Fall 1980

Civil Pageantry in the Reigns of Elizabeth I and James I of England, 1558-1625

Marjorie Ann Watkins
Old Dominion University

CIVIC PAGEANTRY IN THE REIGNS OF ELIZABETH I AND JAMES I OF ENGLAND, 1558-1625

by

Marjorie Ann Watkins
B.A. May 1978, Old Dominion University

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

HISTORY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
December, 1980

Approved by:

Douglas G. Greene

ABSTRACT

CIVIC PAGEANTRY IN THE REIGNS OF
ELIZABETH I AND JAMES I OF ENGLAND, 1558-1625

Marjorie Ann Watkins
Old Dominion University
Director: Dr. Douglas G. Greene

Spectacle and pageantry played an important role in the monarchies of Elizabeth I and James I of England. Generally pageants served reciprocal purposes. It provided a way to let the realm view the state of the monarch's health and allowed the monarch to impress his subjects with royal grandeur. Additionally, it served as a vehicle for the manifestation of the public's desires concerning the direction which the country might move with the accession of a new monarch. Also, civic pageants provide the historian with an indication of popular like or dislike of a sovereign. In this thesis, a considerable amount of discussion is devoted to an elaboration of civic pageantry: what it was like and what it represented. Attention is also devoted to the recurring themes of the pageants.

Basic questions which this thesis addresses are: 1) how was pageantry important for Elizabeth I and James I, and 2) what does the manner in which they used and responded to pageantry tell the historian about them as monarchs and historical figures. Was the use of pageantry vital to the overall success of Renaissance sovereigns? How could the public use civic pageants to indicate popular desires and attitudes?

These questions are answered in the next six chapters.

The final chapter concludes with the following observations. Pageantry was of vital importance in the Renaissance monarchies of both Elizabeth I and James I. Elizabeth was a master of creating a good public image; she had an acute sense of political savoir-faire which James lacked. Had James been more concerned with creating a favorable public image through the use of propaganda pageantry he doubtless would have had a more successful reign.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This author wishes to extend gratitude to Dr. Douglas G. Greene for his invaluable assistance in the writing of this thesis. Dr. Greene must also be credited with arousing the author's first spark of interest in the field of English History; his zeal and enthusiasm in the classroom prompted the author to further pursue the intricacies of the Tudor-Stuart era at the graduate level. The sterling quality of his suggestions, editorial comments and opinions made them highly valued; once again they are gratefully acknowledged.

In addition to Dr. Greene, the faculty of the Old Dominion University Department of History must also be thanked for the Teaching Assistantship which provided not only the financial assistance to make this study possible, but allowed valuable insight into the intricacies of the historical profession.

The friends and family of the author must not be neglected as their support was perhaps the most valuable of all of the assistance offered during the course of this study. In particular, the parents of the author, Mr. and Mrs. Robert V. Watkins, must be acknowledged for their financial assistance in the publication of this study. Mr. Michael R. Price is also commended for his support and constant encouragement. He knew when to provide a sympathetic shoulder, and

when, at times, to urge the author to move ahead with this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the late Tudor early Stuart eras of English history, the success of the sovereign depended in large measure on his popular appeal. English monarchs sought to enhance their popularity by a variety of means; public ceremonial frequently took the form of civic pageants, royal pomp, and ostentatious displays, masques, ballads, poetry, plays and other literary and visual propaganda. In many ways the distinctions between the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I can be attributed to the different attitudes they applied to the ceremonial aspect of English statecraft.

Questions which the author answers in the course of this study include: What does the manner in which Elizabeth I and James I use of civic pageantry tell historians about them as monarchs and historical figures? How and why was pageantry important for Elizabeth and James? How does their use of pageantry differ from that of their predecessor? Why was pageantry in the Renaissance monarchies more elaborate than that of medieval monarchies? This chapter will primarily address itself to the latter question; the other questions will be answered within the succeeding chapters.

In order to give the reader a historical perspective

of pageantry, and to allow for comparison of the earlier pageantry with that used by Elizabeth and James, one must briefly examine the social changes which had occurred within the monarchy since the middle ages. Perhaps the most fundamental alteration was in the subjects' social expectations of the Crown. In particular, their interpretations of the King's duties, his place in society, and the way in which he presented his authority to the community of the realm modified; these changes were reflected in the changing uses of pageantry.

The early medieval king was, simply stated, the first among equals. He was the leader of the social system, the most powerful noble of the realm. Absolute sovereignty was not present; the king needed the support of the leading barons in order to maintain his throne. The power of the king was greatly enhanced when, in the tenth century, he achieved supremacy in law.[1] As the king's responsibilities increased, so too did the use of symbols of kingship. Early medieval English kings buttressed their supreme state on symbolic gestures; e.g., the royal crown, the elevated throne, the sceptre, and the use of titles. These overt efforts to enhance the king's superior status were, in addition, symbolic representations of the fact that the king was no longer simply a war leader; his position had garnered the additional responsibility for the administration of justice. By the eleventh century, the king's responsibilities had been extended

---

[1]Bryce Lyon, A Constitutional and Legal History of Medieval England, 2nd ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1980), p. 40.

to include the administration of the realm, and the maintenance of domestic tranquility. The early Norman rulers recognized the value of public ceremonial to achieve these ends.[2] Accordingly, outward symbols of sovereignty were retained as the feudal order began to develop with the king at the apex of medieval society.

The Angevin successors to the crown continued to emphasize public display. They also continued to strengthen and expand the central authority of the crown. Doubtless, the appearance of a wealthy, healthy sovereign, in complete control of the reins of government, did much to inspire feelings of loyalty, trust and obedience of the subjects. For this reason, it was to the king's advantage to appear often in public. The Angevins also capitalized on the thaumaturgical power of the Crown; Henry II persuaded the Pope to canonize Edward the Confessor from whom the Angevins claimed descent.[3] This measure further enhanced the monarchy's prestige.

The success of the early Angevins was not matched by their successors. By the thirteenth century, the power of the English monarchy was beginning to decline. The Magna Carta symbolized the increasing power of the barons and the inability of the later Angevins to maintain Henry II's monarchial authority. During the reign of John the struggle for the control of government between the barons and the king

---

[2]Ibid., p. 140.

[3]Ibid., p. 245.

began. England would not see an end to this struggle until the days of the Protectorate. These social problems were evidenced by a lack of respect for the monarchy.

The decline of the power of the Crown was also due to the emergence of "bastard feudalism," that is, the perversion of the feudal order to fit the demands of an increasingly monied economy. The old feudal system, stressing loyalty and service in return for land, continued to operate in theory. In fact, however, loyalty became based on monetary recompense. Since mercenaries sold themselves to the highest bidder (more often than not, to persons other than the king), the leading magnates created powerful private armies who owed allegiance not to the king, but to their retainers. From the thirteenth century onwards the king was reduced to a lesser economic and military status than he had enjoyed earlier. In addition, the collapse of serfdom as a result, in part, of the Black Death made the enforcement of feudal duties impossible. Former serfs were now able to bargain their services for money in the depleted labor market. The result of the increasing value of peasant labor produced a heretofore unseen economic hardship on the barons; perhaps this loss of readily available, cheap labor partially explains the fierce cut-throat competition among the baronial class at the time which they blamed on the monarchy.[4]

The growing power of the barons over the monarch is exemplified by a new coronation oath. In addition to the

---

[4]G.R. Elton, England Under the Tudors (London: Methuen and Co., 1975), p. 8.

traditional promises to observe peace, rule honesty and justly, and so on, a new clause was added in 1308. This stated that the king must promise to obey the laws as determined by the community of the realm.[5] Parliament, of course, was the champion of the public welfare. Violation of the 1308 oath was the reason given by Parliament for the depositions of Edward II and Richard II. Mere visible pageantry was not enough to command respect for and obedience of the sovereign.

The deposition of these kings illustrates the depths to which the monarchy had descended. Edward III's disastrous policy of parcelling out the royal demesne added fuel to an ever-heating flame. By doing so, he managed to weaken the monarchy almost to its breaking point. A network of blood relatives, each a potential claimant to the throne was created. When ambitious barons, each fiercely guarding his own interests, combined with a weak, unstable monarchy, the atmosphere was ripe for civil war. The weakness of the king's position was further increased by the lack of money with which to compete with the barons. They were oftentimes more wealthy and powerful than the king and therefore commanded more respect and exhibited more pageantry (richer dress, larger armies, more retainers) than did the king.

The weakness of the feudal monarchy was exposed in the Wars of the Roses. Out of the anarchy of this period a desire arose for a more centralized, authoritarian government, headed by a powerful king who was still willing to work with a

---

[5]Bryce Lyons, A Constitutional and Legal History of Medieval England, p. 499.

representative body such as Parliament. It was absolutely essential that the new monarchy be powerful enough to ensure that never again would dynastic struggles plunge the country into armed warfare. When Henry Tudor emerged the victor at Bosworth Field, he was determined to be the kind of king England needed at the time.

Henry VII had a formidable task to restore the monarchy to its former hegemony within the realm, while simultaneously working with the institution of Parliament. He also faced a disintegrated society, a depleted treasury, and the decay of law and order. In many respects, he had to start from the very beginning to create a viable dynasty and to strengthen the institution of the monarchy; in doing so, Henry had to restore the country to prosperity. Since his claim to the throne was hereditarily weak, Henry had to convince the subjects that he truly was the king of England. He claimed that God's will that he rule was proven by the Tudor victory at Bosworth, a "trial by battle" situation. In addition, Henry did all that he could to exhibit visible kingly attributes by the use of propaganda pageantry.

Renaissance kingship was different than Medieval kingship in several ways. Renaissance kings had to cultivate the good will of the middle class, who had increased in numbers, wealth, and importance. More significantly, Parliament had assumed much of the responsibility for governing the realm, a responsibility which had earlier set the monarch apart from everyone else. He was forced to make up for the loss of this distinctive feature by manifesting a "kingly" image, notably,

wealth, power, magnaminity, and intelligence. The primary means for this was in propaganda pageantry. Always important to English monarch, pageantry, by the Renaissance, had become vital to the kings position. Also, since trade was increasing with foreign powers, the sovereign's wealth and stature were significant forces of international diplomacy. The crown also came to signify the growth of England as a centralized territorial nation-state in the modern sense; the pageantry and grandeur of the sovereign had come to symbolize the entire English nation.

Henry VII staged numerous public displays of royal magnificence so that he could see and be seen by his subjects. Always, while in public view, he was richly garbed and appeared very wealthy; his court reflected his kingly majesty in the eyes of the commoners. Public festivals were held both to entertain and to educate the citizens about the king's good qualities. "These ceremonies were no mere embellishment of political realities; they were in fact, the instruments employed to erect the entire Tudor dynasty upon a sure foundation.[6]

The importance Henry Tudor placed on pageantry is evidenced by the relatively large sums of money he spent in this area.[7] Henry recognized that due to the weak hereditary claim of his dynasty, the ultimate source of his support was his popular appeal. He used civic pageantry to accomplish

---

[6]Sydney Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 11.

[7]Elton, England Under the Tudors, p. 14.

this end. In the civic pageants, he appealed to the commoners and made the crown appear generous, wealthy, and stable. Stability, wealth, and power were essential to the middle-class merchants who needed peace to ensure their prosperity. By making himself look grand and wealthy, Henry also enhanced the prestige of the country in foreign opinion. In making the Crown more visible, Henry became more than the medieval war leader when his military prowess was exhibited at Bosworth; the crown became the symbol of English unity. It provided a focal point around which the newly awakened nationalistic forces could rally.

This concept of national sovereignty was further enhanced by Henry VIII. In the 1553 Act of Appeals, England was envisioned as an empire, a sovereign state free from the interference of foreign (Papal) control.[8] The Protestant Reformation in itself had a great deal to do with England's consciousness as a sovereign state. After the Henrician Reformation the monarchy assumed spiritual supremacy.

> During the early English Reformation [writes Franklin Baumer], the cult authority was popular because the King had come to personify England's nationalism as against papal internationalism, and because he represented the people's surety against internal anarchy. It was this cult of authority which, in addition to the doctrine of Royal Supremacy, chiefly differentiated the Tudor theory of kingship from that of the fifteenth century.[9]

By the time of Anne Boleyn's coronation procession, Henrician

---

[8]Ibid., pp. 160-1, 184.

[9]Baumer, The Early Tudor Theory of Kingship, p. 119.

subjects were beginning to use pageantry visibly to express their views. In 1533, pageants (commissioned by the king) were enacted to praise Anne Boleyn, but the public reception was quite hostile. Pageants and civic celebrations became two-fold in purpose. On the one hand they could buttress the monarch's appeal by praising his virtues and pointing them out to the public, but on the other hand, pageantry could be used to express the citizens' opinions. The successful monarchs listened to these public offerings; the unpopular sovereigns did not. Throughout this thesis the reactions and public displays of Elizabeth I and James I will be compared and contrasted.

Certain limitations have of necessity been placed on this study since virtually every aspect of a monarch's life drew attention and influenced public opinion. Four specific areas of the Renaissance king's life were selected: coronation processions, coronation ceremonies, royal progresses, and funeral ceremonies. This thesis is concerned entirely with public spectacle and not court ceremony, itself a suitable topic for a detailed study. Unless otherwise stated, this work is limited to England from 1558 to 1625, that is, during the reigns of Elizabeth and James.

Certain terms have been frequently used in the course of this study. The terms "spectacle" and "pageant" refer to various festivals, plays, masques, and tournaments which were held. A suitable synonym for "spectacle" would be "public display of ceremony;" of "pageant," "play." The term "progress" simply refers to a journey the monarch and most

of the courtiers made throughout the country; the distance varied from a few miles to several hundred. The term "Renaissance monarch" includes English kings from Henry VII to Charles I. For ease of writing, the term "king" refers to Elizabeth as well as to James. This is not meant to detract from her femininity; rather it refers to the institution of the monarchy.

The chapters will be divided as follows. The first deals with the public activities of the monarch from the time of the death of the predecessor, the journey to London, and the triumphal entry into the city. The coronation procession which provided the first official public opportunity for the sovereign and the subjects to interact is discussed in chapter two. Chapter three deals with the sacred coronation ceremony and the post-coronation festivities. The coronation was vitally important to the new sovereign. No ruler was truly king in every sense of the word until after the ceremony had been performed. Chapter four deals with the progresses. These were conscious efforts of public-image propaganda. According to Alan G.R. Smith,

> Such occasions were partly holidays, but they were also exercises in political propaganda journeys on which the Queen exercised to the full her graciousness and did a great deal to cement those bonds of personal affection and personal loyalty between herself and her people upon which so much of the success of her domestic statecraft rested.[10]

---

[10]Alan G.R. Smith, The Government of Elizabethan England (London: Edward Arnold, 1967), p. 3.

These progresses were an important means by which Renaissance sovereigns could influence their subjects in the days when mass media meant political pamphlets. Progresses allowed the sovereign to view first-hand the condition of the realm. This was an important way for the king to take care of the moral responsibility he shared for his subjects' welfare.[11] These annual journeys allowed the king to more effectively guard the public weal. This paternalistic, moral responsibility of the Renaissance monarch for his subjects was enhanced by the notion of an ordered, organic society with the king at its head.[12] Royal progresses were one of the best means for the king to manifest this role. Chapter five deals with the ceremonial aspects attendant upon the death of a sovereign.

---

[11]A.L. Rowse, The England of Elizabeth: The Structure of Society (New York: Macmillan, 1950), pp. 263-64.

[12]For more information about the "organic" society, see E.M.W. Tillyard's The Elizabethan World Picture.

CHAPTER II

THE CORONATION PROCESSION

It has already been stated that pageantry had long been used by English monarchs as a method of setting them apart from their subjects and manifesting kingship. One of the most important uses of pageantry was in the Coronation Procession. Since 1054 the coronation of English monarchs has included a royal procession through the city of London. The chief function of this procession was to provide the first official opportunity for the monarch to greet his subjects, although, in fact, they had already cheered him as he journeyed towards London for the official entry into the city. In fact, the manual by which the English coronations were performed, the Liber Regalis, required a coronation procession whereby the king offered "himself to be seen by the people who meet him."[1]

In the eleventh century the procession as a part of the coronation ceremony was introduced into England by Italian merchants.[2] The early processions were quite simple and

---

[1]Liber Regalis in English Coronation Records, ed. Leopold Legg (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1979), p. 113.

[2]James Osborne, ed. The Quene's Maiesties Passage Through Westminster the Day Before Her Coronacion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 11.

often consisted merely of a parade of the nobility. During the Tudor era, the ceremony and pageantry associated with these processions had become increasingly sophisticated. For the coronation procession of Henry VII and VIII there were huge crowds in the streets and several prepared speeches were given at various points throughout the city. The coronation procession of Edward VI was similar to those of his father and grandfather. The first time in English history that pageants were presented as an integral part of the coronation was in 1553, at the coronation of Mary Tudor.[3] It was, however, with the accession of Elizabeth I that "pageantry finally came into its own right."[4] By the time of her accession, pageantry associated with coronation festivities was an accepted vehicle for both expressing public sentiments and displaying royal grandeur. Because of this two-fold obligation by the sixteenth century, official pageantry at the coronation procession played a vital role in the welcome of a new sovereign.

Traditionally the entrance of the new monarch into London for the triumphal procession was a festive occasion for the city's inhabitants as well as for the royal entourage. The coronation procession was a parade through the streets of London the day prior to the actual coronation ceremony. The festivities lasted for two days because both the triumphal procession and the coronation ceremony were lengthy and

---

[3]Ibid., p. 9.

[4]Ibid., p. 7.

arduous to all who took part; a good night's rest in between was considered essential. In addition, the delay between the coronation and the procession may have served to strengthen the idea that the procession was a secular counterpart to the solemn coronation ceremony the following day.

The coronation and its procession did not occur on the very day that the new monarch arrived in London. Usually there was a delay lasting anywhere from two days to two months, during which time the previous monarch was buried and the arrangements were made for a new privy council. The new monarch generally lodged at the Tower of London, but this was not a hard and fast rule. The procession, however, always began at the Tower of London and ended at Westminster where the coronation took place.

During the procession, the monarch passed through a series of arches around which several pageants were erected. These pageants were a variety of allegorical portrayals of the expected interaction of the monarch and his subjects. In addition the pageants expressed the role his personal virtues and vices could play. Through these pageants, the sovereign's subjects could humbly offer advice on how to rule the nation. The physical composition of these pageants ran the gamut from colorful paintings, prepared speeches, short plays, or carved pictures. Usually people dressed to represent allegorical qualities were included as well. These pageants were thus a verbal, pictorial, symbolic representation of both the subjects' hopes for the coming reign and their

attitudes toward the new monarch.[5]

Praise and eagerness for the accession of the new monarch outweighed grief for the departed ruler. When Mary died on 14 November, 1558, there was little superfluous mourning.[6] Immediately after Mary's death, Elizabeth was proclaimed "Queen of England, Ireland, France, and Defender of the Faith" by the Herald of Arms in London. Church bells celebrated the accession of Elizabeth, rather than mourning the death of Mary. That evening bonfires were lit throughout the realm to clebrate the new Queen. Tables in the streets provided a veritable feast for the townsfolk of London. Englishmen partied and celebrated for hours on the evening of Mary's death.[7] It appears that the country as a whole was genuinely glad to have a moderate, Protestant, and wholly English Queen at its head. Elizabeth had long been a popular favorite, but doubtless Mary's religious excesses (e.g. the Smithfield Fires) added to Elizabeth's popularity.

From the very outset, Elizabeth did not disappoint her subjects. In one of her first actions after Mary's death, she selected and called a meeting of her privy council. After having established her governing body, Elizabeth then removed

---

[5]Ibid., p. 13.

