

1



Introduction

Conceptual Approaches to the Queen's Body

Regina Schulte

Does the queen have one body, or, like the king, two (Kantorowicz 1957)? How many 'bodies' can a queen possess or inhabit? In an enthusiastic review of Andrea Breth's Vienna production of Schiller's *Maria Stuart* in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, the critic speaks of 'the queen's three bodies'.¹ The queen's body becomes a picture-puzzle made up of medieval theological discourses, politically verifiable facts and the projections that have always been trained upon the feminine. From the beginning, the body of the queen appears to have been incorporated into a political concept, that of the monarchy. We encounter a remarkable paradox here, though; it seems as if the political luminosity of this particular body was repeatedly reduced to its 'natural', its particularly gendered dimension, as if it were its femaleness that limited the ability of the queen's body to engage in politics. Its political strength seems to require the proximity of a male body – as the consort of the king, the mother of future sovereigns, the widow and preserver of the royal or dynastic legacy. The femaleness of the queen's body connotes a lack, but this very dimension opened up its capacity for politics in a specific historical context. For the king's body, too, had revealed a 'natural' side; it could be too young, or become ill, old and feeble-minded; it could be weak, or fall prey to its passions – its corporeality connoted it with deficiency, with femininity.

Was the king's body ideally always a male, or even an androgynous one, which united all genders within it, such as we can find in representations of Louis XIV?² Or was it necessary for the queen to be

able to embody the male form, as in the case of Elizabeth I of England, who claimed to have the body of a woman but the heart and stomach of a king? The phrase is complex: she said 'of a king', not 'of a man'.³

Historians – including some feminists – have persisted in operating within this set of questions, with its dichotomous trap of male versus female and political versus natural. Ernst Kantorowicz exposes this very structure in his marvellous book on the king's two bodies, but only at the beginning of the work does he mention that it was the body of a queen – Elizabeth I – that revealed the full implications of the concept of the dual royal body.⁴ The jurists of the Elizabethan court developed a concept that at once permitted the coronation of a valid sovereign, despite the succession of a woman, and placed limitations upon her. For political and legal reasons, it had become necessary in 1561 to equip the queen with two bodies, a natural one and a political one, with her body politic incorporated into her body natural.⁵ Rachel Weil has pointed to the instability of the English monarchs' relationship to the female sex in the early modern period. 'Queens were not simply women, any more than kings were simply men. The notion that the monarch possessed two "bodies" mystically fused together in her person, her mortal body and the immortal body of the "king-who-never-dies", was available to insure that the ills to which all mortal flesh was subject (including femaleness) did not diminish the aura of divine authority attaching to the ruler's person.'⁶ The symbolism and iconography that arose under Elizabeth acquired increasingly elaborate theoretical underpinnings, which were refined by the London Inns of Court.⁷

The legal construction developed by English jurists, which Shakespeare treats in *Richard II*⁸ and which Elizabeth explicitly addressed,⁹ was both brilliant and fateful. The next monarch but one could be beheaded quite legally, his physical body was subject to juxtaposition with a parliament that was capable both of preserving the king's body 'politic' and rejecting his body 'natural'. I long believed that the appearance of the unique Queen Elizabeth I was the consequence of a fantastic construction born of necessity, until I came to understand that this construction, which resulted from the secularisation of a previously theological concept, was fundamental to the inception of a new understanding of the monarchy, which, in its constitutional form, would later reach a high point under Victoria.

But different political worlds may exist side by side – for instance England and France with its Salic law – and the bodies of queens

follow the structure of political versus natural more than just ideally. Perhaps we can even use the complexity and contradictions of female royal images and biographies to break through the dualistic thought structure prevalent in historical literature. In what follows I would like to pursue the cycle of various life-courses and show, using a few examples, that the political and natural bodies of the queen were inextricably intertwined. At the same time, I would like to emphasise and develop the function of the natural, corporeal image for the political context.

