



*The Saxon Connection:
St Margaret of Scotland, Morgan
Colman's Genealogies, and James
VI & I's Anglo-Scottish Union
Project*

Joseph B. R. Massey



The Saxon Connection: St Margaret of Scotland, Morgan Colman's Genealogies, and James VI & I's Anglo-Scottish Union Project

Joseph B.R. Massey

MANCHESTER METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

Abstract: James VI of Scotland's succession to the English throne as James I in 1603 was usually justified by contemporaries on the grounds that James was Henry VII's senior surviving descendant, making him the rightful hereditary claimant. Some works, however, argued that James also had the senior Saxon hereditary claim to the English throne due his descent from St Margaret of Scotland—making his hereditary claim superior to that of any English monarch from William the Conqueror onwards. Morgan Colman's *Arbor Regalis*, a large and impressive genealogy, was a visual assertion of this argument, showing that James's senior hereditary claims to the thrones of both England and Scotland went all the way back to the very foundations of the two kingdoms. This article argues that Colman's genealogy could also be interpreted in support of James's Anglo-Scottish union project, showing that the permanent union of England and Scotland as Great Britain was both historically legitimate and a justifiable outcome of James's combined hereditary claims.

Keywords: Jacobean; genealogies; Great Britain; hereditary right; succession



On 24 March 1603, Queen Elizabeth I of England died and her Privy Council proclaimed that James VI, King of Scots, had succeeded as King of England. In this proclamation, James was said to have come to the English throne by hereditary right because he was “lineally and lawfully descended from the body of Margaret, daughter to the high and Renowned Prince, Henry the seventh.”¹ James had not been officially recognised as Elizabeth I's heir during her lifetime and was only one of numerous candidates suggested as a possible successor. Now that he had secured the English throne, however, James and his supporters wanted to explain why they thought he was, and always had been, the only rightful claimant.²

¹ *Forasmuch as it Hath Pleas'd Almighty God to Call to His Mercy Out of This Transitory Life Our Sovereign Lady, the High and Mighty Prince, Elizabeth Late Queene of England, France, and Ireland, by Whose Death and Dissolution, the Imperiall Crowne of These Realmes Aforesaid Are Now Absolutely, Wholly, and Solely Come to the High and Mighty Prince, James the Sixt, King of Scotland* (London, 1603; STC 8298), one page.

² Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 13–25; Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, “Introduction: A Historiographical Perspective,” in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), 4.

James's descent from Henry VII, the first Tudor monarch, was explained and celebrated in numerous contemporary panegyrics, poems, and genealogies. James's subjects were told that his right to be king of England was indisputable and unchallengeable: the English succession operated according to a hereditary system of male-preference primogeniture and James was the senior hereditary claimant.³ For most of James's new English subjects, James's descent from Henry VII seems to have been enough justification for them to accept his succession to the English throne—this was the most common explanation given, and James was frequently presented as another Tudor monarch continuing the union of the houses of Lancaster and York, rather than the first monarch of a new royal house.⁴ However, some of James's supporters—and James himself—thought that it was necessary to look even further back in James's ancestry to explain and justify his succession to the English throne.

Early in James's joint reign, Morgan Colman produced a genealogy, *Arbor Regalis*, meaning 'royal tree', which showed that James had another, superior hereditary claim to the English throne than the one he inherited from Henry VII. Even more controversially, *Arbor Regalis* presented James and the Scottish monarchs who came before him as having a hereditary claim to the English throne superior to than every single English monarch since William the Conqueror. *Arbor Regalis* was also possibly intended to promote James's project of permanently uniting England and Scotland together as the single kingdom of Great Britain, which James argued was the natural outcome of his hereditary right to rule both countries. The focal point of this genealogy, and the person who made these arguments possible, was St Margaret of Scotland. This article will discuss the significance of *Arbor Regalis* in the context of the personal union of the crowns of England and Scotland under one monarch, and James's attempts to secure a permanent Anglo-Scottish union.

In the words of Markus Friedrich, there was a "genealogical craze" in Europe from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries.⁵ In England, this was due to increased efforts to control

³ See: Richard A. McCabe, "Panegyric and Its Discontents: The First Stuart Succession," in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. Paulina Kewes and Andrew A. McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 19–36; Andrew A. McRae, "Welcoming the King: The Politics of Stuart Succession Panegyric," in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. Paulina Kewes and Andrew A. McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 186–204; Nenner, *The Right to be King*, 3–4, 16–25, 31–35, 61–62.

⁴ For example, in the proclamation of James's succession to the English throne the Tudor origin myth of the union of the houses of Lancaster and York in the Tudor bloodline was also attached to him. James made the same claim in his first speech to the English Parliament on 19 March 1604. *The Journals of the House of Commons from November the 8th 1547, in the First Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, to March the 2d 1628. In the Fourth Year of the Reign of King Charles the First* (London, 1742), 142–143. Jacobean writers simply had to point out that Margaret Tudor, James's great-grandmother, was also the product of the united Lancastrian and Yorkist bloodline, to extend the Tudor origin myth to James and present him as another Tudor monarch. For example, see: *An Excellent New Ballad, Shewing the Petigree of our Royall King James the First of that Name in England. To the Tune of, Gallants All Come Mourne with Mee* (London, 1603; STC 14423); Anthony Nixon, *Elizæes Memoriall. King James His Arrivall. And Romes Downefall* (London, 1603; STC 18586), sig. C3r; George Buck, *Δαφνις Πολυστεφανος [Daphnis Polystephanos] An Eclog Treating of Crownes, and of Garlandes, and to Whom of Right they Appertaine. Addressed, and Consecrated to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1605; STC 3996), sig. A3v.

⁵ Markus Friedrich, "Genealogy and the History of Knowledge," in *Genealogical Knowledge in the Making: Tools,*

who was classified as belonging to the noble and gentry classes.⁶ It became increasingly common for genealogies to have a judicial purpose, notably for defending succession claims, and royal genealogies began to be used more thoroughly as propaganda.⁷ As Bernard Guenée has observed, “In a time when blood is the basis of legitimacy, the power of a prince is best assured when his genealogy is most convincing.”⁸ Morgan Colman’s *Arbor Regalis* was an example of this type of genealogy, since it was created not only to show James’s illustrious ancestry, but also to defend his succession to the English throne and possibly to promote the permanent Anglo-Scottish union James so desired.

Jacobean genealogies have only recently begun to receive significant attention from scholars. Arnold Hunt, Dora Thornton, and George Dalgleish have discussed the *Lyte Pedigree* specifically, which was presented as a gift to James VI & I in 1610.⁹ They explained that the *Lyte Pedigree* represents “the idea of multiple lines of succession converging providentially on James,” and was “a formidable and sophisticated piece of propaganda designed to put James’s right to the throne beyond all reasonable doubt.”¹⁰ Sara Trevisan, meanwhile, has argued that Jacobean genealogies had another, specific purpose besides claiming that James had the most ancient and impressive lineage: “Such complex genealogical trees were used to support James’s claim to be king not only of Scotland and of England... but of a unified Britain.”¹¹ Trevisan claimed that Colman’s Jacobean genealogies “visualised the new Britishness of James’s Scottish heritage and, in the accompanying poems, the territorial implications of the Union of the Crowns.”¹²

Pre-1603

First, however, we must briefly go back to the eleventh century to understand what made St Margaret of Scotland significant. St Margaret of Scotland (c.1045–1093) was the granddaughter of Edmund Ironside, a Saxon King of England. Edmund lost most of his territory to the

Practices, and Evidence in Early Modern Europe, ed. Jost Eickmeyer, Markus Friedrich, and Volker Bauer (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), 7.

⁶ See: Stéphane Jettot and François-Joseph Ruggiu, “Cultures et pratiques généalogiques des élites anglaises (XVIe-XIXe siècle),” in *L’opération généalogique : Cultures et pratiques européennes, XV^e-XVIII^e siècle*, ed. Olivier Rouchon (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2014), 243–269.

⁷ Germain Butaud and Valérie Piétri, *Les enjeux de la généalogie (XII e-XVIII e siècles). Pouvoir et identité*. (Paris: Autrement, 2006), 22, 86.

⁸ “En un temps où le sang fonde la légitimité, le pouvoir d’un prince est d’autant plus assuré que sa généalogie est plus convaincante.” Quoted in Butaud and Piétri, *Les enjeux de la généalogie*, 76.

⁹ Arnold Hunt, Dora Thornton and George Dalgleish, “A Jacobean Antiquary Reassessed: Thomas Lyte, the Lyte Genealogy and the Lyte Jewel,” *The Antiquaries Journal* 96 (2016): 180. Thomas Lyte, *The Lyte Pedigree*, c. 1605, ink on parchment: British Library, Additional MS 48343.

¹⁰ Hunt, Thornton and Dalgleish, “A Jacobean Antiquary Reassessed,” 184.

¹¹ Sara Trevisan, “Noah, Brutus of Troy, and King James VI and I: Biblical and Mythical Ancestry in an Anonymous Genealogical Role,” in *Mythical Ancestry in World Cultures, 1400-1800*, ed. Sara Trevisan (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), 139.

¹² Sara Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2020), 232.

Danish invader, Cnut, and Margaret's father, Edward the Exile, fled abroad.¹³ In 1042, Edward the Confessor, Edmund Ironside's half-brother, succeeded to the English throne.¹⁴ Edward the Confessor had no children, so Edward the Exile returned to England; however, Edward the Exile died a few days later, leaving his children Margaret, Christina, and Edgar Ætheling.¹⁵ Edgar was suggested as a possible heir to his great-uncle, but when Edward the Confessor died in 1066 it was William the Conqueror, Duke of Normandy, who successfully seized the English throne.¹⁶ Margaret, Christina, and Edgar fled to Scotland, where Margaret married Malcolm III, King of Scots.¹⁷ Margaret, renowned for her piety and her efforts to reform the Scottish Church, was canonised by Pope Innocent IV in 1249.¹⁸ Margaret and Malcolm had eight children, the most important for this discussion being Matilda (1080–1118) and David (c.1084–1153). Matilda married Henry I of England, William the Conqueror's son, bringing Saxon blood back to the English royal line.¹⁹ David eventually succeeded to the Scottish throne and the monarchs of Scotland were descended from him.²⁰ Neither of Margaret's siblings had any children, so Margaret and her descendants were considered the senior surviving Saxon royal bloodline. According to male-preference primogeniture, David's descendants, not his older sister Matilda's, were Margaret's senior descendants.

English monarchs prior to 1603, despite being descended from the Saxon monarchs through Matilda of Scotland, simply had to accept the Norman Conquest as the starting point of their hereditary claim to the English throne if they did not want to admit that the Scottish monarchs had the senior Saxon hereditary claim through their descent from David.²¹ This is how Elizabeth I's hereditary right was represented in a genealogical book designed by Morgan Colman in 1592. Colman's book contains genealogies of the Saxon and post-Norman Conquest monarchs of England, ending with Elizabeth.²² The Saxon genealogy, which runs across multiple pages, traces the descent of the Saxon rulers of England from Egbert, "kinge of the West Saxons; and the first that reduced the whole Realme into a monarchie: & commanndinge it to be called England."²³ The Saxon genealogy ends with St Margaret of Scotland and her siblings. Colman explains that Margaret married Malcolm III, "from whom y^e

¹³ J.A. Giles, ed. and trans., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914), 105–107.

¹⁴ Giles, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 114.

¹⁵ Giles, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 132–133.

¹⁶ Giles, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 139.

¹⁷ Giles, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 142–143.

¹⁸ Catherine Keene, *Saint Margaret, Queen of the Scots: A Life in Perspective* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 119–120, 123.

¹⁹ Giles, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 175.

²⁰ Giles, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 191.

