

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Introduction: premodern queenship and diplomacy

Journal Item

How to cite:

Wilkinson, Louise J. and Wolfson, Sara J. (2021). Introduction: premodern queenship and diplomacy. *Women's History Review*, 30(5) pp. 713–722.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2020 Informa UK Limited



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/09612025.2020.1827729>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's [data policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Introduction: Premodern Queenship and Diplomacy

Louise J. Wilkinson and Sara J. Wolfson

ABSTRACT

Queens, be they consorts, dowagers or regents, often played pivotal roles in the lives of medieval and early modern kingdoms. As the wives and legitimate bedfellows of kings and, in some cases, the mothers of rulers, these elite women enjoyed unique, personal routes of access to heads of state, which often cut through the increasingly bureaucratic and sophisticated mechanisms and structures of government that developed in the medieval and early modern eras. As women who often married across geographical, political and, sometimes, religious borders, they were often ideally placed to serve as diplomats and ambassadors, whether directly as agents or indirectly as transmitters of cultural practices, values and ideas. This introduction celebrates the position which queens occupied at the heart of international and transnational affairs in the premodern era. It argues that queens were, above all, figures who enjoyed meaningful public authority. Their ceremonial actions were imbued with significance, and their deliberate and considered interventions in court politics, and in the wider affairs of their marital and natal families' kingdoms placed them on the international stage and at the heart of European monarchy. This introduction also offers an overview of the articles within this special issue and their contribution to recent historiographical debates on queenship and the nature of pre-modern diplomacy in different historical contexts.

KEYWORDS

queenship; diplomacy; royal marriages; international relations; patronage; gift-giving; politics; culture

BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

Louise Wilkinson is Professor of Medieval Studies at the University of Lincoln. She has published widely on royal and aristocratic women in the thirteenth and early fourteenth

centuries. Her most recent book is *The Household Roll of Eleanor de Montfort, Countess of Leicester and Pembroke, 1265*, The Pipe Roll Society New Series 63 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2020). She is joint general editor, with Ellie Woodacre, of Routledge's Lives of Royal Women Series. Correspondence to Prof. Louise Wilkinson, School of History and Heritage University of Lincoln. Brayford Pool, Lincoln, Lincolnshire. LN6 7TS. Email: LWilkinson@lincoln.ac.uk

Sara Wolfson is a Staff Tutor and Lecturer in History at the Open University. Her research interests chiefly concern the female court and household of Queen Henrietta Maria. Her monograph on Caroline Court Women, 1625–1669 is under contract with Manchester University Press. She has co-edited a collection of essays on *Stuart Marriage Diplomacy: Dynastic Politics in their European Context, 1604–1630* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2018) and *The Wedding of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, 1625: Celebrations and Controversy* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2020). In 2016, she was honoured by the *Times Higher Education* awards as the Most Innovative Teacher of the Year. Correspondence to Dr Sara Wolfson, Staff Tutor and Lecturer in History, School of Arts and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK. Email: sara.wolfson@open.ac.uk

WORD COUNT 5230

Introduction: Premodern Queenship and Diplomacy

Louise J. Wilkinson and Sara J. Wolfson

Queens – as consorts, regents and rulers – occupied central places within princely courts, kingdoms and empires during the medieval and early modern periods. The practice of queenship itself underwent important changes over the centuries as the structures and mechanisms of government evolved within different realms and principalities, giving birth to increasingly complex and professional bureaucracies staffed by men. Court ceremonial, in which queens played pivotal roles, became more elaborate and sophisticated in the later Middle Ages, and fundamental to the ‘display of monarchy’ by incorporating ‘theatre, dance and gallantry’.¹ In the period after 1500, queens regnant - women who ruled kingdoms in their own right - became a more visible phenomenon than they had been in the past, as did queen-regents who assumed responsibility for routine government business on behalf of absent husbands or underage sons.² A queen’s political agency was never domestic in scope, but rather international at its core, thanks to the dynastic interests and international networks that a foreign-born consort brought to her husband’s court. Royal women, as Magdalena S. Sánchez argued in her analysis of Habsburg women at the court of Philip III of Spain, were ‘political creatures’, serving ‘in foreign countries as diplomatic representatives for their relatives’.³ The household of a queen was therefore an alternative diplomatic space of negotiation.⁴ By drawing upon the expertise of historians, musicologist, literary scholars, art historians, and specialists in gender and diplomacy, this special issue reinforces the shifts in time and differences across courts that affected queenship, power and international relations. In doing so, it is sensitive to recent warnings by John Watkins that post-Reformation cross-confessional royal marriages revealed tensions in ‘peace-making and alliance formation’