Initiations

Even as a young girl, Elizabeth I had woven her political ambitions and potential future as a queen into her handiwork and embroidery. A skill always regarded as female became a vehicle of political speech, and needle and thread produced writing, binding the recipient of affectionate gifts to a hand that would later take up the sceptre and the crown.¹⁰ When Elizabeth entered London for her coronation in 1559, she had mastered the choreography of political discourse without being consumed by it. The young queen was greeted enthusiastically by Londoners as a figure of hope after dark political times:

For all men hope in thee, that all virtues shall reyne,
For all men hope that thou, none error wilt support,
For all men hope that thou wilt truth restore agayne,
And mend that is amisse, to all good mennes comfort.¹¹

At this time, Elizabeth needed the support of the city, which devised a festive entrance ceremony in which it sought to commit the young queen to its interests on the day before her coronation. In *The Passage of Our Most Dread Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth*,¹² a text in which the city's elites captured the royal entry, the roles of the paternal city and the virtuous daughter, of Elizabeth as the city's wife and mother are played out, and the virgin queen is entangled in a tight network of economic reciprocities. Susan Frye has shown, however, that Elizabeth at no time relinquished her right of interpretation over these symbolic events, but rather developed a mastery of symbolic expression and self-representation that allowed her to shape her own role as queen while entering into a long and productive phase of collaboration with the city and its populace.¹³ In

a sense, she tailored her royal robes according to her own design. This ritual of entry and its sophisticated choreography became virtually symptomatic of the mastery with which Elizabeth developed from a maidenly, chaste and bride-like queen, whose hair in her coronation portrait still lies girlishly loose upon her shoulders¹⁴ to an icon of a virgin whose husband was the kingdom – ‘I am already bound unto an husband, which is the kingdom of England’.¹⁵ Finally, in an elaborate semantic of love, she came to occupy the sacred place of the secularised Virgin Mary.¹⁶ The metamorphoses of her body were accompanied by a maelstrom of political speculations about her willingness – and her ability – to marry, her political intentions, as well as by poetic and iconographic attempts at interpretation, attribution and transfiguration, with which an entire complex of political and cultural meanings was equipped, leading to the ultimate disappearance or mystification of her natural body. In her last, ‘Rainbow’ portrait (Figure 1.1), painted shortly before or after her death, Elizabeth looks younger than in any of the previous ones – her girlishly loose hair redder, her skin smoother, and her features softer – dressed in a gown composed almost solely of writing and symbols.¹⁷

It seems that, in her initiation into her status as sovereign and into absolute rule, Elizabeth succeeded in maintaining a high degree of self-determination by continually playing the two sides of the royal body against each other. In the seventeenth century, when the Spanish Habsburg princess Maria Teresa of Austria, bride of Louis XIV and future queen of France, was handed over in an elaborate ceremony at the Spanish-French border and made her nuptial entry, the circumstances were quite different. As Abby Zanger demonstrates in an impressive essay, the transfer rituals accomplished the transformation of the Habsburg infanta Maria Teresa into the Bourbon queen Marie Thérèse, transporting her from the symbolic system of one culture, the Spanish, into that of another, the French.¹⁸ In essence it is a process of changing clothes; the body of the princess has already become that of a Bourbon before she ever steps onto French soil. Having shed both clothing and name, the princess stands literally and metaphorically naked, before being physically overcome in a genuine and symbolic act of fitting out with new garments. Never again will Austrian-Spanish thread or cloth touch the bride’s body, which is now arrayed in the silks and laces of French fashion, made in Lyon and not in some foreign land. This ritual of adoption by the French court has also been claimed in the literature for Marie-Antoinette – for instance



Figure 1.1 Allegorical Portrait of Elizabeth I (The 'Rainbow' Portrait), artist unknown, c. 1600–03.

by Stefan Zweig – although it no longer took place in the same manner.¹⁹ Perhaps this was also already a consequence of the softening of strict absolutist court ceremonial.