²¹ For example, Mary, Queen of Scots' descent from Edmund Ironside was used to argue that she had the senior hereditary claim to the English throne, not Elizabeth I. T.E. Hartley, ed., *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I, Volume I 1558-1581* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1981), 348.

²² Morgan Colman, *Genealogies of the Kings of England*, 1592, ink and colour illuminations on paper: Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Yale University Library, MS Osborn fa56. Another copy is BL Stowe MS 75.

²³ Yale University Library, MS Osborn fa56, fol. 7.

kinges of Scotts descend,” and the line of her descendants is shown to continue, the only Saxon line to do so—though her descendants are not included on the Saxon genealogy.²⁴

After the Saxon genealogy, there is a single-page genealogy of Elizabeth I's descent from William the Conqueror, who is shown to be the point of origin for Elizabeth's hereditary claim to the English throne. This single-page genealogy does include a marshalled coat of arms representing Henry I's marriage to Matilda of Scotland, Margaret's daughter—but Matilda and her Saxon blood go unmentioned.²⁵ This is followed by a more detailed, multi-page genealogy tracing the descent of the later English monarchs from William the Conqueror. Colman makes no attempt on this genealogy to justify William's seizure of the English throne on any grounds other than military conquest.²⁶ Colman does show that Saxon blood was reintroduced to the English royal line through the marriage of Henry I of England and Matilda of Scotland, however, represented by the same marshalled coat of arms that was included on the single-page genealogy. Matilda is described as the daughter of Malcolm III and “Margarett neiyce of kinge Edwarde the Confessore,” with a line emerging from her coat of arms that the knowledgeable reader can mentally connect to the line emerging from Margaret's coat of arms on the Saxon genealogy, thereby linking together the Saxon and the post-Norman Conquest genealogies of England's monarchs.²⁷ However, none of Colman's 1592 genealogies include the Scottish monarchs who were also descended from Margaret, thereby avoiding the implication that they were the senior hereditary claimants to the English throne through male-line descent. Elizabeth I is shown to have Saxon blood as a descendant of Matilda of Scotland, but such blood is not presented as essential to Elizabeth's right to rule, and Elizabeth's hereditary right to the English throne is ultimately shown to originate from William the Conqueror and his right of conquest; Colman explains that the post-Norman Conquest genealogy shows the “Kinges of Englande... liniallie continewed, in Blood, and discent of succession, ffrom William Duke of Normandie, (who in Anno 1066 conquered the lande) untill this present 1592.”²⁸

Post-1603

When James VI of Scotland succeeded to the English throne in 1603, everything changed. Through his descent from David I of Scotland, James could claim to be St Margaret's senior descendant and, as a result, the senior hereditary claimant to the English throne from the Saxon line. It was now possible for artists and authors to present James's claim to the English throne as coming from the hereditary right of the Saxons, rather than from the Norman right of conquest or any form of election. For example, immediately after James's accession, Sir

²⁴ Yale University Library, MS Osborn fa56, fol. 11.

²⁵ Yale University Library, MS Osborn fa56, fol. 13.

²⁶ Yale University Library, MS Osborn fa56, fol. 15.

²⁷ Yale University Library, MS Osborn fa56, fol. 16.

²⁸ Yale University Library, MS Osborn fa56, fol. 15.

Robert Cotton wrote a manuscript treatise, *A Discourse of the Discent of the King's Majesty from the Saxons* (1603), in which he claimed that James was “the unquestionable Successor in blood” to the Saxon monarchs “by Margaret the Neice and heire” of Edward the Confessor.²⁹ Cotton was an antiquarian who supported James’s claim to the English throne and his project to permanently unite England and Scotland, and used James’s Saxon descent to argue for his right to rule both nations.

James’s Saxon ancestry was also appealing to the English because, in the sixteenth century, the Saxons had come to be regarded as the ‘true’ ancestors of the English, despite their origins as Germanic invaders.³⁰ Renold Elstrack’s 1603 engraved genealogy of James VI & I’s descent is accompanied by two large text panels that may have been written by the publisher, John Speed, who was also a historian. The text celebrates the various historic marriages between the royal families of England and Scotland, and particularly praises the marriages of Matilda of Scotland with Henry I and Margaret Tudor with James IV for securing Anglo-Scottish peace. The text explains that Matilda was “daughter to Margaret queene of Scotland, who was daughter to Edward surnamed the Outlawe, nephewe to the Confessor, in whom only the English imperiall blood royall was retheyned.” The “English imperiall blood” was thus brought “again to posiese the English crown” through Matilda’s marriage with Henry I, “and so consequently [she] was the mother of all the English kings since succeeding.”³¹ The text does not mention that Scotland’s monarchs were also descended from St Margaret, evidently not wishing to raise the issue of which line had the senior Saxon hereditary claim to the English throne. The intention was simply to celebrate the post-Norman Conquest monarchs of England having Saxon, here described as “English”, blood.

Another writer to celebrate James’s Saxon descent was Richard Verstegan, an English Catholic who published accounts of the executions of his fellow Catholics in England, most famously the *Theatrum Crudelitatum Hæreticorum Nostri Temporis* (Antwerp, 1587).³² Verstegan also wrote an influential book about the Saxons. According to Graham Parry, Verstegan’s *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities, Concerning the Most Noble and Renowned English Nation* (Antwerp, 1605) “reinforced the impression that the Saxons were much more significant than the Romans in the formation of the institutions, religious centres and even the character of the English. And, of course, Anglo-Saxon was the immediate ancestor of the English language.”³³

²⁹ Robert Cotton, “A Discourse of the Discent of the King’s Majesty from the Saxons,” TNA SP 14/1/3. Calendared in: Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of James I, 1603–1610* (London, 1857), 1.

³⁰ See: Elizabeth Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England: Laurence Nowell, William Lambarde and the Study of Old English* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2012).

³¹ Renold Elstrack (engraver) and John Speed (publisher), *The Most Happy Unions Contracted Betwixt the Princes of the Blood Royall of Theis Towe Famous Kingdomes of England & Scotland*, 1603, engraving on paper. British Museum 1856,0614.149.

³² Paul Arblaster, “Verstegan [formerly Rowlands], Richard (1548x50-1640),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/24217.

³³ Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University

Verstegan dedicated this work to James because “your Majestie is descended out of the chiefest blood royall of our ancient English-Saxon kings.”³⁴ This further emphasised the importance of the Saxons. Verstegan found that the English

cannot directly tel from whence Englishmen are descended, and chancing to speak of the Saxons, do rather seem to understand them for a kynd of forreyn people, then as their own true and meer anceters ... for Englishmen cannot but from Saxon originall deryve their descent and offspring ... and therefore are the more in honor obliged to know and acknowledge such their own honorable and true descent.³⁵

Celebrating James's Saxon royal blood was a means of asserting that he was not only England's rightful monarch with the most ancient royal blood, but also an Englishman himself, despite his Scottish birth.

Sir George Buck, a historian, diplomat, and James's master of the revels, is best known for his revisionist history of Richard III. Buck's first published work was Δαφνις Πολυστεφανος [*Daphnis Polystephanos*] *An Eclog Treating of Crownes, and of Garlandes, and to Whom of Right they Appertaine. Addressed, and Consecrated to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1605).³⁶ In it, Buck outright denied the legitimacy of the Norman Conquest, choosing not to trace James's descent from William the Conqueror because William had “no title to the Crowne but violence, and his sword as he confessed, and thereof had remorse of conscience at his death.”³⁷ Buck also claimed that it was the descent of later English monarchs from St Margaret of Scotland through her daughter Matilda that legitimised their right to rule, and included a genealogy in his book to explain the Saxon ancestry of England's post-Norman Conquest monarchs.³⁸ Buck, however, did not conclude that Margaret's male-line descendants, the Scottish monarchs, had the superior hereditary right to the English throne. On the contrary, Buck argued that the Saxon blood that the English monarchs inherited from Matilda was enough to legitimise their right to rule and described Matilda's grandson, Henry II, as the rightful king of England due to his Saxon descent.³⁹ Because English writers did not want to deny the legitimacy of every single post-Norman Conquest English monarch before James, they were forced to accept the Norman Conquest as the starting point for the line of England's monarchs continuing down to Elizabeth I, with the ‘added bonus’ of Saxon blood from

Press, 1995), 3–4. See also: Christopher Highley, *Catholic Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 108–116.

³⁴ Richard Verstegan, *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities, Concerning the Most Noble and Renowned English Nation* (Antwerp, 1605; STC 21361), sig. 2r.

³⁵ Verstegan, *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*, sigs. 4v–5r.

³⁶ Arthur Kincaid, “Buck [Buc], Sir George (bap. 1560, d. 1622),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/3821.

³⁷ Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos*, sig. B3r.

³⁸ Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos*, sig. B3v. The genealogy is in the dedicatory epistle.

³⁹ Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos*, sig. B3v.

Matilda.⁴⁰

It took a Scot to make the bold step of claiming that Scotland's monarchs had always been the true hereditary claimants to the English throne. Thomas Craig was a prominent Edinburgh lawyer who served on James's Anglo-Scottish Union Commission. In a succession treatise written just prior to Elizabeth I's death, Craig argued that if historic claims "continue always valid and effectual ... the right and title to the Kingdom [of England] was devolv'd to the King of Scots by that marriage with Margaret the Sister of Edgar Etheling."⁴¹ James had an even greater claim to the English throne than his senior descent from Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, Craig argued, "for that, as being most Ancient, he having Right even from before the Conqueror," due to his descent from the Saxon monarchs through Margaret.⁴² Craig, like most authors who wrote succession treatises in the final years of Elizabeth I's reign, was responding to Robert Parsons's *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inland* (1595). Parsons argued that James's hereditary claim to the English throne as a descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York was inferior to the hereditary claim of Philip II of Spain and his descendants, who Parsons argued were the senior descendants of Edward III.⁴³ Craig's argument that James had an even older and greater hereditary claim to the English throne from his Saxon descent was a way of countering Parsons's argument.

After James's accession to the English throne, as the idea of a permanent Anglo-Scottish union was being debated, Craig wrote a union treatise in which he reaffirmed that the Saxon hereditary claim to the English throne was the "legal right" that had remained "latent" in the centuries that followed, and that William the Conqueror's descendants had ruled "to the exclusion of the rightful heirs to the English crown." James, as Margaret's senior descendant, was "the only and rightful heir of the English line."⁴⁴ Craig argued that James was the rightful hereditary claimant to the English throne from the ancient British, Saxon, and Norman lines, and therefore concluded that the English

should not fail to embrace the present union, and to settle it firm and inviolable. For by it not only is the union of England and Scotland secured, but the flaws in the Saxon and Norman titles are made good, and England's mighty kingdom passes rightfully and

⁴⁰ Edward Ayscu, while accepting that Edgar Ætheling had the superior hereditary right to the English throne, argued that William the Conqueror was "by generall consent and applause of the whole Nation lawfully established in that Throne," meaning that he was a legitimately elected monarch. Ayscu, however, was still pleased to state that when Henry II succeeded, "the crowne of *England* was restored to the *Saxon* blood," which Henry had inherited from his great-grandmother, St Margaret of Scotland. Edward Ayscu, *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Between England and Scotland* (London, 1607; *STC* 1014), 23, 27, 57.

⁴¹ Thomas Craig, *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England* (London, 1703; *ESTC* T144321), 369.

⁴² Craig, *Right of Succession*, 338.

⁴³ Robert Parsons, *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inland* (1595; *STC* 19398), pt. 2, 6–9, 41–49, 52–53, 110–111.

⁴⁴ Thomas Craig, *De Unione Regnorum Britannia Tractatus by Sir Thomas Craig*, ed. C. Sanford Terry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1909), 267.

peacefully to its lawful prince and heir.⁴⁵

Craig claimed that James's hereditary right was an appropriate basis for a permanent union of England and Scotland, an argument that James himself also made. Craig's two treatises, however, were only available in manuscript form in the seventeenth century and, combined with the fact they were written in Latin, could only reach a limited audience.