within Europe.⁵ The early modern contributions to this special issue focus not on 'mixed' royal marriage alliances, but rather on questions of representation and how queens navigated court ceremonial, either directly or indirectly, against the background of confessional differences across Europe.⁶

Yet, in spite of these developments, there remained strong similarities between medieval and early modern queens consort. The power of a queen consort was founded on her position as the king's wife, and on her privileged access to his person as his legitimate bedfellow and bearer of heirs across these historical periods. Provided a royal couple enjoyed a personal relationship based upon mutual respect, the queen consort could act as an intermediary between the king and his subjects or other third parties; she also could act as a conduit through whom it might be possible to secure concessions and favours, and influence policies. Through the management of their own resources and their own attendants, queens consort were important as patrons and as agents for cultural transmission within and beyond their husbands' kingdoms.⁷ Ideas of cross-cultural exchange have been supported further by Adam Morton and Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, who have demonstrated in their co-edited collection on early modern queens consort how cultural patronage helped to breakdown boundaries between politics and culture. Through the patronage of the arts, political thought, theatre, literature and material culture, Morton argues that domestic cultural patronage was international in scope due to the dynastic networks that underpinned their political agency.⁸ Dynasticism formed another crucial element behind a queen consort's power base, as royal women drew upon and were guided by the aims of their familial networks.

As ladies who often physically embodied a treaty of peace or of mutual aid, and who possessed unique, intimate access to princes, kings and emperors, royal wives were well placed to expedite relations between foreign powers. As royal mothers, queens were also potentially able to pass on their own experience of matrimonial diplomacy to their daughters,

if or when they married other rulers. On her marriage to King Charles I in 1625, Henrietta Maria de Bourbon arrived in England with a letter from her mother, Marie de Médicis. Karen Britland has suggested that these instructions served as a conduct manual for the young Catholic queen in the heretical lands of her Protestant husband, where she was expected by the French court and the papacy to have a socio-religious role.⁹ A similar emphasis on familial interests was expressed in the correspondence between Empress Maria Theresa of Austria and Marie-Antoinette, Queen of France. The empress ordered her daughter to keep in regular contact with the Austrian ambassador in Paris.¹⁰ After all, the inter-dynastic marriages of royal women were widely acknowledged - in literature and life - as valuable weapons in the diplomatic and peace-making armouries of different ruling dynasties.¹¹ The concept of peace and its relationship with queenship underpinned Peter Paul Rubens's cycle of paintings depicting Marie de Médicis's life and diplomatic agency as regent of France. As Chantal Grell reminds us, through the politicisation of art, Rubens presented a clear diplomatic message that the queen mother was an agent of peace in Europe, securing the dual marriage of her children Louis XIII and Elizabeth to Anne of Austria and Philip IV of Spain in 1612/15. The 24 paintings for Luxembourg Palace were to be completed for the wedding celebrations of Henrietta Maria and Charles.¹² Certainly, 'mixed' royal marriages in post-Reformation Europe reflected a move towards alliances based on reasons of state rather than confessional allegiance that royal brides had to navigate. These marriages represented diplomatic shifts as lesser states sought to strengthen their international standing by linking with more powerful dynasties, as well as a means of blocking confessional hegemony across Europe.¹³

