The City of London and the Politics of Succession
Ian Archer
University of Oxford

At the heart of my contribution will be a comparison of the royal entries of 1604 and 1661, though I will try to work in references to other successions. It is one of the curious features of the existing historiography that the caesura of the civil war has deterred such obvious comparisons. There were of course many points of similarity in the Augustan tropes: the returning golden age of Concord and Plenty and the flourishing of the arts under benevolent rule, imperial monarchy encompassing all the virtues.

But 1661 presents some interesting divergences from 1604. The Restoration entry was far franker in its acknowledgement of commerce and (to a lesser extent) industry, themes which in 1604 had appeared (significantly enough) only on the Dutch arch; the imperial theme, presented in terms of the union of crowns in 1604, is now articulated in terms of maritime empire and global trade; although Ogilby larded his 1661 text with a host of classical allusions to explain the iconography, the whole thing was more 'accessible' than Jonson's 1604 text, not least because of the popular songs with which the cavalcade was greeted at each of the arches. But more significantly it was far impossible to conceal the fact of dissidence: Monarchy confronted the hydra of rebellion on the first arch; and to give the point specific application, the burning of the Covenant was shown. For a significant minority of Londoners, the restored regime was already not what they had been buying into a year previously.

I will try to locate the entries in the popular politics of London in the succession period to bring out some of the tensions between the official script and the attitudes of Londoners towards their new monarchs. This will draw upon a reading of civic, guild, and parochial records as well as the texts in the succession database. Both 1603-4 and 1660-1 were characterised by enormous enthusiasm for the crown. But James' accession took place against the background of disaffection about wartime taxation and monopolies and sympathy for the late earl of Essex. When Londoners first addressed the king through the mouth of Richard Martin on his approach to the city, it is clear that they had their own agenda for reform, the themes of which of course do not figure in the entry. In1660 the city had deftly to re-write the recent past to excuse its complicity in the last twenty years of disturbances, and key individuals like Sir Richard Browne switched allegiances in dramatic volte-faces. But those who supported the restoration did so for different reasons and already by the time of the coronation anxieties about the direction of the Church were causing tensions between crown and city, dramatically evidenced by the outcome of the elections for the Cavalier Parliament shortly before the coronation. The presence of a significant dissenting minority meant that the themes of the 1661 entry were potentially much more divisive.

Writing the King's Death: The Case of James I
Alastair Bellany
Rutgers University

The first Stuart king of England died at his palace at Theobalds on March 27, 1625. This paper explores how contemporaries discussed the event, and analyzes the generic

properties and political significance of a broad range of contemporary representations of James' final illness and death.

I begin by surveying the sheer diversity of written responses: courtly and commercial manuscript newsletters; continental printed news; court sermons; printed and manuscript elegies; private memoirs; medical accounts of the causes, course and nature of James' final illness; and, finally, "secret histories" circulated in printed pamphlets and manuscript verse libels. I will then outline some of the political themes that dominate this discourse, and suggest the ideological work this writing performed: the construction of an authorized version of the king's "good death", in which James' spiritual virtuosity conquered his bodily mortality; the negotiation of ideological contradictions, in particular Charles' repudiation of James' pacific foreign policy; and, finally, the construction of underground libelous narratives of James' death that fueled the discursive politics of the proto-revolutionary crisis of the later 1620s.

The rest of the paper focuses on a handful of interestingly problematic texts. I begin by reading Shirley's elegy on the king as a response to the innovative ritual used during James' funeral. Shirley re-presents funerary ritual and symbol in complex ways that both endorse and question official meanings. His reflections on the wooden effigy used during the lying-in-state effectively rethinks the myth of the king's two bodies while articulating the poet's own version of the mystery of royal succession. Abraham Darcie's illustrated broadside on James is a much cruder work, but equally interesting. Darcie combines visual imagery and verse to re-present James's funerary hearse, while attempting to explain James' death as a work of providence and to depict Charles's war against Spain as a continuation not a repudiation of his father's kingship.

I then turn to medical discourse on James's death, in particular the accounts of his post-mortem examination. Royal bodies had to be preserved for several weeks after death, and the only effective method of preservation was embalming. The surgical procedures involved allowed royal physicians a chance to observe the king's internal organs, and the texts they produced are valuable evidence for the pre-history of pathological autopsy. But these reports are also forms of political discourse. The doctors wanted to establish an official medical explanation of the king's death. But by tracking newsletter accounts of the royal autopsy, we can watch contemporaries interpret the physicians' observations not as pathological signs but as political and character judgments on the late king.