Some English writers took the significance of James's Saxon descent one step further, based on the (incorrect) claim that the Saxon monarchs of England had ruled Britain in its entirety. Their evidence for this assertion was drawn from various medieval documents that called the Saxon monarchs some variation of "Rex Britanniaë."⁴⁶ According to Cotton, James could "deduce" from his Saxon blood "the stile of kinge of Brittainne," which "the Conquerour properlie cold not." Cotton argued that James's "just lawfull lineall & undoubted titles" vindicated him if he wanted to adopt the title 'King of Great Britain' and permanently unite England and Scotland together.⁴⁷ Buck also argued that Britain had been united under the rule of the Saxon monarchs, while William the Conqueror "was never possessed of the one halfe of Brittain, for hee had neither Scotland, nor Wales, and in Ireland he not one foote," with such evidence demonstrating the illegitimacy of his reign. According to Buck, Henry II, Margaret's great-grandson, restored the Saxon line to the English throne and made England, Scotland and Wales obedient to him, "which they owed to the British, & Saxon kings his pro genitors."⁴⁸ Thus, James's Saxon heritage legitimised and provided a precedent for his project to permanently unite England and Scotland; Britain had previously been united under the Saxon monarchs, these writers claimed, so it should be united once more. As Alan MacColl has explained, there were competing definitions of 'Britain' in the medieval and early modern period: the term could refer to "England, or England and Wales, to the exclusion or subordination of Scotland," "the southern part of the whole island... geographically separate from its northern neighbor," or "the Scottish conception, emerging in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, of a larger British polity in which England and Scotland are equal participants."⁴⁹ These Jacobean works, however, were all using the term 'Britain' to refer to the island in its entirety, which they claimed had been previously united under the Saxon monarchs, providing a precedent for their union under James VI & I.

⁴⁵ Craig, *De Unione*, 444.

⁴⁶ Buck took his evidence from "ancient records and charters of donations of these kings to Monasteries, and to Cathedrall Churches, and in other ancient monuments." Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos*, sig. B4r. John Speed used "a Saxon Charter made by King Edgar." John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045), 161–162. See also: Sir Henry Savile, "Historicall Collections," in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, ed. Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1985), 210–211.

⁴⁷ Cotton, "A Discourse of the Discent of the King's Majesty from the Saxons," TNA SP 14/1/3.

⁴⁸ Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos*, sig. B3r–B3v.

⁴⁹ Alan MacColl, "The Meaning of 'Britain' in Medieval and Early Modern England," *Journal of British Studies* 45, no. 2 (2006): 269.

The claim that Britain had been previously united under the Saxon monarchs (or at any other point in history, such as under the mythical figures of Brutus and King Arthur) was already disputed by the Jacobean period.⁵⁰ These examples show, however, that arguments about James's Saxon ancestry were not merely attempts to flatter James with the most ancient and impressive lineage, but also contributed to contemporary debates about whether England and Scotland should be permanently united together as Great Britain. Therefore, when we study Morgan Colman's *Arbor Regalis*, we must also consider how it might have contributed to the contemporary union debates.

Morgan Colman's *Arbor Regalis*

Morgan Colman's impressive genealogy, *Arbor Regalis* (or *Arbor Royall* on the English copy), traces the descent of both James VI & I and his wife, Anna of Denmark, from various European princely houses. The genealogy is illuminated and decorated with numerous coats of arms. At least three copies have survived.⁵¹ Trevisan identifies the British Library and College of Arms copies as the products of the same hand, and all three copies are signed by Colman.⁵² The Bodleian Library copy is of superior artistic quality, so it is possible that Colman had assistance producing, or worked harder on, this copy.⁵³ The British Library and Bodleian Library copies are both in Latin, while the College of Arms copy is in English. The central genealogy in all three versions is identical. They are elaborate and impressive works: the Bodleian Library copy is 7 feet 1½ inches high and 3 feet 10 inches wide (about 217cm by 117 cm).⁵⁴

Colman was released from the Fleet in August 1604 after three years of imprisonment (a brief biography of Colman is provided in the Appendix), so this was likely the earliest date at which he could begin working on the genealogy.⁵⁵ The three known surviving copies of the genealogy are all dated 24 March 1604, with the College of Arms copy stating that this was the

⁵⁰ See: John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics, 1603–1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 115–117; Roger A. Mason, “Scotching the Brut: Politics, History and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Britain,” in *Scotland and England, 1286–1815*, ed. Roger A. Mason (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1987), 60–76; Philip Mark Robinson-Self, *Early Modern Britain's Relationship to Its Past: The Historiographical Fortunes of the Legends of Brute, Albina, and Scota* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2019), 33–61; D.R. Woolf, “The Sense of the Past,” in *A Companion to Tudor Britain*, ed. Robert Tittler and Norman Jones (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 408–410.

⁵¹ Morgan Colman, *Arbor Regalis* or *Arbor Royall*, dated 1604: Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I (illuminated parchment roll mounted on canvas); BL Add. MS 17970 (illuminated vellum roll); College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18 (illuminated vellum roll).

⁵² Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare*, 223; Falconer Madan, ed., *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 5:379.

⁵³ For example, the crowns, flowers and leaves on the Bodleian Library copy are more detailed and better rendered and shaded than those on the College of Arms copy.

⁵⁴ Madan, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, 5:379.

⁵⁵ Warrant for release on bond of Morgan Colman, prisoner in the Fleet for debt, 8 August 1604. *CSP Domestic, James I, 1603–1610*, 140.

date when the genealogy “was fully finished.”⁵⁶ This dating is representative of the Old Style of dating used in England (and by Colman in his correspondence) at the time, when the New Year began on 25 March; therefore, the date Colman claimed to have completed his genealogy was actually 24 March 1605. From this evidence, historians can confidently date the creation of the initial genealogy to the period between August 1604 and March 1605. It is likely that Colman then made copies of that initial genealogy and wrote the same date on them, rather than creating at least three copies of the genealogy simultaneously and completing them on the same date, which seems unlikely.

There is internal evidence that the College of Arms copy, which is in English, was created first. On this copy, Colman has awkwardly added another roundel in the limited available space for James and Anna’s daughter Mary, born on 8 April 1605, after he had already completed the genealogy. By doing this, Colman has broken the symmetry of the roundels representing James and Anna’s children and has not had room to include Mary’s coat of arms, as he has for Mary’s three surviving siblings. By contrast, on the Bodleian Library copy of the genealogy Colman has changed his design to properly incorporate a roundel for Mary (though she still does not have a coat of arms, as Colman appears to have wanted to leave the heir to the throne, Prince Henry, at the centre with his siblings Charles and Elizabeth on either side for symmetry, which would not be possible with four large roundels with coats of arms), as well as including another roundel opposite Mary’s for the sake of symmetry, which has been left blank. This suggests that the College of Arms copy was created first, with the Bodleian Library copy being made after Mary’s birth but before the birth of James and Anna’s youngest child, Sophia, on 22 June 1606, who could have been included in the blank roundel or, considering that she only survived for one day, could have been included with James and Anna’s previously deceased children (Margaret and Robert) in the roundel attached to the branch growing below James and Anna’s roundels. This suggests that Sophia had not been born yet when Colman completed the Bodleian Library copy of the genealogy.⁵⁷ The Bodleian Library copy must, therefore, have been created between May 1605 and June 1606.

There is no conclusive evidence that *Arbor Regalis* was a royal commission. When Colman adapted *Arbor Regalis* for an engraving, published in 1608, he dedicated it to “the most immortal memory” of James VI & I and Anna of Denmark’s “most Princely goodness, and royal munificence graciously extended towards him.”⁵⁸ It is possible to interpret this dedication

⁵⁶ College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18. The Bodleian Library copy is damaged in this area, so it is only possible to read “... quarto die Martij, Anno Christi, Millesimo, sex centesimo, quarto” (...4 March 1604), which, corroborated by the other surviving copies, evidently originally read 24 March 1604: Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I. Information on the British Library copy is taken from Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare*, 223.

⁵⁷ On the 1608 engraved copy of the genealogy, Colman has put all of James and Anna’s deceased children (Margaret, Robert, Mary and Sophia) in the same roundel attached to the branch growing below James and Anna’s roundels, which is only occupied by Margaret and Robert on the Bodleian Library and College of Arms manuscript copies of the genealogy. Morgan Colman, genealogy of James VI & I and Anna of Denmark, dated 1608, engraving on paper. BL General Reference Collection 604.I.5.

⁵⁸ BL General Reference Collection 604.I.5.

as evidence that *Arbor Regalis* was a royal commission, with Colman now thanking the couple for their earlier patronage. Trevisan, however, interprets it as evidence that Colman created the genealogy of his own initiative and was rewarded for it when he presented it to James, as Thomas Lyte was for his *Pedigree*.⁵⁹ Given that at least three copies of *Arbor Regalis* have survived, it is also possible that Colman created an initial copy of the genealogy to try and gain financial reward and royal patronage, then James (and/or Anna) commissioned further copies from Colman because he (or they/she) approved of the genealogy and the messages it conveys about hereditary right and Anglo-Scottish union. The date of completion Colman has written on the genealogy, the last day before the (Old Style) New Year, might be interpreted as evidence that he was working to a deadline set by a patron, though this, of course, is only supposition.

One of the three known surviving copies of *Arbor Regalis* was specifically made for Anna of Denmark. The Bodleian Library copy of the genealogy differs from the British Library and College of Arms copies because it has columns on the left and right sides that contain the coats of arms of important royal women: English and Scottish on the left, Danish and German on the right. The Latin text at the bottom of the genealogy informs us that these women were “heroines” who are “presented in order to perfectly instruct.”⁶⁰ This is conclusive evidence that this copy of the genealogy was produced for, and possibly commissioned by, Anna of Denmark, as she was queen consort of England and Scotland and descended from Danish and German royalty. These royal women were perfectly chosen models for her to emulate.⁶¹ The genealogy may have been on display at one of Anna’s residences, though it cannot be identified in surviving published inventories.⁶²

⁵⁹ Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare*, 228.

⁶⁰ “Heroinæ hæ (quarum insignia cum in utroqi latere, tum etiam in medio depicta funi) quæ & quales fuerint, lemmatum quæ singulis subnectuntur perfectio edocebit.” Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I.

⁶¹ There are also two more coats of arms belonging to royal women added to the Bodleian Library copy of *Arbor Regalis*. At the centre of the genealogy, above the arms of William the Conqueror, are the arms of Urraca of Portugal, Queen of León (1148-1211), and Violant of Aragon, Queen of Castile and León (1236-1301). The reason for their inclusion is less clear, but it was possibly to affirm the dynastic connections between the monarchs of England and Spain soon after the Treaty of London (1604) established peace between the two kingdoms. Philip III of Spain and James VI & I were both descended from Urraca and Violant. James was descended from Urraca through Eleanor of Castile (1241-1290), the wife of Edward I (with their marriage represented on Colman’s genealogy by a branch that emerges from the royal line of Castile and León and merges with Edward I’s roundel) and from Violant through Isabella of Castile (1355-1392), the wife of Edmund of Langley, 1st Duke of York (with their marriage represented on Colman’s genealogy by the royal line of Castile and León merging with Edmund of Langley’s roundel, since the Castilian crown passed to Isabella’s half-uncle and his descendants when her father was murdered in 1369). They might also have been included to highlight the precedent provided by Spain (made up of the kingdoms of Castile, Aragon and León, as well as being in a personal union with the kingdom of Portugal at this time) for a union of kingdoms. Anna herself was interested in her familial relationship to the Habsburg dynasty. See: Jemma Field, *Anna of Denmark: The Material and Visual Culture of the Stuart Courts, 1589–1619* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), 140–141.