The foreign backgrounds of many queens gave these women a vested interest in international relations as a means of stabilising their dynasties and promoting their own agendas, as well as those of their male kin.¹⁴ In his pioneering essay collection on *Medieval*

Queenship, first published in 1993, John Carmi Parsons's study of elite marriage formation between 1150 and 1500 demonstrated how medieval queens consort and queens dowager possessed a 'sophisticated' appreciation of the political and material benefits which might accrue to their dynasties and kingdoms through advantageous marriages. He also, tellingly, highlighted the agency exercised by these women in promoting and manipulating the marital unions of their followers and their blood relatives within and across state borders. When, for instance, King Henry III of England sought the hand of Eleanor of Castile for his eldest son and heir, the Lord Edward, in the early 1250s, the English king was careful to seek advice from the bride's mother, the dowager queen of Castile.¹⁵ Similar examples of queens' political agency in securing marital alliances exist for the early modern period. Silvia Mitchell skilfully shows how Queen Mariana and Maria Theresa of Austria helped to bring an end to conflict between France and Spain through the marriage of Carlos II to Marie Louise of Orleans. Their personal negotiations helped to reverse Mariana's original marital arrangements for her son with Maria Antonia of Austria.¹⁶ Queens across the premodern period could also step in to block marriages which went against the interests of their dynasties. This is precisely what Blanche of Castile, the dowager queen of France, famously did, when she prevented Simon de Montfort, the younger son of a French count and a claimant to the English earldom of Leicester, from courting first Mahaut, countess of Boulogne and widow of Philip Augustus of France's son in around 1235, and then Joan, countess of Flanders and widow of Ferrand of Portugal in 1236 or 1237.¹⁷ Marie de Médicis followed a similar policy in her relations with James I and VI for a Stuart match, as a means of blocking an alternative alliance between the British King with Savoy or Tuscany for a French match first with Prince Henry and then Prince Charles.¹⁸

If matrimonial diplomacy underpinned what John Watkins has termed as the 'formation, maintenance and disintegration of premodern European diplomatic society',¹⁹ it is

important to recognise that this was only one form of diplomacy that operated in the medieval and early modern periods.²⁰ Medieval rulers and their consorts were heavily reliant upon networks of representatives and overseas contacts in order to facilitate trade, broker peace agreements, arrange politically beneficial alliances, and engage in warfare.²¹ Envoys carrying gifts and tokens of credence, as well as oral and written messages (if the senders and recipients were literate) were employed in international diplomacy between different heads of state under the Romans, their Barbarian successors, and the early medieval kings and emperors of Western Europe.²² From the twelfth century onward, monarchies developed increasingly sophisticated, formal machinery to facilitate diplomatic negotiations, staffed by clerks and envoys who were considered sufficiently experienced to treat on behalf their royal masters *and* mistresses.²³ Recent essay collections on the practice of diplomacy by Jan Hennings and Tracey Sowerby, on gender and diplomacy by Jennifer A. Cassidy, and on women, diplomacy and international relations by Glenda Sluga and Carolyn James, have all drawn attention to the critically important roles played by queens and other elite ladies in intermediating between different parties; in supporting negotiations; and in fulfilling the roles of ambassadors.²⁴ Queens consort, regent and regnant were often highly active in intrafamilial networking and deployed a variety of strategies in counselling their kin, which existed alongside the more formal governmental mechanisms of late medieval and early modern states. Royal wives and mothers had central parts to play, alongside their husbands and sons, in the rituals that attended diplomatic conferences and summits, and were sometimes authorised to play key roles in the negotiations themselves. David Carpenter's research has illuminated how Henry III of England and Louis IX of France, whose wives were sisters, Eleanor and Marguerite of Provence, met no fewer than five times and sometimes for extended periods of between one and six months, and were usually accompanied by their wives.²⁵ The longest visit, which lasted from November 1259 to April