Nevertheless, a glance at this later Habsburg princess – Maria Antonia / Marie-Antoinette – provides important clues. She brought nothing with her: to the later torment of her imperial mother Maria Theresa she was not trained for her future role, not prepared for political action; she was, rather, a *tabula rasa*, young, cheerful and naïve. In her malleability she presented the ideal body of a bride who was to take shape in the splendour of the French court, and there only. One hundred and ten years before the entry of Marie-Antoinette, however, the iconography and the official account of 1660 in the pamphlet ‘*La pompe et Magnificence fait au mariage du Roi et de L’Enfante D’Espagne ...*’ show the role assigned to her predecessor Marie Thérèse in the ritual of royal entry that followed the dressing ceremony – she was above all an ornament, a jewel in the crown, ‘a curio that could be placed into the royal collection’,²⁰ and thus a function in the overwhelming absolute image of the French king. Beauty was an attribute of the king, and was indeed the king himself. The sight of the somewhat awkward, sweaty Spanish stranger only reflected his own refinement. At the same time, however, it was the perspiration of the newly married Marie Thérèse in her heavy French wedding gown, which was made of brocade and ermine despite the June heat, that led to a confusing and very concrete disturbance of the celebration. After the marriage ceremony the bride undressed and took to her bed, indifferent to all homage, thus withdrawing from the further festivities. Even with the strictest protocol, the body of the young queen was not completely controllable, and the transformation into a royal French body proved to be a process fraught with resistance and obstinacy.²¹ Marie Thérèse remained in the king’s shadow and with the birth of a dauphin her role in the Bourbon–Habsburg power play was over, and her body was banished from the king’s presence. Thus it is perhaps not surprising that this queen is barely present in the iconography of the period.

Who produced the images, and who looked at them? Marie-Antoinette’s enormous iconographic career had much to do with the change of audience;²² she was the Other, the symbol and ugly face of decay, who could not and must not be symbolised within one’s own, French, context. She, the foreigner, represented the

corrupt body of the *ancien régime* king, as long as he had not yet been abandoned as a body politic in his own country.²³

From the beginning, Marie-Antoinette's entry was laden with omens whose historiographic significance the seventeen-year-old could scarcely imagine: an unfortunate mural of the wedding of Jason and Medea on the island in the Rhine near Strasbourg when she was delivered to the French, and a fire that occurred during her entry into Paris that killed hundreds of people. Interpretations of omens, which already saw a bad end looming over the new bride, began to circulate, although now they came not from the court but from middle-class observers and writers, from the people.²⁴ Only when the royal bride adapted to the demands of incipient middle-class ideas about love and images of the sovereign would a safe entry be possible again: that is, when the bride could, as it were, rise from the yeast of the people, when her youth and innocence satisfied a new, strict, bourgeois moral canon, and when her beauty spoke of virtue and nature, not artifice. A new voice had been added now to royal historiography or hagiography, and the natural, chaste body of a queen close to the people should and must be its political dowry.

According to all the requirements of romantic notions of royalty – the Brothers Grimm had just rewritten their fairy tales – in the end it was Queen Louise of Prussia who lived up to the demands of the new era, outdone only by Elisabeth of Austria, popularly known as Sisi. Children of nature who came from the country, with a love story in which the prince recognised his future bride at first sight, fell in love with her and kissed her amidst the babbling of forest brooks, touched the hearts of first the Prussian and then the Austrian people. Henceforth, all queens would be moral and good. The others, the female monarchs of the past, were banished as envious, wicked stepmothers to the realm of witches, where cannibalistic, child- and man-eating monsters like Catherine the Great lived on as the good queens' evil twins.²⁵ Royal brides – Louise – kissed the children of the people and themselves wasted away in poetic verses. The citizens of the capital prepared celebrations for their royal entries, and were near neighbours to their well-known country estates. They drank water instead of wine and distributed bread to the common folk instead of mocking their starving subjects in the manner of Marie-Antoinette. They dressed plainly, affronting the extravagant court ladies with their simple appearance and behaviour, and

communicated with the mother of the famous poet whose verses they scratched into the icy window of a poor cottager's dwelling.²⁶ And this body, which was glorified as 'natural', was their body politic, the programme in the visions of a queen in a constitutional monarchy.

Had a fundamental depoliticisation of the queen occurred? It appears that the middle class in particular placed its fantasies of redemption and hopes for a new beginning after the downfall of decayed royal dynasties and the demise of old, allegedly corrupt and immoral kings, in the virginal brides and queens of the early nineteenth century, as happened in Prussia, and in England with Victoria's ascent to the throne. This young queen promised innocence and purity, and her youth and femininity awakened popular recollections of earlier queens who had passed into legend – Elizabeth and Anne. Thus in romanticised pictorial and literary representations, the moment when Victoria received word that she would ascend the throne assumed a mythical quality. The accession was portrayed in an Annunciation scene, in which Victoria appeared as a secularised, modern Virgin Mary, a Madonna receiving the good news from a minister-angel kneeling before her.²⁷ The body of a young queen could provide material and a vehicle for messages of redemption, just as that of Marie-Antoinette had heralded disaster and later become a site of political and pornographic discourses on the corruption of the court, nobility and Church.