⁶² Three inventories were taken of Anna of Denmark’s possessions at Oatlands Palace, in 1616, 1617 and 1618, which are included as online appendixes to Wendy Hitchmough, “‘Setting’ the Stuart Court: Placing Portraits in the ‘Performance’ of Anglo-Spanish Negotiations,” *Journal of the History of Collections* 32, no. 2 (2020),

Morgan Colman's *Arbor Regalis* and Hereditary Right: St Margaret of Scotland and Malcolm III

James VI & I's descent from St Margaret of Scotland and the Saxon monarchs of England is clearly represented on *Arbor Regalis*. The genealogy's lines of descent take the form of trees, the family tree being a visual format for genealogies that assumed its "canonical form" in the fifteenth century when, in the words of Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "the founding ancestor of a given lineage was normally ensconced in the roots or trunk of a tree, with his descendants scattered among branches reaching to the sky."⁶³ *Arbor Regalis* is distinctive, however, for having not one but two contemporary subjects, James and Anna, whose (largely separate) family lines are represented, and for having not one but eighteen trees growing from the bottom of the genealogy. Despite showing eighteen lines of descent, the genealogy still prioritises a specific 'founding ancestor'—or, in this case, two founding ancestors. Most of the trees begin to grow from the same ground level near the bottom of the genealogy. The only trees that continue further down the page, below that ground level, are the two princely lines that grow from the marriage of St Margaret and Malcolm III: England and Scotland. Margaret and Malcolm are the focus of the genealogy and their marriage makes the genealogy's political arguments possible.

Henry I of England is the final figure of the English royal line above the main ground level where most of the trees originate. To trace the English royal line beyond that ground level to Margaret meant tracing the ancestry of Henry's wife, Matilda of Scotland, rather than Henry himself. As a result of this decision, William the Conqueror, Henry's father, is not included in the line of England's monarchs, and thus the hereditary right of England's monarchs is not represented as originating from him. William the Conqueror is entirely absent from the British Library and College of Arms copies of the genealogy. William the Conqueror's coat of arms is shown on the Bodleian Library copy of the genealogy, which differs slightly from the other two surviving copies, but the coat of arms floats in the middle of the genealogy on its own, disconnected from any royal lines. He is described as "Conqueror and King of England" and his arms are surmounted by a crown. All three copies of the genealogy make clear to the viewer that William was not the source of any hereditary right to the English throne, but an anomaly who could be removed from the line of England's monarchs. This contrasts with Colman's 1592 genealogies, which show Elizabeth I's hereditary right to the English throne originating from William the Conqueror and his right of conquest,

doi:10.1093/jhc/fhz004. For inventories of Anna's London residence, Denmark House (i.e. Somerset House), see: M.T.W. Payne, "An inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark's 'ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcells' at Denmark House, 1619," *Journal of the History of Collections* 13, no. 1 (2001): 23–44; and Oliver Millar, ed., "The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods, 1649-1651," *Walpole Society* 43 (1970-1972): 73–136.

⁶³ Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "The Genesis of the Family Tree," *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance* 4 (1991): 105–106.

even if she did have Saxon blood from Matilda of Scotland. Now that James was on the English throne, it was possible to ignore William and his conquest and trace James's hereditary right back to the Saxon monarchs of England instead.

On *Arbor Regalis*, Colman has marshalled the arms of Henry I and Matilda of Scotland together, demonstrating Matilda's importance as the ancestor of England's later monarchs. These are Matilda's arms, not those of her husband, although Henry's name is given first in the roundel below the arms on the three manuscript copies of the genealogy. This is in sharp contrast to the seventeen other rulers on the same row as Henry above the main ground level, all males, who act as the starting points of their princely lines (with the exception of David I of Scotland, whose line continues below that ground level) and whose coats of arms are not marshalled with those of their wives. Colman has made it clear to the viewer that Matilda, as the daughter of Margaret, was the only source of any hereditary right to the English throne claimed by the English monarchs who were descended from her. They could not claim any hereditary right through their descent from William the Conqueror.

Colman's genealogy, therefore, suggests that conquest could not be a legitimate starting point for a hereditary monarchy; as such, it was necessary to look elsewhere to justify the right to rule of the post-Norman Conquest English monarchs. This was the same argument that Buck, among others, had made when he celebrated the re-introduction of Saxon blood into the English royal line through Matilda of Scotland. Colman's genealogy asserts that the post-Norman Conquest English monarchs continued to rule by hereditary right, due to their descent from Matilda, even if Matilda was not the senior Saxon claimant. This was an awkward argument to make, but it was necessary in order to deny that England's monarchs ruled by right of conquest—or that every single English monarch from William the Conqueror had no right to rule at all. Colman's genealogy presents the English succession as having always operated according to hereditary right, which is why the English royal line is traced from the Saxons through Matilda, not from William the Conqueror.

The marriage of St Margaret and Malcolm III of Scotland—represented by their marshalled coats of arms (the Saxon and Scottish royal arms) at the centre bottom of the genealogy—is the central focus of Colman's *Arbor Regalis* and the basis of subsequent political arguments that can be drawn from it. The main purpose of *Arbor Regalis* is to demonstrate that James VI & I was the true and unchallengeable heir to both the English and Scottish thrones through his descent from Margaret and Malcolm. The text at the bottom of the genealogy states that Malcolm, “by marieng with St Margaret (sister and heire of Edgar Etheling) should by right of inheritance (at ye time of ye Norman Conquest) have possessed ye Crowne of England.”⁶⁴ It then claims that England and Scotland were separated between Margaret and Malcolm's descendants (through Matilda and David), until the two branches were reunited

⁶⁴ College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18. The Latin version makes the same claim: “MALCOLMUM. 3^{um}: iure' matrimonii contracti cum S^{ta}: MARGARETA, sorore & hærede Edgari Ethalingij, tempore invasionis (vulgo conquestæ) Normannicæ, debuisse' Angliæ regnum possedissee.” Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I.

through the marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV of Scotland (whose great-grandson was James VI & I).⁶⁵ James's succession to the thrones of England and Scotland is presented as achieving the union of the crowns that should have occurred through the marriage of Margaret and Malcolm, the rightful hereditary claimants to the thrones of England and Scotland, respectively, but had been prevented by the Norman Conquest.

To make clear that James was the true hereditary claimant to the throne of England by virtue of his Saxon descent, the Saxon coat of arms has been superimposed over James's regular coat of arms at the top of the genealogy as an inescutcheon. No other English monarch, from William the Conqueror to Elizabeth I, is shown with the addition of the Saxon coat of arms, demonstrating that James, as Margaret's senior descendant, was the only monarch with the right to claim such ancestry.⁶⁶ By doing this, the genealogy shows that James's hereditary right to the English throne was superior to that of any English monarch since the Norman Conquest. James had the oldest, and therefore strongest, claim to the English throne, because his coat of arms includes not only the three lions of the Plantagenet monarchs of England, but also the more ancient Saxon arms attributed to Margaret and her Saxon ancestors at the bottom of the genealogy.⁶⁷ The previous English monarchs might have possessed Saxon blood through their descent from Matilda of Scotland (from whom James was also descended through Margaret Tudor), but only James could claim to be Margaret's senior descendant and heir to the Saxon monarchs of England through Margaret's son, David. Colman has also added the Saxon coat of arms as an inescutcheon to the arms of James's

⁶⁵ The English version states: "yt ye braunch issuing from them w^{ch} devides, and perceth ye earth carye upp ye descentes of England, and Scotland, and rejoyns againe in King James ye 4:th and Queene Margaret his wife (eldest daughter of Henry ye 7: King of England:)." College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18. The Latin version states: "Atque ramum ab ipsius germinantem, divisum postea, ac terram transfigentem, propagine, Angliæ, & Scotiæ suffulcire, necnon in Rege JACOBO 4, & Regina MARGARETA (eius coniuge filia HENRICI 7^{um}: Regis natu maxima) reuniri." Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I.

⁶⁶ The Saxon coat of arms is also represented on the two successive great seals James used as king of England. On the obverse of both great seals, James is shown enthroned and flanked on either side by his own coat of arms, quartering the arms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Below the coat of arms on James's left is a crowned lion, the heraldic supporter of England, bearing a banner with the arms of Cadwaladr, last king of the Britons. Below the coat of arms to James's right is a unicorn, the heraldic supporter of Scotland, bearing the banner of Edward the Confessor. This banner is the Saxon coat of arms that was also attributed to St Margaret of Scotland, so the decision to have the Scottish unicorn bearing the Saxon arms may have been a reference to James's claim to be the senior descendant of the Saxon royal line through his Scottish ancestry. In the words of Paul Dryburgh, James's great seal "is a highly nuanced portrayal of the union of the crowns of England and Scotland and the fusing of national imagery inherent in the person of a king of both realms." Paul Dryburgh, *Royal Seals: The National Archives: Images of Power and Majesty* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword History, 2020), 82.

⁶⁷ The various Saxon coats of arms were not contemporary with the Saxon themselves, being later inventions. The basic features of the Saxon coats of arms shown on Colman's genealogy are an azure (blue) shield and a gold *cross fleury*. Edward the Elder's coat of arms has the addition of four gold crowns. St Margaret's coat of arms and the Saxon coat of arms superimposed over James VI & I's regular coat of arms include five gold *martlets* (martins)—known as the arms of Edward the Confessor (and seemingly based on examples of Edward's coinage). See: R.H.M. Dolley and F. Elmore Jones, "A new suggestion concerning the so-called 'martlets' in the 'Arms of St Edward'," in *Anglo-Saxon Coins*, ed. R.H.M. Dolley (London: Methuen & Co., 1961), 215–226.

children, Henry, Charles and Elizabeth, thereby showing that they had also inherited the Saxon hereditary right to the English throne from their father, and so the succession to the English throne would continue to operate on the basis of superior hereditary right.

Morgan Colman's *Arbor Regalis* and Hereditary Right: Alpin, King of Scots, and Egbert, King of Wessex

Colman's genealogy not only traces James's descent from St Margaret and Malcolm III, but also goes further back by tracing Margaret and Malcolm's respective ancestries. Colman traces Margaret's descent from Egbert, King of Wessex, and Malcolm's descent from Alpin, King of the Scots. The text above these two men tells us that this is where Colman begins to trace the pedigrees of the kings of England and Scotland, respectively.⁶⁸ So why choose Alpin and Egbert as the genealogy's starting points?

At the start of the ninth century, the territory that we now recognise as Scotland was divided between the Kingdom of the Picts and the Kingdom of the Scots. According to medieval and early modern Scottish historians, Alpin succeeded as King of the Scots in 831, but also claimed to be rightful King of the Picts through the hereditary right he inherited from his mother. The Picts refused to acknowledge Alpin as their king, and after unsuccessfully waging war against them, Alpin was captured and executed. Alpin's son, Kenneth, succeeded as King of the Scots, then successfully defeated the Picts, conquering their realm and becoming the first king to rule all Scotland.⁶⁹ This was the beginning of the kingdom of Scotland.

Colman begins his line of the "Kings of Scotland" in 831, the year Alpin succeeded as King of the Scots, though he did not rule over the Picts at the time of his accession. On the English version of the genealogy, Colman describes Alpin as "King of Scotland" in his roundel and in the paragraph of text at the bottom.⁷⁰ On the Bodleian Library's Latin copy of the genealogy, Colman does not describe Alpin as "King of Scotland" in his roundel; however, Colman does describe him as "Rege Scotiæ" (King of Scotland) in the paragraph of text at the bottom.⁷¹ Colman presents Alpin as the first King of Scotland, even if contemporary historians reserved that distinction for Alpin's son, Kenneth. Alpin was said to have had the hereditary right to rule both the Scots and the Picts, and this was the basis of his descendants' claim to have the right to rule all Scotland. This might be why Colman begins the line of Scotland's

⁶⁸ College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18: above Alpin, the text reads "Kings of Scotland, from y^e yeare of Christ 831"; above Egbert, the text reads "Kings of England, from ye yeare of Christ 801." Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I: above Alpin, the text reads "Stemma Regum Scotiæ, ab Anno Christi 831"; above Egbert, the text reads "Stemma Regum Anglia, ab Anno à Christo . . . 801."