1260, saw Henry fulfilling the terms of the recently agreed Treaty of Paris, and both Henry and Eleanor overseeing the final details and arrangements for the marriage of their daughter Beatrice with John, the heir to the duchy of Brittany on 22 January.²⁶ English royal correspondence reveals that the match between Beatrice and John was initiated at the suggestion of the French queen, Marguerite.²⁷

Recent essay collections have highlighted the ways in which early modern women rulers 'secured and consolidated their positions through their command of international relations' by extending their activities to overseas 'trade and piracy'.²⁸ They have also shown how it was possible for a queen to employ hospitality, gift exchange, cultural transfers and 'royal displays of magnificence in order to offer counsel, facilitate diplomatic relations and promote her own agenda'.²⁹ The 'emblematic queen' consort and queen regnant, as she was represented in paintings, portraits, sculpture, funerary monuments and other forms of ornamentation, became an important figure in transnational exchanges.³⁰ The material patronage of queens, their asymmetric links to domestic and foreign artisans, and their ability to direct their own international reputation through spatial display against their dynastic identity remains an important area of female political agency that has only started to garner scholarly attention.³¹

The articles within this special issue are intended to make a contribution towards the emerging field of 'new diplomatic history' by exploring how medieval and early modern queens participated in diplomacy as intermediaries between dynasties by engaging not only in ambassadorial exchanges and diplomatic correspondence, but also in gift-giving, in consuming foreign goods, and in staging and participating in courtly entertainments and rituals.³² Taking on board recent definitions of diplomacy as 'both a written and performative activity', as well as redefining 'the diplomat' away from the resident ambassador³³ have enabled the inclusion of women more fully into studies of diplomatic processes. The articles

also consider, more generally, the different methods by which medieval and early modern queens as consorts, regents, dowagers and regnants exercised power, and how the portrayal of that power was subject to manipulation by contemporaries. Fundamentally, this special issue looks at the real and symbolic roles assumed by royal women in balancing the complex intricacies of European politics within different courtly settings. The articles here therefore address important questions about the transnational contexts in which medieval and early modern queens routinely exercised agency, directly, in terms of what they did or *enacted*, and softly, in terms of how they *influenced* people, policies, events, and culture.³⁴

The first article in this special issue is Tracey Sowerby's study of queens at renaissance courts, which illuminates the political strategies that these women also employed through reciprocal gift-giving to facilitate friendly relationships between princely dynasties, thereby promoting their own interests and those of their marital and/or natal kin, and, ultimately, bolstering their own positions. Sowerby's analysis of gift exchanges involving queens indicates a gendering of their networks, so that those of queens consort appear to have been more likely than kings to engage in international gift exchanges with recipients who were other royal women, such as consorts, regents, or dowagers. Queens consort and queens regnant were identified by foreign rulers, by resident foreign ambassadors, and by foreign merchants as useful recipients of gifts, who might help to promote their own political and economic interests. Gifts might be carefully tailored and even produced by other royal women so that they were appropriate for the gender and personal interests of individual recipients, conveying messages of familiarity and closeness between the women of different ruling dynasties. In addition to applied modes of decoration, gifts were perfumed to appeal to the senses of those who received them. Sowerby argues, persuasively, how queenly gift-giving on the part of consorts, often mirrored and complemented that of their husbands, and was deployed, quite deliberately, as a strategy to reinforce familial aims, or influence them

for their own ends. Early modern queens, like their medieval predecessors, acted as intermediaries between their natal kin and their husbands, thereby shaping foreign policy through promoting preferred relationships and ties, as well as diffusing tensions. Yet, not all queens accepted the gifts that were sent to them, especially if those gifts implied an open divergence from, or criticism of, their husbands' policies.