The fate of the official medical explanation is the subject of the final part of the paper, which looks at George Eglisham's *Forerunner of Revenge*, a 1626 pamphlet that retold the death of James I as a secret history of courtly poisoning. Eglisham's allegations had an unusually long political life, and I focus here on two reasons for their longevity: Eglisham's self-presentation as purveyor of hidden secrets to a large political public; and the centrality of post-mortem medical evidence to his case. Thanks to Eglisham, narratives of James' death would become as contested as those of his son's a quarter century later. Indeed, Charles's fate in 1649 was inextricably linked to the regicidal revival of the secret histories of his father's murder.

'I haue brought thee vp to a Kingdome': sermons on the succession of Charles I
David Colclough
Queen Mary, University of London

Sermons surrounded the successions of early modern monarchs. Preached over the body of the deceased king or queen, a central part of the coronation service, and delivered to the court of the new ruler and to his or her first parliament, they played a major role in the formal recognition of shifts in the political order. Beyond the centre of power in London, preachers addressed new monarchs in their travels around the country, and frequently printed their sermons.

This paper analyses a number of sermons delivered around the accession of Charles I in 1625. It considers the complex set of tasks that such sermons undertook, from attending to the spiritual state of the former and current rulers, to counselling the new monarch on ecclesiastical policy, and speaking to the anxieties of a nation in transition. In doing so, it sheds light both on the hopes and expectations that preachers had of their royal masters and on the delicate decisions made by those kings over who should be chosen to speak to – and to some extent for – them at the beginning of their reigns.

I focus on John Donne's sermon on Psalm 11: 3, the first preached before the new king, in his residence at St James's Palace, while the court of his father was still in place at Whitehall. Donne was compelled to prepare his sermon at very short notice, and as has been noted previously, Charles's choice of him for this occasion was both significant and unexpected. I argue that in his choice of scriptural text, and his exegesis of it, Donne deftly combines reassurance with advice, and builds a discourse that unites the four 'houses' he discusses (the church, the state, the family, and the self) into one. Alongside Donne's sermon to the court, I briefly consider two sermons preached at rather different inaugural moments: Richard Senhouse's notorious coronation sermon on Rev. 2: 10 (reconstructed from notes and printed in 1627), and William Laud's sermon on Ps. 122, preached at the opening of parliament in February 1626.

The Impress of our Lawfull Coyn: the numismatic dimension of the Stuart successions
B.J. Cook
The British Museum

Whatever the advances of print culture, it is unquestionably the case that the most familiar, pervasive and unavoidable representation of European monarchy in the 17th century still remained the coinage. A coin is at once an object and document, a functional artefact and a material metaphor of lawful rule, encapsulated in the stamp of authority that defined its nature as a coin. This stamp itself combined image and text to create, it was intended, a unity of message.

This paper will seek to demonstrate that Stuarts were well aware of all of this and that virtually all of them displayed a keen interest in their numismatic depiction. This was something that would not wait long after each succession: the Mint wanted to begin coinage of the new monarch as soon as possible and new monarchs were thus immediately placed in the position of establishing his, her or their preferred names, titles, images and (in broad terms) message on display in this ubiquitous medium. By the 17th century it was, of course, unremarkable in itself that a new reign would usually produce new coin designs, but virtually every Stuart succession involved an extra dimension, an edge, an agenda that the coinage designs reflected, to a degree apparent in no other age. In two reigns there were two coinage redesigns in quick

succession, doubling the impact of monetary messages, both versions of which, of course, remained in currency. Coins stayed around, long after reigns ended.

There were particular scenarios to be addressed. James I, arriving in England with a long-established numismatic legacy in Scotland, had to present literally the new face of a male monarch to vie with the Elizabethan issues that remained dominant in the currency throughout his reign and beyond. James also had to incorporate references to his multiple kingdoms, which led to a major transformation within a year of the issue of his First Coinage of 1603-4. He quickly saw the coinage as one of the most powerful tools at his free disposal in constructing the identity of Great Britain in 1604, including the coordination of the money of his two major kingdoms, England and Scotland. Charles I had a profound interest in his numismatic depiction that led to many interventions from the very beginning of his reign and throughout it thereafter (there would be different, rival coinages from 1643 issued for parliamentary and royalist England).