⁶⁹ For example, see: John of Fordun and Walter Bower, *Scoticronicon cum Supplementis et Continuatione* (Edinburgh, 1759), 1:177–186; Stephanie Malone Thorson, "Adam Abell's *The Roit of Qubeill of Tyme*: An Edition" (PhD thesis, University of St. Andrews, 1998), 120–122; Hector Boece, *The History and Chronicles of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1821), 2:145–152; George Buchanan, *The History of Scotland, Translated from the Latin* (Edinburgh, 1827), 1:272–273.

⁷⁰ College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18.

⁷¹ Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I.

monarchs with Alpin and gives him the title “King of Scotland,” since he claimed to have the *de jure* hereditary right to rule all Scotland, even if he did not rule it *de facto*.

Egbert, King of Wessex (or King of the West Saxons), was considered to be “the first English monarch” and the “first sole and absolute monarch of the English-men” by many medieval and early modern English historians.⁷² This was because he united the Heptarchy of Saxon kingdoms when he “assailed and subdued the *Mercians*, the *Northumbers*; the *Kentish* and the *East Saxons*.”⁷³ In 819, Egbert was crowned and issued an edict to change the name of his kingdom to “Angle-land,” or England.⁷⁴ Not all Jacobean historians believed that Egbert had united England as a single kingdom, and his achievement did not last beyond his lifetime.⁷⁵ Modern scholars do not consider Egbert to be the first King of England—Egbert’s 3x-great-grandson, Æthelstan, has that honour.⁷⁶ Colman, however, chose to follow those contemporary historians who did think Egbert was the first King of England.

There are multiple possible explanations for why Colman chose to represent Egbert as the first King of England. The simplest explanation is that the text(s) Colman used as his source(s) did so and he followed their interpretation. Colman had already claimed that Egbert was the first King of England in his 1592 royal genealogy, so nothing he read in the meantime had changed his mind. Colman also might have chosen to represent Egbert as the first King of England in order to make the kingdom of England a similar age—and slightly older—than the kingdom of Scotland, as to begin with Æthelstan would mean accepting that the kingdom of Scotland was almost a century older than the kingdom of England, and feelings of national pride (and English superiority) would be hurt. Another possible explanation is that beginning with Egbert meant that an equal number of English and Scottish ancestors could be represented on either side of the genealogy leading up to Margaret and Malcolm, creating visual symmetry, while beginning with Æthelstan would mean representing significantly fewer ancestors on the English side.

Colman also would have faced a genealogical problem if he had represented Æthelstan as the first King of England on *Arbor Regalis*: Margaret was not descended from Æthelstan, as she was a descendant of his half-brother, Edmund I. Only Margaret’s direct line of male ancestors is represented on the genealogy, so Æthelstan and many other Saxon monarchs are

⁷² Quotes taken from John Clapham, *The Historie of Great Britannie* (London, 1606; *STC* 5348), 280, 291. See also: Anonymous, “A Treatise about the Union of England and Scotland,” in *The Jacobean Union*, 65. For earlier examples, see: Thomas Forester, ed. and trans., *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon* (London, 1853), 141–143; Raphael Holinshed, *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande and Ireland* (London, 1577; *STC* 13568.5), 203–204.

⁷³ Quote taken from Speed, *The History of Great Britaine*, 348.

⁷⁴ Clapham, *The Historie of Great Britannie*, 296; Speed, *The History of Great Britaine*, 160, 349.

⁷⁵ D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and ‘The Light of Truth’ from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 58, 95–96.

⁷⁶ See: Olivier de Laborderie, “The First King of England? Egbert and the Foundations of Royal Legitimacy in Thirteenth-Century Historiography,” in *The Image and Perception of Monarchy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Sean McGlynn and Elena Woodacre (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 70–83.

excluded. As such, it was not possible for Colman to represent Æthelstan as the first King of England while only showing Margaret's direct line of ancestry. Meanwhile Egbert, Margaret's 7x-great-grandfather, could be represented as both the first King of England and as an ancestor of Margaret. This made Egbert a much more suitable choice than Æthelstan as the origin of the line of England's monarchs on Colman's genealogy.

Colman begins his line of the "Kings of England" in 801, the year Egbert was thought to have succeeded as King of Wessex.⁷⁷ On the English version of the genealogy, Colman describes Egbert as King of England in his roundel and in the paragraph of text at the bottom.⁷⁸ On the Bodleian Library's Latin version of the genealogy and the 1608 engraved version, Colman does not describe Egbert as King of England in his roundel, but as "King of the West Saxons" (his original title); however, Colman does describe Egbert as "Angliæ Rege" (King of England) in the paragraph of text at the bottom of the Bodleian Library copy.⁷⁹ Colman recognised Egbert as the first king of a united England, ruling over the newly-named 'English' people.

Colman's genealogy asserts that prior to the reigns of Alpin and Egbert, the kingdoms of England and Scotland did not exist. It was only with their reigns that the kingdoms either came into being (England) or first had a legitimate basis for existing (Scotland). The genealogy thus tells us the story of the creation of the kingdoms of England and Scotland and shows the viewer that James VI & I's hereditary right to rule both countries dated all the way back to their very foundations. There could be no stronger hereditary claim to either throne than that. Colman's genealogy identifies the histories of England and Scotland with the histories of their respective monarchies and royal lines, which now converged in the same person.⁸⁰

The format of a genealogy allowed royal succession to be simplified to a purely hereditary process, ignoring any suggestions of election or nomination because the viewer was only shown the familial relationship within a line of monarchs. This was important in a Scottish context, because George Buchanan's influential history of Scotland, *Rerum Scotticarum Historia* (Edinburgh, 1582), argued that Scotland's monarchy had always been elective rather than strictly hereditary, and thus the people of Scotland had the authority to depose unsatisfactory monarchs. James was adamantly against this argument, outlawing Buchanan's history in 1584 and denying the right of subjects to depose their monarchs in his own works.⁸¹ This was also important in an English context, because James did not want to be considered an

⁷⁷ There was debate over whether Egbert succeeded in 801 or 802; John Speed listed both years and his sources. Speed, *The History of Great Britaine*, 348.

⁷⁸ College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18.

⁷⁹ On the Bodleian Library copy, Colman calls Egbert "Rex Saxonum Orientalium" (King of the East Saxons), but this is obviously just a mistake, as on the engraved version, Colman correctly describes him as "Egbert King of the West Saxons." Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I; BL General Reference Collection 604.I.5.

⁸⁰ Butaud and Piétri identify the same process first taking place in late medieval and early modern France. Butaud and Piétri, *Les enjeux de la généalogie*, 69–70.

⁸¹ See: Roger A. Mason, *Kingship and the Commonweal: Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland* (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), 181–185, 191–194.

elected monarch, a status he considered inferior to a monarch who ruled by hereditary right and a possible means of limiting his royal authority.⁸² For example, when the English Parliament of 1614 was discussing whether the king had the power to impose subsidies, Sir Henry Wotton argued in James's favour on the grounds that there was a difference between "elective and successive kings, affirming that kings elective could not impose of their own authority because they come in by the will of the people and the prince has his dependence on them; but successive, their power is greater because they come to the crown by a hereditary right and freer title."⁸³ According to the Venetian ambassador, it was pointed out in response that James could be considered both a hereditary and an elective monarch, "because in passing from Scotland to England he was called and to some extent chosen, and the succession also belonged to him by blood."⁸⁴ This was not what James wanted to hear, as to argue that he was an elected monarch was, in effect, an attempt to limit his authority.

Colman's genealogy does not claim that the Saxon monarchs of England had ruled Britain in its entirety, as Cotton and Buck had argued. Colman also does not trace the history of the British Isles any further back than Alpin and Egbert on the manuscript versions of the genealogy, as this might have complicated his straightforward narrative of the history of the two kingdoms (for example, if he had touched on the numerous English and Scottish foundation myths, or claims that Britain had previously been united).⁸⁵ The genealogy simply affirms that the kingdoms of England and Scotland had always been separate, since the genealogy's purpose was to show James's direct line of descent from the founders of each kingdom.

Hereditary Right and James VI & I's Anglo-Scottish Union Project

James VI & I's succession to the English throne in 1603 meant that England and Scotland were sharing a monarch in a personal union, while remaining separate kingdoms with their own pre-existing political and legal institutions.⁸⁶ James wanted to change this, so on 19 May 1603 it was proclaimed that "his Majestie doth hereby repute, hold and esteeme both the two Realmes as presently united, and as one Realme and Kingdome, and the Subjects of both the

⁸² See: Rei Kanemura, "Kingship by Descent or Kingship by Election? The Contested Title of James VI and I," *Journal of British Studies* 52, no. 2 (2013): 317–342.

⁸³ Maija Jansson, ed., *Proceedings in Parliament 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988), 316–317.

⁸⁴ Antonio Forsarini, Venetian Ambassador in England, to the Doge and Senate of Venice, 27 June 1614. Allen B. Hinds, ed., *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in the Other Libraries of Northern Italy, Volume 13* (London: HSMO, 1907), 138.

⁸⁵ The engraved version does touch on the previous history of the British Isles and the idea that Britain had been united before, with a poem entitled "Britaine." In it, Colman explains how the British people were conquered first by the Romans and then the Saxons, forcing them to retreat to Wales. England was then conquered by the Danes and the Normans. Henry VII restored British blood to the English throne, and James VI & I's succession meant that Britain "again... beares her ancient name." However, Colman makes no such claim on the manuscript versions of the genealogy. BL General Reference Collection 604.1.5.

⁸⁶ Bruce Galloway, *The Union of England and Scotland, 1603-1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986), 1–12.

Realmes as one people, brethren and members of one body.” James already considered England and Scotland to be one united kingdom because his hereditary claims made him rightful ruler of them both; therefore, in his view, it was only necessary for this personal union to be “perfected” and made permanent by parliamentary legislation.⁸⁷ In the words of Conrad Russell, James’s concern “was not necessarily to produce a full uniformity between the kingdoms... but simply to ensure that he ruled over a single state. This was an urgent practical necessity, because if he ruled over two states, they had two different laws of succession, and therefore might again become divided.”⁸⁸

James opened his first English Parliament on 19 March 1604 with a speech in which he claimed that the union of England and Scotland was “made in My Blood” because he ruled both countries by hereditary right. James was “the Head, wherein that great Body”—England and Scotland, referred to as a single entity—“is united.” James also described the union as a marriage: “What God hath conjoynd then, let no man separate. I am the Husband, and all the whole Isle is my lawfull Wife.”⁸⁹ By using the political analogy of the monarch as the head of the body politic, and the religious analogy of marriage between one man and one woman, James presented the permanent union of England and Scotland as the natural and unavoidable outcome of the two countries sharing the same monarch. A head could not have two bodies, and a man could not have two wives. Therefore, England and Scotland had to be permanently united as one kingdom when they had one king.

On 20 April 1604, James summoned the Lords and Commons to come to “the gallery next St. James’s Park,” likely the Tiltyard Gallery, in Whitehall Palace.⁹⁰ James explained to them that he wanted an Act of Union so that his subjects would properly understand that England and Scotland were united in “One Allegiance, and loyal Subjection, in Me and My Person, to My Person and My Posterity for ever.” He argued that the union of England and Scotland was “already set down in the Recognition of [my] just Possession of the Crowns” of both England and Scotland, which had come about “by the great Blessing of God.” He claimed that “God, by his Providence, in apparent Sight of all the World,” had already caused the English and Scots to begin to develop a “Uniformity of Manners and Customs.” By “Finishing” what God had started with an Act of Union, “the true Meaning of that Acknowledgement in My Recognition may be performed and accomplished.”⁹¹ James believed that his hereditary right to the thrones of England and Scotland meant that the two countries were already united. Parliamentary legislation would only continue the process providentially begun by God of removing the differences between the English and Scottish peoples, making

⁸⁷ “Proclamation for the Uniting of England and Scotland, 19 May 1603, Greenwich,” in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625*, ed. James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 19.