The second article by Susan Johns in this special issue shifts the focus back, chronologically, to the ways in which queens accessed power in twelfth-century Britain. Johns examines the operation of queenship in the native ruling dynasties of Wales and highlights the protection and privilege afforded the queen, as one of the officers of the royal court in the native Welsh laws. Ideas about royal women and power in Wales permeated literary sources, which placed emphasis on the queen's importance within the royal household, but also stressed the vulnerability of her sexual reputation and honour, especially in the works of writers allied to their Anglo-Norman political rivals. Individual Welsh royal women led armies and acted as diplomats, mediating between neighbouring English rulers and their husbands, and sharing intelligence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Queenship in medieval Wales was a vital prop for kingship, and provided an essential means of support for masculine monarchical power structures in the Age of Princes; hence the emphasis placed by Welsh poets on building queenship into their stories of the past. Wales remains the focus of Danna Messer's article on Joan of England, wife of Llywelyn ap Iorwerth, ruler of early thirteenth-century Gwynedd, which explores the different ways in which Joan's diplomacy supported her husband's ambitions to extend his authority within Wales. Messer mounts a convincing challenge to traditional scholarship on Welsh royal women by arguing that Joan's pivotal role in Anglo-Welsh relations was founded not only on her formal position as Llywelyn's wife, but also on the established duties associated with her office at the Venedotian court. Joan's actions were, by no means, exceptional for a Venedotian queen, but

followed in the footsteps of earlier royal women and reveal contemporary expectations of Welsh queenly behaviour, especially in relation to their highly visible presence as authority figures within and beyond the court, and as petitioners whose authority extended across political and geographical boundaries.

Adrian Jobson's article on Sanchia of Provence, queen of the Romans and consort of Richard of Cornwall, makes an important contribution to our understanding of the importance of interdynastic marriage as a tool for establishing trans-European, diplomatic networks a little later in the thirteenth century. He also deftly reminds us of the problems presented by gaps in the extant evidence for tracing the careers of medieval royal women. Sanchia was one of the four daughters of Count Raymond Berengar IV of Provence and his wife Béatrix of Savoy, whose marriages bound together the royal houses of England, France, Germany and, in time, Sicily, in the thirteenth century. Her sisters were Eleanor, wife of Henry III of England (Richard's older brother), Marguerite, wife of Louis IX of France, and Béatrix, wife of Charles of Anjou (Louis IX's brother and king of Sicily by conquest from 1266). Jobson argues that Sanchia's personal connections, her construction of an idealised 'public persona', her conspicuous consumption, her ceremonial displays, and her hospitality all helped to elevate her own and her husband's position, first in England and then in Germany. Although she appears to have possessed a more restricted role in government than either Marguerite and Eleanor, Sanchia still encouraged her English and French queenly sisters, as well as her Savoyard uncles, to support Richard of Cornwall's controversial candidature for the German throne.

Kathleen Neal's article focuses on the treaty initiatives pursued during the so-called Gascon Conflict of the 1290s by Sanchia of Provence's oldest sister, Marguerite, widow of Louis IX of France and aunt of Edward I of England, Marie of Brabant, widow of Philip III of France, and Jeanne of Navarre, wife of Philip IV of France, her mother Blanche, the

second wife of Edward I's brother, Edmund of Lancaster, and their male kin. These women's repeated, personal involvement in the recurrent rounds of talks between the English and French crowns, in ways that were strongly reminiscent of those of Eleanor and Marguerite of Provence in the 1250s and 1260s, showcases how royal kinswomen were routinely involved as peace brokers in negotiations, acting as intermediaries, offering opinions and sharing relevant information with their relatives. Although their efforts, in this case, were unsuccessful, the familial ties enjoyed by these women opened up informal avenues for exchange, which were less rigid and more adaptable to changes in the political climate, and which had greater potential for reaching agreements through compromise. Even *litterae de statu*, letters exchanging news of health, might be employed within family groups to instigate and maintain transregional diplomatic exchanges, as a normal feature of political life. Neal therefore highlights how kinship between royal women was perceived as a constructive force in international diplomacy in the central Middle Ages; at a time when government institutions for transregional diplomacy were evolving, personal relationships remained fundamentally important and shaped the channels, as well as the rhetoric, by which rulers communicated with one another.