The Bodies of Queens

Before that, however, her mother Maria Theresa had depicted the ideal image of the queen of France for her daughter Marie-Antoinette and the image of the mother of the French dauphin, whose grandmother she, the Austrian empress, would be. In a correspondence lasting ten years she deluged Marie-Antoinette, like her other children, with instructions, orders and admonitions. She concerned herself with her daughter's appearance and proper conduct at the court of Versailles, attempting to turn her inexperienced and poorly prepared child into a queen of France on her own model.²⁸

But what was the image that she had of herself as a monarch? As the first-born daughter of Charles VI, she had been forced, in the absence of a male heir, to succeed him upon his sudden death. At the age of twenty-three she found herself the almost wholly unprepared ruler of an immense and dangerous empire:

At that time I possessed the experience and knowledge necessary to rule such vast and far-flung lands all the less as my lord father had never seen fit to involve or instruct me in either domestic or foreign affairs. Thus I found myself all at once devoid of money, troops and counsel.²⁹

That was how she described her situation eleven years after she ascended the throne, in a memorandum of 1750/51, when she was thirty-three years old and the mother of eleven children. In the meantime she had come to fill her role, was queen of Hungary and Bohemia and had refused to be crowned empress at Frankfurt at the side of her husband Francis Stephen of Lorraine, who had been elected emperor, 'since she esteemed this coronation less than the two masculine crowns [*couronnes masculines*] she wore herself, having once said that she preferred not to change her sex again at a coronation, and repeated to me today that this coronation was but a comedy in which she did not wish to participate.'³⁰

Instead she turned her journey to Frankfurt into a 'private' triumphal procession through her lands. Along the way she played with the charm of her 'naturally beautiful' appearance, which in the eyes of the people seemed for a long moment to be freed from etiquette and the exigencies of royal disguise, and finally stole the show in Frankfurt from her officially imperial but still relatively powerless husband.

When His Imperial Majesty had nearly reached the Römer, accompanied by the constant joyful shouting with which the air fairly buzzed, Her Majesty the Empress-Queen, standing at the window and waving a white handkerchief, showed her heartfelt pleasure at the so successfully accomplished coronation of his Most Serene Highness her husband, and as soon as a small silence ensued, cried out a cheerful 'Vivat!' of her own.³¹

Which body of the empress-queen became visible here? Was it her private body, or the one that claimed the masculine crowns and political authority still more plainly at the moment when Maria Theresa used the offer of coronation as imperial consort merely as an occasion for a refusal and a folksy encounter with the people? Was she interested in a brilliant fusion, a dissolve, a constantly changing play with herself as queen, consort and, finally, the mother of many children and as many aspirants to royal roles? Maria Theresa was a master of the art of permanent transgression of the body politic and the body natural. A fine example is the famous

scene of 7 September 1741 in which, dressed in mourning with a six-month-old infant (the long-awaited heir to the throne) in her arms and the crown of St Stephan on her head, she tearfully begged the representatives of the Hungarian nobility for their support (for the 'insurrection', that is, a levy *en masse*). Legend has it that the men, moved to tears themselves, 'threw themselves at their ruler's feet, drew their daggers and swore a sacred oath: "moriatur pro rege nostro Maria Theresia"'.³²

Maria Theresa knew how to put her maternal body to good political use and to assert her political will by touching the emotions. The increasingly rigid disciplining of her everyday life and office, the perfection of her representations and the strictness of her canon of virtues were ultimately revealed when, after the death of her beloved husband, she put aside her jewels forever, wore nothing but mourning until the end of her life, and banished all gaiety from her surroundings. In this way she glorified and stylised her marriage as the 'most blessed' and as the flawless nucleus of her huge family and her empire, an example for all.³³

At some point, however, the body natural of the weary old queen began to rebel. Letters were the central medium of her rule, her personal means of influencing and participating in the lives of her children. She wrote her letters largely in her own hand. Her last letter to Marie-Antoinette, written one month before her death, ends with the following words: 'I myself have been suffering for four weeks from rheumatism in my right arm, which is the reason that this letter is written less well than usual, and which causes me to close [now] with the assurance that you have all my love.'³⁴