[6]Mary Tudor was not a popular monarch, whereas for years Elizabeth was looked on by many Englishmen with favor. There were several plots during Mary's reign to replace her with Elizabeth. On numerous occasions, Elizabeth actually feared for her life because of Mary's jealousy.

[7]John Nichols, The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth (London: Nichols and Son, 1823), I: 29.

herself from Hatfield and journeyed towards London. Great crowds cheered her along the way. Upon her arrival in London, Elizabeth entered the Tower of London to the sound of trumpets, the Tower artillery, and the cheers of her subjects. This procession into the Tower included the Queen's privy councillors, the Lord Mayor of London, the Queen's Heralds in full regalia, the Knights of the Garter, and lastly, the Queen herself, wearing a royal robe of purple velvet.[8]

Not caring much for the accommodations in the Tower, and probably remembering how close she came to ending her days there during Mary's reign, Elizabeth left the Tower on 23 December to spend the Christmas season at Westminster. On 12 January she returned to the Tower by barge, accompanied by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London.[9] Elizabeth remained there until 14 January, the day of her coronation procession. Just prior to leaving the Tower, she said the following prayer.

> I give thee most heartie thanks that thou hast been so merciful vnto me as to spare me to beholde this ioyful daye. And I aknowledge that thow hast delt as wonderfully and mercifully with me as thow didst wyth thy true and faithful servant Daniel thy prophete whom thou deliurest out of the dene from the crueltie of the gredy and rageing Lyons: even so I was overwhelmed and only by thee delivered. To thee therefore only be thankes, honor, and prayse, for ever, amen.[10]

---

[8]Osborne, The Quene's Majesties Passage ..., p. 132.

[9]Nichols, ed., The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, I: 34.

[10]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy, p. 29.

Such were Elizabeth's thoughts as she entered her elaborately decorated horse-drawn chariot in the afternoon of 14 January, 1558. The procession included the Queen's privy councillors, her Lords and Ladies in order of rank, the royal trumpeters in their scarlet uniforms, and the Heralds in full armor. The large and colorful procession wound its way through the narrow, freshly gravelled streets which were further decorated by colorful streamers and banners from the windows of every house along the parade route. The Queen's subjects lined the streets and cheered her and her entourage. Eventually the group came to the first pageant at Fenchurch Street.

Here the Queen was greeted with the noise of many musical instruments as a child welcomed Elizabeth on behalf of the citizens. In a speech to the Queen, the child offered Elizabeth two gifts: (1) the blessing and welcome of the city's inhabitants, and (2) their "true hearts to love her."[11] Of Elizabeth's reaction, a contemporary chronicler noted the following.

> ... the Quenes majesties countenance during the time that the child spake, besides a perpetuall attentiveness in her face, a marvelous change inloke, as the childes wordes touched either her person, or the Peoples tonges or hertes. So that she with rejoysyng visage did evidently declare that the wordes took no less place in her minde, than they were moste heartely pronounced by the chylde....[12]

---

[11] Nichols, ... The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, I: 39-40.

[12] Ibid., p. 40.

Elizabeth thanked the city for this pageant and promised that she would live up to her subjects' expectations.

The next pageant was more elaborate than the first. This pageant at Gracious Street occurred on a stage which extended the entire width of the street. A large wreath of red and white roses bore a banner which stated, "the uniting of the two houses of Lancaster and York." According to an eyewitness, the few empty places were "furnished with sentences concerning unitie."[13] The scaffolding, in three levels, contained children representing Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, and on the uppermost level, a child represented Elizabeth.

The symbolism of this pageant is obviously an allusion to the peace and unity which the marriage of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York brought to the country, then torn by factionalism resulting from the Wars of Roses. Through this pageant, the English subjects were reminding Elizabeth that England was, at the time of her accession, similarly divided, although on the question of religion. This was a plea for her to ease the divisions within the country. Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn were included to show Elizabeth's legitimacy and to emphasize the fact that she was a direct descendant of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. A child explained this symbolism to the Queen; her final sentence was, "so now that jarrs shall stint, and quietness encrease, we

---

[13]Ibid., pp. 40-41.

trust o noble Queen thou wilt be cause along."[14] Elizabeth thanked the city for the pageant, praised its craftsmanship, and promised to heed its advice to ensure peace and unity.[15]

As the procession approached the conduit in Cornhill, the next pageant and triumphal arch came into view. The title of the pageant as written on a banner was "the right office of a Prince was, and is to advance virtue and suppress vice." This pageant showed a child (representing Elizabeth) sitting on a "seat of worthie governance" and was supported by four persons portraying "virtues" which trod on four persons portraying "vices." "Pure Religion" trampled on "Superstition and Ignorance," "Love of Subjects" trampled on "Rebellion and Insolencie," "Wisdom" over "Follie and Vain Glorie," and "Justice" over "Adulation and Briberie."[16] The child's oration made the theme of the pageant clear:

> how all the subjectes hertes, o Prince of pereles fame, do trust these vertues shall maintayn up thy throne and vyce be kept down still, the wicked put to shame.[17]

The theme of virtues triumphing over vices was common in Renaissance art, but this was probably the first time it was used in English pageantry.[18] Also, the specific

---

[14]Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[15]Ibid., p. 42.

[16]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, p. 348.

[17]Nichols, ... Progress of Queen Elizabeth, I: 45.

[18]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, p. 355.

virtues which were selected are significant; in particular, the use of "Pure Religion" over "Ignorance and Superstition" refers to the triumph of the Protestant religion over Catholicism. "Love of Subjects" over "Rebellion and Insolencie" refers to the religious turmoil under Mary. The child's oration clearly warned the Queen that if she ever let vices gain the upper hand, "it woulde put the seat of worthie gouernement in perill of falling."[19] Elizabeth's response was again to thank the city and to promise to maintain her virtues and suppress vice.

The next triumphal arch and pageant was located at Soper Lane. In this pageant, eight children represented the beatitudes. Their names were carved on tables above their heads, and they were dressed to represent their particular blessing. The message of this pageant was that each of the beatitudes represented could be applied to events in Elizabeth's life and that faith in God has sustained her through many dark hours. The direct reference was again to the problems incurred during the reign of Mary. According to contemporary accounts, Elizabeth was especially moved at this pageant, and thanked the city for bestowing its blessings on her reign.[20]

At the standard in Cheape the Queen met the Recorder of the city, Randolph Cholmoley, and the Aldermen of London.

---

[19]Ibid., pp. 348-9.

[20]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 347.

Against a backdrop on which the chronology of all the Kings and Queens of England was painted, Cholmoley delivered a speech of good will to Elizabeth and presented her with a crimson satin purse containing one-thousand marks of gold. Elizabeth's reply indicates her gratitude.

> ... be ye ensured, that I will be as good unto you as ever a Quene was to her people... and persuave your selves, that for the safetie and quietnes of you all, I will not spare, if need be to spend my blood. God thanke you all.[21]

This speech, more than any other, reflected Elizabeth's love of subjects and her courage as well. These words are exemplary of Elizabeth's accute political sense. She instinctively knew what her subjects wished to hear, and said what she knew would please them.

The fourth pageant, erected at the Little Conduit in Cheape, displayed two allegorical commonwealths. On one side of the stage, a barren mountain was topped by a dead tree. Beneath the tree a homely person mourned. Inscriptions below the tree read "want of the feare of God," "disobedience to rulers," "blindness of guides," "briberie in maiestrats," rebellion in subjects," "civill disagreement," "flatering of princes," "unmercifullnese in rulers," and "unthankfulnes in subjects." A banner overhead proclaimed the title "Ruinosa Republica." On the other side of the stage a green hill was crowned with flowers and a healthy tree, under which a smiling young person stood. Inscribed under this tree was "feare of God," "a wise prince," "learned rulers," "obedience to others,"

---

[21]Ibid., p. 49.

"obedient subjects," "lovers of the commonweale," "vertue rewarded," and "vice chastened." Over this tree, the title "Republica bene institutia" was displayed. From between the two allegorical commonwealths an old man representing "Time" came forth, leading a lady dressed as "Truth." "Truth" held a book entitled Verbatum Veritas. When the Queen approached the pageant, "Truth" handed the book to a child who greeted Elizabeth with verses which explained how "Time" had brought his daughter "Truth" from behind a rock where she had been hiding. The child went on to express the city's hope that Elizabeth would embrace "Truth" and pointed to the differences between the two commonwealths represented in the pageant. She also expressed the hope that Elizabeth "heale the sore [religious division] and cure that is not green which thinge the book of Truth doth teache in writing plain."[22] The theme of this pageant was to demonstrate the kind of state to which England had degenerated under Mary and to show the kind of state to which the English subjects aspired under Elizabeth. Elizabeth's reaction to this pageant was to receive the book of "Truth," which was actually a vernacular Bible. She kissed the book, laid it on her breast, and again sincerely thanked the city. The crowd was impressed by her acceptance of the vernacular Bible and cheered loudly.[23]

After a brief stop at St. Paul's churchyard where she

---

[22]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, p. 350.

[23]Ibid., p. 351.

heard an oration delivered in Latin by one of the school's pupils, Elizabeth and her procession continued towards the fifth pageant, located at Fleet Street. The stage spanned the street and featured three platforms of equal height. On one platform a woman dressed in Parliament robes sat on a throne and held a sceptre. Above her head a banner proclaimed her "Debora, the judge and restorer of the house of Israel." On the other platforms, the nobility, the clergy, and the commonality were represented. A table in front of these figures were inscribed "Debora with her estates consulting for the good gouernment of Israel." In verse, a child explained how the Israelites were enslaved by Jaben until God sent Debora to defeat Jaben's troops. Debora had a long, peaceful reign and ruled quite well. The child further explained that God has sent Elizabeth to accomplish a similar mission.[24] This was also a reminder that God sometimes sent women to rule a kingdom, an allusion to John Knox's recently published work, The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women.[25] In addition, this pageant reminded Elizabeth that a good sovereign should consult frequently with her Parliament.

---

[24]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, p. 351, and Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 53.

[25]John Knox, The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women, 1558. Edited by Edward Arber (New York: AMS Press, 1967), pp. 11-14. This entire work is quite caustic towards women rulers; Knox cites numerous biblical quotations against women rulers.

The Queen's next stop was at the children's hospital at St. Dunstan's church. Her reaction indicates her concern for the poor and her political sense for pleasing the public. "I see thys mercyful worke towarde the poore, whom I must in the middest of my royaltie needs remembre."[26] In Latin, a child delivered a speech which summarized the pageants thus far.

> At thine entraunce First, O Prince of high renowne,
> Thou was presented with tonges and heartes for thy fayre,
> So now sith thou must nedes depart out of this towne
> This citie sendeth thee firme hope and earnest praier.
>
> For all men hope in thee; that all vertues shall reygne,
> For all men hope that thou, none errour wilt support,
> For all men hope that thou wilt trueth restore agayne,
> And mend that is amisse, to all good menes comfort.
>
> And for this hope they pray, thou mayest continue long,
> Our Quene amongst vs here, all vice for to supplant,
> And for this hope they pray that God may take the Strong,
> As by his grace puissant so in his trueth constant.
>
> Farewell o worthie Quene, and as our hope is sure,
> That into errours place, thou wilt now trueth restore,
> So trust we that thou wilt our soueraigne Quene endure,
> And louing Lady stand, from henceforth evermore.[27]

The final pageant was at Temple Bar. Here, statues of Gotmagot the Albione and Corineus the Breton guarded the triumphal arch. A summary of the pageants was written on the arch. As Elizabeth passed through this arch, children sang praises of her and a poet bade her farewell. At last, the exhausted Queen and her retinue and reached Westminster.[28]

---

[26]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 55.

[27]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, pp. 352-3.

[28]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 57.

These pageants constructed for Elizabeth's coronation procession had taken only five weeks to write, design, and construct. The city of London selected a committee of fourty-four persons to do the planning. This central committee, headed by Richard Grafton, was subdivided into committees each of which was in charge of a single pageant, Richard Mulcaster, a schoolmaster, was commissioned to translate the subjects' ideas into Latin and English verse for the orations.[29] Appointed by the Queen, Nicholas Throckmorton and William Cecil also supervised the preparations for the festivities.[30] Other civic preparations included repainting of the conduits and gravelling of the streets. Queen Elizabeth appreciated the time and money which had gone into the construction of these pageants. According to Tottil,

> ... one about Her Grace noted the Cities charge, that there was no cost spared: Her Grace answered, that she did well consyder the same, and that it shoulde be remembred.[31]

The town had not constructed these pageants simply for the sake of tradition. There was a message to Elizabeth in each of the five pageants. She was told at the first pageant what virtues to embrace and what vices to suppress; she was also told that if she failed to suppress vice, her kingdom would no longer be stable. At the second pageant she was told that

---

[29]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, p. 346.

[30]Calendar of State Papers of the Reign of Elizabeth, Domestic Series, November 15, 1558.

[31]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 53.

she represented the beatitudes and that she must continue to do so. Later, she was given an English Bible which would teach her how to heal the decayed nation that she inherited from Mary. The fourth pageant showed causes why states either flourish or fail. The next pageant explained that the reign of the biblical Queen Debora should be used as a model for Elizabeth. Lastly, she was warned that she should govern with the advice of her nobles, clergy, and commons. It is significant to note that instead of rushing past the pageants as Mary had, Elizabeth listened carefully to the speeches and studied each pageant's symbolism. Her comments expressed the desire to be the kind of monarch her subjects deserved.[32] Much of her reactions were doutbtless expressions of her "public sense." Most of her comments must therefore be interpreted as such, rather than as examples of her true feelings.

Just as the townspeople used the pageants to display public wishes for the ensuing reign, Elizabeth utilized the occasion to influence her subjects. She courted their favor by smiling, waving, and accepting with grace even the humblest gifts of her subjects. The story of her gracious acceptance of the rosemary is well known. Tottil states that the Queen showed herself to be the perfect image of a worthy lady.[33] In her coronation procession Elizabeth courted her subjects;

---

[32]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, p. 346.

[33]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 58.

as a result, at the start of her reign, public opinion was on her side. The fact that Elizabeth was so successful at creating the public image of a concerned, loving, and gracious monarch at her coronation procession contrasts markedly with the behavior of her successor.

Although the public was sad when Elizabeth died on 24 March, 1602-3 (see Chapter V), they responded to the new monarch James I with equal fervor. Although Elizabeth had never formally named a successor, on several occasions she had indicated a desire that her Stuart cousin, James VI of Scotland be heir to the English throne. It is interesting to note that the succession of James was by no means definite; there could very likely have been a disputed succession. Henry VIII's will specifically excluded the Stuart line from the English succession. However, since Elizabeth had indicated, albeit vaguely, a desire that the crown go to the King of Scotland, and since she died childless, the last surviving legitimate descendant of the Tudor line, the crown was transferred peacefully to the Stuart dynasty. Within six hours[34] of Elizabeth's death, James was proclaimed "King of England, Scotland, Ireland, France, and Defender of the Faith" before an open assembly of nobles at the Richmond Court gates (Elizabeth died at Richmond). When the official proclamation was made later that day in London by the royal heralds, the townspeople cheered the new monarch. At Hull when the

---

[34]Elizabeth died at approximately 2:00 AM, thus the proclamation was read at about 8:00 AM in London. C.H. Firth, Stuart Tracts, 1603-93 (New York: Cooper Square, 1964), p. 15.

proclamation was read, liquor was distributed to the population so that all could drink to the King's health. Bells rang and bonfires burned to celebrate James' accession. Throughout the realm the proclamation was celebrated with great rejoicing. Once again, the English spirit of optimism outdid mourning for the departed Queen.

Sir Robert Carey rode about four-hundred miles from Richmond to Edinburgh to inform James of Elizabeth's death. James and his native Scotsmen were glad to hear of his accession; many Scots had long believed that Elizabeth died much sooner than was reported and that an old woman was substituted for her.[35]

James left Edinburgh on 5 April, 1603. He and Queen Anne parted in a tearful farewell which touched the hearts of the Scots who gathered to bid James farewell.[36] The two were to meet at a later date so that they could make the triumphal journey into London together. Queen Anne delayed her journey for several reasons. She was in the middle of a pregnancy; she also wanted to wait to see how the English received her husband. In addition, Anne demanded that Prince Henry (the Heir Presumptive) be allowed to go south with her but the powerful Earl of Mar refused. Anne was forced to delay until

---

[35]John Jessee, Memoirs of the Court of England in the Reign of the Stuarts, (Boston: Chester F. Rice, n.d.), I: 63.

[36]Probably these tears were to influence public opinion. Most sources indicate that Anne and James did not get along well and in fact there was probably very little affection between them. C.H. Firth, Stuart Tracts, pp. 64-65.

James, already on the way to London, sent an official warrant for Henry's release. Anne suffered a miscarriage as a result of her quarrels with the Earl and was forced to further delay her travels south until the end of May.

Although Anne was left behind in Scotland, James took several of his most powerful Lords on the progress to London. Among them were the powerful Duke of Lennox, and the Earls of Argyll, Morray, and Cassilis. English Lords joined the procession as they continued south. As the party entered each shire it was met by the Sheriff, Justices of the Peace, and the principle gentry of the shire who escorted the royal party to the next shire. James was surprised with the wealth he encountered in England; he was more accustomed to the relative poverty of his native Scotland. James was impressed with the lavish entertainment he received in the houses of England's wealthiest barons. Crowds of commoners gathered to cheer the procession along his journey; unfortunately, James had an aversion to large crowds and frequently ordered them dispersed. Unlike Elizabeth who played up to her crowds, "James did his best to dampen the ardor of his subjects."[37]

James did not hurry south; he took five weeks to get from Edinburgh to London. James had an intense fear of anything relating to death so he travelled slowly in order that the might arrive in London well after Elizabeth's burial.

Upon arrival at Stamford Hill, three miles outside of

---

[37]Firth, Stuart Tracts, p. 65.

London, James and Anne were greeted by over five-hundred citizens of London, minor court officials, and the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London. James was thus magnificently escorted to the charter house in London. The road to the city was so thronged with spectators what a new road had to be made for the procession.[38]

Although he was greeted with joy at first, many of the upper echelon of English society soon became dissatisfied with James. The most frequent accusation was that he prostituted all titles of honor; within six weeks after Elizabeth's death, James knighted over two-hundred and thirty-seven people.[39] His court was, from the start, tainted with immorality[40] and many Englishmen blamed this on the Scots James had brought south with him. Accusations were also made that James did not spend enough time with affairs of state. A contemporary wrote, "the English soon learned that they had 'an huntinge kinge and a dauncing queen.'"[41] Despite this minor dissatisfaction with their king, the English still accorded him the honors of a triumphal coronation procession, and in doing so, gave him an opportunity to display his "public sense."

---

[38]G.P.V. Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, or the Court of James I (New York: Atheneum, 1978), p. 19.

[39]Firth, Stuart Tracts, p. 66.

[40]Sir Simonds D'Ewes, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. Edited by James Halliwell. (London: Richard Bentley, 1845), pp. 325-6.

[41]Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, p. 22.

James' coronation procession differed from the norm in that it occurred forty days after his coronation. The reason for this deviation from tradition was that the plague was raging in London and hundreds were dying every day.[42] To have celebrated with parades in the streets filled with people would have been sheer folly and would have furthered the epidemic. Thus the parade was postponed to maintain the monarch's health and to prevent the spread of the pestilance. The coronation went on as scheduled; however, the only people who were allowed to attend were the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London, and twelve citizens.