In the late sixteenth century, Empress Maria of Austria's household at the imperial Habsburg court and its importance as a centre for Spanish patronage and faction-building, is the subject of Rubén González Cuerva's article. As the consort of Emperor Maximilian II and the mother of sixteen children, Maria exerted influence through her chapel and her chamber. In the former she was served by leading Spanish theologians, who helped her to facilitate the Catholic Reformation in Vienna. In the latter, she was served by wellborn Spanish ladies who assisted in raising her children and for whom she helped to arrange socially advantageous marriages with Imperial noblemen. Empress Maria's privileged access to Maximilian and their mutually respectful and affectionate relationship with one another helped her to be a

highly influential, political figure and mediator at the imperial court, where her position was buttressed by the work of the Spanish ambassadors and by the support she received from her son-in-law Philip II of Spain. Empress Maria's return to Spain in widowhood witnessed her exercising patronage in a way that allowed an Imperial-Popish network to develop led by her female kin.

As a key facet of hospitality in early modern courts, diplomatic practice extended to the realm of dance.³⁵ Anne Daye's article analyses the symbolism conveyed through particular choreographic choices in royal court dances and dance theatre, notably masques and ballets. At a time when diplomats and high-ranking envoys were greeted with elaborate suppers, followed by exquisite balls and ballets de cour, dance was an important medium for transmitting messages about unity, harmony and common interests. Queens and their attendances learned and performed dances by foreign masters in order to honour foreign rulers and their ambassadors, as well as to convey messages about their religious and political allegiances. Daye demonstrates how dance-based entertainments at the courts of Catherine de Médicis in France, Mary, Queen of Scots, and Elizabeth I of England embodied similar messages about female rulership. Daye also argues that by self-consciously adopting the trope of the nine muses these women represented themselves as sisters pursuing peace to facilitate better relations between their kingdoms.

Jemma Field's article moves us from the world of courtly dance to the intricate arrangements for the funeral of Anna of Denmark, consort of King James VI of Scotland and I of England, in 1619. Even in death, queens consort might be drawn into the diplomatic strategies of their living husbands. Field argues that this Stuart king's decision to commemorate his dead wife in such a lavish way formed part of a diplomatic initiative to secure a new Stuart-Habsburg marriage to promote peace for his son Charles, prince of Wales, by broadcasting the Stuart dynasty's splendour, and in particular, its wealth, its loyal

elite, and its impressive international connections. The dead queen's funeral effigy, her ceremonial lying-in-state at Denmark House, the employment of heraldic decorative schemes that celebrated Stuart ties with Anna's own royal Danish house of Oldenburg, and the physical performance of the funeral itself, all served to advertise the strong, stable position of the Stuart monarchy against the immediate background of the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. Anna's funerary arrangements therefore serve as a fitting way to draw this special issue to a close - by reminding us that queenly influence and their value for their dynasties in the realms of international statecraft could even outlive the earthly women themselves.

The last article by Anna-Marie Linnell examines the representation and royal image of Queen Mary Beatrice of Modena, wife to King James II, from her arrival in England to her exile at the court of St. Germain. Through analysis of English writers and their printed texts, Linnell considers how literature connected questions of loyalty and succession to the Stuart monarchy. The queen's image played a crucial part in positive depictions of James II's leadership, but it was also used by writers to support and reflect upon the political settlement of 1688–1689. Linnell shows how important questions were raised in print about Mary Beatrice's alleged activities in exile at St Germain, which helped shape public perceptions of the Stuart court and its diplomatic status. The extent to which queenship, representation and diplomatic relations were controlled by figures beyond the court are timely reminders of the transnational relevance of the public sphere in shaping and defining debates about authority and sovereignty.

¹ T. Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 251.

