nineteenth-century French historians' loyalty and disloyalty to contemporary monarchy was discernible in their historiographical representations, especially concerning those of the Merovingian period (*c.* 490s to 750s). The political and social instability of the first half of the nineteenth century inspired many historians and politicians to seek examples and solutions from previous history, even as early as the Merovingian period. I will focus on the works of two different kinds of historians who were both active in the 1830s, Henri Martin (1810–1883) and Pierre-Denis, Count of Peyronnet (1778–1854). I have chosen these two historians because they were visible and influential figures in French politics in different times and ways: Peyronnet was a politician who turned into a historian during the Restored Monarchy; Martin was a historian who turned into a politician after the fall of the French monarchy. The chapter focuses on the representations of the Merovingian period because early nineteenth-century historians perceived this era as the cradle of the French monarchy. The Merovingian queens are of special

H. Aali (✉)
University of Turku, Turku, Finland

interest in the article because they were popular figures in various fields of historical literature in the nineteenth century, and looking at their representations will shed light on the way political affiliations affected the images of historical figures.

Historians in the early nineteenth-century did not constitute a homogeneous group, and no such thing as a professional historian truly existed at that time. Almost all the men and women who wrote about history were amateurs who had an education in something other than history. For example, both Martin and Peyronnet, like many of their contemporary historians, were educated as jurists. They are exceptional individuals because their lives are well documented, which was not always the case with early nineteenth-century writers of history. Yet, all historians' writings were subjective, no matter how famous they were and no matter what kind of education they had. Historians made value judgments—implicit and explicit—in their works as they discussed many contemporary political, social, and economic questions. It was considered the duty of historians to choose what was worth remembering since their readers were not trusted to make their own judgments about history.¹ As is well known, history was used to find solutions to current social, political, and dynastic problems. Thus, when writing about past royals early nineteenth-century historians often simultaneously took a stand on the nature and role of the monarchy reigning at the time.

The early nineteenth century in France was a tumultuous era which saw, among other political events, two restorations and two revolutions. The French monarchy was first restored in 1814, after the fall of Napoleon and again in 1815 after Napoleon's return, the so-called Hundred Days. The restored monarch was Louis XVIII, the younger brother of the guillotined Louis XVI. The restored monarchy was not like the Old Regime even though the king and many of the old aristocratic families sought to have their old position and rights re-installed. The Ultra-Royalists only really reached a position of power after 1824 when Louis XVIII died and his younger brother Charles X came to the French throne. The attempts to restrict freedom of the press, to extend the diminished relationship between the throne and altar, and to increasingly concentrate power in the king's hands were among the causes of the Revolution of 1830 and hence of Louis-Philippe's rise to power from the younger branch of the Orléans. The July Monarchy (1830–1848) was also famous for its historian-politicians such as François Guizot (1787–1874), who was a prime minister in the 1840s. The July Monarchy was hailed by its supporters as the

new start for the monarchy; one which would grant the constitution more power and would not repeat the authoritarian mistakes of the Bourbon kings. However, eventually, Louis-Philippe's regime failed to reform the laws and norms according to the needs of contemporary society and this led to another revolution in 1848.

Utilizing discussion of historical royals to criticize current monarchy was not an invention of the early nineteenth century. This form of discourse had been in use in political rhetoric during the late eighteenth-century revolutions. For example, Louise-Félicité Guinement de Keralio's *Crimes of the Queens of France* (*Les crimes des reines de France*, 1791) and the anonymous *Antoinette of Austria, or Dialogue between Catherine de Medici and Fredegonde, Queen of France in Hell* (*Antoinette d'Autriche ou Dialogue entre Catherine de Médicis et Frédégonde, reines de France, aux enfers*, 1789) harshly criticized the French queens all the way from the early middle ages onwards, and explicitly blamed the royals for many problems in French society and politics.² Even though the historiographical works of the first half of the nineteenth century were more subtle in their criticism than those published in the early 1790s, both because of the changed political climate and censorship (especially in the 1820s), critical discussion of monarchy flourished during this period. Yet, history could also be used to legitimize monarchy, and in the early nineteenth century French monarchy needed such legitimization since its position was no longer guaranteed by divine right. For example, according to Grégoire Franconie, during the July Monarchy the royal family commissioned stained glass portraits of themselves as national saints in the royal chapel of Dreux. These included Saints Denis, Remigius, Germain, Geneviève, Radegonde, and princesses Clotilde, Bathilde, and Isabelle. King Louis-Philippe was obviously Saint Philip, and Queen Marie Amelie was Saint Amelie. The Orléans family equated themselves with the sanctity and virtues associated with the saintly figures and simultaneously reminded the French people, especially with the Merovingian royal saints Clotilde, Radegonde, and Bathilde, of the long history of the French monarchy.³

1. The Two Historians

I shall now look more closely at Peyronnet and Martin, and the ways their works displayed loyalty or disloyalty towards the French monarchy. I begin with the ultra-royalist Pierre-Denis de Peyronnet and his *History of the Franks* (*Histoire des Francs*) (1835). Peyronnet's father was executed

during the Terror, which probably made him view the Revolution in a negative light.⁴ Peyronnet wrote the work while a prisoner in the castle of Ham, in northern France, sent there in 1830 by the supporters of the July Monarchy. He was thus one of many politicians who turned historians after their careers in politics had ended. Bitterness at political defeat was clear in Peyronnet's study, as he stated in the dedication of his work that "[a]fter serving for long years the passing generation, it gives me a prison for reward."⁵ According to the Dutch historian Pim Den Boer, right-wing legitimists and Catholic historiographers "flourished" during the July Monarchy, after their time in active politics had ended.⁶ As a legitimist it was not enough for ultra-royalist Peyronnet that France was ruled by a monarchy; he viewed the Bourbon dynasty as the only legitimate ruling family in France. Among the legitimists, the Orléans family and King Louis-Philippe were seen as usurpers.