⁸⁸ Conrad Russell, *King James VI and I and his English Parliaments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 30–31.

⁸⁹ *Journals of the House of Commons*, 142–143.

⁹⁰ James Spedding, ed., *The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon* (1868), 3:193.

⁹¹ *Journals of the House of Commons*, 180.

them recognise the union already achieved through James's hereditary right.⁹²

Many English MPs, however, were resistant to the idea of a permanent Anglo-Scottish union. Speaking in the House of Commons on 26 April 1604, Edwin Sandys challenged James's claim that hereditary right was an appropriate basis for a permanent Anglo-Scottish union. Sandys pointed out that James's union of England and Scotland was a union by marriage, meaning that James had succeeded to both thrones because he had inherited both hereditary claims, and, Sandys claimed, there was no precedent for a union by marriage resulting in two countries dropping their names to adopt another. Sandys also claimed that by changing name, the kingdom of England would be dissolved, along with its Parliament and laws, and replaced by a new kingdom.⁹³ English judges confirmed that if the name England was replaced with Great Britain, this would necessarily be followed by "an utter extinction of all the laws now in force," which would all have to be replaced.⁹⁴ On 2 June 1604, however, the House of Commons finally agreed to an act that established a Union Commission to negotiate terms.⁹⁵ On 7 July 1604, James prorogued the English Parliament, which did not meet again until 5 November 1605. After James's speech on 9 November 1605, Parliament was prorogued again until 21 January 1606.⁹⁶

James also summoned a Scottish Parliament, writing to them on 12 June 1604 that their only business was to agree to a Union Commission and confirm his choice of Scottish commissioners to achieve "the perfyteing of so honorabill and necessair ane Unioun." Then, the Scottish Parliament would only need to agree to the same legislation as the English Parliament, "that, as you boith mak bot one body under us your head, so your actionis and conclusionis in this cais may be equall and uniforme in all poyntis."⁹⁷ The Scottish Parliament met on 11 July 1604 and passed an act appointing Scottish commissioners to meet with their English counterparts to negotiate "a perfect union of the realms of Scotland and England," given that "as by lawful succession they are one in the head, so in the body and every member thereof they may be so inseparably conjoined."⁹⁸ This phrasing mimicked James's claim that his

⁹² It was common for union treatises to argue that a permanent union of England and Scotland was God's will, as revealed by providence. James's own statements about providence are further examples of this. See: Sir Francis Bacon, *A Briefe Discourse, Touching the Happie Union of the Kingdomes of England, and Scotland* (London, 1603; *STC* 1117), sig. A7v–A8r; John Gordon, *England and Scotlands Happiness in Being Reduced to Unitie of Religion* (London, 1604; *STC* 12062.3), 5; Craig, *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae Tractatus*, 264.

⁹³ *Journals of the House of Commons*, 186. Sandys also brought this point up when speaking to the Union Committees on 7 March 1607: Robert Bowyer, *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606–1607*, ed. David Harris Willson (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), 219–220.

⁹⁴ Robert Cecil, Baron Cecil, to John Erskine, 19th/2nd Earl of Mar, 28 April 1604. *Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, 3:200.

⁹⁵ *Journals of the House of Commons*, 231.

⁹⁶ *Journals of the House of Lords Beginning Anno Vicesimo Elizabethæ Reginae* (n.d.), 344, 355–360; *Journals of the House of Commons*, 256–257.

⁹⁷ David Masson, ed., *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1885), 7:458.

⁹⁸ "Commissioun for the Unioun, 11 July 1604," in *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, ed. Keith M. Brown, Gillian H. MacIntosh, Alastair J. Mann, Pamela E. Ritchie, and Roland J. Tanner (St Andrews, 2007–

hereditary right was an appropriate basis for a permanent union of England and Scotland, and indeed made a permanent union necessary.

While the English Parliament was prorogued, the Scottish Parliament was dissolved, and the Union Commission was negotiating, James decided to take further action. On 20 October 1604, James proclaimed himself King of Great Britain, reiterating his argument that “the blessed Union, or rather Reuniting of these two mightie, famous, and ancient Kingdomes of England and Scotland, under one Imperiall Crowne” was God’s will, as “it hath pleased God to reserve many yeeres in his Providence to our Person, and now in the fulnesse of the time of his Disposition, to bestow upon Us” the crown of England. James argued that the union of England and Scotland was “not inforced by Conquest and violence, nor contracted by doubtfull and deceivable points of transaction, but naturally derived from the Right and Title of the precedent Princes of both Kingdomes, concurring in our Person, alike lineally descended from the blood of both through the Sacred conjunction of Wedlocke.” James was asserting once again that his hereditary right to the thrones of both England and Scotland legitimised a permanent union of the two kingdoms.⁹⁹ James’s adoption of this new title was, in the words of Gilbert Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, “a good fyrst stone of y^e excellent worke of a further perfect union.”¹⁰⁰ English MPs had been reluctant to adopt the name Great Britain, so James did it for himself.

The English Parliament resumed in 1606 to discuss the proposals put forward by the Union Commission.¹⁰¹ On 18 November 1606, James spoke to the English Parliament again, making the same argument that “this happy Union is already in his person made by the Singuler Providence of God; That now it only remayneth that the same be confirmed by the Parliament.”¹⁰² He continued to argue that a permanent union of England and Scotland was God’s will, and that the union begun through his succession to the English throne only needed to be perfected by parliamentary legislation. Unfortunately, no agreement could be reached. James was disappointed, declaring to the English Parliament on 31 March 1607 that when he first suggested a permanent Anglo-Scottish union, “I then thought there could have been no more question of it, than of your declaration and acknowledgement of my right unto this Crown, and that as two twins, they would have grown up together.”¹⁰³ James’s assumption was that the personal union of England and Scotland under one monarch, the individual with the true hereditary right to both kingdoms, would naturally lead to a permanent union. The

2020), <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1604/4/20>.

⁹⁹ “Proclamation concerning the Kings Majesties Stile, of King of Great Britaine, 20 October 1604, Westminster Palace,” in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 1*, 94–98.

¹⁰⁰ Gilbert Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, to Robert Cecil, Viscount Cranborne, 26 October 1604. Cecil Papers, Hatfield House Archives, MS CP 107/82. Calendared in: M.S. Giuseppi, ed., *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquess of Salisbury* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1933), 16:336.

¹⁰¹ Galloway, *Union of England and Scotland*, 93.

¹⁰² *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Boyer*, 185.

¹⁰³ James VI & I, “Speech to the English Parliament, 31 March 1607, Whitehall,” in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. J.P. Somerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 160.

reluctance of English MPs to support his union project had proved otherwise.

Morgan Colman's *Arbor Regalis* and Anglo-Scottish Union

As discussed above, we can deduce that Morgan Colman made the initial copy of *Arbor Regalis* at some time between August 1604 and March 1605, with the date of completion given as 24 March 1605. This overlapped with important developments in James VI & I's Anglo-Scottish union project: the English Parliament was dissolved on 7 July 1604; James declared himself King of Great Britain on 20 October 1604; the Union Commission first met on that very same day; they presented their proposals to James on 6 December 1604; and the English Parliament did not meet again until 5 November 1605. Colman's genealogy presents James's hereditary claims to the thrones of England and Scotland as insurmountable and unchallengeable. However, the genealogy might also have been intended to contribute to the Anglo-Scottish union debates.

Arbor Regalis reflects James's own views on hereditary right and Anglo-Scottish union in many ways. James believed that his hereditary right to the thrones of England and Scotland was an appropriate basis and justification for a permanent union of the two kingdoms. It was God's will that he had succeeded to both thrones, specifically at a time when England and Scotland were enjoying peaceful relations. Therefore, in James's view, it was also God's will that England and Scotland be permanently united. James affirmed this in speeches and proclamations dating from both before and after the creation of Colman's genealogy, and the genealogy appears to make the same argument. The genealogy presents James as the undisputable hereditary claimant to the thrones of both England and Scotland, which perfectly accords with James's views. The genealogy also shows that James's hereditary claims to both thrones went all the way back to the monarchs who founded the kingdoms of England and Scotland, a clear assertion of monarchical authority and sovereignty. The cartouche in the top left corner affirms that the union of England and Scotland was like a marriage, being a sacred union that bound the two countries together, and that Fate had made sure this took place under James's rule.¹⁰⁴ James also used the terminology of marriage to describe the union of England and Scotland, and argued that this made a permanent union necessary. The genealogy could thus be used to support James's argument that his divinely ordained hereditary right was an appropriate basis for permanently uniting England and Scotland.

It was common for Jacobean writers to look for historic precedents to support James's union project, with varying degrees of historical accuracy.¹⁰⁵ For instance, Buck wrote: "The

¹⁰⁴ The English version states: "Love hath warrs colours into courtynes chang'd, / English from Scots no longer are estrang'd, / For the selfe torch which at the nuptials shone, / The same did also both the realmes attone: / Fate finisht hath her woorke under King James." College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18. The Latin version states: "Fu[n]dit HYMEN MARTEM, thalamo quæ teda reluxit, / Hæc eadem paci, sacrum coit utraque tellus / In nodum, atque suum jam nunc sub rege JACOBO / Fatum." Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I.

¹⁰⁵ For example, Buck and Cotton's claim that the Saxon monarchs of England had ruled the entirety of Britain. James himself claimed that Britain had previously been united under the legendary figures of Brutus and Arthur

foundation of this great worke hath bin layd, by many Kings your Majesties ancestors,” and claimed that “many ages before the good king Malcolm Canmoir [Malcolm III] projected this worke (and that with happy successe) by the mariage of Margaret daughter of the Saxon Prince Edward Exul, heire of the great Edgar, out of which royall bride-bed your Majestie is issued.”¹⁰⁶ Colman’s genealogy also promotes the historic legitimacy of the union of England and Scotland, since it claims that the two kingdoms should already have been united through the marriage of St Margaret and Malcolm III, the true hereditary claimants of both thrones. The cartouche in the top left corner of the genealogy explains that Fate caused James to succeed where Malcolm had failed. The Latin version goes into further detail than the English version, explaining that ‘Britain’ had not been united under Malcolm but was now united under James due to James’s legitimate hereditary right.¹⁰⁷ Given that the Bodleian Library’s Latin version of the genealogy was produced at a later date to the initial English copy, it is possible that the addition of the term ‘Britain’ was made to more closely tie the genealogy’s message to James’s campaign for a permanent Anglo-Scottish union. The genealogy, therefore, can be interpreted as asserting that hereditary right was an appropriate basis for the permanent union of England and Scotland as Great Britain. The use of the term ‘Britain’ at the start of James’s joint reign was not exclusive to a vision of permanent Anglo-Scottish union, as numerous texts celebrated James’s succession to the English throne as achieving the union, or reunion, of Britain, when at that time it was merely two separate kingdoms sharing one monarch.¹⁰⁸ This suggests uncertainty over what James’s succession to the English throne immediately achieved in terms of the relationship between England and Scotland: in the words of Jenny Wormald, the use of the term ‘Britain’ in the context of the union of the crowns was “casual and slap-happy.”¹⁰⁹ It was clear by the time Colman created the various copies of his genealogy, however, that James aspired to permanently unite England and Scotland as the single kingdom of Great Britain, giving the term ‘Britain’ a more specific, contemporary meaning. Colman’s genealogy may have reflected this political development.