Queen Victoria was so successful because she could represent the bourgeois ideal of the royal couple who found their vocation in the family while at the same time apparently having no difficulty in wielding power and asserting their own (so-called natural) will. She was undoubtedly conservative and had no sympathy for female emancipation, and the affairs of the common people were more likely to touch her heart than to inspire her to political reforms. Why was she able to become such a strong force for stability in nineteenth-century England? At her coronation, the tears in her eyes were plainly visible,³⁵ and her emotionality brought her closer to the common people, and made her an ideal for middle-class Englishwomen.

She was perceived as the tireless, protective mother of the growing brood of children her voluminous body brought into the world. Rapturous poetry celebrated her: "'The blessings happy

peasants have, be thine, O crowned queen". If Victoria does not quite become a peasant, she is likened to one. Democratized and domesticated – wedded *yet* crowned – Victoria upholds a romantic idea of the merrily married folk.³⁶

Victoria presented herself as the loving wife of her prince-consort, who competently relieved her of the duties of rule and became an essential part of her body politic, and whom she crowned a secret king.³⁷ It was to him, whom she adored, that she gazes devotedly upwards on countless paintings and photographs. She mourned his death to excess.

Queen Victoria refused to wear the crown without ever doubting that it belonged to her alone.³⁸ In her self-representations she did not compete with the beautiful queens of Europe, preferring the plainest, almost rustic, clothing. She looked like a woman of the people, and could be mistaken for one. Thus she could become a legend, as in one of the countless Highland tales about encounters with the queen, with a shepherd lad as hero:

'Gang out of the road, lady, and let the sheep gang by', he cried. Finding that his appeal produced no effect, he shouted yet louder, 'I say, gang back, will you, and let the sheep pass!' 'Do you know, boy, whom you are speaking to?' asked the Queen's attendant. 'I dinna know, and I dinna care', replied the exasperated lad; 'that's the sheep's road, and she has no business to stand there'. 'But it is the Queen', was the reply. 'Well', replied the astonished boy, 'why don't she put on clothes so that folks would know her?'³⁹

The queen did not go about in disguise like the figure in a fairy tale in order to learn the secrets of the common folk. Instead, her clothing betrayed *her* secret to the people, who recognised her as one of their own, as Adrienne Munich notes in her excellent analysis of 'Queen Victoria's Secrets', the building blocks of her myth.⁴⁰ 'Intensively private in her domestic relations,' however, 'the Queen displayed her privacy for public consumption; she was alone and surrounded; autocratic and abject; charitable to the poor, egocentric and abrupt to others; immensely hardworking and immensely self-indulgent.'⁴¹ The fact that she was regarded as a constant troublemaker who defied the ideas about queens held dear by the upper classes who actually ruled Britain, and who hoped that she would abdicate in favour of her son, does not appear to have bothered Victoria. Nor was she troubled by the family mutterings and newspaper gossip about her long-time Scottish

manservant and lover Mr Brown, whom she mourned as publicly (much to the embarrassment of those in her immediate surroundings) as her late husband Prince Albert.⁴²

It might appear that Victoria conquered a realm in which her political and natural bodies merged. Or that she was the right queen at the right time, with her naïvety, her delight in the theatrical, her sense of power and ultimately her immense wealth. Towards the end of her life she was the worst-dressed and the richest woman in the world. She managed at the same time to be racist and to love her Indian servants dearly; her close relationships with her dogs inspired animal protection laws that offended the hunt-loving aristocracy – she embodied all the paradoxes of a country that sought to be at once aristocratic *and* democratic, but nevertheless needed the protective, powerful and wilful body of a super-mother as well. Victoria was a fantasy and an invention of the nineteenth-century English middle classes, in whose minds the femaleness of the royal body served more to preserve than to dismantle the monarchy. Her magnificent eccentricity and wilfulness offered redemptive elements in dealing with a monarchy whose rigid fetters had given way, along with the severed heads of the *ancien régime*, to a semantic of flowing political discourses, within which the English monarchy could be stabilised. And in the discourses of the people these flows were connoted as feminine.