Why did Peyronnet decide to write about the Franks, or, more precisely, about the ruling dynasties, the Merovingians and the Carolingians? In the early nineteenth century historiography was very much still about royalty, even though many historians sought to bring up "le peuple" (the people). Topics related to early medieval rulers were far from uncontroversial.⁷ Peyronnet revealed his motivations right in the beginning of his work when he wrote that he wanted to examine how one dynasty fell and another replaced it, how one king's fortune and luck disappeared over night and how kings rose to power and were overthrown from there. Peyronnet also emphasized that study of the Franks was important because it was thanks to them that France existed. One needed to know the early middle ages to know the recent centuries, according to Peyronnet.⁸ It is obvious that Peyronnet's interest in long-ago kings and queens was a consequence of the recent revolution that had ended his career. Perhaps he wanted to find parallels and to explain how such a revolution could happen again, even if this time it had not overthrown the whole monarchy. The eighteenth-century revolution was also still fresh in many minds and many wounds were unhealed.

The second historian, Henri Martin, had a different approach to writing history. He was only 23 years old when the first volume of his *History of France* was published in 1833; thus he was from a younger generation than Peyronnet. Martin's historical work won several awards, including the Grand Prix Gobert in 1844.⁹ He was similar to Peyronnet in that he was politically active, but his most influential years were in the latter half of the nineteenth century.¹⁰ According to French historian Agnès

Graceffa, who has extensively studied the treatment of the Merovingians in nineteenth-century French historiography, Martin's work had clear republican tendencies.¹¹ Yet, it did have a monarchist flavour as well, especially in his interpretation of Clovis and Clotilde. Martin was briefly (in 1840) a professor of history at the University of the Sorbonne even though he had been initially educated in law. His term as a professor ended with the revolution of 1848, but he was later (1878) elected to the Académie française. Martin was thus in his time a very influential historian and a politician even though today he is quite forgotten. Unlike Peyronnet, who was first a politician and then a historian, Martin was first a historian and then a politician.

2. Interpreting Merovingian History

Peyronnet's work *Histoire des Francs* was political history because it focused on the wars, laws, and conquests of the rulers. Peyronnet also made allusions to the recent revolutions of 1789 and 1830 when he wrote about the conversion of King Clovis. Clovis I converted to Christianity at the end of the fifth century which, according to Peyronnet, was the starting-point for the French monarchy. He wrote that Clovis added a fleur-de-lys to his crown, a flower that was ever after the sign of the French monarchy. He continued that "This [the fleur-de-lys] has been the sign of the French monarchy for one thousand and thirty-five years. After all this time, it has now been denounced and repudiated: did they know what they were doing?"¹² Since the fleur-de-lys was removed again from the French flag during the 1830 revolution, Peyronnet is clearly referring to the revolutionaries of the 1830 in the last sentence. In French, using the passive voice, he said "[...] savait-*on* ce que l'on faisait?" (my italics), yet I doubt he was writing about "us"—himself included—who removed the fleur-de-lys, and who indirectly influenced the "denouncing" of the "real" French monarchy, the Bourbon dynasty. Rather, he was most likely writing about the supporters of the July Monarchy whom he seemed to consider as having done irreparable damage to France.

Interpretation of Saint Clotilde's role in Clovis' conversion tended to divide Catholic and leftist historical interpretation in textbooks up until the 1880s: Catholics believed that it was Saint Clotilde who inspired the conversion, whereas the other school of thought saw Clovis' conversion as a politically motivated act.¹³ Of course, the division was not always that plain, but it was manifest in other literature besides textbooks. Peyronnet,

for example, can be included in the group of “Catholic historiographers” mentioned by Pim den Boer. Peyronnet believed that Clotilde inspired the conversion even though ultimately the conversion was accomplished because of the victory of the Franks in the battle of Tolbiac and thanks to the positive influence of two other saints, Remigius and Medard.¹⁴ Peyronnet wrote that he followed in his work the system “that had pleased Providence,” meaning that he only “wrote” history and did not “imagine” it; he “reproduced” history and did not “make” it.¹⁵ In other words, he claimed that he abdicated all responsibility for making selections; he wrote that he only described what he saw. Yet, his Catholic emphasis was quite clear. Clearly, Peyronnet did not consider that the conversion was only a consequence of Clovis’ political agenda but he viewed it was also a result of a true religious awakening, strengthened by the saints’ influence. As in many “professional” historiographies, Clotilde’s role was rendered very small in the end, apart from the inspiration she gave to Clovis. The emphasis on the connection between the Catholic Church and monarchy was important for Peyronnet—one needs to keep in mind that the Catholic Church had lost its official position in 1830 in France, thus breaking the “sacred union” between throne and altar. So, by emphasizing the early union, Peyronnet highlighted the state of separation between throne and altar in 1835.