If Colman’s genealogy was intended to promote the permanent union of England and Scotland, then the location in which it was displayed was significant, as placement would determine who would be able to see the genealogy and be privy to its message. Unfortunately, there appears to be no surviving evidence about where any copy of Colman’s genealogy was

“who had the style and were kings of the whole island,” a disputed claim. *Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, 3:194.

¹⁰⁶ Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos*, sig. A3r.

¹⁰⁷ The English version states: “Fate finisht hath her worrke under King James; / Rejecting Malcolm, and all other names.” College of Arms, Num. Sch. 18/18. The Latin version states: “aeque suum jam nunc sub rege JACOBO / Fatum, absoluti opus revocato nomine prisco, / Se sub MALCOLMO non passa BRITANNIA dici... nunc ultrō nomine gaudet, / Victa tua[m] virtute, et stirpis jure JACOBÆ.” Bodleian Library, MS Lat misc a.I.

¹⁰⁸ For example, see: Samuel Daniel, *A Panegyrike Congratulatorie to the Kings Majestie* (London, 1603; STC 6258) and Edward Wilkinson, *Isabacs Inheritance; Dew to Our High and Mightie Prince, James the Sixt of Scotland, of England, France and Ireland the First* (London, 1603; STC 25643).

¹⁰⁹ Jenny Wormald, “The Union of 1603,” in *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 23.

displayed in James's royal residences.¹¹⁰ Trevisan suggests it can be identified as the "large table" with "the royal race of Scotland" recorded in Whitehall Palace during the visit of John Ernest, Duke of Saxe-Weimar, in 1613.¹¹¹ This is possible, but it is not conclusive evidence, especially given that Colman's genealogy shows much more than James's Scottish ancestry.¹¹² An Exchequer payment to Colman in 1622 mentions "two large beautiful tables" created by Colman that were "standing in his Majesty's privy lodgings at Whitehall," and it seems likely that at least one of these genealogies was *Arbor Regalis*.¹¹³ Given that Whitehall Palace was James's principal residence in London, it would have been the most appropriate place to display *Arbor Regalis*.

From his first speech of 19 March 1604 until his speech of 18 November 1606, James usually addressed the English Parliament in the House of Lords. However, on 31 March 1607 and 2 May 1607, James made the Lords and Commons come to him, giving his speeches in the Great Chamber of Whitehall Palace.¹¹⁴ The Great Chamber, also called the Guard Chamber and the Watching Chamber, was part of the Privy Lodgings.¹¹⁵ It is, therefore, possible that Colman's genealogy was on display in the room where James addressed the English Parliament in 1607.

In the first speech James made to the English Parliament in Whitehall Palace's Great Chamber, on 31 March 1607, he expressed his frustration that they had not made more progress in securing a permanent Anglo-Scottish union. He responded at length to their objections on the grounds that a permanent union would overthrow or undermine England's

¹¹⁰ No genealogy that can be firmly identified as *Arbor Regalis* is recorded in the accounts of Jacobean visitors to the royal residences, or in the inventories taken during the reign of James's son, Charles I. There appear to be no surviving inventories of James's residences dating from his own reign. See: William Brenchley Rye, ed., *England As Seen By Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James I* (London, 1865); Oliver Miller, ed., "Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collection of Charles I," *Walpole Society* 37 (1958-1960); Millar, "Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods, 1649-1651." We do know that a genealogy described as "Colman's Arbour Royall or Genealogie of the Kinge and Queene" was on display in the court lodgings of "Mr H. Howarde" in the Lower House of Greenwich Lodge, property of Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, in 1614. It seems unlikely that Northampton would choose to display a large, valuable manuscript genealogy in the private room of one of his relatives. Also, the genealogy and "Speede's large mapp of *England Scotland and Ireland*" are only valued together at twelve shillings. In 1607/8 Colman produced an engraved version of the genealogy discussed in this article, so the genealogy at Greenwich Lodge was probably a copy of this engraving given its location and value. Philip Shirley, ed., "An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard, K.G., Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614," *Archaeologia* 42, no. 2 (1870): 372.

¹¹¹ Rye, *England As Seen By Foreigners*, 165.

¹¹² Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare*, 196, 223.

¹¹³ Frederick Devon, ed., *Issues of the Exchequer; Being Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue During the Reign of King James I* (London, 1836), 263.

¹¹⁴ James gave his speech of 21 March 1610 in Whitehall Palace's Banqueting House, before returning to the House of Lords for his speeches of 5 April 1614 and 30 January 1621.

¹¹⁵ Simon Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1690* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 18-19; "Whitehall Palace: Buildings," in *Survey of London: Volume 13, St Margaret, Westminster, Part II: Whitehall I*, ed. Montagu H. Cox and Philip Norman (London: London County Council, 1930), 41-115.

legal system. James, however, made clear that he still expected them to carry out his union project, so that “your King may have his lawfull desire, and be not disgraced in his just endes.”¹¹⁶ James still believed that his divinely ordained hereditary right was a legitimate basis for a permanent Anglo-Scottish union, despite objections from English MPs. James said that it was not possible for “one head to govern two bodies, or one man to be husband of two wives,” making the permanent union of England and Scotland necessary when James was the sole monarch.¹¹⁷

When James spoke to the English Parliament in the Great Chamber again, on 2 May 1607, he claimed it was to clarify the meaning of his previous speech. He asserted that it had been misinterpreted by MPs as a call for a “perfect” union when what James claimed to want was “an absolute and full Union.” James explained that the union of England and Scotland was “already a perfect Union in me, the Head,” because “it is an Union in my Blood and Title.” However, it was not “an accomplisht and full Union; for that Time must ripen and work.” James was re-asserting his belief that a permanent union would naturally develop from the personal union of England and Scotland under one monarch, which was the result of his hereditary right to both thrones. However, he was changing what he meant by a “perfect” union, as he had previously stated that the personal union needed to be “perfected” to become a permanent union. Just as a child grows into an adult, James explained, so the personal union of the kingdoms under one monarch would grow into a permanent union.¹¹⁸ This attitude was reflected in the name of the union bill James then presented to the House of Commons: “An Act for the *continuance* and *preservation* of the blessed Union.”¹¹⁹ James expressed his displeasure towards those MPs who made speeches against the union project, which he described as speeches “against Duty, almost against Allegiance.”¹²⁰ As their king, he expected them to fulfil his wishes in a matter that he believed was both God’s will and his own prerogative.

If Colman’s genealogy was on display as James was speaking to the English Parliament, or when politicians and elite figures visited Whitehall Palace at any other time, it would have served to visually reinforce James’s arguments in favour of a permanent Anglo-Scottish union. The genealogy presents James as the undisputable hereditary claimant to the thrones of both England and Scotland, and his succession to both thrones as divinely ordained. The genealogy can also be interpreted as presenting the permanent union of England and Scotland as historically legitimate, as the two kingdoms should have been united as ‘Britain’ through the marriage of St Margaret and Malcolm III but this had been prevented by the Norman Conquest. God had waited for James’s reign to unite the crowns and make the permanent union of England and Scotland possible. Colman’s genealogy can be interpreted as a visual

¹¹⁶ James VI & I, “Speech to the English Parliament, 31 March 1607, Whitehall,” in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, 160, 178.

¹¹⁷ James VI & I, “Speech to the English Parliament, 31 March 1607,” 162.

¹¹⁸ *Journals of the House of Commons*, 366–367.

¹¹⁹ *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer*, 289. Italics my own.

¹²⁰ *Journals of the House of Commons*, 367.

companion to the arguments made by Thomas Craig and Robert Cotton—that James had the superior hereditary right to the English throne through his Saxon descent and was, therefore, justified in his ambition to permanently unite England and Scotland together as a single kingdom. The genealogy can be interpreted as an affirmation that James's hereditary right was an appropriate basis for permanently uniting England and Scotland together as one kingdom, as James himself so frequently argued.

Conclusion

Eventually, the bill “for the Continuance and Preservation of the blessed Union” was reduced to a bill “for the utter Abolition of all memory of hostility,” a repeal of England's hostile laws towards Scotland, and passed by both Houses.¹²¹ This was nowhere near what James had hoped for and, on 4 July 1607, he prorogued the English Parliament, abandoning other bills that were already underway.¹²² James secured the English naturalisation of the post-Nati (Scots born after his accession to the English throne) through a common law judgement in *Calvin's Case* (1607).¹²³ The union debate was only briefly revived in the 1610 session of the English Parliament, to no avail.¹²⁴

Colman's *Arbor Regalis*, however, had a life beyond the parliamentary union debates. In 1608, an engraved genealogy based on *Arbor Regalis* was published. Colman was evidently involved in the adaptation of the genealogy as an engraving, as he dedicated it to James VI & I and Anna of Denmark.¹²⁵ This engraving, which was made up of fifteen sheets, was intended for a wider audience than the original manuscript genealogy, as the text on the engraved genealogy is in English and many copies could be produced on a printing press in quick succession. In 1614, a copy of Colman's engraved genealogy and an engraved map were valued together at twelve shillings, so subjects who could afford to purchase an elaborate engraving such as this could display it in their own homes, meaning that the genealogy's message could be dispersed more widely—both geographically and socially—than a manuscript genealogy which could only be viewed in a royal residence.¹²⁶

While there are numerous small differences between the manuscript and engraved versions of the genealogy, the core message remains the same. The engraved genealogy shows James's descent from Egbert and Alpin through the marriage of St Margaret and Malcolm III,

¹²¹ *Journals of the House of Commons*, 379; Galloway, *Union of England and Scotland*, 125–126.

¹²² Russell, *James VI & I and his English Parliaments*, 62–63.

¹²³ Conrad Russell, “Topsy and the King: The English Common Law, King James VI and I, and the Union of the Crowns,” in *Law and Authority in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to Thomas Garden Barnes*, ed. Buchanan Sharp and Mark Charles Fissel (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), 73.

¹²⁴ Galloway, *Union of England and Scotland*, 137.

¹²⁵ The dedication is given in a cartouche below James and Anna's roundels: “Consecrated by their most humble subject & servant Morgan Colman, to the immortal memory of their most Princely goodnesse, and roial munificence graciously extended towards him.” BL General Reference Collection 604.I.5.

¹²⁶ Shirley, “An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard,” 372.

with the English royal line traced from Margaret rather than William the Conqueror.¹²⁷ The engraved genealogy makes explicit that Margaret's daughter, Matilda of Scotland, is the significant figure for her descendants on the English throne, rather than her husband, Henry I. The text in the roundel below their joint coats of arms begins with Matilda, while the text in the roundel on the manuscript genealogy begins with Henry. The roundel text on the engraved genealogy ends with the date of Matilda's death and does not give Henry's. The engraved genealogy, therefore, makes explicit that Matilda is the only person who matters as the ancestor of England's later monarchs, not Henry I or his father, William the Conqueror. It was only the descent of England's post-Norman Conquest monarchs from Margaret, through her daughter Matilda, which gave them any hereditary claim to the English throne, not as descendants of William the Conqueror. James's own coat of arms on the engraved genealogy does not have an inescutcheon of the Saxon arms as it does on the manuscript genealogy, but James is still shown to be the senior descendant of Margaret and the Saxon monarchs through his male-line descent from Margaret's son, David I of Scotland.

What purpose could this engraved version of Colman's genealogy serve when James had effectively abandoned his attempts to permanently unite England and Scotland by 1608? A cartouche in the top left corner, addressed to James's eldest son, Prince Henry, offers an explanation. The text tells us that Prince Henry is heir to "thy great Parents worke, his Union" of England and Scotland, which "began" when Henry was a child, and which Henry would "enjoy, and finish when a man." James had been unable to "finish" the permanent union of England and Scotland, and the union that existed in 1608 was incomplete. James believed that the personal union of England and Scotland under a shared monarch was only a starting point for a permanent Anglo-Scottish union, and while he had been unable to achieve it, the engraved genealogy looked to the reign of the future King Henry IX in the hope that he would achieve what his father had not. The engraved genealogy thus appears to have been produced to encourage broader support for a permanent Anglo-Scottish union in the future. This is further evidence that Colman's original manuscript genealogy was intended to support a permanent Anglo-Scottish union, since that was the explicit purpose of the engraved genealogy based on the manuscript version.