The most dramatic Stuart succession from the monetary perspective, widely discussed by contemporaries, was that of Charles II, which saw England's only politically-inspired recoinage, as the Commonwealth issues (themselves a rallying-point for the English Republic's supporters) was demonetised and replaced by Charles's First Coinage. Then in 1662 there occurred the most fundamental reshaping of royal representation on British coinage in the whole period, as a major technological change (mechanised techniques of manufacture) was combined with the introduction of a new neo-classical style that would have a very long legacy. The joint reign of William and Mary offered a new challenge to numismatic royal representation, while the heraldic implications of succession had their own impact, with the possible incorporation of Scottish, Orange and Danish elements. All the Stuarts operated three coinages, in Scotland and Ireland as well as in England and relationships between them were broadly coordinated, an aspect of the issue of multiple kingdoms rarely addressed.

1685 and the Battle for Dutch Public Opinion: Succession Literature from a Transnational Perspective
Helmer Helmers
University of Amsterdam

Since most early modern successions created periods of transition which impacted as heavily on foreign policy as on domestic politics, and since kings and queens were – and still are– international icons, Stuart succession literature should be studied as an international phenomenon. Many texts and images related to the succession either specifically targeted foreign audiences or found their way to the continent in reprints or translation.

Especially in the Dutch Republic, whose politics and public sphere were deeply interwoven with England and Scotland throughout the seventeenth century, numerous publications reflected on the Stuart successions. How do these foreign publications relate to English and Scottish texts? Who caused them to be published, and why? And what was their impact on political debate and public opinion abroad? In order to answer these questions, this paper will investigate a relatively small corpus of 200 Dutch publications on the English succession of 1685.

By means of the 1685 case, I will highlight succession literature's function within a transnational public sphere. Like other 17th century successions, the 1685

succession created a complex political situation with conflicting economic, dynastic, and religious interests. This stimulated transnational, Anglo-Scoto-Dutch networks to appeal to Dutch public opinion to either support James II or the Earl of Monmouth. The result was an Anglo-Scoto-Dutch debate over the succession, which prepared Dutch public opinion for William III's campaign of 1688-89.

Charles II: A Wanderer of Uncertain Religion
Chris Highley
Ohio State Univesity

The Restoration of Charles Stuart in 1660 saw an outpouring of literature celebrating his return to his homeland and the resurrection of monarchical rule. Scholars have already examined this writing in detail, paying special attention to accounts of civic pageantry and of the coronation itself. What has not been studied, however, is the mystery that Charles II himself posed to his prospective subjects. For most English people, the new king was an enigmatic figure: his absence from England for over a decade (1649-1660) meant that his new subjects knew little about him. Charles's apologists thus needed to enlighten their countrymen with their hero's history, providing details of his exile. Some narratives adopted the genre of the adventure story or heroic romance to tell of Prince Charles's narrow escapes from his enemies after his one attempt to regain power at the battle of Worcester in 1651. The focus of my paper will be on the efforts of Charles's supporters to account for the prince's sojourn in foreign Catholic courts during the 1650s. I am especially interested in how writers attempted to reassure a largely Protestant readership that the prince's wanderings in Catholic Europe had not compromised his commitment to the reformed faith. Because the downfall of his father, Charles I, was connected with fears of the country's backsliding into Catholicism, the new king's religious identity was a subject of anxiety and one his supporters had to carefully manage in order to secure the restoration. My paper will discuss pamphlets, poems, and sermons of the years 1660-1661 that discuss the topic of Charles II's religious education and experiences in exile, like 'England's Faith's Defender Vindicated', 'A Letter out of Flanders', and 'The Royal Pilgrimage'.

The coronation of Queen Anne: political capital and royal ritual
Joseph Hone
University of Oxford

The coronation of Queen Anne on St George's Day 1702 was an event celebrated both on the streets and in print. Scholars have paid attention to the coronations of the Tudors and early Stuarts, particularly to the elaborate pageantry of Elizabeth and James I's royal entries into London on the eve of the ceremony. The final Stuart coronation has, however, remained something of an enigma. This paper attempts a corrective by presenting the coronation as a carefully managed public event, designed to popularize the image of the new queen. Anne's status as a failed royal progenitor, the final protestant Stuart, was, however, problematic. The coronation made use of ritual iconography, sermon, and medal design to counter Anne's precarious position, fashioning her both as a mother to the nation, and the heir of ancient English liberty. The focus of my paper will be both on the manipulation of coronation ceremonial, as