In *Histoire de France* (1833) Henri Martin presented Clovis’ conversion quite similarly to Peyronnet’s interpretation: Clotilde inspired in Clovis the desire for “her” God but eventually it was the victory in Tolbiac and the teachings of Saint Remigius that confirmed the conversion. According to Martin, Clovis was afraid that his “people” would not tolerate the conversion because not all of them were “Christians,” which here refers uniquely to Catholicism, but the “people” were actually happy about the conversion and together promised to abandon all their old gods.¹⁶ In a later passage, however, Martin emphasized that, especially during Clovis’ later years, his reign proved to be an odd mélange of religion and political atrocities. Martin thus highlighted that the king did not change into an ideal Christian after his conversion or abandon his previous habits.¹⁷ The role of Clotilde and the events leading to Clovis’ conversion were presented quite differently when Martin re-published his multi-volume work in 1855: Clotilde’s sanctity was questioned, she was pictured as vindictive, and her faith was almost ridiculed in the passage where Martin described the death of her first son.¹⁸ No longer were Clovis’ followers uniformly pleased by the conversion but a number of his troops left him afterwards to join rival kings, according to Martin.¹⁹

Henri Martin's work from 1833 could not have been so successful had it been openly republican. According to Martin's biography, published in 1885, two years after his death, he had experienced a "republican youth" in 1830, but it is hard to assess the accuracy of this statement since we should take into consideration that the biography was written during the Third Republic.²⁰ Regardless of his possible republican bent, some of the interpretations in Martin's *Histoire de France* (1833) were quite similar to those of Peyronnet's because they both seemed to be unsatisfied with the monarchy, though for different reasons. In 20 years, Martin's opinion changed significantly but it is difficult to say whether Martin initially wrote as he did in order to get the work published or whether it was what he actually believed to have happened. In 1855 France had an emperor, Napoleon III, and therefore presenting the conversion of Clovis and a royal saint such as Clotilde in a positive light would have caused more criticism than twenty years earlier since these figures were associated with a monarchist reading of history. One must keep in mind that the heyday of Clovis as a national figure was in the 1820s and he was still perceived in a positive light in the 1830s whereas, after 1848, historians increasingly described the Franks as violent conquerors, and the Gauls replaced them in French histories as the "ancestors" of the French. This change highlighted the image of the Franks and Merovingians as enemies of France rather than as the predecessors of French monarchy.²¹

The way the Merovingians and their queens were represented in historiography was closely related to the current political situation in Peyronnet's and Martin's works. Historians and authors were influenced by, and themselves influenced, the way French monarchy, with its kings and queens, were perceived in contemporary France. Both Peyronnet and Martin showed disloyalty to the July Monarchy and to the (short-lived) Orléans dynasty but loyalty to other regimes. Historians lived in and interacted with contemporary political society even though they claimed only to describe the events of the past. Neutrality was not an option and all historians had to choose their sides. They were thus both making and writing history.

NOTES

1. See, for example, the way the famous dictionary of the *Académie française* defined history over time: *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* (5th Edition, 1798): s.v. "Histoire," ("Narration des actions et des choses dignes de mémoire") and *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* (6th Edition, 1835), s.v. "Histoire," (se dit également d'Un récit quelconque d'actions, d'événements, de circonstances qui offrent plus ou moins d'intérêt").

2. Louise-Félicité Guinement de Keralio, *Les crimes des reines de France, depuis le commencement de la monarchie jusqu'à Marie-Antoinette* (Paris: au bureau des révolutions de Paris, 1791); *Antoinette d'Autriche ou Dialogue entre Catherine de Médicis et Frédégonde, reines de France, aux enfers: pour servir de supplément et de suite à tout ce qui a paru sur la vie de cette princesse* (London, 1789).
3. Grégoire Franconie, "Louis-Philippe et la sacralité royale après 1830" in *La Dignité du roi. Regards sur la royauté en France au premier XIXe siècle*, edited by Hélène Becquet and Bettina Frederking (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2009), 97–114.
4. On Peyronnet's background, see *Dictionnaire des parlementaires français*, Vol. V, edited by Adolphe Robert, Edgar Bourlouton, and Gaston Cougny (Paris: Bourlouton, 1889–1891), 612–13. Peyronnet was the minister of justice, *le garde des sceaux*, from 1821 until 1828 when Prime Minister Jean-Baptiste de Villèle left him out of the government because of his unpopularity with the people. Peyronnet was one of the men behind the much-criticized laws restricting the freedom of the press in 1826.
5. "Après que j'eus servi de longues années la génération qui s'en va, elle me donna une prison pour salaire." Pierre Denis de Peyronnet, *Histoire des Francs* (Brussels: Meline, 1835), I, vi (my translation).
6. Pim Den Boer, *History as a Profession: The Study of History in France, 1818–1914*, translated by Arnold J. Pomerans (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 38.
7. There was a large debate already among the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century historians about the Frankish rulers and if they had come to Gallia as conquerors or if they had come as allies of the Roman Empire, once its influence had started to diminish in southern Europe. On this debate, see (among others) Claude Nicolet, *La fabrique d'une nation. La France entre Rome et les Germains* (Paris: Perrin, 2003), 57–73.
8. Peyronnet, *Histoire des Francs*, I, xviii.
9. Martin's *Histoire de France* would ultimately have altogether 19 volumes; it was rewritten and reprinted several times. According to *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, in 1833 only the first volume appeared, but by 1834–1836 fifteen volumes had been published, in 1838–1854 the number of volumes reached nineteen, and in 1838 the first volume was reprinted. In 1844 all nineteen volumes were reprinted. In 1855–1860 seventeen volumes were reprinted, in 1857 only the first volume, in 1862 only the ninth volume; then, in 1878–1885, eight volumes, in 1878–1888 seventeen volumes, and finally, in 1885, the eighth volume. Most of the volumes were published by Furne.
10. See Henri Martin, "L'Académie Française," <http://www.academie-francaise.fr/les-immortels/henri-martin?fauteuil=38&election=13-06-878>, accessed 25 July 2015.