The delay in the procession probably served to make the public more eager for the event. It is significant that although the procession was postponed, the citizens deemed it important enough that it was still held. When 15 March arrived, the population of London was more than ready for the procession to occur; it was attended by the bulk of the London population and "all the peers and lords of England, and a good part of those of Scotland."[43]

So many nobles attended that it took hours for everyone to find his proper place in the procession. One's place was assigned on the basis of rank and tenure of his title. At the head of the parade were the pursuivants of arms; these included the knights of the rose, bluemantle, portcullis, rouge dragon,

---

[42]Hoby, Lady Margaret, Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby. Edited by Dorothy Meads (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1930), pp. 204, 205, 207.

[43]Firth, Stuart Tracts, p. 182.

and rouge croix. The second group included the officers of the king's court, the judges, privy councillors, barons in order of rank, bishops, and the ambassadors of Wurtemberg, Brunswick, Lorraine, Denmark, and France. In the third unit, two earls carried the royal spurs and St. Edward's sceptre. Three earls marching abreast carried the three swords of state. Next, three ceremonial officers, the lord constable, lord great chamberlain, and the earl marshall preceeded three other earls who carried the sceptre of the dove, the crown, and the orb.[44] The fifth unit of the procession contained the King. Supported by the bishops of London and Durham, and flanked by the barons of the cinq ports, King James rode on a white horse under a canopy upheld by eight men of the privy chamber. The Queen's retinue was the sixth unit of the procession. Queen Anne was supported in her chariot by two bishops, and her sceptre and crown were carried before her by two earls. Following the Queen were the marchionesses, countesses, and baronesses in order of their husband's rank. The Queen's ladies of the privy chamber ended the lengthy procession.[45]

As the enormous procession left the Tower of London about eleven o'clock in the morning, fireworks and other water

---

[44]These symbols of sovereignty will be elaborated on in the next chapter which deals specifically with the coronation ceremony.

[45]The nobles were placed in line according to their rank and tenure of the title. Much of the order relies on ancient precedents. Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, pp. 29-30.

displays could be seen on the river Thames. Three-hundred children of Christ's hospital sang praises of the new monarch.

The first pageant, at Fenchurch, was erected by the stationer's guild. Persons representing St. George, patron saint of England, and St. Andrew, patron saint of Scotland were in full armor and engaged in mock combat, until a man dressed as a poor hermit persuaded them to unify their efforts. As the King approached, St. George and St. Andrew rode hand-in-hand towards him and the two escorted James to the first pageant.[46] On his arrival at the first pageant, the curtains were drawn open to reveal a miniature replica of the city of London. Atop of this frame and replica city was an allegorical figure representing Monarchia Brittania. At her feet a person sat representing Divine Wisdom. Others represented Veneration, Promptitide, Vigilance, Gladness, Loving Affection, and Unaniminitie; each rested a hand on Monarchia Brittania's knee. Beneath these figures, the Genius of the City was portrayed counselling with the City Council; on the other side of the stage, armed figures represented the Warlike Force Of The City. Thamesis the River was also portrayed. The speakers of this pageant welcomed the King, offered him congratulations, and explained the allegory.[47]

The allegory of the first pageant was fairly simple. The union of Scotland and England when James assumed the crown was exemplified by the prominent figures of St. George and

---

[46]Nichols, ... Progresses of James, I: 343.

[47]Ibid., pp. 330-382, and Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, pp. 29-31.

St. Andrew. The curtains which were painted like clouds and drawn apart on James' arrival symbolized the clouds on the face of the city which were dispersed upon the King's arrival. Monarchia Brittania (representative of the institution of the monarchy) was supported by and depended on the several virtues. The message of this pageant was clearly a warning to James; either he maintain and use the mentioned virtues, or the throne was in peril. Thematically, this pageant was quite similar to Elizabeth's pageant at Cornhill. To help him maintain virtue and to suppress potential enemies, James was reminded that he could depend on the city of London for arms and advice. Oboes played loudly as James left for the next pageant.

At Gracechurch, the next pageant was executed by the Italian merchants. Over the arch, a short poem praised James and displayed the royal arms of England and Scotland. Between two of the great columns, a woman representing Peace sat at a table; she held an olive branch in her hand. In the center of the pageant, above the arch, figures portrayed the Kings of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland held hands as symbols of unity. As James went through the arch, a laurel wreath was tossed on his head and "Henry VII" passed the sceptre to James.

The themes of this pageant were expressed in the Latin verses and in the particular figures which were represented; there was no oration to accompany this pageant. Peace and unity were the predominant themes. The Italian community also praised James and his virtues in the Latin verses carved over the arch.

The third pageant was also created and executed by foreigners. The Belgians erected a large pageant at the Royal Exchange. The focal point of this pageant was a large square room covered with a silk curtain. When James approached, the curtain was opened to reveal several young ladies, each sitting on a chair of state and representing one of the provinces of Belgium. In a table over the right portal a picture showed a snake pursued by a lion. Sequitur gravis ira feroces was written above. A serene country scene was portrayed above the other side portal. Venit alma circubis aura was written above this pastoral picture. On a platform above the main arch two boys represented King James and King Solomon. At the very top of this extremely high pageant, four pyramids were prominent. Between the first two on the left a woman portrayed Justice; between the last two on the right, a woman symbolized Fortitude. This pageant contained an unusual feature; that is, the back of it was also decorated. Pictures depicted the Belgian people at work on their farms and the shipping industry as well. Other paintings showed the merchants at the Belgian exchange.[48]

The message of this pageant seems to have been an official recognition of James' accession on behalf of the Belgian people. The figures of Justice and Fortitude represented qualities that the Belgians believed James possessed. Also, the portrayal of James with King Solomon was a reference to James' belief that he embodied the wisdom of the biblical

---

[48]Nichols, ... Progresses of James, I; 353-55.

Solomon.

After this pageant, the procession continued towards Westminster, but it briefly halted at St. Mildred's church where nine trumpeters played a Danish march to honor and welcome Queen Anne.[49] Queen Anne was quite pleased with this tribute to her native country.

The next pageant was at Soper Lane. This pageant, like the others, was a triple arched device. The middle arch was the most prominent and was the most elaborately decorated; the two portals on either side of this main arch were smaller and more plainly decorated. Over the main arch a platform held a woman who represented Britannica. She cast her eyes on the ground until King James approached the pageant. Her white dress symbolized her youth and chastity; her crown and sceptre indicated sovereignty. Directly beneath her, Fame was represented by a woman dressed in blue flowing robes with gold wings attached to her back. In her hand she carried a trumpet. Fame represented swiftness and the ability to dispell rumors. Below her, a concave room contained people representing the five senses: Auditus, Visus, Tactus, Olfactus, and Gustus. They were eached dressed in colorful costumes that described their sense and banners across their chests declared their names. Beneath the senses a fountain, the "fount of vertue," ran between two sleeping figures, labeled Detractio and Oblivio. Detractio held an open cup and imitation snakes

---

[49]Ibid., p. 352.

twisted at his feet. These snakes indicated that whatever Detractio touched turned to poison. Oblivio held a covered black cup which symbolized the envious desire to drown the memory of noble persons. Over the smaller arch on the right side three women represented the three graces: Aglia (brightness or majesty), Thalia (youth or flourishing), and Euphrosine (cheer or gladness). All wore flowing robes and their hair was long and loose. Aglia was decorated with symbols of pleasantness: flowers and fruit; Thalia was decorated with a corn garland, the symbol of plenty, and held a myrtle branch, the symbol of a flourishing economy. Euphrosine was decorated with grape vines and olive branches; she symbolized peace. Over the smaller left arch appeared the three hours: Love, Justice, and Peace. Each held two goblets; in one, flowers represented spring, and in the other, figs represented summer.

When the King approached, Fame began the dialogue. At the same time the Fount of Vertue stopped flowing. Fame inquired why the fount had dried up, but neither the graces nor the hours could answer. Euphrosine pointed out the two monsters, Detractio and Oblivio, who tried to suck dry the Fount of Vertue. Fame sounded her trumpet; at this point, Arabia Brittanica finally looked up, and the five senses appeared startled. Detractio and Oblivio, who had just awakened tried to drink from the desicated Fount. When they noticed King James on the street below, they became frightened and sank in subjection. Once they were subdued, the Fount began to flow again with milk and honey. A young boy stepped

forward, and in a brief speech, he praised James' accession and indicated that under his leadership England would become a new Arabia, a land of inestimable wealth and riches. The youth also pointed out that James was so powerful that his mere approach cowed Detractio and Oblivio, and that he had the power to subdue evil. The symbolism of spring and summer was also explained by the youth as a time of rebirth; the subjects saw the advent of a new reign as a time of renewed economic prosperity. Summer symbolized the mature economy, which the subjects hoped to enjoy during the long reign of King James I. This pageant ended with songs of praise to the new King.[50]

The next stop for the royal procession was at Charing Cross. Here, the Lord Mayor, Recorder, Chamberlain, Town Clerk, Aldermen, and City Council of London were assembled. Sir Henry Montague, the Recorder of the City, gave an official welcome to James. He urged the king to preserve the Anglican religion, to confirm and ratify all the ancient laws and thereby rule according to the ancient constitution. He also warned James to command justice to all men, and to help the poor. Montague then presented James, Anne, and Prince Henry with cups of gold valued at £417.[51] These cups symbolized the more valuable gift of the hearts of the citizens of London, according to Montague.

After the Recorder's presentation, four youths dressed

---

[50]Ibid., p. 355-7.

[51]Ibid., p. 407.

as sylvans in green ivy and carrying bows and quivers met James. Other forest creatures played small wind instruments. They carried a message from Eirene, their mistress, who represented peace. Eirene had sought refuge in many countries but this had been denied. She hoped that James would allow her to reside in England. Eirene's daughter Euphoria (Plenty) was always by her side. Nine muses represented by choristers from St. Paul's invited James into the garden where Peace and Plenty awaited his answer. The procession passed through two gates which were decorated like rose arbors. The pageant that appeared was decorated with greenery and fruit clusters. Eirene wore a crown of olives and laurel; palm branches decorated the area around her. These were symbols of purity, peace, and royalty. In her hand, Eirene held mercury's rod, the symbol of peace. Euphoria was dressed in gold and wore a wreath of poppy and mustard seed on her long hair; these were symbols of plenty and fertility. She held an overflowing cornocoupia, also representative of plenty. Other figures in the garden of Peace and Plenty were representative of Gold and Silver; these two supported a glove of the earth. Nine muses held different musical instruments, and the seven liberal arts were also portrayed. A verse over the top of this pageant explained that these figures were pruning the garden of everything but that which was good and beneficial. James was likened to sunshine; without his good rule the garden would die.[52] England could only remain successful if

---

[52]Ibid., pp. 362-4.

James embraced peace and shunned war; in turn, peace insured prosperity.

The next stop was at the conduit at Fleet Street. Here, persons portrayed Astraea and Fortuna. Astraea sat on a platform above a globe whereas Fortuna turned it. The four kingdoms of England, France, Scotland, and Ireland were represented. A figure named Zeal explained the pageant to James. She stated that when Elizabeth died, the world was confused, but when James became King, the world was set straight again. Zeal also explained how the four elements (earth, air, fire, and water) moved together to produce a harmonious earth. Fortuna ruled the world, but virtue (Astraea) was superior even to Fortuna. Envy simply looked on and wished to destroy a healthy kingdom. The four kingdoms, like the four virtues, were united by one King, James. Astraea also symbolized Heaven, from where Queen Elizabeth looked down over England.[53]

The next pageant was at Temple Bar. The form of this pageant was structured to look like a Greek temple. Once again, Peace was the central character of the pageant. Wealth sat beside Peace, whose feet trampled War. Quiet rested her feet on Tumult. Liberty trod on Servitude, Safety, another of Peace's handmaidens, trod upon Danger. Felicitie, the fourth handmaiden, rested her feet upon Unhappiness.[54] When James arrived at this pageant, a person dressed in noble

---

[53]Ibid., pp. 369-70.

[54]Ibid., pp. 389-91.

regalia came forth hand in hand with the Genius of the City (from the first pageant). He explained the symbolism of the pageant which was chiefly the triumph of virtues over vice and the end result of peace. The Genius of the City bade farewell to James on behalf of the city of London.

Although the pageant at Temple Bar was the last official pageant of London, the city of Westminster and the duchy of Lancaster financed a pageant at the Strand. This was a very simple pageant, compared to those previously described. Beneath a rainbow, the moon and stars were situated between two pyramids. Electra, a representative of serenity, offered a final blessing to James. At last,

> after more than six hours of spectacle, speeches, and crowds, James was probably glad to dismount from his white jennett and head for the quiet of his privy chamber.[55]

Of the eight pageants which entertained James at his triumphal procession only five were financed by the city of London; the others were paid for by the Italian and Belgian merchants and the city of Westminster and duchy of Lancaster. London's pageants were coordinated by a committee of sixteen people appointed by the city council to prepare for the procession. This committee was composed of four Aldermen and

---

[55]Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, p. 33.

twelve representatives from the various guilds.[56] The city also appointed a clerk for the committee, two officers to give summons to the meetings, a clerk of works, two master carpenters, seven master painters, twenty-four carvers, eighty joiners, sixty carpenters, six turners, twelve sawyers, and seventy-six laborers. This group was responsible for the scaffolding and construction of the five pageants from the city of London. Stephen Harrison, the inventor and architect of the pageants, was in charge of the preparations.[57]

James' public obviously appreciated the work of this committee. They appeared in great numbers to celebrate, if somewhat belatedly, James' coronation. A contemporary pamphleteer mentions that despite the multitudes of people, no one was injured.[58] For him to note this fact suggests that there were indeed huge crowds at James' procession. The spectators cheered James, but many of his subjects were less than pleased with his behavior. For example, many subjects

---

[56]The Aldermen were Sir Stephen Soame, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Campbell. Norvell Sotherton represented the Merchant tailors; William Quarles represented the Merchant Guild, and Robert Felton the grocers. William Chester represented the Drapers, and Richard Wiseman the Goldsmiths. The remaining committee members were: Cornelius Fiske (Skinner), Thomas Bramley (Haberdasher), Thomas Rudd (Salter), Thomas Fettyplace (Ironmongers), Jonathan Anderson (Vinter), and Richard Foxe (Clothworker). Nichols, ... Progresses of James, I: 375-6.

[57]Ibid., pp. 375-6.

[58]Firth, Stuart Tracts, p. 82.

thought that he failed to stay long enough at the several pageants; he quickly hurried on and did not ask questions or praise the city as Elizabeth had done. Also, unlike his predecessor, James did not accept insignificant gifts from his subjects. Of the several accounts published of James' procession, none mention that he stopped along the parade route to acknowledge his subjects. In fact, all extant accounts mention the great haste with which he hurried along the procession route. An example of his indifference to his subjects is mentioned in nearly every account. At one point in the procession, an elderly man begged to be allowed to deliver a poem of praise to the new King; James refused, since it was an unscheduled event.[59] It seems likely that the haste and indifference with which James went on his procession was due in part to his lifelong fear of large crowds. In the political context, however, James' ill-behavior at the coronation procession served only to emphasize his lack of political sense which Elizabeth had used so adroitly. James was, if not incapable of exhibiting graciousness, love, and concern for his subjects, certainly unwilling to buttress his public image in this way. He could, however, be quite warm and affectionate within the privacy of his court and among selected courtiers; a lack of public warmth was, unfortunately, James' weakness. By contrast, Elizabeth, who could be imperious, catty, and tempermental at court, displayed only her gentle, self-assured,

---

[59]Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, pp. 78-9.

regal qualities in the public's eyes. Elizabeth doubtless had little intention of actually heeding her subjects' humble advice as offered in the pageants unless she chose to do so, but she made her subjects believe that she really was concerned over their desires. By hurrying through the parade route, James showed open indifference to his subjects. Had his displeasure and fear of crowds been more subtle, he would have created a much more favorable public image. A large part of Elizabeth's popular success and James' lack of it can be attributed directly to their behavior while in the public view.

Many of the differences can in large measure be traced to the distinctions within the personality of the two rulers. Elizabeth began to rule immediately upon news of Mary's death; she immediately formed and summoned her privy council. Elizabeth met almost daily with this body until the day of her coronation. She did not waste any time in getting to London to assume her monarchial duties and responsibilities. James, on the other hand, did not hurry to London, but rather spent his time hunting and feasting. James did not love the adulation of large crowds, but saw only potential assassins lurking therein rather than loyal supporters. Elizabeth had much more to fear from her crowds than did James, since the Pope had expressed a desire that she be murdered.

Elizabeth attained valuable public support for her reign by her actions at the coronation procession; she used the occasion for its intended purpose. She truly impressed her subjects with her regal bearing, her concern for the

welfare of the English subjects, and the desire to do a worthy job. The fact that she remained at the pageants for a long time, inquired about the symbolism, and thanked the city for each pageant, contrasts markedly with James' haste and coldness. Rather than using the procession fruitfully, James' coldly indifferent behavior served only to alienate some of his countrymen; James simply failed to live up to the public expectations of a Renaissance Prince.

In many ways the processions of both monarchs were similar. Both followed tradition in having processions, although James was delayed due to the plague. The procession routes and even the location of the pageants were nearly identical. Also, the prevailing themes of the procession pageantry for each monarch were peace and the suppression of vice. Each monarch was advised to uphold virtue, especially love of subjects, wisdom, and justice. James and Elizabeth were advised to rule wisely and well by frequently consulting with Parliament. Although one of the major functions of the procession was to praise and support the new monarch and to welcome him publicly, the primary function of the procession pageantry was to serve as a vehicle for the display of the subjects' desires for the ensuing reign. The pageantry allowed the subjects simultaneously to praise their new ruler and yet admonish him to show mercy and widsom. These same pageants also manifested the consequences if he failed to do so. The pageantry presented to Elizabeth and James allowed

their subjects to advise them on a proper course of action.[60] It was no mere accident that the particular allegories were chosen. According to E.M.W. Tillyard, these allegorical figures were well-known and understood by the great majority of the population.[61]

The pageants at both Elizabeth's and James' coronation processions provided a joyous, secular celebration of the coronation. The secular, festive, and popular aspects of the coronation processions made them a compliment to the solemn, highly ritualized coronation ceremony.

---

[60]Anglo, Spectacle Pageanty and Early Tudor Policy, p. 375.

[61]Tillyard, The Elizabethan World Picture, passim.

CHAPTER III

THE CORONATION

The coronation ceremony was the religious counterpart to the secular festivities of the coronation procession. Like the procession, a great deal of color and symbolism was displayed; also like the procession, the coronation allowed the monarch the same opportunities to display regal qualities and to impress his subjects with his grandeur. On the whole, the coronation ceremony is less well-documented and therefore more difficult to study than the processions.[1] Perhaps this is due to the fact that the coronation ceremony was largely set by tradition and there was little significant variation from ruler to ruler. Many elements of the coronation date from 371, although the basic rules that were used by Renaissance English monarchs were those established in the Liber Regalis, and date from the coronation of Richard II.

There were many differences in the functions of the procession and the coronation. The procession was more oriented towards the general public; the coronation ceremony was mostly limited to the peers and upper gentry of the realm. The bulk of the population had to be content with lining the streets

---

[1]Neville Williams, Elizabeth I, Queen of England (London: Sphere Books, Ltd., 1972), p. 60.

and courtyards surrounding Westminster Abbey and Palace, hoping to catch a glimpse of the monarch. Although denied admission to the Abbey, due to space limitations, many subjects nevertheless declared their joy for the new reign by singing, dancing, playing music, and cheering outside of the Abbey. According to contemporary chronicler John Hayward, those outside of the Abbey were quite dazzled and impressed with

> the rich attire, the ornaments, the beauty of the Ladyes, did add particular graces to the solemnity, and held the eyes and hearts to men dazzeled betweene contentment and admiratione.[2]

Like the coronation procession, the coronation provided color and excitement for the citizenry, but its real importance lay in the fact that it formally, publicly consecrated the King with fixed rites. Until he was elected,[3] crowned, and anointed, the monarch was King in name only; these ceremonies were essential to officially consecrate the new sovereign. The coronation also signified popular approval of the monarch. The King was invested with symbols of authority in return for his oath to support, defend, and rule his subjects justly and well. By the King swearing this solemn oath, the subjects were assured that he would be a fair ruler. In return for the Kings's oath, he was suitably invested with sovereign powers and the royal regalia, both proofs of his sovereign status.