² *Ibid.*, 251. Queens regnant were found in parts of medieval Europe and Latin Christendom, including Aragon, Castile, León-Castile, Jerusalem, Navarre and Poland: *ibid.*, 250. For an

excellent study of the five queens of medieval Navarre, the kingdom which produced the largest group of queens regnant, see E. Woodacre, *The Queens Regnant of Navarre: Succession, Politics and Partnership, 1274-1512* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). For queens regnant in medieval Iberia, see, for instance, B.F. Reilly, *The Kingdom of León-Castilla under Queen Urraca, 1109-1126* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982); W.C. Stalls, 'Queenship and the Royal Patrimony in Twelfth-Century Iberia: The Example of Petronilla of Aragon', in *Queens, Regents and Potentates*, ed. T.M. Vann (Sawston: Academia Press, 1993), 49-62; J. Bianchini, *The Queen's Hand: Power and Authority in the Reign of Berenguela of Castile* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); and the numerous works on Isabella of Castile.

³ M.S. Sánchez, *The Empress, The Queen, and the Nun: Women and Power at the Court of Philip III of Spain* (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 5.

⁴ S.Z. Mitchell, 'Marriage Plots: Royal women, marriage diplomacy and international politics at the Spanish, French and Imperial Courts, 1665–1679', in *Women, diplomacy and international relations from 1500*, eds. G. Sluga and C. James (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), 99.

⁵ J. Watkins, *After Lavinia: A Literary History of Premodern Marriage Diplomacy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017), 6.

⁶ For 'mixed' marriage alliances more generally in early modern Europe, see B.J. Kaplan, 'For They Will Turn Away Thy Sons': The Practice and Perils of Mixed Marriage in the Dutch Golden Age', in *Piety and Family in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Honour of Steven Ozment*, eds. M.R. Forster and B.J. Kaplan (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 115-33; M.C. Canova-Green and S.J. Wolfson, eds., *The Wedding of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, 1625: Celebrations and Controversy* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2020).

⁷ J.C. Parsons, 'Of Queens, Courts and Books: Reflections on the Literary Patronage of Thirteenth-Century Queens', in *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women*, ed. J. Hall McCash (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1996), 175-201.

⁸ See in particular A. Morton, 'Introduction: Politics, Culture and Queens Consort', in *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c. 1500-1800*, eds. H. Watanabe-O'Kelly and A. Morton (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2017), 1-14.

⁹ K. Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 6-9.

¹⁰ C. Harris, *Queenship and Revolution in Early Modern Europe: Henrietta Maria and Marie Antoinette* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), 44.

¹¹ J.L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 38-9; K.L. Geaman, 'Beyond Good Queen Anne: Anne of Bohemia, Patronage and Politics', in *Medieval Elite Women and the Exercise of Power, 1100-1400: Moving Beyond the Exceptionalist Debate*, ed. H.J. Tanner (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 71.

¹² C. Grell, 'The fêtes of 1612-15 in History and Historiography', in *Dynastic Marriages 1612/15: A Celebration of the Habsburg and Bourbon Unions*, ed. M.M. McGowan (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 220-21. For a recent reappraisal of the Marie de Médicis cycle, see J.F. Dubost, 'Rubens et l'invention d'une image politique: la France personnifiée, XVIIe-XVIIIe siècle' in *The Age of Rubens: Diplomacy, Dynastic Politics and the Visual Arts in Early Seventeenth-Century Europe*, eds. L. Duerloo and R.M. Smuts (Turnhout: Brepols: 2016), 65-98.

¹³ Watkins, *After Lavinia*, 6-7; R.M. Smuts, 'Introduction. Festivals, Dynastic Alliances, and Political History: Notes on the History and Historiography of Royal Weddings', in *The Wedding of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, 1625*, eds. Canova-Green and Wolfson, 35.

¹⁴ M. Shadis, *Berenguela of Castile (1180-1246) and Political Women in the High Middle Ages* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 52.