11. On Martin, see Agnès Graceffa, "Race mérovingienne et nation française: les paradoxes du moment romantique dans l'historiographie française de 1815 à 1860," in *Vergangenheit und Vergegenwärtigung: Frühes Mittelalter und europäische Erinnerungskultur*, edited by Helmut Remitz and Bernhard Zeller (Wien: Verlag des Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009), 61.
12. "Ce signe a été celui de la royauté en France, durant treize cent trente-cinq ans. Au bout de ce temps, on l'a désavoué et répudié: savait-on ce que l'on faisait?" Peyronnet, *Histoire des Francs*, I, 58.
13. Christian Amalvi, *Les héros de l'histoire de France: de Vercingétorix à de Gaulle, un tour de France en quatre-vingts personnages* (Toulouse: Privat, 2001), 65.
14. Peyronnet, *Histoire des Francs*, I, 54–6.
15. Peyronnet, *Histoire des Francs*, I, xii.
16. Henri Martin, *Histoire de France depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'en juillet 1830* (Paris: L. Mame, 1834), I, 177.
17. Martin, *Histoire de France* (1834), I, 201.
18. Henri Martin, *Histoire de France depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'en 1789* (Paris: Furne, 1855), I: 417, 419.
19. Martin, *Histoire de France* (1855), I, 426.
20. Gabriel Hanotaux, *Henri Martin Sa vie—Ses Oeuvres—Son Temps 1810–1883* (Paris: Librairie Léopold Cerf, 1885), 36.
21. On Clovis, see, for example, Christian Amalvi, *Les Héros des Français. Controverses autour de la mémoire nationale* (Paris: Larousse, 2011), 22. On the conflict between Franks and Gauls in French historiography, see Eugen Weber, "Gauls Versus Franks: Conflict and Nationalism," in *Nationhood and Nationalism in France: From Boulangism to the Great War*, edited by Robert Tombs (London: HarperCollins Academic, 1991), 14–15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amalvi, Christian. *Les héros de l'histoire de France: de Vercingétorix à de Gaulle, un tour de France en quatre-vingts personnages*. Toulouse: Privat, 2001.
- . *Les Héros des Français. Controverses autour de la mémoire nationale*. Paris: Larousse, 2011.
- Anon. *Antoinette d'Autriche ou Dialogue entre Catherine de Médicis et Frédégonde, reines de France, aux enfers: pour servir de supplément et de suite à tout ce qui a paru sur la vie de cette princesse*. London, 1789.
- Den Boer, Pim. *History as a Profession: The Study of History in France, 1818–1914*. Translated by Arnold J. Pomerans. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.

- Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*. 5th Edition, 1798. University of Chicago: ARTFL Project, <http://artfl.atilf.fr/dictionnaires/ACADEMIE/CINQUIEME/cinquieme.fr.html>.
- . 6th Edition, 1835. University of Chicago: ARTFL Project, <http://artfl.atilf.fr/dictionnaires/ACADEMIE/SIXIEME/sixieme.fr.html>.
- Dictionnaire des parlementaires français*, 5 Vols. Edited by Adolphe Robert, Edgar Bourlouton, and Gaston Cougny. Paris: Bourlouton, 1889–1891.
- Franconie, Grégoire. “Louis-Philippe et la sacralité royale après 1830.” In *La Dignité du roi. Regards sur la royauté en France au premier XIXe siècle*. Edited by Hélène Becquet and Bettina Frederking, 97–114. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2009.
- Graceffa, Agnès. “Race mérovingienne et nation française: les paradoxes du moment romantique dans l’historiographie française de 1815 à 1860.” In *Vergangenheit und Vergegenwärtigung: Frühes Mittelalter und europäische Erinnerungskultur*. Edited by Helmut Remitz and Bernhard Zeller, 59–69. Wien: Verlag des Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009.
- Hanotaux, Gabriel. *Henri Martin Sa vie—Ses Oeuvres—Son Temps 1810–1883*. Paris: Librairie Léopold Cerf, 1885.
- Keralio, Louise-Félicité Guinement de. *Les crimes des reines de France, depuis le commencement de la monarchie jusqu’à Marie-Antoinette*. Paris: Au bureau des révolutions de Paris, 1791.
- Martin, Henri. *Histoire de France depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu’en juillet 1830*. 8 Vols. Paris: L. Mame, 1834–1836.
- . *Histoire de France depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu’en 1789*. 15 Vols. Paris: Furne, 1855.
- . *L’Académie Française*. Available at <http://www.academie-francaise.fr/les-immortels/henri-martin>.
- Nicolet, Claude. *La fabrique d’une nation. La France entre Rome et les Germains*. Paris: Perrin, 2003.
- Peyronnet, Pierre Denis de. *Histoire des Francs*. 4 Vols. Brussels: Meline, 1835.
- Weber, Eugen W. “Gauls Versus Franks: Conflict and Nationalism.” In *Nationhood and Nationalism in France: From Boulangism to the Great War*. Edited by Robert Tombs, 8–21. London: HarperCollins Academic, 1991.