And yet, didn't Victoria's natural, self-willed body ultimately merge into an imperial fantasy? In closing, I would like to cite the ingenious beginning of Dorothy Thompson's biography of Victoria:

By the time of her death her nine children, thirty-six grandchildren and thirty-seven great-grandchildren, with their spouses, constituted a flock of Battenbergs, Bernadottes, Bourbons, Bourbon-Parmas, Braganzas, Coburgs, Glücksburgs, Hapsburgs, Hessens, Hohenzollerns, Mecklenburg-Strelitzes, Romanovs, Savoyes and Wittenbachs, enough to occupy most of the remaining thrones of Europe for the foreseeable future.⁴³

There is, however, yet another, oft-repeated story about the elderly Victoria, according to which, by her own account, she felt utterly alone sitting amongst this multitude of kinfolk.⁴⁴ Was this, too, a self-polished jewel in the crown of an imperial queen and mother, or was it instead the contemplation of a woman in the full possession of her faculties, whose body sensed the nearness of death?

Notes

1. Gerhard Stadelmaier, 'Die drei Körper der Königin. Frauenbilderkrieg: Andrea Breths gloriose "Maria Stuart" kämpft in der Wiener Burg', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 29 October 2001.
2. Cf. the picture of the young king as a dancer in Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (London and New Haven, 1992), 46.
3. Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England 1680–1714* (Manchester and New York, 1999), 166; see also Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London, 1977).
4. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Theology* (Princeton, NJ, 1957).
5. Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 12; see also Susanne Scholz, *Body Narratives: Writing the Nation and Fashioning the Subject in Early Modern England* (London and New York, 2000).
6. Weil, *Political Passions*, 166. See also Fanny Cosandey, *La reine de France, Symbole et pouvoir XV^e–XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 2000), 361ff.
7. Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, Chapter 1; Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 12ff.; Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London, 1977); Rudolf Braun and David Gugerli, *Macht des Tanzes – Tanz der Mächtigen. Hoffeste und Herrschaftszeremoniell 1550–1914* (Munich, 1993).
8. See the impressive interpretation of Shakespeare's *Richard II* in Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, Chapter 2.
9. 'And as I am but one body naturally considered, though by His permission a body politic to govern' is the earliest of Elizabeth's references to the doctrine of the king's two bodies, made on 20 November 1558 in her first speech before her coronation, to her secretary and lords. Elizabeth I, *Collected Works*, ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago and London, 2000), 52.
10. Susan Frye, 'Sewing Connections: Elizabeth Tudor, Mary Stuart, Elizabeth Talbot, and Seventeenth-Century Anonymous Needleworkers', in *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*, eds. Susan Frye and Karen Robertson (New York, 1999), 165–82, 167.
11. Quoted in Dorothy Thompson, *Queen Victoria: Gender and Power* (London, 1990), 27.
12. Richard Mulcaster, *The Passage of Our Most Dread Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth through the City of London to Westminster the Day Before her Coronation* (London, 1558[9]) (STC 7590). For excerpts from this account of the entry see Elizabeth I, *Collected Works*, 53–55.
13. Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (New York and Oxford, 1993), 22ff.; see also Braun and Gugerli, *Macht des Tanzes*, 73.
14. Cf. the coronation portrait painted by an unknown artist around 1600 in Elizabeth I, *Collected Works*, 50.