---

[2]Sir John Hayward, Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Elizabeth, edited by John Bruce (London: John Boyer, Nichols and Son, 1839), p. 15.

[3]This was a mere formality whereby the peers gave their assent to the accession. For more details see page 49.

Religious symbolism made the coronation sacred: as such, it "was a safeguard on the one hand for the freedom of the people, and on the other for the authority of the Chief Magistrate."[4] In addition, the coronation was important because it formally elevated the monarch to a higher status than the leading peers of the realm; it set the ruler socially apart from the others. Thus, the religious spirit of the coronation lent a solemn sanctification to the accession and bound the sovereign even more closely to his oath.

The coronation procession ended at Westminster Palace, where the monarch spent the night. The next morning, all of the peers met and "elected" him to the throne. Obviously this was a mere technicality and was simply a holdover from the Anglo-Saxon tradition of the witan determining the next ruler. The writings of the Liber Regalis dictated this step.[5] The election occurred in the Great Hall before the monarch entered.

After these formalities the monarch was escorted into the Abbey. By tradition, the Bishops of Durham and Bath performed this service. The monarch was seated in the great coronation chair which enclosed the Stone of Scone. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who traditionally presided at such occasions, was joined by the other great officers of state; this group escorted their King to each of the four corners

---

[4]Randolph Churchill, The Story of the Coronation (London: Derek Verschoyle, 1953), p. 20.

[5]There is some speculation on this point. Churchill states that the barons had insisted on this upon the accession of King John; they wanted John to feel that he owed his throne to the peers. Liber Regalis, Leopold Legg, ed. English Coronation Records (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1979), p. 114.

of the room. At each, the Archbishop proclaimed the accession of the new monarch, whereupon trumpets sounded and the spectators responded "God save the King/Queen." This ceremony, known as the confirmation, or recognition, is an allusion to the fact that the monarch enjoyed sovereignty only with the subjects' assent. After this ceremony, the monarch knelt with the Archbishop and recited the Lord's Prayer.[6]

The next step in the ceremony was the administering of the all-important coronation oath. The sovereign prostrated himself on the altar and swore on the Bible to uphold the promises of the coronation oath. Kneeling, with hands on the Bible, the monarch took the coronation oath. Contrary to what one might expect, the exact wording of the oath remained basically unchanged in substance; it was a formal promise to respect and rule in accordance with the laws of the land. Put into the form of questions and answers, specifically, the King promised to maintain domestic tranquility, promote a healthy economy, make and execute just laws, and to rule with mercy and wisdom. The Renaissance monarch also promised to consult with Parliament. The oath was further sanctified by the fact that it occurred on the high altar, and its administration by the Archbishop of Canterbury. As additional insurance against abrogating this promise, the sovereign signed it in the presence of the nobles, clergy, and peers assembled in the Abbey.[7]

---

[6]Liber Regalis, in English Coronation Records, edited by Leopold Legg, p. 116.

[7]Ibid., p. 252.

Although today the climax of the coronation ceremony is the crowning of the new monarch, in the Tudor-Stuart era, the actual crowning was of secondary importance to the anointing with holy oil. The use of sacred oil for this purpose further emphasized the sacramental nature of the coronation ceremony. By anointing the monarch with sacred oil, he was set apart from the subjects, somehow made "holy." There was a close connection between this rite and the ceremony used in the ordination of clergy. The sanctification of the ruler was also important because the English sovereign was the supreme head of the Church of England. Interestingly, Post-Reformation English monarchs also retained theis ceremony despite its Catholic origins mostly because of the respect for tradition and, perhaps, the fear that to omit this hallowed rite might in some way undermine the future authority of the King.[8] The King knelt once again to receive this rite. After several lengthy prayers, the Archbishop used oils from a sacred ampulla[9] to anoint the King on the breast, hands, and head. While doing so, he explained "and as Solomon was anointed King by Zadok the Priest and Nathan the prophet, so be you anointed

---

[8]Roger Milton, The English Ceremonial Book: A History of Robes, Insignia, and Ceremonies Still in use in England (London: C.E. Dawkins, 1972), p. 61.

[9]The oil in the ampulla dated from 1345 and was used in every coronation since. By Elizabeth's time, the oil was old, causing her to reply that it smelled badly. Although reserved for cornations, it was used up by James' coronation. Legend has it that the ampulla was given to Thomas a Becket by the Virgin Mary. After Becket's death, it was given to a St. Cyprian monk. Eventually it was given to Edward, the Black Prince, although it was first used in the coronation of Henry IV in an attempt to bolster the legitimacy of his reign. Brian Barker, Symbols of Sovereignty (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979), pp. 80-3.

blessed, and consecrated... the Lord your God hath given you to rule and govern...."[10]

Only after the monarch had sworn to obey the laws of the land and had been anointed was he invested with the royal robes and regalia. Like the anointing, the investiture with the royal robes was similar to the sacramental ordination of bishops. The rich vestments were worn only at the coronation, and were immediately returned to the Abbot of Westminster upon completion of the coronation ceremony. The first of the royal garments was the colbium sidonis, a sleeveless white linen robe which was open on one side; it was gathered at the waist by a linen girdle and put over the other garments of the King. The resemblence of this simple, plain garment to the clothes worn by ancient Byzantine commoners symbolized that sovereigns derived their authority ultimately from the people. Also the fact that the colbium sidonis was worn closest to the body reminded the King that he should ever hold the commonality dear to this heart.[11]

The next garment that the King received was the supertunica, a richly embroidered garment which went over the colbium sidonis. In the church, a supertunica was a symbol of authority. Lastly, a purple velvet robe edged and lined with miniver and ermine further symbolized regal authority.[12]

---

[10]Liber Regalis, in English Coronation Records, edited by Leopold Legg, p. 258.

[11]Barker, Symbols of Sovereignty, p. 92.

[12]Churchill, The Story of the Coronation, p. 72.

After the monarch was suitably invested with the royal robes, he received the other official royal regalia. The order in which he received these ornaments had remained unchanged from the early thirteenth century.[13] Each of the symbols of regal authority was sacred and bestowed with the utmost solemnity. First, the King received a coronation ring. This was a sapphire and ruby creation set in fine gold. The coronation ring was created anew for each monarch, for upon the death of the predecessor, the coronation ring was destroyed. The ring therefore symbolized the reign of the monarch. Also, it signified the "marriage" of the sovereign to the kingdom. Next, the king received a set of great golden bracelets. The sovereign was told to

> receive the bracelets of sanctity and wisdom, both for tokens of the Lord's protection embracing you on every side, and also for symbols and pledges of that bond which unites you with your people...[14]

After the bracelets, a set of golden spurs was given the King. These indicated his sovereignty over all of the orders of knighthood.[15] The monarch was then invested with the

---

[13]Ibid., p. 63.

[14]Liber Regalis in English Coronation Records, edited by Leopold Legg, p. 260.

[15]Barker, Symbols of Sovereignty, p. 93.

symbolic sword of state. He was directed to

> receive this kingly sword, brought now from the altar of God and delivered to you by the hands of us the Bishops and servants of God though unworthy. With this sword do justice, stop the growth of iniquity, protect the Holy Church of God, help and defend widows and orphans...[16]

This sword of state was elaborately jeweled and was laid on the altar after the monarch touched it, a symbol that he would protect the subjects' religion.

The sovereign was next invested with St. Edward's crown. This was gold, bejeweled, and was quite heavy. It had four arches which met in a point and was topped with an orb and cross, the symbolism of which will be discussed later in this chapter. The crown rested on an ermine band and purple velvet draped the center area under the arches. This crown was worn only at the coronation; each monarch had a smaller personal crown to wear at other state occasions. The sovereign was also invested with St. Edward's staff, which symbolically "guided the King's steps." The King, upon receipt of this vestment, gave it to a favored lord to carry before him. After the staff of St. Edward was given, the King received two sceptres, the royal sceptre with the cross, and the royal sceptre with the dove. The former was the ultimate symbol of authority and kingly power. Made entirely of gold, it contained a five-hundred carat diamond. The screptre with the dove symbolized equity, mercy, and peace. This was a solid gold

---

[16] Liber Regalis in English Coronation Records edited by Leopold Legg, p. 260.

staff topped with an enamelled white dove that also symbolized the Holy Ghost.[17] The monarch then received the orb and the cross which was "a golden ball surrounded by a heavily-jeweled metal band.... [which met in] a similarly jewelled arch with a cross at the apex."[18] The orb and cross signified dominion and authority. It also reminded the monarch that the whole world was subject to Christ's power.

At this point in the ceremony, a smaller crown was usually substituted for the heavy and cumbersome crown of St. Edward.

After receipt of the royal robes and symbols, the Archbishop of Canterbury prayed the Coronation Prayer:

> The Lord give you fruitful lands and healthful seasons; victorious fleets and armies, and a quiet Empire: a faithful Senate, wise and upright counsellors and majestraites, a loyal nobility, and a dutiful gentry, a pious and learned and useful clergy, an honest, peaceable and obedient commonality.[19]

This prayer was cheered by the audiences.

The Liber Regalis dictated the next part of the coronation ceremony, the enthronement. The sovereign was led to and seated at the thorne. The Liber Regalis dictated

> Then shall the sovereign go to the throne, and be lifted up into it by the Archbishops and Bishops, and other Peers of the kingdom and being Inthronised, or placed therein, all the Great Officers, those that bear the swords

---

[17]Churchill, The Story of the Coronation, p. 80.

[18]Ibid., p. 82.

[19]Liber Regalis in English Coronation Records edited by Leopold Legg, p. 120.

> and sceptres, and the Nobles who carried the other regalia, shall stand round about the throne; and the Archbishop...shall say: Stand firm and hold fast from henceforth the seat and state of royal and imperial dignity which is this day delivered unto you in the Name and by the authority of the Almighty God, and by the hands of us the Bishops and servants of God, though unworthy...[20]

This was a visible, physical elevation of the monarch above the subjects. As such, it was a physical counterpart to the symbolism of the preceeding sections of the coronation.

The Liber Regalis further dictated that the nobles swear fealty and homage to the sovereign.[21] The Archbishop of Canterbury led the procession to the enthroned sovereign, swore fealty, and kissed the monarch's left cheek. The other lords spiritual swore fealty, after which the lords temporal, in order of rank, swore homage to the monarch.

The next part of the ceremony consisted of a mass complete with communion, followed by the Te Deum and recessional. The sovereign left the Abbey to the joyful sounds of trumpets, choristers, drums, bells, and cheers.

The official festivities were not over. From the Abbey, the monarch went to the banquet room of Westminster Palace. Here the richly dressed nobility were gathered for a huge celebration of the coronation. At the far end of the hall on a raised platform, the monarch, dressed in purple and ermine, presided. Behind the other officers of state, the heralds

---

[20] Liber Regalis in English Coronation Records edited by Leopold Legg, pp. 121-2.

[21] Ibid., p. 122.

held the banners of each. The other nobles were seated at tables. In the galleries overlooking the banquet room the lesser nobility and the upper gentry watched the festivities. It is interesting to note that the peeresses were also confined to the gallery, but they often lowered baskets to the ground floor which their husbands' pages filled with rich food from the banquet. The other spectators brought their food from home. After the meal, the peeresses were allowed to join their husbands for the dancing and other activities. The official banquet was huge; often as many as thirty entrees were offered. Each course was introduced by fanfare and ceremony. Traditionally, after the first course the most exciting moment occurred. A mounted fully-armoured knight rode into the center of the room; he was known as the King/Queen's champion, and since Edward II's reign, this honor was hereditarily held by the Lord of Lincolnshire. He was flanked on either side by the Lord High Steward and the Lord High Constable; the Champion was preceeded by trumpeters. The Champion declared to those assembled that he would fight to the death to defend the King/Queen and would slay anyone who dared to challenge the authority of the newly coronated monarch. He challenged anyone who denied the sovereignty of the monarch to make his presence known. The trumpets sounded two more times as the challenge was twice repeated. The champion rode to the monarch where he dismounted and bowed; the King presented the Champion with a gold cup, after which the Champion exited. The guests applauded, and the banquet resumed.[22] After the feasting

---

[22]Churchill, The Story of the Coronation, p. 68.

was over, the guests took to the dance floor. These celebrations often lasted into the early hours of the next day.

In general terms, the coronations of both Elizabeth I and James I followed the previously described model. Exceptions from the preceeding pattern will be described next. There was, however, in either case, little deviation from the norm.

Elizabeth's astrologer, Dr. Dee, decided that 15 January was the most auspicious date for the coronation. Astrologers calculated coronation days based on the idea that the heavenly bodies had to be in order to insure that the reign would be prosperous and successful. Despite the provision in the Liber Regalis that the coronation be done by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Elizabeth was crowned by the Bishop of Carlisle, Dr. Oglethorpe.[23] There were several reasons for this departure from the normal pattern. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Reginald Pole was dead, and the second ranking church official, the Archbishop of York was a staunch Catholic and refused to officiate at Elizabeth's coronation. Elizabeth was relieved for she hated the Archbishop of York for his support of her half-sister Mary. Several other ranking church officials had incurred Elizabeth's ire during Mary's reign and she bypassed them as well. The Bishop of Carlisle agreed to officiate, but he insisted on the Catholic mass which Elizabeth found repugnant. Elizabeth was unable to persuade Oglethorpe to omit the Catholic communion service. Consequently when it came during the

---

[23]Ibid., p. 68.

coronation, she retired behind a curtain and remained there in protest during the elevation of the host. To show her displeasure with the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, Elizabeth did not return to the ceremony until after communion had been served.[24] Elizabeth's coronation was, nevertheless, certainly Protestant in substance; for example, when she took the oath, it was on an English Bible, and the prayers were mostly in the vernacular rather than in Latin. Her refusal to have the pro-Catholic clergy preside at the ceremony and her absence during the communion service led to her Protestant beliefs. The Protestant tone of her coronation caused the Spanish ambassador, II Schifanoya, to describe the coronation as a ceremony with "Crows in the habits of Cardinals, of asses as Bishops, and of wolves representing Abbots."[25] Elizabeth's coronation was the last in the Catholic (medieval) tradition; following her coronation, Parliament decided on a new litany with a clearly Protestant emphasis. The basic medieval order of the ritual remained intact, as previously outlined except that certain prayers and religious litanies were changed.

Elizabeth used the coronation to impress her subjects with her queenly qualities. She appeared regally self-assured, poised, and confident. She presented the appearance of a strong-willed and capable monarch. Elizabeth, with her fondness of being the center attraction, used the occasion to exhibit saintly behavior and religious convictions. Her

---

[24]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 76.

[25]Williams, Elizabeth I Queen of England, p. 45.

subjects were so impressed that the carpet on which she walked from the palace to the Abbey was literally destroyed by souvenir takers; the Duchess of Norfolk who carried the Queen's train was nearly tripped by them several times along the route.[26]

One of Elizabeth's subjects, Sir John Ferne, published a pamphlet shortly afterwards entitled The Glory of Generosity. This was an account of the symbolism of the jewels in the Queen's crown. The sardus[27] reminded the subjects the respect due to the English monarchy; its red color symbolized that, like the Queen, it was of the earth. The topaz reminded her to exercise all virtues; the emerald depicted kingly justice and mercy. The chrysolyth symbolized that rulers should shine in wisdom, prudence, fortitude, and courage. The pale hyacinth warned all courtiers that they were to shine in the light of the ruler's divine, celestial virtues. The green jaspar symbolized a land of bountiful harvests, and the sapphire symbolized cleanliness of body and spirit. The amethyst represented the Queen's willingness to shed her blood to defend her subjects. The sardonyx reminded Elizabeth to exhibit humility, charity, and sincerity.[28] Through this pamphlet, and others like it, Elizabeth's subjects were admonishing her to be a good Queen, while simultaneously assuring her (and themselves) that she embodied the fine

---

[26]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, p. 344.

[27]Williams, Elizabeth I, Queen of England, p. 45.

[28]The sardonyx was a red-gold semi-precious gem.

qualities necessary to do so. By uniting these desires with the coronation regalia, and by using the crown and the jewels to get the message across, Ferne attempted to make his comments more enduring and valid.

Whereas Elizabeth had been coronated according to the old tradition, with a Latin mass, James' was the first coronation of an English sovereign according to the revised format.[29] The changes, however, were minimal, and the coronation proceeded along the same basic pattern as that of his predecessor. However, one notable exception did occur. Since the plague was raging in London, James' coronation was quite subdued. It has already been noted in the previous chapter, that James' coronation procession was an anomaly in that it occurred long after the actual coronation, rather than the day before, as was the general pattern. Whereas Elizabeth's coronation was gay and cheerful, James' was somber and subdued. His coronation was reduced to the bare essentials, and attendance was strictly limited due to efforts to prevent further spread of the dreaded plague. Consequently, few specatators cheered him outside of the Abbey, in marked contrast to the crowds who wildly cheered Elizabeth. Like Elizabeth, James had his astrologer set the day for the coronation; 27 July was determined to be the most favorable date. While James was journeying south to London, before news of the plague was evident, the date was set. There was much debate as to

---

[29]Barker, Symbols of Sovereignty, pp. 82-3.

whether the coronation should commence on schedule. Due to the importance of the coronation, however, it was determined that James should be crowned as planned, but the festivities would be limited and the procession would occur at a later date.

Contemporary sources reveal that the coronation of King James and Queen Anne went according to the established pattern with little exception to the rule. Their ceremony was brief and simple in comparison to Elizabeth's. The number of nobles in attendance was much smaller than the attendance at Elizabeth's; many nobles preferred to remain in the country to avoid the plague. James' service was performed quickly so that the nobles that did attend could disperse quickly. Unlike Elizabeth, James and Anne were crowned in accordance with the Liber Regalis by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The communion service, however, provided a noteworthy event in their coronation just as it had in Elizabeth's. Because of her Catholic religious convictions, Queen Anne refused to participate in a reformed communion. King James did, however, partake of the Eucharist, causing nearly all contemporary chroniclers to note that Anne's refusal was quite conspicuous.[30] It was rather ironic that Anne refused the Eucharist because it was a Protestant ceremony, whereas Elizabeth had refused because it was conducted according to Catholic ritual.

Many of James' public failures were due to the plague. Although the subjects were glad for the coronation of their

---

[30]William Jones, Crowns and Coronations, a History of Regalia (London: Chalto and Windus, 1902), p. 311.

King, daily concerns about the dreaded plague overshadowed any spontaneous joy they might have desired to show. Also, since attendance was limited at James' coronation, he had a much smaller audience than Elizabeth had had to impress. Based on James' other public behavior, it appears likely that even if there had not been a plague, he would have probably failed to use the coronation day as an opportunity to court the public good-will anyway; too many factors in his personality indicate that James would not have behaved any differently had the plague not occurred.