INDEX¹

A

- ‘Absolute dynastic loyalty’ *vs.*
‘situational dynastic loyalty’, 88
- Adger, W. Neil, 152
- Adultery, accusations of, 69, 114
- Aegisthus (King of Mycenae), 20
- Afonso V (King of Portugal)
 death of Pedro, 99
 return of power to, 102
- Agamemnon (King of Mycenae), 20
- Amalia Wilhelmine (Holy Roman
 Empress), 167, 169
- Amalric (King of Jerusalem), 22
- Amaxotzin
 (Queen of Teotihuacán), 21
- Amphimetric strife
 examinations of, 52–56
 Ogden’s theory of, 51
 and polygamy, 50
 and the stability of the
 Hellenistic dynasties, 49
- Ancient historiography, 3–4
 See also Historiographers and
 historians
- Anna of Denmark (Queen of England)
 death of, 144, 145
 early life of, 142
 patronage of the arts, 139
 portraits, 144
 rule of, 141–142
- Ansegisus, 26n1
- Antiochus Hierax (Seleucid king), 59n21
- Antiochus III Grypus (Seleucid king),
 26n1, 54, 55
- Antiochus VII (Seleucid king), 54
- Antiochus IX Cyzenicus
 (Seleucid king), 54, 55
- Antipater, 59n21
- Antoinette d’Autriche ou Dialogue
 entre Catherine de Médicis et
 Frédégonde, reines de France,
 aux enfers* (anonymous), 183

¹ Note: Page numbers followed by ‘n’ refer to notes.

Anton Ulrich (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), 167
 Apollonis (Queen of Pergamon)
 agency of, 33–34
 benefactions of, 36–38
 family of, 32–33
 marriage to Attalus I, 33
 and the relations of Teos with the Attalids, 35
 return to Cyzicus, 34
 temple at Cyzicus, 34–35
 widowhood of, 40n14
 Archedice, epitaph of, 25
 Arnesson, Kalv, 91
 Arsinoë (Queen of Egypt), 60n26
 Attalus I (King of Pergamon), 33
 Augustus, Philip, 91
 Ayşe Sultan, 154, 155

B

Babington Plot, 115
 Bagge, Sverre, 89
 Baillis, 91
 Baldwin III (King of Jerusalem), 22
 Banqueting House, 139, 141, 145–146
 Barkey, Karen, 155
 Basilissa, title of, 10
 Bassianus, Julius, 70
 Begga, 26n1
 Bell, Karen E., 26n1
 Benefactors, Queens as, 5, 36–38
 Berenice (Seleucid queen), 60n26
 Berenice II (Seleucid queen), 11, 52–54
 Beza, Theodore, 124, 130–132
 Blaisdell, Charmarie, 124
Blood Swept Lands and Seas of Red
 installation, 140
 Bronze Age, 152
 Brown, Katrina, 152

C

Calvin, Jean, 124, 130
 Candaules (King of Lydia), 20
 Carney, Elizabeth, 51
 Caroline (Queen of Great Britain), 171
 Catherine de Médicis (Queen of France), 128
 Catholicism, 124, 146, 167
 Çelebi, Evliya, 156
 Chamberlain, John, 143
 Chang, Leah, 127
 Charles I (King of England), 145, 146
 Charles II (Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel-Bevern), 172
 Charles VI (Holy Roman Emperor), 166, 170, 172
 Charles IX (King of France), 128
 Christensen, Peter, 152
 Christian IV (King of Denmark), 142
 Çinili Camii Mosque, 156
 Cleopatra I (Queen of Egypt), marriage of, 26n1
 Cleopatra II (Queen of Egypt), marriages of, 21, 51
 Cleopatra III (Queen of Egypt), 56
 Cleopatra Thea (Seleucid queen), 54–55
 Climate change, 153
 Cline, Eric, 152
 Clovis I (King of the Franks), 185
 Coins
 depicting solar themes, 70
 paying homage to Julia Domna (Roman Empress), 68, 72–73
 Collapse theory, 152
 Consort queens, 19
 See also Queens
 Co-regnant queens, 10
 See also Queens
 Correspondence, as networking, 170–171
 Costa-Gomes, Rita, 99

Couillard, Antoine, 127–129
 Court masques
 description of, 142
 Masque of Augurs, The, 145
 Prince's Masque, The, 145
Crimes des reines de France,
 Les (Keralio), 183
 Crouch, David, 89
 Cyzicus, 33–35