it unfolded before a public audience in Westminster Abbey, and on the reimagining of the event in celebratory literature. Older scholarship has dismissed much of this writing as popular ephemera. This literature does, however, exemplify the importance of royal representation to partisan discourse in the early eighteenth century. Coronation panegyric provided a poetic model for those seeking to praise the queen, but equally it afforded an opportunity for political point scoring in the weeks leading up to the general election. I am especially interested in the rhetorical strategies used by writers to associate the royal image with party interest. Particularly, my paper will discuss popular verse and panegyric published in the days surrounding Anne's coronation, examining how and why the queen is represented in certain lights. These poems include *The English Muse* and *Albina*, as well as Henry Waring's Tory panegyric, *The Coronation*, Richard Burridge's Whig effort, *A Congratulatory Poem on the Coronation*, and a host of less illustrious material.

Addressing the Monarch 1685-1715: Lessons in Loyalty?
Mark Knights
University of Warwick

My paper will examine the floods of addresses that were presented to monarchs on their successions, from James II in 1685 to George I in 1714-15. These will be placed in a wider context of addressing, both within the period under study, when there were addresses to commemorate particular victories and the defeat of plots, and more widely, since the fashion for addressing new rulers began with those presented to Richard Cromwell. Addresses soon acquired an ambiguous value: on the one hand they were useful ways of mobilising and demonstrating loyalty to the person and institution of monarchy and because the addresses were a key way of articulating and dissemintating political principles and theory; they both reflected opinion and helped to shape it. On the other hand, they could also be seen as rather empty panegyrics and as tools in a partisan game, especially when they overlapped with electioneering campaigns. I will examine a history of addressing published by the Whig John Oldmixon, who argued that the addresses were increasingly meaningless and insincere. The capacity of addresses to divide as well as to unite will be examined: addresses could provoke opposition and fail to attract key sponsors, either because their wording was seen as too controversial or because those promoting an address were seen as factional. Addresses were, on the whole, about quality as much as quantity of subscribers but the extent to which mass signatures were thought to enhance or detract from the value of the addresses will be studied for what it tells about a participatory culture of acclamation. The geographical spread of addresses - both within Britain and across its colonies, will also be charted. The nationwide campaigns included the colonies and helped to foster an imagined nation, particularly important at a time of imperial expansion and union with Scotland.

'"Let the Succession of the Stuarts sayl": celebrating the royal wedding of 1662'
Anna-Marie Linnell
University of Exeter

Moments of succession and moments of royal marriage were connected by the promise of dynastic continuity. As the only legitimate partner of the monarch, the

royal consort was the vessel for the successor's successor. Their arrival provided a unifying symbol of stability, whilst also prompting questions about the future reign. When Catherine of Braganza arrived to England in May 1662, an outpouring of texts greeted her landing as the completion of the 1660 succession. The close proximity of the Braganza Match to Charles II's accession also meant that the restoration settlement was still being entrenched in law. This paper investigates how the writers greeting Catherine also reconciled the political decisions of the early restoration, including the marriage itself. What kinds of texts were written about her arrival, and what strategies were used to construct their praise? How did writers replay the themes of restoration and succession to mark the latest development in the Stuart dynasty?

As a foreign and Catholic Princess, Catherine was arriving to a country that remained firmly suspicious about Catholicism in general, but Catholic consorts especially. Moreover, her landing coincided with some of the most divisive legislation of her husband's reign: including measures against religious nonconformists, and a crippling new hearth tax. Whilst recent scholarship has paid close attention to the importance of a language of consensus at the 1660 succession, and the manipulation of this discourse in political negotiations during the early settlement, the texts greeting the Braganza Match have not been considered within this context. Instead, the most extended study of the English reception of the marriage focuses on Catherine's entry pageants of August 1662, and remains sceptical about its public impression. Concentrating on the sizable body of panegyric that marked Catherine's arrival, I argue that the themes of restoration and succession were recycled to provide a narrative for the royal marriage. However, they were also characterised by an explicit focus on Catherine's economic value, which had not been present in descriptions of the earlier consorts. I contend that these themes palliated discomfort about Catherine's Portuguese nationality, whilst also reorienting the focus of fractious domestic dispute.