Colman's manuscript genealogy had two purposes, one of which developed from the other. First, it was intended to promote James as the legitimate hereditary claimant to the thrones of both England and Scotland without depending on conquest or election as an origin point. The genealogy does this by showing that James was the senior descendant of the founders of both England and Scotland, inheriting his hereditary right to rule from St Margaret and Malcolm III, and by emphasising James's Saxon ancestry, removing William the

¹²⁷ Three of the original fifteen sheets are missing in the British Library's copy of the engraved genealogy, but comparing it with the original manuscript genealogy shows that these missing sheets depicted the marriage of St Margaret and Malcolm III, and the origin of the Scottish royal line with Alpin. BL General Reference Collection 604.1.5.

Conqueror from the line of England's monarchs. Second, the genealogy appears to have been intended to promote James's plan to permanently unite England and Scotland as a single kingdom by presenting such a union as historically legitimate and the natural outcome of James's hereditary right to rule both kingdoms. The genealogy could be used to support James's claim that his hereditary right to the thrones of England and Scotland was an appropriate basis and justification for a permanent union of England and Scotland as the single kingdom of Great Britain. Ultimately, James's union project failed, but Colman's *Arbor Regalis* remains a testament to the political use of genealogies in early modern Britain and, more specifically, in the Anglo-Scottish union debates.

Appendix: Who was Morgan Colman?

Markus Friedrich has drawn attention to the need for more scholarly research on how genealogies have historically been created, rather than just what purpose they served.¹²⁸ This brief biography of Morgan Colman is intended as an example of the kind of person who created genealogies in early modern England, while at the same time correcting some pre-existing misconceptions about his life.

In late 1579, Morgan Colman became secretary to Sir William Pelham, the new Lord Justice of Ireland.¹²⁹ There is possible evidence of Colman's artistic capabilities dating from this period, as the title page of Pelham's letter book (compiled by Colman) is elaborately decorated in ink and inscribed with Colman's verses.¹³⁰ In 1581, Pelham returned to England, where Colman continued to work for him, and he went with Pelham to the Netherlands in 1586.¹³¹ Pelham died on 24 November 1587 and at the beginning of 1588 Colman petitioned William Cecil, Baron Burghley, for a position as one of his secretaries.¹³² This letter of petition is dated "second Januarie 1587," and so has been mistakenly calendared as dating from 1587. However, this was according to the Old Style of dating the New Year, so it really dates from 2 January 1588. This is confirmed by Colman's reference to "my hard loss of a most deare master," meaning Pelham's death in November 1587. Colman was not employed by Burghley, but quickly became steward to Peregrine Bertie, 13th Baron Willoughby de Eresby, who was also serving in the Netherlands.¹³³

A mistake in the British Library's catalogue entry for a letter from Colman to Burghley, dated 12 October 1588, has led some scholars to assume that Colman was working for one of Burghley's sons at this time.¹³⁴ This is because Colman refers to Burghley's "fatherlie caringe" for Colman's employer (who is not referred to by name in this letter) and assures Burghley that he "shall allwaies finde hym [Colman's employer] (as yo^r sonne) thankefull, redie to honor and serve you." However, the employer Colman is referring to is Willoughby, whose employ Colman had been in since January or February 1588. Colman wrote this letter to Burghley

¹²⁸ Friedrich, "Genealogy and the History of Knowledge," 1–2.

¹²⁹ In a letter to Sir William More dated 27 November, Colman mentions working for the late Lord Justice of Ireland "and now as my lord's unworthy secretary." This dates the letter to 1579, as Sir William Drury, the previous Lord Justice, had died on 13 October 1579 and was replaced by Sir William Pelham, Colman's employer: Surrey History Centre, Woking, LM/COR/3/614.

¹³⁰ Sir William Pelham's letter book, the verses are signed by Colman: Lambeth Palace Library, MS 597.

¹³¹ Colman is listed as one of the surveyors of Pelham's lands in Lincolnshire in 1585: Lincolnshire Archives, YARB 5/1/1; Morgan Colman to William Davison, Secretary of State, 10 October 1586: TNA SP 84/10/1, fol. 142. Calendared in: Sophie Crawford Lomas and Allen B. Hinds, ed., *Calendar of State Papers Foreign: Elizabeth, Volume 21, Part 2, June 1586-March 1587* (London: HMSO, 1927), 188.

¹³² Morgan Colman to William Cecil, Baron Burghley, 2 January 1588: BL Lansdowne MS 99, item 48, fol. 139.

¹³³ A letter from Colman to Burghley concerning Willoughby's finances dates from February 1588: TNA SP 84/21, fol. 117. Calendared in: Sophie Crawford Lomas and Allen B. Hinds, ed., *Calendar of State Papers Foreign: Elizabeth, Volume 21, Part 4, January-June 1588* (London: HMSO, 1931), 147. Colman kept records of money he received for Willoughby from February 1588: Lincolnshire Archives, 1-ANC12/C/4.

¹³⁴ Colman to Burghley, 12 October 1588: BL Lansdowne MS 99, item 49, fol. 141.

because he wanted to gain Burghley's support for a request he had made to the Privy Council to increase Willoughby's income. Colman refers to Willoughby's financial distress in his letters to both Burghley and the Privy Council. Colman's letters to the Privy Council on Willoughby's behalf (dated 2 October and 21 October 1588) bookend his letter to Burghley, proving that he is referring to Willoughby in his letter to Burghley and could not have been in the employ of one of Burghley's sons.¹³⁵ Willoughby's brother-in-law, Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, had been married to Burghley's recently deceased daughter, Anne Cecil, which is a possible explanation for Colman's use of familial language to describe Willoughby and Burghley's relationship. Unfortunately, Colman fell out of Willoughby's favour, under the shadow of potential financial mismanagement.¹³⁶ Colman then found new employment in England as steward to Sir John Puckering, Queen's Serjeant and, from 1592, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal.¹³⁷

In 1592, Colman produced several royal genealogies, some in book form.¹³⁸ According to Trevisan, Colman designed but may not have created these genealogical books, as the drawing styles and handwriting differ in each copy. These books were conceived as gifts to show Colman's skills as a genealogist and antiquarian, with one copy being given to Sir Francis Bacon and another possibly being given to Burghley.¹³⁹ Colman's single-page genealogy of Elizabeth I's descent from William the Conqueror, included in these books, was also included on a map of England, Ireland and Wales, engraved by Joost de Hondt and published in 1592.¹⁴⁰ It was around this time that Colman tried to find employment in the College of Arms. Colman applied for the position of Norroy King of Arms, but in 1593 it went to William Segar.¹⁴¹

After Puckering's death on 30 April 1596, Colman was employed by the next Lord Keeper, Thomas Egerton.¹⁴² Colman was admitted to Gray's Inn on 1 November 1596, while working for Egerton.¹⁴³ By August 1601, however, Colman was imprisoned in the Fleet for failing to submit money in his capacity as collector of the second and third subsidies granted

¹³⁵ Morgan Colman's letters to the Privy Council: TNA SP 84/27 fols. 161, 226. Calendared in: Richard Bruce Wernham, ed., *Calendar of State Papers Foreign: Elizabeth, Volume 22, July-December 1588* (London: HSMO, 1936), 238, 274.

¹³⁶ Morgan Colman to Peregrine Berie, 13th Baron Willoughby, undated: Lincolnshire Archives, 8-ANC7/90.

¹³⁷ Receipt for money for Henry Cripse, servant of Morgan Colman, when Colman was in the service of Sir John Puckering, 1593: Lambeth Palace Library, MS 649, fol. 311.

¹³⁸ Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Yale University Library, MS Osborn fa56; BL Stowe MS 75.

¹³⁹ Trevisan, *Royal Genealogy in the Age of Shakespeare*, 36–37; Edward Scott, ed., *Catalogue of Stowe Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1895), 1:47.

¹⁴⁰ Joost de Hondt (engraver) and Morgan Colman (genealogist), *Angliae et Hiberniae*, 1592, hand-coloured engraving on paper: National Library of Wales, MAP 5391.

¹⁴¹ Mark Noble, *A History of the College of Arms, and the Lives of all the Kings, Heralds and Pursuivants from the Reign of Richard III* (London, 1804), 204.

¹⁴² The household book of Thomas Egerton, Lord Chancellor, 11 July 1596 - 30 December 1597, kept by his steward, Morgan Colman: Bodleian Library, MS Rawl D.506.

¹⁴³ Joseph Foster, ed., *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889* (London, 1889), 91.

by the English Parliament to Elizabeth I in 1598.¹⁴⁴ He was released from the Fleet on bond in August 1604.¹⁴⁵ Then, as discussed above, Colman produced copies of *Arbor Regalis* for James VI & I and Anna of Denmark.

Colman continued to frequent James's court, but fell out of favour in 1610/1611 when he proposed financial reforms to reduce James's household expenses.¹⁴⁶ Colman claimed that his "utter ruen was plotted" by the servants of James's financial officers—making the diplomatic decision not to blame the officers directly—and he was arrested by a bailiff. Colman appealed for assistance to Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, and was released, but remained "odious in court."¹⁴⁷

By 1622, Colman was a pensioner of the Charterhouse, described as "a poore caste-down gentleman."¹⁴⁸ In April 1622, Colman sent a petition to the Lord High Treasurer, Lionel Cranfield, Baron Cranfield.¹⁴⁹ In response, Cranfield employed Colman to write up household books and accounts for himself and his wife.¹⁵⁰ In August 1622, a writ confirmed that Colman would be given £250 by the Exchequer for "making two large beautiful tables, standing in his Majesty's privy lodgings at Whitehall, and for making many of the genealogical tables for his Majesty's honour and service."¹⁵¹ It seems likely that this money, "his Majesty's princely Grace's free gift and bounty," was being given to Colman for past services rather than new work, in response to Colman's petition to the Treasurer. I have not found any records relating to Colman after this date, so it is possible he either died around this time or lived quietly on this royal gift.

¹⁴⁴ Robert Clerke to Henry Fanshawe, 5 August 1601: TNA Exchequer letters, SP 46/42, fol. 127. Catalogued in *National Archives Online Catalogue: SP 46: State Papers Domestic: Supplementary* (Kew: The National Archives, 2009).

¹⁴⁵ Warrant for release on bond of Morgan Colman, prisoner in the Fleet for debt, 8 August 1604: *CSP Domestic, James I, 1603-1610*, 140.

¹⁴⁶ Morgan Colman to Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, 10 April 1611: TNA SP 14/63, fol. 31. Calendared in Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of James I, 1611-18* (London, 1858), 22.

¹⁴⁷ Colman to Salisbury, April 1611: TNA SP 14/63, fol. 30. *CSP Domestic, James I, 1611-18*, 22.

¹⁴⁸ Morgan Colman is described thus in the household book of Anne Brett, Baroness Cranfield and later Countess of Middlesex, which he wrote in 1622: Lambeth Palace Library, MS 1228.

¹⁴⁹ "Manuscripts of the Earl de la Warr (Baron Buckhurst), Knole," *Historical Manuscripts Commission, 4th Report* (London, 1873), Appendix, 277.

¹⁵⁰ Morgan Colman, household books of Lionel Cranfield, Baron Cranfield and later Earl of Middlesex, and Anne Brett, Baroness Cranfield and later Countess of Middlesex: Lambeth Palace Library, MS 3361 and 1228.

¹⁵¹ Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, 263.