¹⁵ J.C. Parsons, 'Mothers, Daughters, Marriage and Power: Some Plantagenet Evidence, 1150-1500', in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. J.C. Parsons (Stroud: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1993), 63-4.

¹⁶ Mitchell, 'Marriage Plots: Royal Women', in *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics*, eds. Sluga and James, 86-106.

¹⁷ J.R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 17-18.

¹⁸ Grell, 'The fêtes of 1612-15', 226. For a detailed analysis of the international politics surround the Stuart-Bourbon marriage of 1625, see R.M. Smuts, 'The French Match and Court Politics', in *Stuart Marriage Diplomacy*, eds. Caldari and Wolfson, 13-28.

¹⁹ Watkins, *After Lavinia*, 4.

²⁰ R. Adams and R. Cox, 'Introduction', in *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*, eds. R. Adams and R. Cox (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 7.

²¹ P. Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London: Hambledon, 2003).

²² *Ibid.*, 1-20.

²³ G.P. Cuttino, *English Diplomatic Administration, 1259-1339* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

²⁴ J. Hennings and T.A. Sowerby, 'Introduction: Practices of Diplomacy', in *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410-1800*, eds. T.A. Sowerby and J. Hennings (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2017), 10-11; H. McCarthy and J. Southern, 'Women, Gender and Diplomacy: A Historical Survey', in *Gender and Diplomacy*, ed. J.A. Cassidy (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2017); see also essays by E. Woodacre and S.Z. Mitchell in *Women, Diplomacy and International Relations*, eds. Sluga and James.

²⁵ D.A. Carpenter, 'The Meetings of Henry III and Louis IX', in *Thirteenth Century England* X, eds. M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005), 3.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 7-24.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 24.

²⁸ E. Paraque, N. Probasco and C. Jowitt, 'Introduction to Colonization, Piracy and Trade in Early Modern Europe: The Roles of Powerful Women and Queens', in *Colonization, Piracy and Trade in Early Modern Europe: The Roles of Powerful Women and Queens*, eds. E. Paraque, N. Probasco and C. Jowitt (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 8;

²⁹ M.L. Beer, 'Between Kings and Emperors: Catherine of Aragon as Counsellor and Mediator', in *Queenship and Counsel in Early Modern Europe*, eds. H. Matheson-Pollock, J. Paul and C. Fletcher (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 39. See also the essays in *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies in Waiting across Early Modern Europe*, eds. N. Akkerman and B. Houben (Brill, 2013), 265-85; *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c. 1500-1800*, eds. H. Watanabe-O'Kelly and A. Morton (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2017).

³⁰ See the various essays in *The Emblematic Queen: Extra-Literary Representations of Early Modern Queenship*, ed. D. Barrett-Graves (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

³¹ J. Field, *Anna of Denmark: The Material and Visual Culture of the Stuart Courts, 1589-1619* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020); E. Griffey, *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court* (London and New Haven, Yale University Press, 2016); C. Hibbard, '“By Our Direction and For Our Use”: The Queen's Patronage of Artists and Artisans seen through her Household Accounts', in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, ed. E. Griffey (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 115-137.

³² On 'new diplomatic history', see J. Watkins, 'Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 38, no. 1 (2008): 1-14.

³³ T.A. Sowerby and J. Craigwood, 'Introduction: Literary and Diplomatic Cultures in the Early Modern World' in *Cultures of Diplomacy and Literary Writing in the Early Modern World*, eds. T.A. Sowerby and J. Craigwood (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 9-10.

³⁴ A valuable distinction made in the introduction to W. Layher, *Queenship and Voice in Medieval Northern Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). See also Morton's discussion of the terminology 'agent', 'instrument' and 'catalyst' to explore the political activity of consorts, Morton, 'Introduction', 3.

³⁵ See the essays in *Early Modern Diplomacy, Theatre and Soft Power: The Making of Peace*, ed. N. Rivère de Carles (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017). See also E.R. Welch, *A Theater of Diplomacy: International Relations and the Performing Arts in Early Modern France* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017).