James simply did not exhibit the kingly qualities the English subjects expected of a Renaissance prince. Whereas Elizabeth was a master at using pageantry and ritual to buttress her royalty, James disliked it and whenever possible avoided it. In contrast to what Elizabeth's reactions might have been, James did not object when his coronation was shortened. Most likely had Elizabeth had a shortened coronation, she would have flown into a royal rage. She liked and used each minute of the limelight to strengthen her position. James probably used each minute of his limelight to think only of it being over. Luckily for James, although he was not fond of public attention, Queen Anne was. She pleased the subjects in many respects, but she could in no way atone for her husband's shortcomings in this area. With a quotation from a Venetian ambassador who attended the coronation of James and Anne, Antonia Fraser sums up James behavior and contrasts it with Elizabeths's

> King James 'did not caress the people nor make them that good cheer that the late

> Queen did, whereby she won their loves: for the English adore their sovereign... [and] like their King to show pleasure at their devotion ... but this King manifests no taste for them.' Years back at the coronation of the young Elizabeth a wise observor had opined that 'in such ceremonies the scret of government doth much consist.' Not only was James an obstinately unheroic figure himself, but he followed the most professional heroine which the stage of the English monarchy had ever supported.[31]

Because the coronation was so rigid and formalized it afforded little opportunity for the monarch to show individual personality traits. Even James, although he did not use the opportunity to the fullest, cannot be considered a failure at his coronation; he made the correct responses, and was duly anointed and crowned according to English tradition. He did, however, fail to court the public affection. One must bear in mind that even the clever, showy Elizabeth had relatively few opportunities to impress the public at the coronation; it was simply too formalized for much of that. By contrast, the annual progresses, like the coronation procession, offered a much greater opportunity to examine the different approaches Elizabeth and James used towards creating a loyal citizenry.

---

[31]Antonia Fraser, James VI of Scotland and I of England (New York: Knopf, 1975), p. 97.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROGRESSES OF ELIZABETH AND JAMES

Lupold von Wedel, a Pomeranian noble described the arrival of one of Queen Elizabeth's progresses at Westminster.

> Riding ahead were her servants, then followed two of her guard, then came her equerries, and behind these, her chamblerlain, of whom there were about twenty. Then came the Privy Councillors: with them rode the Archbishop of Canterbury with fifty of his own horsemen. Elizabeth herself, in a gold coach was preceeded by Burleigh and Walshingham. The Queen, sitting all alone in her splendid coach appeared like a goddess such as painters are wont to depict. Behind her rode Leicester, as Master of the Horse, and more of the Privy Councillors; then the Maids of Honor, twenty-four of them... followed by some fifty more of the Queen's guard.[1]

This must have been quite a sight for common yeoman farmers as this glittering assembly passed through their county. The progresses were one more area in which the monarch was able to impress the subjects with the splendor and richness of the court. Clearly the monarch was the focal point of the procession, and those who surrounded her served to set the sovereign apart from ordinary mortals. It was as if the monarch were the sun and the courtiers planets revolving around it.

---

[1]Letter from Lupold von Wedel as reprinted in Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I, by Ian Dunlop (London: Jonathan Cape, 1962), p. 21.

Both Elizabeth and James went on many such progresses, or journeys through the English countryside. There was a great deal of planning involved in these undertakings, both on the behalf of the court officials and on the part of the towns and various noblemen the monarch was to visit. Court officials had to arrange for lodgings, provisions, and processions routes.[2] Usually about three to four-hundred carts were used to transport equipment, clothes, beds, and other furniture; between two and three-hundred horses were involved.[3] Civic preparations for the arrival of the sovereign were equally elaborate. Streets would be cleaned and freshly gravelled, houses decorated, pageants devised, and speeches prepared. Gentlemen from the court arrived a few days prior to the royal visit to insure that adequate preparations had been carried out.

The arrival of the King into a corporate town or city was always a matter of ceremony. The town officials posted men along the expected route to watch for the sovereign's approach. On the arrival of the monarch, church bells sounded to summon the citizens, mayor, and aldermen to the city gate to greet the visiting royalty and nobility. Once the King had arrived, the city recorder extended an official greeting, usually in the vernacular. The mayor then delivered the civic mace or sword (which was freshly gilded); also at this time

---

[2]Burghley coordinated most of Elizabeth's progresses until his death when Robert Cecil took over this job. Buckingham was the organizer for most of the Jacobean progresses.

[3]Dunlop, Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I, p. 117.

a monetary gift was made to the King. It was customary that the King touch the sword or mace and return it to one of the leading local magnates to carry it before him as the retinue passed through the streets lined by cheering citizens. It was a tradition for the burgesses to feast the King at a civic banquet.[4]

Elizabeth's visit to Norwich in 1578 and James' visit to Lincoln in 1617 illustrate the procedures for the ceremony expected of towns. These two examples also serve to indicate the differences between the attitudes of the two sovereigns concerning their subjects. When the mayor of Norwich gave Elizabeth the customary purse, she graciously replied

> we heartily thank you, master mayor, and all the rest for these tokens of Goodwill. Nevertheless, Princes have no need of money, ... we come not therefore, but for that which is right in our own, the hearts and true allegiance of our subjects, which are the greatest riches of a Kingdom, whereas we assure ourselves in you, so do you assure yourselves in us of a loving and gracious sovereign.[5]

Despite the fact that the Crown needed money, Elizabeth reassured her subjects that she valued their love and allegiance far greater than their gift of gold. By this simple statement, she endeared herself to her subjects of Norwich, and indeed, several similar examples of her graciousness can

---

[4]Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, p. 166, and Joan Parks, Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970), p. 231.

[5]Sir Robert Wood, The Joyfull Recyving of the Quene's Most Excellent Majestie into hir Highnesse Citye of Norwich, The Things Done at hir Abode Theyr and the Dolor of the Citye at Hir Departure reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, II: 141.

be found in many of the Elizabethan progresses. By contrast, James did not go out of his way to endear himself to his subjects, and, therefore, did not have the success with his progresses that Elizabeth did. His progress to Lincoln is a case in point. When the city sent out messengers to inquire when and by what route the King would arrive, James' advisors told the city messengers that the entourage would arrive via the King's highway. The next day, however, James decided to do some hunting along the way. Since hunting involved travelling off the road, the city officials had a difficult time meeting the King. Finally the officials saw James, but it was not in the previously appointed place. When the lord mayor offered the cup James received it but rudely pushed the sword aside and inquired whether there was a speech of welcome to be delivered.[6] By refusing the sword, the symbol of the hospitality of the citizens, James insulted his subjects. The King's advisors had already warned the city messengers that "his Highness did not love long speeches"[7] of welcome. The speech accordingly brief; James reply perfunctory. James was however, quite happy with the entertainment he received at Lincoln. He was especially delighted by the cock fights, the horseracing, and the excellent hunting.

Elizabeth and James were not the first English monarchs

---

[6]The Manner of King James' First Coming to Lincoln, March 27, 1617, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 262.

[7]Ibid., p. 262.

to go on progresses. Other sovereigns had travelled throughout the realm, although their progresses had been to specific places for a specific purpose, mainly to put down rebellions or to visit or hunt at a particular royal residence. The early progresses were therefore irregular. Elizabeth was the first English monarch to go on progress regularly each summer. She was the first to realize the public-relations effect they had on her subjects.[8] James, recognizing that the subjects had come to expect such journeys from the sovereign, continued the practice, although he did not achieve the results that Elizabeth had.

Both sovereigns recognized the fact that by travelling throughout the countryside, they had the opportunity to view firsthand the economic status of the country and also observe the political mood of the inhabitants. Like most other aspects of Renaissance English pageantry, the progresses allowed the monarch to impress the subjects with the splendor and majesty of the glittering court, and by exhibiting richness, assure the subjects that all was well with the privy purse. Progresses therefore allowed the sovereign to reinforce the subjects' ideas of what was expected of him, e.g., what he wore, the way he acted, the deference shown to him. If they were used to greatest advantage, as Elizabeth did, progresses could provide unique opportunities to impress the subjects with the solidarity of the monarch and the sovereign's

---

[8]Williams, Elizabeth I, Queen of England, pp. 144-5.

genuine love and concern for their peoples well-being.

The speeches of the monarch could be used quite effectively to further this idea. By the willingness of the sovereign to travel to distant parts of the country, a personal touch was added to the subject-sovereign relationship. In fact, this intercourse between the subjects and the sovereign was the primary reason for the progresses. The fact that the progresses allowed the monarch to come to the people allowed many Englishmen who lived in distant parts of the realm to pay homage and express their loyalty to the Crown. In most cases, the English court on progress was the only opportunity for them to see the monarch.

Several additional factors encouraged the use of progresses. The English aristocracy as a whole was engaged in a building spree by the middle of the sixteenth century. Several magnificent residences were built specifically for the purpose of entertaining the sovereign; Burghley's Theobalds, and Leicester's Kenilworth are but two examples.[9] Progresses were economical, for they saved the royal purse the money that it would normally take to house and feed the courtiers; by visiting the wealthy nobles, this burden was shifted from the Crown to the host. After all, wealthy courtiers lived at the sovereign's court for the greater part of the year at the monarch's expense, and they were expected to entertain the King when he journeyed through the countryside.

---

[9]Ibid., p. 46.

Much organization was required for the court to go on progress, some of which has already been alluded to. The entire court travelled, from the lowliest servants to the highest court officials. Hundreds of carts were needed to carry supplies and trunks of clothes; Queen Elizabeth always carried and slept in her own huge bed which was brought on every progress. Travel was arduous for the court, and usually the progress averaged only about three miles per hour.[10] The progress was often delayed by inclement weather and poor roads. The bulk of the court travelled on horseback; the sovereign travelled by horseback, chair, litter, or coach. Litters were not used very often, except when the sovereign was in ill-health. Coaches were just starting to replace carts and pack horses. They were quite costly and were used only by the financial elite. Coaches were not very practical for the progresses since they often became stuck on the muddy roads, and they had a difficult time getting through the large pot-holes. Both Elizabeth and James preferred to ride on horse-back; they were escorted by liveried footmen. The ladies of the court usually rode in carts. The menials either walked alongside the carts or they rode the horses that pulled the carts and coaches.[11] Barges, elaborately decorated boats, rowed by as many as sixty oarsmen were sometimes used as a means of transport, however, their use was limited to short journeys. King James did not use this means of transport

---

[10]Ibid., p. 145.

[11]Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, p. 165.

nearly so often as his predecessor.

The crown had many houses which were kept in perpetual readiness for a royal visit. At Elizabeth's accession, there were several small royal residences and five main palaces: Greenwich, Hampton Court, Whitehall, Windsor, and Nonsuch. Elizabeth did not build any new palaces, but she often visited those she inherited. In James' reign, the list of royal palaces were extended to include other splendid palaces; Theobalds is one such example. Elizabeth frequently travelled between her major royal palaces but she occasionally visited the lesser palaces at Oatlands, Weybridge, Hatfield, Hunsdon, and Woodstock. The northernmost point that Elizabeth ever visited was Chartley, near stafford. She also travelled to Oxford and Cambridge, as well as most of the southern, western, and eastern parts of her realm. Rarely did she ever repeat her procession route, as she wanted to see as much of England as possible. Even when plots to assassinate her were rampant, Elizabeth continued her progresses, much to the dismay of her privy council. When the Ridolfi plot was simmering, however, she remained near London. She continued her progresses until the year of her death, although the last few progresses remained near London.

James recognized the value of progresses and continued them on a regular basis throughout his reign. His favored palaces were Richmond, Nonsuch, Oatlands, Windsor, and Theobalds. James often visited Wiltshire and Hampshire, although he never went to the eastern counties beyond

Newmarket and Saffron Walden. Likewise, James did not travel very far into western England; rarely did he pass west of Dorset. He did, however, visit the northernmost counties on his progress to Scotland. James' route was generally determined by the quality of the hunting available. By contrast, Elizabeth chose her routes in order that she might see as much of the country as possible. King James' court was usually divided during the summer progresses; Prince Charles and Queen Anne often went on separate smaller progresses. It is possible that this division lessoned the dramatic impact of the size and grandeur of James' court.

There were several problems associated with progresses. Neither Elizabethan or Jacobean courtiers were fond of these summer journeys. It was a dubious honor for the nobles to host a royal visit because although it was a sign of royal favor, great expenses were entailed. Theoretically all that was required of the host was to surrender his house, but it was an unwritten rule that the host bear the cost of not only feeding, housing, and entertaining the court, he was expected to present a lavish parting gift to the sovereign at the end of the vist. Friends, neighbors, and dependents of the host were expected to contribute to lessen the staggering expense. Consequently, nobles often made excuses to avoid a royal visit when the itinery was being planned. Their excuses varied: their house was too small, the roads too poor and/or dangerous, the weather foul, and so on. If the sovereign could not be persuaded to visit elsewhere, care was taken to make sure that

the visit would be brief. James did not seem to recognize the economic burden his visits entailed, but Elizabeth tried to limit the frequency and duration of her visits. Although her sojourns were usually one-time affairs, Elizabeth expected to be more lavishly entertained than James. It did not cost a great deal to send the King hunting, but the expensive gifts Elizabeth expected were definite burdens.

The principal rooms of the house were surrendered to the sovereign. Other courtiers were housed in various places. Servants and lesser officials were put up in out-houses, nearby inns, tents, and neighboring houses. Conditions were often rudimentary at best for many courtiers. For this reason, many courtiers hated the annual progresses. Most courtiers did not want to spend their time traipsing around the countryside; they longed to be home with their own families, yet were required by court etiquette to attend the sovereign.[12] The rigors of travel and the lack of adequate housing were only two problems associated with royal progresses. Often the nobles who accompanied the King disliked the areas they were forced to travel in, as Sir Anthony Weldon attested in his 1617 account of James' progress to Scotland.

> theyre ys great store of fowle, as fowle houses, fowle sheetes and shirts, fowle lynnen, fowle dishes and potts, fowle trenchers and napkins, with which sort we have been forced to fare as the children of Israel did with their fowle in the wilderness...

---

[12]Leicester wrote that he did not want to go on the progress; Burghley responded and advised him to hold out until the last possible moment to join the court. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, of the Reign of Elizabeth I, vol. 88 (1572): 2 July 1572, p. 448.

> As men of olde did not more wonder that the great messias should be borne in so poore a towne as Bethlehem in Judea, as I shoulde be borne in so stinking a town as Edinborough in l--sy Scotland.[13]

The activities of the courtiers while on progress were also exhausting. Their usual duties in attending to the monarch continued; yet, they were also forced to spend hours travelling. Once they halted for the evening, they were expected to be entertained with the monarch; if dancing was the entertainment, they were expected to dance. Dancing was, in fact, a favorite pastime of Elizabeth. At the end of the long days, government business was taken care of by correspondence.

Entertainment included tilting, feats of agility, mock-battles, cock-fights, fireworks, masques, picnics, and hunting. Most hosts, eager to please the monarch, attempted some sort of spectacle. These spectacles were elaborate play-like productions which frequently involved madrigal lyrics, dancing, and versified orations praising the monarch. Those created by William Churchyard and George Gascoigne were the most popular.[14] Great lengths were taken to enhance their effect; at Evesham, the spectacle offerings centered around a crescent-shaped pond dug for the occasion. Most of the dramatic offerings had a thematic unity. For example, those

---

[13]Anthony Welden, A Satirical Description of Scotland, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III:338-43.

[14]Neville Williams, All the Queen's Men: Elizabeth I and her Courtiers (New York: Macmillan, 1972), p. 148.

enacted for Elizabeth at Kennilworth in 1575 followed the theme of Arthurian legends.[15] Noblemen usually entertained James with several spectacles and masques, the number and elaborateness depending on the length of the visit and the purse of the host.

Lavish banquets were not the least of the host's expenses. These feasts lasted several courses, each in itself a complete repast. Each host tried to court the sovereign's favor by offering succulent varieties of local dishes. A menu from one dinner during one of James' entertainments included duck, mutton, capon, chicken, rabbit, turkey, venison, heron, beef, pidgeon, wild boar pie, custard pie, pear tart, and buttered peas to name but a portion of the offerings.[16] James loved to eat; Elizabeth, on the other hand, was a rather sparse eater, yet she expected an elaborate dinner such as the one previously described. After the banquets, fireworks often ended the day's festivities.

Elizabeth's progress to Evesham exemplifies many of the features discussed above. The Queen journeyed to Hertfordshire in late September, 1591, to visit the Earl of Hertford at Evesham. A three day royal visit required a great deal of preparation by the Earl. He hired three-hundred men to enlarge

---

[15]Robert Laneham, Queen Elizabeth's Visit to Kennilworth Castle, 1575, pp. 8-39 passim.

[16]Henry Philip Houghton, Bart. "Notes of the Diet at Houghten, at the King's coming there," menu from dinner 17 August 1617, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 401-3.

the main house and to build several out-houses, so called because they were located outside the walls of the main house. These out-houses were covered with fragrant branches and clusters of ripe hazel nuts, and on the inside they were hung with arras cloth and ivy leaves. Fragrant herbs and fresh rushes covered the floor. They were unfurnished, but the court always carried extra furnishings for these hastily constructed buildings. These out-houses were intended for the lodgings of higher court officials. Hertford also had several smaller utilitarian buildings constructed, among them a new buttery, and a new larder.[17] Several tents were set up for the servants and lesser court officials.

The extremes to which the nobles went to provide spectacles for the Queen's pleasure can be evidenced by the measures taken at Evesham. A pond was dug specifically to provide a staging place for the Queen's entertainment. This pond was the focus of the entertainment for the entire three day visit. It was crescent-shaped, rather large, and had three islands in it. In 1591 an Elizabethan pamphleteer, John Wolfe, described the pond as follows.

> Betweene the Earl's house and the forsayd hill, where these rooms were raised, there had bene made in the bottom, by handy labour, a goodly Pond, sut to the perfect figure of a half moon. In this pond were three notable grounds, where hence to present

---

[17]John Wolfe, "The Honerable Entertainment given to the Quene's Majestie, in Progress at Elvetham in Hampshire, by the Right Honerable Earle of Hertford," 1591, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 401-3.

> her Majestie with sports and pastimes.
> The first was a Ship Ile, of a hundred
> foot in length, and four-score foote broad,
> bearing three trees orderly set for three masts.
> The second was a Fort twenty foot square every
> way and overgrown with willows. The third
> and last was a Snayl Mount, rising to foure
> circles of greene privie hedges, the whole in
> height twentie foot, and fortie foote broad
> at the bottom. These three places were
> equally distant from the sides of the ponde,
> and everie one, by a just measured proportion,
> distant from the other. In the said water
> were divers boates prepared for musicke:
> but especially there was a pinnace,
> ful furnisht with masts, yards, sailes,
> anchors, cables, and all other ordinarie tackling,
> and with iron peeces; and lastly with flagges:
> streamers, and pendants, to the number of
> twelve, all painted with divers colours,
> and sundry devices.[18]

A great deal of trouble was taken to insure that the islands were symmetrically placed and that the scene provided a colorful and unique staging place for the ensuing spectacles.

Early in the morning on the day of the Queen's arrival, Hertford called all of the servants to a meeting at which he explained the finer points of court etiquette. He also warned them of Elizabeth's temper if they gave her just cause. After briefing his servants, Hertford rode towards the procession in order to personally escort the Queen onto his lands. By the time the progress reached Evesham, it was between five and six p.m. on 20 September, 1591. As the Queen rode between the park gate and the house, a poet greeted the entourage. He was clad in green (the symbolic color of joy), crowned with a laurel wreath, and carried an olive branch in his hand. The poet greeted the Queen with a fine Latin oration, in which he

---

[18]Ibid., p. 102.

likened her to a goodess. He also alluded to her scholarly attributes, her kindness, and her magnificence. There were frequent allusions to her power and the imagery of a Sun Queen was frequently used. In his pamphlet, Wolfe translated the Latin into the vernacular.