15. Elizabeth I, *Collected Works*, Speech 3, Version 2, 1559. Her answer to the Commons' petition that she marry, 59; cf. Philippa Berry, *Of Chastity and Power. Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen* (London and New York, 1989), 66.
16. See John N. King, 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990), 30–74.
17. On the 'Rainbow' portrait and the 'mask of youth', see Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, 46–54, and *Gloriana: The Portraits of Elizabeth I* (New York, 1987), 146–61.
18. Abby Zanger, 'Fashioning the Body Politic: Imaging the Queen in the Marriage of Louis XIV', in Louise Olga Fradenburg, ed., *Women and Sovereignty* (Edinburgh, 1992), Yearbook of the Traditional Cosmology Society 7, 101–20. On the handing over of the bride on the banks of the River Bidassoa and on the marriage celebrations, see also Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York, 1995), 334–35.
19. See Regina Schulte, 'Der Aufstieg der konstitutionellen Monarchie und das Gedächtnis der Königin', *Historische Anthropologie. Kultur – Gesellschaft – Alltag*, 6, 1 (1998), 76–103, here 76–77.
20. Abby Zanger, *Scenes from the Marriage of Louis XIV. Nuptial Fictions and the Making of Absolutist Power* (Stanford, Calif., 1997), 157.
21. Zanger, 'Body Politic', 111ff.
22. See Sarah Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres of Prerevolutionary France* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1993), esp. 167–211.
23. See Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (London, 1992), 89ff.
24. Schulte, 'Aufstieg', 76.
25. See Helmut Brackert, 'Hänsel und Gretel oder Möglichkeiten und Grenzen literaturwissenschaftlicher Märchen-Interpretationen', *Und wenn sie nicht gestorben sind ... Perspektiven auf das Märchen*, ed. H. Brackert (Frankfurt a.M., 1980), 9–38; Johann Gustav Droysen, *Vorlesungen über die Freiheitskriege*, 2 vols. (Kiel, 1846), 1, 374.
26. See Schulte, 'Aufstieg', 92ff.
27. Susan P. Casteras, 'The Wise Child and her "Offspring": Some Changing Faces of Queen Victoria', in *Remaking Queen Victoria*, eds. Margaret Homans and Adrienne Munich (Cambridge, 1997), 182–92, 197–98 f.; cf. Thompson, *Queen Victoria*, 24.
28. See *Marie-Antoinette. Correspondance secrète entre Marie-Thérèse et le Cte de Mercy Argenteau. Avec les lettres de Marie-Thérèse et de Marie-Antoinette*, ed. Alfred von Arneth and Matthieu Auguste Geoffrey, 3 vols. (Paris, 1874); Paul Christoph, ed., *Maria Theresia und Marie Antoinette. Ihr geheimer Briefwechsel* (Vienna, 1952).
29. Maria Theresa, *Briefe und Aktenstücke in Auswahl*, ed. Friedrich Walter, Freiherr-vom-Stein-Gedächtnis-Ausgabe, Ausgewählte Quellen zur Deutschen Geschichte der Neuzeit, ed. Rudolf Buchner, 12 (Darmstadt, 1968), 64.

30. Fred Hennings, *Und sitzt zur linken Hand. Franz Stephan von Lothringen* (Vienna, Berlin and Stuttgart, 1961), 265.
31. Hennings, *Und sitzt*, 280–81; see also Peter Berglar, *Maria Theresia* (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1980), 48–49.
32. Edwin Dillmann, *Maria Theresia* (Munich, 2000), 36.
33. Cf. Gertrud Fussenegger, *Maria Theresia* (Munich, 1988), 263.
34. Christoph, *Geheimer Briefwechsel*, 343.
35. Cf. Adrienne Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets* (New York, 1996), 19.
36. Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets*, 21; the most important biographies of Queen Victoria are Lytton Strachey, *Queen Victoria* (1921; reprint Harmondsworth, 1971); Elizabeth Longford, *Victoria R. I.* (London, 1964); Stanley Weintraub, *Victoria: Biography of a Queen*, 2 vols. (London, 1987); and Dorothy Thompson, *Queen Victoria*; a good German selection of Victoria's voluminous correspondence with commentary is printed in Kurt Tetzeli von Rosador and Arndt Mersmann, eds., *Queen Victoria. Ein biographisches Lesebuch* (Munich, 2000).
37. Cf. Thompson, *Queen Victoria*, 36; Weintraub, *Victoria*, Vol. 1, 170–71.
38. Cf. Weintraub, *Victoria*, Vol. 1, 14, 138, and Dorothy Marshall, *The Life and Times of Victoria* (London, 1972).
39. Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets*, 59; on royal enthusiasm for the Scottish Highlands, see Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland', in *The Invention of Tradition*, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge, 1983).
40. Munich, *Queen Victoria's Secrets*.
41. Margaret Homans and Adrienne Munich, Introduction in *Remaking Queen Victoria*, eds. Margaret Homans and Adrienne Munich (Cambridge, 1997), 3.
42. On Victoria and John Brown, see among others, Thompson, *Queen Victoria*, 61ff.; Weintraub, *Victoria*, Vol. 1, 372ff.
43. Thompson, *Queen Victoria*, xiv.
44. *Queen Victoria in her Letters and Journals*, ed. Christopher Hibbert (London, 1984), 304.