D
 Darius I (King of Persia), 22
 Darnley, Lord Henry (King of Scots)
 death of, 115
 marriage to Mary, 113–115
 Daughters, role of, 26n1
 Demaratus (King of Sparta), 22
 Demeter, sanctuary of, 37
 Demetrius Cataibates, 35
 Demetrius II Nicator
 (Seleucid king), 54
 Demetrius Poliorcetes (King of
 Macedonia), 35
 Denmark House, 143
 D'Espeville, Charles, *see* Calvin, Jean
 Diamond, Jared, 152
 Diana (Princess of Wales), 140
 Dio, Cassius, 70
 Dionysus, 35
 Diplomatic marriage, 87, 92
 See also Marriage
 Divinity and royalty, 145
 Divorce, 10
 See also Marriage
 Douglas, Archibald
 (Earl of Angus), 114
 Douglas, Margaret, 113
 Dowager queens, 19
 See also Queens
 Duarte (King of Portugal), 100, 101
 Dudley, Robert (Earl of Leicester), 113
 Dynastic loyalty, discussions of, 4

Dynasties, in Scandinavia, 88
 Dynasty/dynasties
 embodied by women, 12
 in Scandinavia, 88

E
 Earenfight, Theresa, 89
 Edith-Matilda (Queen), 24
 Election, and levirate marriage, 22–23
 Elisabeth Christine
 (Holy Roman Empress)
 as advisor to Charles VI, 168–169
 correspondence of, 170–171
 as a dynastic actor for the
 Habsburgs, 166
 influence of, 172–173
 life of, 166
 marriage to Charles VI, 167
 motherhood, 169–170
 natal dynasty of, 172–173
 religious conversion of, 167–168
 Elisabeth Christine of
 Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel
 (Empress), religion of, 11
 Elisabeth Christine of Brunswick-
 Wolfenbüttel-Bevern
 (Queen of Prussia), 172
 Elizabeth I (Queen of England),
 12, 115
 entertainment of the Duke of
 Anjou, 141
 issuance of *Regnans in Excelsis*, 116
 negotiations with Mary, 113, 115
 Elizabeth II (Queen of England), 141
 Ellenblum, Ronnie, 152
 Emblems, 185
 Endowments, 156
 Enrique, 100
 Epitaphs, of women, 25
 Erling Skjalgsson, marriage to Astrid
 Tryggvasdaughter, 90
 Euergetes, *see* Benefactors, Queens as

F

Family members, influence of, 5
 Fear, 61n32
 Ferdinand (Prince of Wolfenbüttel),
 172–173
 Fernando (Prince of Portugal), 102
 Food shortages, 156
 Francis I (Holy Roman Emperor), 170
 Francis II (King of France), 112
 François I (King of France), 124
 Franconie, Grégoire, 183
 “Fratricidal war”, 59n21
 Frederick II (King of Denmark), 142
 Frederick II (King of Prussia),
 172, 173

G

Gender history, development of, 1–2
 Geoffrey (Count of Anjou), 24
 George II (King of Great Britain), 170
 Gevherhan Sultan, 155
 Goddess trope, 5
 Graceffa, Agnès, 184–185
 Greek historiography, 3–4
 Gringore, Pierre, 127
 Grjotgardsson, Olve, 91
 Guizot, François, 182
 Guy of Lusignan
 (King of Jerusalem), 22

H

Hafiz Ahmed Pasha, 154
 Hampton Court Palace, 142
 Harald I Fairhair (King of Norway), 89
 Harington, Lucy (Countess of
 Bedford), 142, 143
 Hatra, siege of, 69–72
 Hazzard, Richard A., 51
Heimskringla (Sturluson), 89, 92, 93
 Heirs, Queens as producers of, 5

Henri II (King of France), 112, 128
 Henrietta Maria, 145
 Henry (Prince of Portugal), 102
 Henry I (King of England), 23
 Hepburn, James (Earl of Bothwell),
 114, 115
 Hercule d’Este, 124
 Heredity, and levirate marriage, 22–23
 Herodian, 72
Histoire des Francs (Peyronnet),
 183–184
Historia Augusta (*HA*), 69
 Historic Royal Palace, 140
 Historiographers and historians
 Aurelius Victor, 68
 den Boer, Pim, 184
 Dio, Cassius, 68, 70
 Graceffa, Agnès, 184–185
 Guizot, François, 182
 Herodian, 72
 Martin, Henr, 184–185
 Peyronnet, Pierre-Denis,
 Count of, 183–184
 Plutarch, 32
 Polybius, 32, 34
 Von Domaszewski, Alfred, 67
 William of Tyre, 28n14
 Historiography, 3
 History
 development of, 1–2
 environmental impacts on, 152
History of France (Martin), 184–185
 Howard, Frances, 144
 Howard, Thomas
 (Duke of Norfolk), 116
 Hundr, Torir, 91
Hymenai, 144

I

Ibşir Mustafa Pasha, 155
 Inheritance, rules of, 170

Inscriptions

- Hellenistic queens in, 10
- paying homage to Julia Domna, 73–74
- paying homage to Julia Maesa, 73

Intercessors, queens as, 5

- Isabel (Duchess of Burgundy)
 - influence of, 100
 - mediation efforts of, 103–104
- Isabel (Queen of Portugal)
 - death of, 105–106
 - influence of, 100
 - marriage to Afonso V, 101
 - mediation efforts of, 102