> seest thou that English Nimph [Elizabeth] in face and shape resembling some great Goddesse, and whose beames Doe sprinkle Heaven with unacquainted light... More fair than Nimphs, she governs all the Nimphs: More worthy than the Gods, shee wins the Gods... Come therefore, come under our humble roofe, And with a becke commaund what it containes: For all is thine: each part obeys thy will; Did not each part obey, the wholl should perish.
>
> Sing songs, faire Nymphs, sing sweet triumphal songs, Fill ways with flowrs, and th' ayr with harmony.[19]

At the poet's last sentence, three persons representing the hours and three persons representing the graces symbolically removed "blocks" in the Queen's path, which were supposedly laid by Envie. The hours and graces were dressed in pale tafeta gowns and wore floral wreaths on their heads. They carried baskets of flowers and herbs which, after they curtsied to the Queen, distributed along her path. As they scattered the flowers, they sang songs of praise to the Queen. After Elizabeth reached the house, the Countess of Hertford welcomed the entourage. As she approached two brass cannons saluted her. That evening, Elizabeth dined with only her ladies of the privy chamber and the hosts. After dinner, six

---

[19]Ibid., pp. 106-08.

musicians provided entertainment. The Queen then retired for the evening.

The next day, poor weather kept the entertainment inside. The Queen remained by herself most of the day. A large banquet was provided for the evening meal; afterwards she was escorted to the side of the pond where a large canopy was erected, made of green satin and decorated with silver lace and white plumes. Four knights held the canopy over the Queen. Elizabeth was then treated to an elaborate water spectacle in which richly garbed figures representing various Greek gods waded in the pond in an ornate sea procession. Trumpeters led the parade. A pinnace held singers, flute players and three virgins playing Scottish gigs. Twenty other boats followed. At this point in his description, Wolfe, in an aside, tells the reader that (1) in the pinnace there were two jewels to be presented to the Queen, (2) armed men surrounded the fort, (3) the snail mount was lit with flaming torches, and that (4) Sylvanus and his men awaited in the woods at the edge of the pond.[20]

The pageant began when a nymph, Nereus, swam towards the Queen and gave her an oration. He hailed Elizabeth as "FaireCynthia," and alluded to the time when "jealous waves swallowed up your foes."[21] This allusion to the English victory over the Spanish armade delighted Elizabeth. After Nereus' speech, he presented Elizabeth with a large jewel and

---

[20]Ibid., pp. 110-11.

[21]Ibid., pp. 111-12.

sang a song about springtime. The lyrics of the song compared Elizabeth's visit to springtime in a world weary of winter. She was welcomed, like spring; although her visit was in late September, it signified a rebirth, a renewal of her subject's love and loyalty. Sylvanus then entered from the forest and began a dialogue with Nereus, in which he expressed the desire to see his beloved Nearea. Nereus was afraid that the lusty Sylvanus would "prophane her [Neaera's] undefiled state,"[22] and hoped "that water will extinguish wanton fire."[23] A hilarious water battle ensued in which Sylvanus was humiliated (and Nearea's chastity protected). Sylvanus and his men ran ashore and found shelter in the forest. At this point, the fair maid Neaera spoke to the Queen. "Her [Elizabeth's] beames yield gentle influence, like fayre starres; Her silver soundinge world is prophesie. Speake, sacred Sibyl, give some prosperous name..."[24] The Queen then named the pinnace the Bonadventure, and Neaera gave a great jewel to Elizabeth. The Queen was especially pleased with this entertainment much to the relief of the Earl of Hertford.[25]

The third day's entertainment was more simple. About nine o'clock in the morning, the Queen was serenaded by

---

[22]Ibid., p. 115.

[23]Ibid., p. 115.

[24]Ibid., p. 116.

[25]Ibid., p. 116.

madrigals under her window. She remained in her chambers until that afternoon when she watched a game which resembled tennis between two of Hertford's servants. That evening, she was treated to another spectacular fireworks display over the pond. These fireworks were discharged from the three islands. Each set was more dazzling than the last; shooting rockets concluded the ceremony. After the fireworks display, there was an open-air banquet by torchlight in the privie garden.

The next day was the Queen's departure. That morning she was serenaded by a person representing Aureola, the queen of the fairies. The young girls representing Aureola's fairies then sang a song of praise to Elizabeth.

> Elisa is the fairest Quene,
> That ever trod upon this greene.
> Elisaes eyes are blessed starres,
> Inducing peace, snbduing [sic] warres.
> Elisaes brest is that faire hill,
> Where Vertue dwels, and sacred skill,
> O blessed bee each day and houre
> Where sweet Elisa builds her bowre.[26]

As they sang, the group danced. Elizabeth was so flattered that she had the maidens repeat the song and dance three times, and called the other courtiers to see the spectacle. The Queen's pleasure made the effort worthwhile to the participants.

The royal entourage departed Evesham within an hour of this event. Despite the rain, the Queen made the progress out of the park halt so that she could hear each farewell oration. All the sea-gods, the graces, and the hours lined the road and wrung their hands and cried. The poet, who had been clad in

---

[26]Ibid., p. 119.

green at her entry, was now clad in black as he bade the Queen farewell. His oration summed up the entertainment and emphasized the sadness at her departure. His final words were "O, either stay, or soone returne againe, for sommers parting is the countries paine."[27] As the Queen exited through the gate, all of the participants of the spectacles sang a song which admonished her to quickly return. The success of Hertford's entertainement earned him a place of favor and Elizabeth continued to be grateful to him.

The previous example was included to show the specific types of activities that were common when the sovereign journeyed to a particular private dwelling. The next example serves to illustrate, in a more general sense, the factors involved in a long progress. Perhaps the most controversial and complicated of James' progresses was the journey to Scotland in 1617.

In a letter from King James to the Scottish privy council, James gave the following reasons why he wished to make the journey. He had a "natural longing" to see his native land; he had not returned to Scotland since he left thirteen years earlier to assume the English throne. Also, he wanted to meet his Scottish subjects and extend the King's justice to such subjects as could not otherwise get this benefit. He stoutly denied charges that his true motive for

---

[27]Ibid., p. 120.

the visit was to enforce the Anglican religion at the expense of Scottish Presbyterianism.[28]

This progress seemed ill-fated from the start. Many Scots did not accept his assurance that he did not plan to enforce the Anglican ritual, and they tried to dissuade the King from making the journey. His English advisors were also against this progress, primarily because of the expense and geographic complications. According to John Chamberlain, "I never knew a journey so generally misliked both here and there."[29] Money for this progress was obtained, somewhat reluctantly, through forced loans from select London citizens and the wealthier peers.[30] To save money, James reduced his normally large retinue to fifty gentlemen pensioners and twenty-four members of the Chapel Royal. He included the unpopular Bishop Laud in the entourage. Laud was probably an unwise choice since his anti-puritan sentiments were widely known and disliked by the Scots. No amount of advice could sway the King, who insisted on making this Scottish progress, even if it was in a reduced size. It left Whitehall in 1616.

---

[28]Letter from King James I to the Scottish Privy Council, 15 December, 1616, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 309.

[29]John Chamberlain, The Chamberlain Letters, edited by Elizabeth Thompson (London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1923), p. 140.

[30]The King virtually forced the London merchants to loan him the money for the Scottish progress. Parkes, Travel in Seventeenth Century England, p. 226, and Chamberlain, The Chamberlain Letters, p. 277.

The Scots, once they realized that James was really going to visit, set about making preparations for the King's arrival. Roads were repaired, and treasures (fine tapestries, silver, gold, and so on) were hastily imported from abroad so that James might be impressed with his Scottish subjects. The Scots wished James, who had grown accustomed to English luxuries, to think of Scotland in more favorable terms than as a barbarous, impoverished, land. Several municipal laws were passed to make the King's travels more pleasant. In 1616, Edinburgh passed a law which protected the King's retinue from the beggars.[31] Also, a directive of the Scottish privy council insured that there would be sufficient food and clean lodgings for about five-thousand men and horses.[32] In addition to these preparations, the usual care was taken to prepare for the King's entertainment.

James enjoyed his journey through the North to his homeland. He hunted, feasted, and was lavishly entertained along the progress. In general, the people readily accepted James and he showed uncharacteristic graciousness in acknowledging their praise. At Rochester, where the King spent his birthday, "many beautifyl garlands, curiously made up with costly scarves and ribbons decked with spoons and bodkins of

---

[31]An Act Against Beggars: 16 January 1616, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 313.

[32]Directives of the Privy Council for Scotland at Edinburgh: 24 December 1616, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 313.

silver and small plate of several sorts"[33] hung across the roadway. Maids scattered flowers before his coach, and he was entertained by a morris dance.[34] Subjects lined the procession route to catch a glimpse of the King. Unlike Elizabeth, however, James was more preoccupied with hunting than with impressing his subjects. He did not make the simple gestures that Elizabeth did so naturally. At Castle Douglas, James was entertained by verses penned by William Drummond. "Ah why should Isis [England] only see thee shine, is not the Forth as well as Isis thine? Though Isis vaunt she halth more wealth in store, let it suffice thy Forth doth love thee more."[35] It seems from these lines that the Scottish subjects were hurt that James waited thirteen years to return. They also let it be known that they realized that Scotland was less wealthy than England, but so they claimed, the Scottish subjects were more loyal. Most likely, if these same words had been spoken to Elizabeth, she would have responded in a manner that assured the citizens she valued their love and loyalty far more that their riches. James merely thanked the subjects and declined to comment further on this verse.

---

[33]Thomas Creake, England's Joy, or a Relation of the Most Remarkable Passages From His Majesty's Arrival at Dover to his Entrance at Whitehall, 1660, reprinted in Firth, ed., An English Garner, Stuart Tracts, 1603-93, p. 428.

[34]A morris dance was a vigorous Spanish style dance. Colorful costumes and lively music made the moorish theme more predominant: this was a very popular dance form in the seventeenth century.

[35]Verse by Wiliam Drummond, cited in David Matthew, James I (n.p. University of Alabama Press, 1968), p. 391.

James entered Edinburgh on 16 May 1617. He was accorded the usual honors of the civic reception. The provost, William Nisbet, welcomed the King and presented him with a purse containing five-hundred double angels of gold. The oration praised his piety and scholarly qualities. James' wisdom was compared to Solomon's, his rectitude to David's, and his godliness to Josiah.[36] After hearing the sermon from the Archbishop of St. Andrews, the procession continued towards Holyrood House where John Hay, recorder of Edinburgh, expressed the Scots' joy that James had at last returned. These welcome orations do not appear to be cynical or sarcastic; rather, they seem quite genuine. Also at Holyrood House, the faculty and students of Edinburgh University welcomed James with Latin verses. In subsequent days, he was further entertained by the faculty and students of the University; James especially enjoyed the debates and disputations. Topics that were debated for his entertainement included the origin of fountains and springs, the nature of local notion, and the issue of whether the position of sheriff should be hereditary.[37]

When James addressed the Scottish Parliament his true motive for the journey was revealed. In his speech, he not only confirmed the Scots' convictions that he wished to Anglicanize the Presbyterian ritual, but he insulted the Scots as well. His speech expressed the need and desire for more

---

[36]Records of the High Court of the Justiciary, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 317.

[37]Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 368-9.

unity between England and Scotland. The King went so far as to urge the Scots to ape English manners, customs and religious practices. This speech was not very well received by the Scots who wished to retain the cultural independence of which they were quite proud.[38] James was forced to admit defeat when St. Andrews refused to alter their ritual to bring it into accordance with Anglican practices.

James gave in on the issue and returned towards home. On his return, he visited Stirling, Glasgow, Hamilton, and Dumfries. He was well-received at each. He bade farewell to his native land at Carisle; he never returned to Scotland. After an absence of more than seven months, the court returned to London in mid-September. The progress had not been a popular idea from the start. Its failure only further illustrated that James did not use the progress to the advantage that he could have.

The success of the Elizabethan progresses is well-documented. Several accounts mention the gestures she made that instilled love and loyalty in her subjects. She showed great trust in the wives of Sandwich when she ate of their banquet without the formality of an assay (tasting for poison).[39] At Warwick, the recorder was visibly nervous

---

[38]James' speech to the Scottish Parliament, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, III: 345-7.

[39]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, II: 338-9.

as he read the opening speech. After the speech, the Queen put him at ease by saying, "You were not so afraid of me as I was of you."[40] Her statement made the recorder love her for puttting his fears to rest even though she as the monarch had obviously nothing to fear from the humble recorder. As Elizabeth grew older, she never tired of the progresses. In fact, the older she became, the more prolonged the visits seem to have been. When one well-meaning youthful courtier suggested that, due to her advanced years, the Queen would be more comfortable in a coach than riding horseback, Elizabeth was enraged and rode horseback the entire progress to prove that she was physically capable.[41] The public-relations success of her progresses were truly phenomenal. Elizabeth used the progresses to keep herself in the public view and exhibited herself in a most artful and politically advantageous way. Contemporaries agreed. The Spanish ambassador wrote the following account of Elizabeth's visit to Berkshire:

> She was received everywhere with great acclamation and signs of joy, as is customary in this country, whereat she was exceedingly pleased and told me so, giving me to understand how beloved she was by her subjects and how highly she esteemed this... she would order her carriage sometimes to be taken where the crowd seemed thickest and stood up and thanked her people....[42]

---

[40]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 315.

[41]Violet Wilson, Queen Elizabeth's Maids of Honour and Ladies of the Privy Chamber (New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., n.d.), p. 275.

[42]Williams, All the Queen's Men, p. 145.

James was well-received by his subjects but he did not make the simple, loving gestures that seemed to be second nature to Elizabeth. Accordingly, the public relations success of his progresses was limited. This was an age where sovereigns were respected and treated with deference; this James' subjects did. They did not, however, praise him the way they praised Elizabeth. It would not be fair to James to blame all of this on his personality and public behavior; several underlying problems of the late years of Elizabeth's reign saw fruition in James' reign. Economic, social, and constitutional problems had already appeared for which James cannot possibly be blamed. These concerns nevertheless affected the subjects' attitudes toward the Crown. James was never rudely received, but there was a distinct difference in the tone of his receptions. His court had a reputation for being lavish, loose, and immoral; the staid English frowned upon this. James' officials complained that they had little time to spend with the day-to-day affairs of government; they were forced to accompany the King on interminable hunting ventures.[43] While James was on progress, government took a back seat to social activities. One of James' progresses in particular illustrates the frustration some of the subjects felt towards his preoccupation with hunting. In 1608, the court was making its third visit to the Earl of Cumberland.

---

[43]D. Harris Willson, King James VI and I (New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., n.d.), p. 185.

Cumberland wrote to John Chamberlain on 8 July, 1608 "The progress holds on towards Northamptonshire as unwelcome in these parts as rain in harvest."[44] The farmers complained that hunting caused their fields to be trampled. The farmers sent a subtle message to the King via a note tied around the neck of a "lost" hound, named Jowler.

> 'Good Mr. Jowler,' it read, "we pray you to speak to the King (for he hears you everyday, and so doth he not tell us) that it will please his Majesty to go back to London, for else the country will be undone; all our provision is spent already and we are not able to entertain him any longer.'[45]

James did not understand the message of this note; he thought it was written to amuse him and remained for two more weeks, hunting all the while. This incident also illustrates the fact that James abused his privileges; he wore out his welcome by visiting for too long at one spot. Elizabeth, on the other hand, by generally limiting her visits to brief one-time stays, did not abuse the hospitality of the subjects.

There were other differences in the progresses of Elizabeth and James. James' progresses were simply not acts of policy as Elizabeth's were. He chose his routes for other than political expediency. Elizabeth and James both were scholarly and both visited Oxford and Cambridge, yet, James did not generally enjoy the more scholarly entertainments

---

[44]Cumblerland memoirs, 8 July 1608, reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, I: p. 200. Also, Chamberlain, The Chamberlain Letters, p. 40.

[45]Willson, King James VI and I, p. 184.

such as certain classical dramatic offerings. James was especially bored by masques since he was not musically inclined and was not interested in drama. His favorite entertainments were cock-fights, and of course, hunting and eating. Elizabeth seems to have enjoyed, or at least pretended to enjoy, most of the different types of entertainment she was offered.[46] Another difference, besides entertainment preferences, lay in the way the two sovereigns planned their routes. James never visited the homes of those in opposition to him; perhaps he was too terrified of assassination, but more likely, he desired to go where he knew he would enjoy himself the most. Accordingly, James confined his visits to the homes of loyal supporters and trusted advisors.[47] Elizabeth by contrast, challenged her adversaries and visited them regardless of their personal sentiments.[48] Elizabeth viewed the annual progresses as an act of polity, whereas James saw them as annual vacations; Elizabeth's were "working vacations," while James' were pleasure vacations.

The progresses of both monarchs shared similarities as well as differences. Sovereigns enjoyed their progresses and expected to be entertained in a manner befitting their sovereign status. Both received lavish entertainment and

---

[46]Ibid., p. 191.

[47]Mathew, James I, p. 243.

[48]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 345.

praise. Each of the monarchs recognized the need to travel to the subjects because the subjects could not otherwise see them and pay homage. Religion often entered into the motives and selection of the progress routes for both Elizabeth and James. James refused to visit Roman Catholics,[49] and Elizabeth's actions at her overnight visit to Lambeth Palace in 1573 indicate her attitudes toward a married clergy. Her parting words to the wife of the Archbishop of Canterbury were "And you--Madame, I may not call you; Mistress I am ashamed to call you, and so I know not what to call you. But howsoever, I thank you."[50] Another common theme during the reigns of both sovereigns was that the courtiers almost universally disliked the progresses. It was, moreover, quite costly to host even a brief visit because both Elizabeth and James demanded royal treatment. Both courts were plagued by hang-by's who infiltrated the lower echelon of servants and therefore lived illegally at the Crown's expense. These parasites consisted of undesirable whores, and disease-ridden vagabonds, and were a considerable problem to both sovereigns. They seem, however, to have been more of a problem with the Jacobean progresses. Despite the problems, progresses allowed Renaissance English monarchs invaluable opportunities for intercourse with the subjects they ruled. Accordingly, the success of the progresses lay greatly with the individual

---

[49]Mathew, James I, p. 244.

[50]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, I: 325-6.

monarch and the way in which he used the public relations opportunity to political advantage.

Once again, Elizabeth used the public exposure to win the hearts of her subjects. James attempted to do the same, but he was unwilling to sacrifice his personal wishes in order to do so. By failing to travel to different parts of the realm (with the exception of the Scottish progress), and by failing to respond gracefully to the public orations of welcome, James spoiled the opportunity the progresses afforded to cement the subject-sovereign bonds of loyalty. The instances of his actually insulting his subjects are numerous; one finds very few such cases in the Elizabethan progresses. Once again, as in the coronation ceremony, and coronation procession, Elizabeth proved her innate sense of public display and James proved his lack of the same instinct.

CHAPTER V

THE DEATH AND FUNERAL OF ELIZABETH AND JAMES

Although he had little actual control over the funeral ceremonies, the English monarch nevertheless exhibited pageantry even in death. It was important for Kings and Queens to "die well;" that is, they were to follow the established traditions in their final sickness and subsequent death. In the Tudor-Stuart era, it was essential that the monarch "make a good end," for often his entire life was judged by the way in which he faced the ultimate challenge, death. If he approached death with fear and trepidation, it could be assumed that he was fearful of meeting his creator and was likewise reluctant to answer for sins committed throughout his life. It was often believed that if one faced death courageously and showed patient resignation to impending death, then one was most likely a candidate for Heaven.[1] It was therefore essential for English monarchs, as heads of state, and therefore much in the public view, to die without fear. As heads of the Anglican church, it was likewise important that they exhibit acceptance of death as the Bible directs Christians to do.

---

[1]Beatrice Saunders, The Age of Candlelight: The English Social Scene in the Seventeenth Century (Philadelphia: Dufour Editions, 1961), p. 111.