Panegyric and its Discontents: The Stuart Succession, 1603-04
Richard McCabe
University of Oxford

No-one attending to the succession debate in the 1590s would have concluded that the outcome was in any sense certain. Elizabeth gave out conflicting signals, an insecure James VI was watching the London press with an attention bordering on paranoia, and Catholic partisans were so intent on promoting the Spanish Infanta that they unwittingly canvassed a wider range of claimants and pretenders than might have been known to most of their readership. The perceived urgency of the issue was exacerbated by the official prohibition on discussion and those not in blatant breach of the ordinance, such as Persons, were forced to resort to oblique codes of reference and allusion. Yet anyone reading the literature of the Stuart succession in 1603 might be forgiven for concluding that the outcome was inevitable – indeed inevitability, variously cast in terms of political foresight, genealogical legitimacy or providential design, was a major theme of the flood of print and manuscript that signalled the end of the embargo. What I seek to demonstrate in the present paper, however, is that much of this literature was designed to reify what it overtly celebrated, that its unrelenting assertiveness was born of continuing doubt, uncertainty, and fear. As the son of Mary Queen of Scots, an 'alien' born, and a highly controversial political theorist, James was an unknown quantity and panegyric was designed to mould as

well as flatter, or to mould through flattery. Though apparently homogeneous, the celebratory literature of 1603-04 is diverse in emphasis and disparate in tone, affording not one but many versions of James and kingship. The undoubted fact of succession, that is to say, is offset against its problematical meaning: what had actually happened? Had James become King of England as well as Scotland or rather of a new state called Britain? By which right was he also King of Ireland? Was he Elizabeth's successor or Mary's? Would he respect England's mixed constitution? Would he favour religious toleration? As variant images of James flit through the literature of panegyric like the multiple avatars of Spenserian romance, the political mythology of the preceding reign is revised, deconstructed and re-invented in endless attempts to redefine and reimagine his relationship not just to the dead queen but to her living iconography. She had come to embody the nation but it was no longer clear what the nation was. Perhaps for the first time since William the Conqueror, the new monarch, like his published works, needed to be Anglicised – while simultaneously retaining his Scottish identity and appearing both Gaelic and English to his divided subjects in Ireland. It was at the permeable interface between panegyric and fiction that such transformations were attempted.

University Volumes and the Stuart Successions
Henry Power
University of Exeter

From late in Elizabeth I's reign until the mid-eighteenth century, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge issued collections of verses to mark every major royal event; this was in fact a practice more or less coeval with the reign of the Stuarts in England. Among these celebrations of royal births and marriages, hopeful departures and glorious returns, both universities published official volumes to mark the accession of every Stuart monarch to the throne. The verses in these volumes – mostly in Latin, though there are also a number of contributions in English and Greek, and a handful in Arabic, Hebrew and Italian – were written by a mixture of senior university figures (Vice-chancellors, Heads of House), dons, blue-blooded undergraduates, and recent graduates.

Should these collections be seen as little more than dutiful verse miscellanies (of rather mixed quality), or can we discern a concerted effort on the part of the institutions to position themselves in relation to the incoming monarch? As a test case, I will look closely at the volumes produced during one especially turbulent period: 1658-1660. In 1658, Cambridge issued a volume (*Musarum Cantabrigiensium Luctus et Gratulatio*) to mark Oliver Cromwell's death and his son Richard's succession as Lord Protector. Two years later, many of the contributors to this volume (and especially those holding senior posts in the university) were called upon to celebrate the return of Charles II (*Academiae Cantabrigiensis ΣΩΣΤΡΑ*). My paper will look at the ways in which these contributors repositioned themselves in 1660. I will also look at the ways in which they present themselves as speaking for the university. Oxford remained silent in 1658 (though they had observed Oliver's elevation in 1654), but I will also look at the Oxford volume of 1660, *Britannia Rediviva*, and again ask whether the collection as a whole can be regarded as an institutional statement.