Isabella I (Queen of Jerusalem), 22–23

J

- James VI and I (King of Scotland), 115, 117, 139
- João I (King of Portugal), 99, 100
- Jochens, Jenny, 88
- Jones, Inigo
 - arrival in London, 139
 - Banqueting House, 146
 - patronage of Anna of Denmark, 144–145
 - training of, 142
- Jonson, Ben, 143, 145
- Joseph I (Holy Roman Emperor), 167, 170
- Jouffroy, Jean, 103–105
- Juan (King of Navarre), 100
- Juan II (King of Castile), 100
- Julia Domna (Roman Empress)
 - accusations of treachery, 67–69
 - appearance on coinage, 71
 - inscriptions paying homage to, 73–74
 - loyalty to the cult of Ba'al, 11
 - and the siege of Hatra, 70–72
 - Syrian customs of, 74–75

Julia Maesa, 73–74

July Monarchy, 182–183

K

- Kensington Palace, 140
- Keralio, Louise-Félicité
 - Guinement de, 183
- Keynes, Simon, 89
- Kings, relationships with chieftans, 92
- Köprülü Mehmed Pasha, 157
- Kösem Sultan, 154, 156

L

- Lambert, Thomas, 131
- Laodice I, 59n21
- Laodice III, 36
- Lapidge, Michael, 89
- Legitimacy of women, 20
- Leonor (Queen of Portugal)
 - as dowager queen, 100–101
 - family of, 100
- Leonor Teles
 - (Queen of Portugal), 101
- Leslie, John (Bishop of Ross), 117
- Letters of friendship, 171
- Levirate marriage
 - heredity and election, 22–23
 - involving outsiders and insiders, 20–21
 - use of term, 20
 - See also* Marriage
- Louis XII (King of France), 124
- Louis XVIII (King of France), 182
- Loyalty, 88, 94

M

- Macurdy, Grace Harriet, 52
- Magas, 53
- Maitland, William, 113

- Manahutzzin
 (King of Teotihuacán), 21
- Maren (Mesopotamian god), 71
- Marguerite d'Angoulême
 (Queen of Navarre)
 marriage to Hercule d'Este, 124
 patronage of, 124
- María (Queen of Castile), 100
- Maria Anna (Arch-duchess), 169
- Maria Comnena
 (Queen of Jerusalem), 22
- Maria Theresia (Holy Roman
 Empress), 169, 173
- Marie de Medici, 145
- Marot, Clément
 patrons of, 124
 poetry of, 125–127
- Marriage
 alliances, 156
 diplomatic, 87, 92
 divorce, 10
 intra-dynastic, 11
 levirate marriage, 20–23
 mistresses, 92
 nature of, 10
 polyandry, 62n42
 polygamy, 11, 51
 and religious conversion, 166–168
 serial, 154
- Martin, Henri, 181, 186–187
- Martyrdom, 118–119
- Mary (Queen of Guise), 111
- Mary (Queen of Scots)
 accusations of adultery, 114
 death of Darnley, 115
 early life of, 111–112
 imprisonment of, 115–118
 marriage to Darnley, 113–115
 martyrdom of, 118–119
 motherhood, 115
 rule of, 112–113
 training as a consort, 112
Masque of Augurs, The, 145
- Masques
 description of, 142
Masque of Augurs, The, 145
Prince's Masque, The, 145
- Matilda (Empress), 24
- Matricide, 53
- Matrimonial politics, 155
See also Marriage
- Mediation, role of women in, 102–104
- Medieval Feminist Forum*, 3
- Melville, James, 115
- Mentzer, Raymond, 131
- Merovingian history, 185–187
- Metric strife, 50, 57
- Mistresses, 92
- Monarchy
 definition of, 3
 legitimacy of, 182–183
- Motherhood
 celebrations of, 37
 of Elisabeth Christine (Holy Roman
 Empress), 169–170
 of Isabel (Queen of Portugal), 105
 of Mary (Queen of Scots), 115
- N**
- Naima, Mustafa, 157
- Napoleon III (Emperor of France), 141
- O**
- Odysseus, 20
- Ogden, Daniel, 20, 51
- Olaf I (King of Norway), 87
- Olaf II (King of Norway), 92
 conflict with Olof, 87
 conquest of Norway, 92
 dynasty of, 89
 marriage to Astrid Olof's daughter,
 92
 royal authority of, 91–92
- Olof (King of Sweden), 87

Olofsdaughter, Astrid
 (Queen of Norway), 89
 conflict with Olaf II, 92
 marriage to Olaf II, 93
 Olympias, epitaph of, 25
 Orning, Hans Jacob, 89
 Ottoman Empire
 adaptation of, 158–159
 centralized authority of, 153–154
 dynastic loyalty in, 154
 fiscal strategies, 155–156
 legitimacy of, 158
 matrimonial politics, 154
 Seventeenth Century
 Global Crisis, 151
 tax farms, 156
waqf foundations, 156
 wars, 153

P

Palaces
 commissioning of, 139
 position of, 140–141
 Parker, Geoffrey, 158
 Parry, William, 117
 Patronage of queens
 importance of, 6
 religious, 11
 Patronage, and philanthropy, 157
 Paulet, Amyas, 117
 Pedro (Prince of Portugal)
 death of, 102–103
 death of Duarte, 100
 election to governor
 of the realm, 100–101
 Pedro the younger, 100
 Peirce, Leslie P., 157
 Penelope, 20
 Peyronnet, Pierre-Denis, Count of,
 181, 185–186