In general, one might say that both Elizabeth and James faced death in an acceptable fashion, with departures from the norm consistent with their different personalities. The specifics of the death of each will be discussed later in this chapter. First, however, the generalities associated with the death of each will be described.

Both monarchs died due to illness, James from a tertian ague, and Elizabeth from infections resulting from tuberculous laryngitis. Both lingered for days and were surrounded by advisors, clergy, and courtiers. In each case, after physicians had given up, the monarchs turned to spirtual comfort. The ranking clergy spent hours praying at the death and final hours of each monarch. Each sovereign seemed eager for the prayers, and, in fact, seemed to have been solaced by prayer. Both died rather lonely deaths despite the fact that many courtiers and councillors were on the premises. When Elizabeth died, the only people who were present were three of her trusted ladies-in-waiting and the Archbishop of Canterbury. When James died, no one even noticed until hours later. Both seem to have accepted, if somehat reluctantly, impending death. Elizabeth had long refused to permit anyone even to comment upon her age or health; she had an immense dislike of the subject of death. In her last days, however, she appears to have at least accepted her physical degeneration; she asked to be shown a mirror for the first time in several years. Several remarks she made indicate her belated acceptance of her infirmity. King James likewise had a lifelong dislike of death. Indeed, his fear became a phobia that was strong

enough to prevent his attending the funeral of either of his wife, Queen Anne, or his heir, Prince Henry. This was probably the result of his childhood fear of assassination. Like Elizabeth, James, despite his fear of death, met his own last hours with fortitude. He seemed reconciled to his impending death and sought solace in his religion. In this sense, both Elizabeth and James "died well." In addition, both seem to have been almost weary of life. When Elizabeth made her "Golden Speech" to Parliament, it was as if she knew she would not be living to address the next Parliament. Both she and James had the misfortune of outliving their trusted friends and advisors and were consequently aware of their own passing age.

James and Elizabeth followed the traditionally accepted pattern of death for monarchs. It should be noted however that Elizabeth departed from the norm in that she failed concretely to name a successor. Since she died childless, it was imperative that she name an heir. Before she had made several vague allusions to James as a successor but had not made any definite statements as to this important matter. Unlike Elizabeth, James kept with tradition by naming his eldest surviving son, Charles, as the heir apparent. James, however, died a most undignified death, aggravated by dysentary. For a monarch to die such a messy and unpleasant death was frowned upon; not that he could have done anything

about it, but his subjects would have preferred that he die a more becoming and seemly death.[2]

The bodies of both monarchs were carefully prepared for state funerals. It was important that the bodies be quickly embalmed since they laid in state for about a month before burial. Elizabeth had asked that she not be embalmed, but Cecil disregarded this request. She was probably against this procedure because she did not want to have an autopsy performed, despite the fact that autopsies were an accepted and necessary part of the embalming process for Kings and Queens. It was important to determine if the monarch died of natural causes.

The corpse was quickly and carefully prepared for burial according to tradition. James was embalmed within two days of his death. The embalming process included disemboweling the corpse, removing the heart, liver, and kidneys. These organs were then placed in a leaden vessel and buried with the body. The head was split open with a chisel and a saw, and the brains were removed. In James' case, contemporaries noted that he had a large brain. It was "a mark of his infinite judgement."[3] The body was then filled with spices. A woolen hat was placed on the corpse, gloves on the hands, and the body was wrapped in wool; no thread or silk could be used.[4]

---

[2]Helen Stafford, James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1940), p. 281.

[3]Nichols, ... Progresses of James, IV: 1037.

[4]Saunders, The Age of Candlelight, p. 112.

Four inches of bran were used to line the wooden coffin. After the corpse was prepared, the coffin was closed and sealed. A wax effigy was prepared and placed on the coffin. These effigies were quite lifelike and were often undistinguishable from the appearance of the monarch during life.

The funeral ceremony for a deceased monarch was an occasion for pageantry and established ceremoney. No expense was spared, as the funeral was officially paid for by the succeeding monarch. The member of the Howard family who held the hereditary title of Earl Marshall was responsible for the planning of the funeral.[5] Printed invitations, decorated with macabre drawings of skulls and skeletons, were issued to the peers and household staff of the monarch.[6] Black was the accepted color of mourning, although other colors were used in the banners. Rooms where the corpse lay in state were hung from floor to ceiling with black velvet. Black mourning dress was traditionally worn for one year after the death of a King or Queen. It was customary for the government to present the gentry with mourning gloves and scarves.[7] The state also paid for yards of black velvet to drape the funeral chapel at Westminster.[8]

There was a great deal of ritual associated with the funeral procession. There was an established order of

---

[5]Williams, Elizabeth I, Queen of England, pp. 23-5.

[6]Saunders, The Age of Candlelight, p. 112.

[7]Ibid., p. 114.

[8]Nichols, ... Progresses of James, IV: 1035.

procession which went from the place where the body lay in state to Westminster. Those participating in the cortege wore black mourning dress; the casket itself was draped in black velvet, and a wax effigy in dull state dress was placed on the top. The casket was carried in

> a carriage made of purpose, covered with blacke velvett, and drawne by six goodly blacke horses covered with velvett on their bakes and blacke feathers on their heads.[9]

The funeral procession was led by the mounted Knight Marshall, who with fifty of his men cleared the streets lined with people to allow for the passage of the cortege. The Earl Marshall and one-hundred men followed. The procession included virtually all of the King's household servants in groups which were broken by nobles displaying banners. Trumpeters, the officials of London, and all of the foreign ambassadors added to the procession.[10] The body was drawn in a chariot preceeded by the gentlemen ushers at the foot and the Chief Mourner at its head. Six assistants walked beside the caisson. A canopy was held over the caisson by the gentlemen or ladies of the privy chamber. The gentlemen pensioners and footmen also walked alongside. Queen Elizabeth's Chief Mourner was Lady Scrope, and James' was his heir, Charles I. Each Chief Mourner had several assistants. This

---

[9]Ibid., p. 1038.

[10]The contemporary account, as reprinted in Nichols, ... Progresses of James, vol. 4, takes up over seven pages of text; this indicates the complexity of the order of procession and the number of those who participated.

group was flanked by twelve colorful bannerols[11] that pictured various events in English history.

The cortege entered Westminster for the state funeral. Funeral ceremonies consisted of a funeral service conducted by a leading clergyman, eulogies; and the final respects of the nobility to the deceased monarch. After the funeral service, the Chief Mourner, the assistants to the Chief Mourner, and a group known as the Close Mourners offered their respects to the dead sovereign. The Close Mourners included the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, the Master of the Horse, the Lord Treasurer, and the Lord Chamberlain.[12] After this group had paid their respects by filing past the coffin, bowing before it, the rest of the nobles paid the final hommage to the deceased sovereign. The English Earls led the procession, followed in James' case by the Scottish Earls. Next the Viscounts and then the eldest sons of the Earls followed. The Bishops, the English Barons, and in James' case the Scottish Barons were next to pay hommage. After the Barons came the Earls' younger sons and then the other officers of state who broke their staves in a symbolic gesture that signified that their tenure in office was officially ended with the sovereign's death. After all had paid their last respects to the deceased, the Garter Principal of the Knights of Arms read an official proclamation

---

[11]These were large, colorful banners and heralds.

[12]Nichols, ... Progresses of James, IV: 1948.

which confirmed the death of the monarch and proclaimed the heir to the throne. Shouts of "long live the King/Queen" followed.[13] It should be noted that the funeral services were offered simultaneously at various churches throughout the realm.

English monarchs liked to be buried in good company. The effigies were placed in a special wax-work chamber in Westminster Abbey. The effigies were quite lifelike and some remain well-preserved.[14] Generally the bodies were placed in tombs also in the Abbey. The precise location of the individual tombs was left to the wishes of the deceased monarch, and no hard and fast rule applied.

Now that the generalities of the deaths and burials of Renaissance English monarchs have been ascertained, one can at last delve into the specifics of the death and funeral rites of Elizabeth I and James I.

Queen Elizabeth died at the age of seventy in the fourty-fourth year of her reign. She had narrowly escaped death in 1562 when she caught smallpox, but the royal physicians were able to save her. This was the last time until her death that a truly serious illness plagued her. This was partly due to the fact that Elizabeth ate and drank in moderation and exercised frequently by vigorous dancing. Her long

---

[13]Lucy Aiken, Memoirs of the Court of James I, (London: Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1822), II: 402.

[14]Agnes Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England (Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1849), VII: 226.

life can in part be attributed to her determination not to get old and unhealthy. The older she became, the more determined she was to show that she enjoyed good health despite her frequent attacts of gout.[15] The aging Elizabeth dared any of her young courtiers to refer to her age, and even forbade mourners at her court in order that she not be reminded of her own mortality.[16] Nevertheless, as her final months approached, Elizabeth's attitude towards death changed dramatically. While she did not accept death as imminent, at least she began to make preparations for it; she sensed that death must not be far in the future. Historian Violet Wilson suggests that this change in attitude can be largely attributed to the deaths of many of her favorite courtiers who had shared in Elizabeth's success from the early days of her reign. Burleigh, her trusted advisor was dead, as were Leicester, Essex, and her favorite lady-in-waiting, and trusted friend, Kate Carey.[17] The deaths of these people must surely have made the Queen realize that even a sovereign was "not above death." Her "Golden Speech" to Parliament in 1601 was Elizabeth's swan song. This seemed to be her farewell speech to her country; many accounts note that most of the representatives were weeping as Elizabeth spoke.[18]

---

[15]Wilson, Queen Elizabeth's Maids of Honour and Ladies of the Privy Chamber, p. 275.

[16]Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England, VII: 220.

[17]Wilson, Queen Elizabeth's Maids of Honour and Ladies of the Privy Chamber, pp. 274-6.

[18]Alison Plowden, As They Saw Her, Elizabeth I (London: George G. Harrap, 1971), p. 164.

Elizabeth's words were similar to those she had spoken at her coronation procession. "You have had many Princes more mighty and wise....yet you never had any...more careful and loving."[19] When she finished the speech, Elizabeth asked that the members of Commons kiss her hand. This was not an accepted, traditional part of the opening of Parliament; rather it was as if the Queen knew she would never again address her beloved commons. The fourty-fourth anniversary of her accession day was likewise celebrated "almost as if people predicted she would never see another 17 November."[20]

Clearly, Elizabeth was failing in health by December 1602; yet, she refused to make a direct statement concerning the naming of her successor. She did correspond with James, however, and told him to read between the lines "as becommeth a King."[21] She was reluctant to name a successor because of the possibility that factions would develop around the heir presumptive. Her own experience during Mary's reign had taught Elizabeth the value of remaining silent on this issue. However, by not officially naming a successor before her death, she violated one of the deathbed duties of a sovereign. It was her duty to make provisions to insure a peaceful transfer of power upon her death. Although Elizabeth did not

---

[19]Williams, Elizabeth I, Queen of England, p. 209.

[20]Ibid., p. 212.

[21]Ibid., p. 215.

officially name James, her advisors and many of the courtiers knew that he would become the next English King. Several legends have arisen that declare Elizabeth officially named James her successor. In all liklihood, these legends are false; it would have been most uncharacteristic of her to do so.[22] One legend goes as follows. About three months before death, while journeying from Whitehall to Richmond, Elizabeth is said to have remarked to her coutiers, "I told you my seat has been the seat of Kings, and I will have no rascal to succeed me; and who should succeed me but a King?"[23] Rumor has it that Elizabeth continued "who but our cousin of Scotland?"[24] Another legend recounts that on her deathbed on March 23, with her Privy Councillors surrounding her bed, one of them asked the speechless Queen to hold up a finger if she wished the King of the Scots to succeed her. Elizabeth put her hands to her head as though to indicate a crown.[25] This account seems rather unreliable, since it would have been much easier for her, in her weakened condition, to have simply held up a finger as she was asked. Since she had a fever, it was quite likely that her head hurt, hence, the reason why she put her hand to her head.

---

[22]Ibid., p. 215.

[23]Ibid., p. 215.

[24]Ibid., p. 215.

[25]Robert Carey, The Memoirs of Robert Carey. Edited by F.H. Mares (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 59.

Elizabeth's illness set in about one week before her death. Her three favorite ladies, Lady Warwick (Anne Russell), Lady Scrope (Philadelphia Carey), and Lady Southwell (Elizabeth Howard) tried in vain to get the Queen to go to bed and to cheer her out of her melancholy state. When Elizabeth's favorite, Robert Carey, came to visit, she had been lying on cushions for days and had continued to refuse to go to bed and take her medicines.[26] Carey tried in vain to persuade her to obey the royal physicians. The weary Elizabeth replied "I wish not to live any longer, but desire to die."[27] Robert Cecil also tired to get Elizabeth to go to bed. When he lost his patience and told Elizabeth she must rally to her former spirits. She haughtily replied "The word must was not used to Princes... but you know I must die, and that makes you presumptuous."[28] Indeed, Cecil's behavior further agitated the Queen in other respects as well. He also carried on a secret correspondence with James VI of Scotland, keeping him informed of the events in Elizabeth's final months. Often he openly referred to James' succession upon Elizabeth's death.[29] Such an action if discovered would have been treason.

---

[26]Robert Cecil, The Corresponsence of King James VI of Scotland with Robert Cecil and Others in England During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by John Bruce (Westminster: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1861), p. 72.

[27]Sir Arthur MacNalty, Elizabeth Tudor, The Lonely Queen (New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1961), p. 257.

[28]Frederick Chamberlain, The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth (London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1923), p. 310.

[29]In this correspondence, leading officials were referred to by numbers to maintain annonymity; Cecil was "10."

In addition, Cecil spread rumors that Elizabeth, as exemplified by her refusal to go to bed, had gone insane. Accounts from her ladies stoutly deny this accusation.[30] Nevertheless, Cecil's actions and accusations deeply hurt and upset the Queen. She was almost pleading with Cecil when she said, "Cecil, I know I am not mad; you must not think to make Queen Jane of me."[31] Although they did not think her insane, Elizabeth's fretful behavior caused her courtiers great concern. She slept only fitfully, wept copiously, and sighed often. Robert Carey mentioned in his account that the only other time he had ever seen Elizabeth sigh was after the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots.[32] Elizabeth also refused to eat and frequently complained of dryness in her mouth. On the Saturday before her death, she seemed to have rallied. She declared that she would attend chapel the next morning, and French Ambassador Beaumont wrote, "This morning the Queen's musician has gone to her. I believe she means to die as gaily as she has lived."[33] The next morning, however, Elizabeth was very weak, and once again speechless; she did not attend chapel as she had planned to. The Bishops cried as they prayed for

---

[30]Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England, vol. 7, p. 221. Also, Carey, Memoirs of Robert Carey, p. 60, and Chamberlain, The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth, p. 22.

[31]Queen Jane was Queen of Castille and was quite insane. Agnes Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England, VII: 221.

[32]MacNalty, Elizabeth Tudor, The Lonely Queen, p. 257.

[33]Carey, Memoirs of Robert Carey, p. 58.

her recovery. That evening, The Archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift, was called to Richmond to pray for the Queen.

Elizabeth thus turned to spiritual medicine. Her physicians had given up three days earlier. Archbishop Whitgift prayed continuously for hours. When he thought Elizabeth was sleeping and tried to leave, she motioned for him to continue praying; this happened several times as the Archbishop tried to leave the room for a rest period. Whitgift was relieved at times by Bishop Watson of Chichester, and by Bancroft, Bishop of London. An eyewitness recorded that Elizabeth was aware enough of her surroundings that "she [prayed] very devoutly, in her eyes, hands, and tongue, and with great fervency."[34] She confirmed her belief in the holy trinity and God's ultimate mercy by signs, and died peacefully in her sleep while holding Whitgift's hand as he prayed for her soul. What more fitting way could there be for the death of a Renaissance monarch? Lady Scrope discovered that the Queen no longer breathed. She then removed a ring and threw it out of the window into the hands of her brother-in-law, Robert Carey. By this predetermined signal, Carey knew it was time to begin the journey to Edinburgh to inform King James that he was King of England. It should be noted that the privy council had been summoned at Richmond before Elizabeth died, and had forbade the spread of the news of the Queen's death for fear of disorder and riots. As such, Carey's ride was illegal, although probably the privy

---

[34]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, III: 609.

councillors knew about it and did nothing to stop him.[35] It should be mentioned that loyal subjects gathered in the cold to await news of their sovereign's health.

Elizabeth had left instructions that her body not be examined at an autopsy. She also stated her wish to have her body embalmed immediately after her death.[36] These pleas, however, were ignored, as they were contradictory to the tradition of the autopsy of English sovereigns. Robert Cecil took charge of this procedure. The Queen's heart was removed, wrapped in lead, and put in an urn beside Mary Tudor's in Westminster Abbey. The autopsy reports were quite thorough, allowing modern physicians to determine that the cause of Elizabeth's death was most likely tuberculous laryngitis. Another possible explanation would be a streptococus infection, acquired as a result of influenza.[37] The lead-wrapped corpse was re-wrapped in wool, placed in a wooden coffin which was then nailed fast. When the Queen's body lay in state, the poorly prepared, hastily embalmed body burst with a great noise. This terrified the ladies who remained with the body day and night. They were certain that it was a supernatural occurrence.[38]

Elizabeth had died at Richmond on 23 March, 1603. Her body was brought to London by barge and was attended by six of her ladies, dressed entirely in black. Her body lay

---

[35]Carey, Memoirs of Robert Carey, pp. 62-3.

[36]MacNalty, Elizabeth Tudor, the Lonely Queen, p. 242.

[37]Ibid., p. 242.

[38]Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England, VII: 226.

in state at Whitehall until 25 April. Elizabeth's funeral procession evoked much love and drama from her subjects. According to Stow's Chronicles, her richly dressed, crowned effigy provoked

> such a general sighing, groaning and weeping as the like hath not been seen or known in the memory of man neither doth any history mention any people, time, or state, to make like lamentation for the death of their sovereign.[39]

Elizabeth's beloved subjects turned out in multitudes to pay their last respects to the sovereign they so loved. Had she been able to see the effect her cortege had on the subjects she doutbtless would have approved. William Camden left today's historians a sketch of Elizabeth's cortege. Camden's sketch reveals four black horses complete with plumes and black covers with the royal insignia on each side. The chariot itself was covered in purple velvet and a black canopy held over the coffin was borne by six knights. Gentlemen Pensioners flanked the coffin.[40]

After the funeral, which followed the traditional pattern, Elizabeth's body was interred in a white marble tomb, erected by James I and paid for by the citizens of London.[41] The tomb, located in the Chapel of Henry VII enclosed the

---

[39]Ibid., p. 226.

[40]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, III: 624.

[41]MacNalty, Elizabeth Tudor the Lonely Queen, p. 243.

bodies of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor. Elizabeth had vocalized a wish to be placed with Mary after her death, and the inscription on the tomb reads, "Partners alike in the throne and grave, we sisters, Elizabeth and Mary, sleep in the hope of the resurrection."[42] Before her death, Elizabeth had expressed a

> desire that my name may be recorded in a line or two which shall briefly express my name, my virginity, the years of my reign, the reformation of religion under it, and my preservation of peace.[43]

This is interesting, since it exhibits the way in which Elizabeth wished to be remembered. James complied with the Queen's wishes.

In many respects James' death was quite similar to Elizabeth's. Albeit the specifics vary greatly, the generalities in their attitudes and acceptance of impending death indicate common features.

Although much younger than Elizabeth, James was prematurely old physically and mentally at the time of his death. His appearance, like Elizabeth's in her final years, was somewhat haggard. James no longer looked the picture of the ideal Renaissance King. A contemporary described him as a

---

[42]William Camden, The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England, edited by Wallace MacCaffrey (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 318.