Stuart Coronations in Scotland
Jane Rickard
University of Leeds

Though neglected in accounts of seventeenth-century 'British' history until relatively recently, the Scottish coronations of Stuart monarchs were highly politically significant - and controversial - occasions. Charles I postponed his Scottish coronation for eight years, and when, in 1633, he finally did visit Scotland to be crowned, the manner of the coronation and of the King's conduct bred considerable anxiety and resentment among the Scots. Charles I's son would be crowned in Edinburgh long before he was crowned Charles II in England: taking place in 1651, this Scottish coronation was a defiant challenge to the Commonwealth regime and a determined attempt to assert the power of the Scottish kirk over the Stuart monarchy. Finally restored to the throne of England in 1660, Charles II was to be the last British monarch also crowned on Scottish soil. The present paper centres on literature surrounding and linking the 1633, 1651 and 1661 coronation ceremonies published in Scotland, and, in some cases, republished or answered in England. Tracing the interconnections and histories of individual texts, it shows how this literature both continued and provoked cross-border dialogue and debate of different kinds. In 1633 such Scottish writers as William Drummond negotiate anxieties about the King's relationship to his native land through engaging with English literary models as well as invoking Scottish historical narratives. The 1651 ceremony, by contrast, attempts to rewrite recent history and mark a decisive break with the past. Robert Douglas's account of this remarkable occasion would continue to exert a disruptive force on the celebrations of 1660-1, on both sides of the border. The paper argues that Scottish coronation writing thus played a vital part in shaping debates not only about the monarchy but about Scotland's relationship with England. This writing exemplifies the cultural and political agency of succession literature, and complicates critical notions of Scotland's cultural identity and Anglo-Scots relations in the period.

1689 and the Aesthetics of Succession
John West
University of Exeter

The 1689 succession was constructed, perhaps haphazardly, through active parliamentary intervention and popular opposition rather than by an incumbent monarch's death and the accession of their rightful heir. The accession of James VI to the English throne amidst the uncertainties of 1603 or the recall of Charles II by the Convention in 1660 (a precedent that did not go unnoticed by members of the 1689 Convention) might be described as similarly engineered events. Yet neither left the Stuart lineage so clearly split between monarchs with opposing claims to the throne. Nor did they produce quite the same level of explicit confusion and division about how events had reached such a juncture and how they were to proceed. The legal and constitutional consequences of parliamentary and pamphlet debates about such matters as desertion, demise, abdication and vacancy have attracted a considerable historiography over the decades. Whilst drawing on this work, I will be concerned with how this succession's constructed quality affected the imaginative responses to it, in pamphlet and in poetry.

I will focus predominantly on succession writing from the 'Interregnum'

period between the escape of James to France in December 1688 and the declaration of William and Mary as joint monarchs in February 1689, a window of time in which there remained great uncertainty over how to settle the succession. Pamphlets in this period seek out historical precedent and use a precise style that strives to represent events as a natural process. Such rhetorical habits sought to quell confusion, of course; but they also reacted to images that either described or sought to avoid describing the succession process and the state more broadly as artifice or unreality: as fabric, edifice, theatre, dream, fable, or fiction. Having explored this imagery in Williamite, Jacobite and 'true Whig' pamphlets, I will consider what impact the climate of suspicion about political invention had on verse panegyric. Only a small number of succession panegyrics were printed in 1689 comparative to 1685 and 1660, and some of those that were printed appear self-conscious in developing a plain style evasive of literary artifice itself. I will conclude by focussing on Elkanah Settle's *A View of the Times*. Unique as a pro-James poem printed in the midst of the Convention's deliberations about the succession, Settle's ode is also attuned to the interlinked pliability of both rhetorical and political form in early 1689.

'He seems a king by long succession born': The problem of Cromwellian accession and succession
Steve Zwicker
Washington University

> *He seems a king by long succession born,*
> *And yet the same to be a king does scorn,*
> *Abroad a king he seems and something more,*
> *At home a subject on the equal floor.*

That was the problem—what to think of Oliver Cromwell: a king or no king; a subject on the equal floor or 'something more'. So Andrew Marvell mused in *The First Anniversary*, his anxious, exultant, and mysterious poem celebrating Cromwell's first year as Lord Protector. Nor was Marvell alone in puzzling over Cromwell's rule—by what rites and rituals had he acceded to power, by what rights and authority did he hold office? And how—failing the apocalypse—would he be succeeded?
As his accession to power was without precedent, so Cromwell's succession posed equal, perhaps more peculiar challenges to those who would mourn 'his Late Highness' and hail the uncertainties of an office now seemingly to be held by lineal descent: how to find a language for this new, unprecedented form of rule and succession? The dilemma produced strange results: silence from John Milton, a poem that collapses in tears from Andrew Marvell, an elegy from John Dryden that cultivates a distance and coolness to which the soon-to-be Stuart laureate would never return. Nor were these three colleagues from Cromwell's office for foreign tongues alone in facing the intellectual and argumentative problems or the rhetorical challenges of fashioning idioms for Cromwellian succession. This essay will address such problems by probing the dilemmas of those who celebrated the Lord Protector, lamented his death, and greeted Richard Cromwell, the heir apparent to an office premised on a denial of the authority of lineal descent.