Philanthropy, 9, 157
See also Patronage of queens
 Philip II (King of Spain), 116
 Philippine Charlotte, 172
 Philometor, 26n1
 Pina, Rui de, 102
 Pippinids, 26n1
 Pius V (Pope), 116
 Pizzaro, Gonzalo, 27n3
 Plautianus, Fulvius, C., 68
 Plutarch, 32, 52
 Polybius, 32, 34
 Polygamy, 50, 51
See also Marriage
Polygamy, Prostitutes,
and Death: The Hellenistic
Dynasties (Ogden), 49
 Pomeroy, Sarah B., 52
 Porphyrogenitus, rights of, 22
 Portraits
 of Anna of Denmark,
 142, 144
 of James VI and I, 145
 of Julia Domna, 74
 of the July Monarchy, 141
 of Marie de Medici, 145
 Pragmatic Sanction, 169, 170
Prince's Masque, The, 145
 Ptolemaic dynasty of Egypt, 50
 Ptolemy II Ceraunus
 (King of Egypt), 21
 Ptolemy III Euergetes
 (King of Egypt), 11
 Ptolemy IV Philopater
 (King of Egypt), 53
 Ptolemy V Epiphanes
 (King of Egypt), 26n1
 Ptolemy VI Philometor
 (King of Egypt), 51
 Ptolemy VIII Physcon
 (King of Egypt), 21

Q

Queen Mother, 19

Queens

agency of, 33–34

as benefactors, 5, 36–38

consort queens, 19

co-regnant queens, 10

criticism of, 183

dowager queens, 19

goddess/whore trope, 5

in inscriptions, 10

as intercessors, 5

patronage of, 11

as producer of heirs, 92

“Queenship and Power” series, 2

regnant queens, 10 (*see also* Queens)

title of, 10

use of term, 19

See also Women

“Queenship and Power” series, 2

R

Reconciliation, role of women in,
102–104

Recueil des Opuscles (Calvin), 130

Regnans in Excelsis, 116

Regnant queens, 6, 19, 111, 112

See also Queens

Reid, Jonathan, 124

Religion, patronage by royal
women, 11

Religious conversion, 166–168, 185

Renée de France (Duchess of Ferrara)
natal family of, 124

personal motto of, 126

persona of, 125

Resilience theory, 152

Ridolfi, Roberto, 117

Riley-Smith, Jonathan, 28n14

Rizzio, David, 114

Roman historiography, 3–4

Royal widows, power of, 10

Royalty

divided loyalties of, 173

and divinity, 145

Rubens, Peter Paul, 145

Rune stones, 90

Russell, Daniel, 125, 126

S

Sagas, 90

Seleucus II (Seleucid king), 59n21

Seleucus V Philometor

(co-regnant of the Seleucid
empire), 54–55

Serial marriages, 154

Seventeenth Century Global Crisis, 151

Severus, Septimius

(Roman Emperor), 67, 69–72

Shamash (Mesopotamian god), 71

Sibylla (Queen of Jerusalem), 22–23

Singer, Amy, 156

Situational loyalty, 88, 94

Soane, John, 140

Solar deities, 70–71

Somerset House, 143

Soup kitchens, 156

Stafford, Pauline, 3

Stewart, James (Earl of Moray), 112

Stewart, Matthew (Earl of Lennox),
113

Stratonice (Queen of Pergamon), 37,
41n15

Stuart dynasty, 146

Sturluson, Snorri, 88, 89, 92, 93

Süleyman Agha, 162n35

Sultans, 153

T

Talbot, George

(Earl of Shrewsbury), 116

Teuhzihuatzin (Queen of
Teotihuacán), 21

Thesmophoria, 37
 Thessalonice (Princess), 59n21
 Throckmorton plot of, 117
Time Vindicated to Himself and his Honours, 145
 Tomeyauhtzin (Queen of Teotihuacán), 26n1
 Toresson, Sigrid, 91
 Toresson, Sigurd, 91
 Toussaint, Daniel, 132
 Tower of London, 140
 Tryggvasdaughter, Astrid
 dynasty of, 89–90
 intervention of, 93
 marriage to Erling Skjalgsson, 90
 relationship with Olaf II, 88
 Tryggvasdaughter, Ingeborg
 dynasty of, 89–90
 relationship with Olaf II, 88
 Tryggve Olafsson, 90
 Tudor, Margaret, 114
 Turhan Sultan, 155–157

V

Validé sultans, 154, 157
 Van Somer, Paul, 144, 145
 Vertical kinship relationships, 94
Vision of the Twelve Goddesses, The, 142
 Von Domaszewski, Alfred, 67

W

Walsingham, Francis, 118
Waqf foundations, 156

Watt, Isabella, 131
 White, Sam, 158
 Whore trope, 5
 William I (the Conqueror)
 (King of England), 23
 William II (Rufus)
 (King of England), 23
 William of Tyre, 28n14
 Women
 accusations of adultery, 69
 Apollonis as a benefactor of, 37
 correspondence of, 170–171
 divided loyalties of, 173
 epitaphs of, 25
 examinations of monarchy, 2
 history, development of, 1–2
 legitimacy of, 20
 motives of, 61n35
 stability provided by, 157
 See also Queens
 World history, environmental
 impacts on, 152
 Wren, Christopher, 140
 Wyatt, James, 140

X

Xiuhlotlotzin
 (King of Teotihuacán), 21
 Xolotzin
 (King of Chichimecs), 26n1

Y

Yeni Cami Mosque, 156