[43]Chamberlain, The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth, p. 30.

"broken, debauched, semi-invalid, broken-spirited, repulsive old man who was quite senile."[44] Unlike Elizabeth, he did little to improve his aging visage. Elizabeth had clearly not been senile, nor was she a great drinker like James, who was corpulent and often inebriated. One could not in any way state that, physically, James aged gracefully. However, his very lack of care for his appearance in his later years perhaps indicates an acceptance of the aging process and subsequent death that his predecessor had, until the end, refused to recognize.

James accepted his aging more readily than Elizabeth but he still had a great fear of death. In particular, he feared assassination to the point that it became a phobia and detracted greatly from his subject-sovereign relations. Although Elizabeth did not like to mourn for others, James carried his fear of the subject to extremes; even the death of his wife could not persuade James to attend a funeral.[45] Like Elizabeth, James outlived many of his courtiers and friends. The deaths of the Marquess of Hamilton and his counsin Lennox, Queen Anne, and Prince Henry, made James realize his own mutability and realize that his was a passing generation.

When James died on 27 March, 1625, in the twenty-second year of his reign at the age of fifty-nine, his death was not unexpected. Each year since 1619, the year of Anne's death, James suffered more physical and mental decline. Gout and

---

[44]Willson, King James VI and I, p. 425.

[45]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland and I of England, p. 177.

arthritis often incapacitated him, and premature senility further added to his lack of popular appeal. According to Antonia Fraser, "James was not so much old as senile."[46] The Venetian Ambassador to James' court paints a cruel picture of James' incompetence. He describes James' reluctance to give audiences and describes James' self-love and morbid fear of assassination.[47] One cannot fault James too much for mistrusting nearly everyone. He was greatly troubled by the coalition between Buckingham and Prince Charles as well as by public rumors of his senility. There were also rumors that James, recognizing his incompetence, would abdicate and let Charles govern while he pursued his studies and hunting.[48] James also may have suffered from a terrible disease known as porphyria,[49] commonly called the "royal disease" since it frequently afflicted kings. This affliction resulted in sudden attacks of abdominal pain, mental illness, and general body pain and nervousness. Colic and diarrhea were also associated, as was ultra-sensitive skin. The skin of those who suffered porphyria was thin, sweaty, itchy, and bruised easily. The most distinctive feature of this disease was purple urine. Since his youth, James exhibited all of these characteristics. This disease could account for much of his ill-health as well

---

[46]Ibid., p. 177.

[47]Ibid., p. 177.

[48]Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, p. 385.

[49]For more up-to-date information, see Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary, p. 117.

as for the fact that he did not like to be close enough for people to touch his person.[50] James also suffered from arthritis and probably had severe dental problems.[51]

King James' final days began while he was hunting deer at Theobalds, in March of 1625. The King exhausted himself while hunting in the chilly spring air. He fell ill with a common type of fever, the tertian ague. Normally this type of ague ran a three-day cycle and exhibited flu-like symptons. While suffering from this illness, James was notified of the death of his friend, the Duke of Hamilton. James is said to have replied, "I shall never see London more."[52] Following this, James' condition worsened. He collapsed with convulsions, lost his speech, and suffered severely from melancholy.[53] Eventually he regained his speech but continued to have a high fever and great physical pain. Within days, dysentary set in, leaving James most uncomfortable and humiliated. The King's physician, Sir William Paddy, realized that there was nothing else they could do for the King except to pray for his soul. James, deeply pious throughout his life, asked for the solace religion could offer in his last hours. The Bishop of London attended the King. James partook of the Eucharist, repeated

---

[50]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland, and I of England, p. 178.

[51]Matthew, James I, p. 319.

[52]Otto Scott, James I (New York: Mason-Charter, 1976), p. 407.

[53]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland and I of England, p. 209.

the Apostle's Creed, declared his love and charity for his neighbors, and called for Prince Charles in order that he might have a few last words with him.[54] By the time Charles arrived, however, the King could no longer speak.

As James himself once stated, "A royal majesty is not privilege [sic] against death."[55] James died at Theobalds on 27 March 1625. He died a horrible death. A stroke left his facial muscles paralized, causing his jaw to droop open, revealing his swollen tongue. Saliva drooled from his gaping mouth.[56] Physically it would be quite difficult, if not impossible, to die an imperious death while suffering from dysentary. One historian has noted that "on Sunday March 27, just before noon, James was carried away in an ongoing tide of his own shit."[57] Somewhat more gracefully, Antonia Fraser describes James' death as follows. "The poor King, weakened by the unpleasant demands of dysentary lay speechless, robbed of his dignity even in death."[58] Obviously, as noted above, James did not die a death that befitted a King. The very fact that so many of James' biographers note the dysentary indicates the importance of James' humiliation at death. Kings were not expected to die in the midst of their own excrement, or drooling saliva, or with great pain.

---

[54]Willson, King James VI and I, p. 446.

[55]Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, p. 394.

[56]Willson, King James VI and I, p. 446.

[57]Scott, James I, p. 408.

[58]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland and I of England, p. 211.

It is interesting that while some of James' biographers note his worst moments, others praise the courage with which he died. Lucy Aikin states that "the King died with great composure and decency."[59] Despite his fear of death and assassination once his death was imminent, James sought solace and comfort in religion. That fact alone probably gave him the courage to accept the inevitable.[60]

James' body was embalmed and an autopsy performed. The report was that

> all the vitals were sound, as also was his head, which was very full of brains; but his blood was wonderfully tainted with melancholy.[61]

On 4 April, 1625, James' body was removed from Theobalds to Denmark House where it lay in state for one month. His coffin lay in the house's presence chamber which was draped in black velvet. Six large silver candlesticks were spaced equidistant around the body and held tapers four feet tall. These candles burned continuously. A black canopy was hung overhead and a gold escutcheon hung overhead of the coffin.

James' funeral was on 5 May. A very long procession escorted his body to Westminster Abbey. Charles, then King of England, was his father's Chief Mourner. The assistants

---

[59]Aikin, Memoirs of the Court of King James, II: 395.

[60]William Rye, ed., England As Seen By Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967), pp. 120-1.

[61]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland and I of England, p. 211.

to the Chief Mourner were the Earls of Kent, Lincoln, Salisbury, Montgomery, Leicester, Warwick, Holdernes, Sussex, Dorset, Exceter, Bridgewater, Northampton, Devon, and Nyddisdale.[62] James' funeral was extravagant. Charles spent over £50,000. Antonia Fraser notes that there had never been such an elaborate funeral display in English history, nor would there be another of such magnitude until the death of Oliver Cromwell.[63]

James' funeral service was exceedingly long.[64] In a lengthy service, Bishop Williams of London idealized, eulogized, and practically sanctified James. Throughout, he compared James to King Solomon. James probably would have been pleased at that, since he always fancied himself a seventeenth-century version of Solomon.[65] According to Williams, both James and Solomon were only sons who inherited a kingdom while still in infancy. Both were twice crowned and anointed Kings; both were scholarly and patrons of the church. In addition, each had secret enemies in their later years, and both improved shipping and navigation during their reigns. After the sermon and eulogy, the mourners paid their final respects to the King, as was customary, and Charles was officially proclaimed King of England.

James' funeral embodied the aspects of kingship that

---

[62]Nichols, ... Progresses of James, IV: 1047.

[63]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland and I of England, p. 211.

[64]Akrigg, Jacobean Pageant, p. 394.

[65]Aikin, Memoirs of the Court of King James I, II: 402-6.

he most admired. According to John Chamberlain, over 9,000 subjects mourned the King's death.[66] Charles commissioned an elaborate catafalque designed by Inigo Jones. This domed structure was supported by eight doric columns and was elaborately decorated with classical ornamentation. It also contained carved inscriptions attesting to James' wisdom.[67] Interestingly, James' body was hidden for 250 years. The precise location of his body was not discovered until 1875 when Dean Stanley instituted a search. James' body was discovered in the tomb of Henry VII. The location was fitting: both Kings were founders of a new dynasty, and James had always admired Henry VII.[68]

In many ways the final days, funeral processions, and funeral ceremonies of Elizabeth and James followed the accepted model for the time. Both monarchs turned to religion when medicine was of no avail. Both in their last days seem to have accepted death as imminent and met it courageously; the courage and calm acceptance of their deaths is striking when compared to their attitudes concerning death and mortality during their lives. Elizabeth and James also shared the common problem of having their former allies and trusted advisors turn away from them as their deaths approached. Elizabeth was particularly upset over Cecil's correspondence

---

[66]Nichols, ... Progresses of James, IV: 1040.

[67]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland and I of England, p. 211.

[68]Ibid., p. 211.

with James concerning the succession. Even Robert Carey voiced concern over his own position:

> I could not but think in what
> a wretched state I should be
> left, most of my livlihood depending
> on her life.[69]

Because of the importance of patronage, it was quite natural that courtiers should be concerned about their own future.

An additional point of similarity is the role superstition played in the deaths of both sovereigns. For example, Elizabeth's coronation ring had eaten into her flesh and had to be sawed off; the ring actually symbolized the reign, as it was traditionally removed and broken at the death of a monarch. Most courtiers considered the premature removal of the Queen's coronation ring a very bad omen.[70] Elizabeth also paid attention to the advice of her astrologer, Dr. Dee. He warned her not to be in Whitehall in March, so she removed to Richmond. Dr. Dee had also predicted that the Queen would die in her bed, hence her reluctance and refusal for days to go to bed.[71] When Buckingham and his mother tried to give the dying James some homemade country remedies, charges of witchcraft and poisoning were made as the King's condition worsened.[72]

Despite the above-noted similarities between the deaths

---

[69]Carey, Memoirs of Robert Carey, p. 58.

[70]Plowden, As They Saw Her, Elizabeth I, p. 167.

[71]Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England, VII: 222.

[72]John Jessee, ed., Memoirs of the Court of England During the Reign of the Stuarts, Including the Protectorate (Boston: Chester F. Rice, n.d.), I: 131.

of Elizabeth and James, there were a number of significant differences. Elizabeth expired in a way that was acceptable for a Queen to die. She died very nobly in her sleep. James, on the other hand, did not die a noble death, physically, but the courage with which he met death made up for the circumstances of his death. At her death, Elizabeth failed to live up to the responsibility to name an heir. James, on the other hand, lived up to this kingly responsibility by naming his son, Charles as his successor, but he incurred great problems as a result of doing so. James was plagued by problems of the coalition between Charles and Buckingham. Perhaps Elizabeth actually made the wisest choice when she violated the traditional duties in this respect.

The public response to the funerals of both sovereigns was mourning and sadness. Just as the subjects had done for the triumphant coronation processions, they lined the streets once again to pay tribute to the sovereign. The subjects who had officially greeted the monarch at the coronation procession officially bade him farewell at the funeral procession. The funeral procession, like the coronation procession, was an occasion where a great deal of pageantry was displayed. Likewise, it was an occasion for public relations and political propaganda for the successor. If he spent large sums of money on the funeral of his predecessor, it made him appear to be generous, kind, and accepting of the traditional English value. In addition, by spending freely on the pageantry associated with the funeral of his predecessor, the successor allowed the subjects to participate in the mourning of the departed ruler

in a public way. In James' case, by spending vast sums of money for an elaborate funeral, it seems as though Charles was atoning for the problems of his father's reign. In other words, he was paying for the love of his subjects that his father had not been able to get by public relations propaganda (e.g., through the progresses, coronation procession, etc.). Elizabeth, by contrast, did not need a great elaborate funeral to "buy" the love of her subjects. Throughout her reign she successfully courted their love and won it so firmly that when she died, the realm truly mourned her loss. Perhaps too, the successor to the throne looked ahead to his own death. By spending generously for a funeral for his predecessor, perhaps he hoped that his own successor would do the same when he died, for

> Man is but noght; soone as he breathes, ...soone as he 'gins to live, he 'gins to die.... impartial fates spare none, for die must all, Both baser cobler and proud Cardinall. Loe, here for signe, how death doth equall made the Princely sceptre, the delver's spade Wittnesse this trophee of insulting Death.[73]

---

[73]Nichols, ... Progresses of Elizabeth, III: 651.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Renaissance English monarchs were expected to exhibit pageantry and spectacle from their accession to their death, as we have seen in the previous chapters. Elizabeth and James used the vehicle of pageantry and ceremonial in different ways, and with varying degrees of success. One pattern is evident; Elizabeth was a master at showmanship but James did not know how to use public display to appeal to his subjects.

Properly used, pageantry could help the monarch to create good relations with his subjects. Used extensively, it could influence public loyalty and affection for the crown. Pageantry could be a diversionary tactic to hide the lack of solutions to pressing political problems by focusing public interest on the pomp and splendor of the monarchy. Elizabeth used this facet of domestic statecraft especially well in the later years of her reign. By focusing public attention on her grandeur and magnaminity, Elizabeth diverted her subjects from the problems and unified her country in praise of the glory of its monarch. The political problems became more evident when James failed to use propaganda pageantry in the same manner. He simply failed to use the valuable weapon of propaganda pageantry as a tactic to divert attention from

contemporary problems. It is interesting to speculate whether James could have used ceremonial displays with the same amount of success. The very fact that, although he hated public attention, James nevertheless carried through with the same types of ceremonial as his predecessor, indicates two things: one, that the use of pageantry was so firmly established, he was more or less required to use it; and two, James recognized the value of ceremonial as a diversionary tactic, but was unable to understand how to use it effectively.

In the opening chapter of this thesis, a brief history of the monarchy, and a general description of Renaissance kingship was given. Within this framework, it is possible to evaluate Elizabeth and James. Renaisance monarchs were expected to have frequent interaction with their subjects. This was necessary because the English king was not absolute; he required the support of the local gentry in order to enforce royal proclamations and to get his extraordinary income. Renaissance kings could gain support of the local gentry by actively cultivating a successful public image. This could best be done by the monarch's evidencing intelligence, regal bearing, and genuine affection for his subjects. Renaissance monarchs had to be politicians in the sense that they needed actively to gain their subject's goodwill; medieval monarchs, of course, had not needed to exhibit as much propaganda pageantry, since the medieval king was less dependent on popular appeal.

The coronation procession was the first official state opportunity for the sovereign to exhibit seemly behavior.

The coronation procession allowed the king opportunity to appear concerned and loving. The procession also allowed the subjects to express their sentiments concerning the upcoming reign through the pageant themes. The themes of both Elizabeth and James' pageants were peace, unity, and prosperity. Both sovereigns tried to promote these desires in their reigns. Elizabeth used the occasion to endear herself to her subjects; James insulted his subjects by paying little attention to the expense they had entailed or their handiwork of the pageant.

Chapter III examined the coronation ceremony itself. This was a solemn religious service and ceremony which made the King's person sacred. Because James' coronation took place in the midst of an epidemic of plague, it was a rushed affair. Elizabeth's, however, was attendant with all of the ceremony the occasion demanded. She frequently alluded to her "marriage" with her country, which was, in fact, her coronation ceremoney.

Chapter IV described the royal progresses and the pomp and ceremony thereof. Both Elizabeth and James used progresses, but obtained different degrees of success. Elizabeth chose her routes strictly for political advantages; James chose his by the quality of the hunting available.

Chapter V described the ritual and ceremonial aspects of the death of a Renaissance sovereign. Even in death, over which the monarch had little control, he was expected to observe certain formalities. Kings were supposed to die peacefully looking forward to the life everlasting. They

were supposed to leave an heir presumptive; Elizabeth failed to leave a successor.

Two other significant features about Renaissance English pageantry must be expounded upon: the internationalism of royal pageantry, and the fact that it was, by the Elizabethan age, becoming somewhat professionalized. One reason that pageantry was so important in its international aspects was that a glittering royal retinue was a feather in the cap of international diplomacy. A brilliant, wealthy, much-admired and beloved monarch made the entire realm appear successful to foreign dignitaries, and, consequently, made it seem more of a force to be reckoned with if provoked.[1] Foreign ambassadors were duly impressed with the splendor of the displays of both Elizabeth and James. It should be mentioned that civic pageantry, royal progresses, and other such propaganda ceremonials were by no means unique to England. Civic pageants such as those described in the first five chapters were commonly used throughout Europe.[2] In the royal entries of the French King, Charles IX, the civic pageants followed the same themes and organization as those of his English contemporaries.[3] Elizabeth's contemporary, Catherine de Medici, recognized the value of endearing the sovereign to the subjects by the royal progresses. She and Charles IX

---

[1]Anglo, Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, p. 2.

[2]Ibid., p. 6.

[3]Victor Graham and W. McAlister Johnson, The Royal Tour of France by Charles IX and Catherine de Medici: Festivals and Entries, 1564-6 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), pp. 12, 18.

embarked on a series of progresses through France in 1563 in an attempt to head off the civil wars that seemed imminent.[4] If the Stuarts had used pageantry in a similar way, perhaps the English civil wars might have been postponed.

As pageantry became more important and more widespread it became quasi-professional. Edward Somerset, the fourth Earl of Worcester, was responsible for a great number of ceremonial functions. For example, Somerset was in charge of the state entry into London in 1604, the christening of Princess Mary, 1605, and the investiture of Henry as Prince of Wales in 1610.[5] There were many authors who devoted themselves increasingly to the creation of masques and spectacles for royal entertainment; William Churchyard and Ben Jonson exemplify this new profession.

Within the preceeding five chapters, the reader has been made aware of the similarities and differences in the way that Elizabeth and James used civic pageantry in their respective reigns. Their similarities were relatively few; those they shared generally concern basic attitudes of their concepts of the English monarchy itself, and how these perceptions related to royal ceremonial. Both recognized the fact that progresses could be recreational, although this was not the chief reason that Elizabeth went on them. Both

---

[4]Ibid., p. 4.

[5]Roy Strong, The Cult of Elizabeth: Portraiture and Pageantry (n.p.: Thames and Hudson, 1977), p. 40.

monarchs recognized the subjects' need to see the sovereign in public ceremonial; they recognized the need for color and excitement in the lives of their subjects. Both sovereigns, along with most other contemporary European Princes, believed that sovereigns were chosen by God to lead their countrymen. As far as religion itself was concerned, both sovereigns never doubted their rights as head of the Church of England. Both saw the crown as the foremost authority in the realm. Although Elizabeth and James recognized the need to work with Parliament, Elizabeth saw Renaissance kingship in a more conservative fashion than James; James was more attuned to the seventeenth-century continental ideas of absolutism.[6] Despite his lofty talk of the supremacy of the Crown, however, James never acted the part of an absolute monarch.

In spite of these shared attitudes about progresses, the monarchy, and religious supremacy, Elizabeth and James were more different than they were alike. Most of the differences in the way they used public display can be attributed to their different personalities. Many of the political problems that plagued James' reign were evident under Elizabeth, but her use of pageantry masked the real problems of growing religious division, increasing Parliamentary powers at the Crown's expense, and economic hardship. Had James been more of a showman, perhaps the problems he encourntered could have been staved off temporarily. My opinion is that, even if James had been more adept at using propaganda pageantry, he

---

[6]A.L. Rowse, The England of Elizabeth: The Structure of Society (New York: Macmillan, 1951), p. 261.

could not have stopped the inevitable problems (e.g., the power of Parliament versus the power of the Crown) from surfacing. His reign, however, would have been more successful and his personal weaknesses less evident. Historians have not, on the whole, given James a good press. Perhaps this is due to the rather weak public image he created while King of England as much as to his personal failures. His subjects recognized his kingship, but there was much popular disapproval of him as a public figure.

Whatever personal or political faults one might find with Elizabeth, one must recognize that she has had an excellent press. I rather doubt that this was the sole result of her able governing of the realm; her public image was far superior to James' and was carefully maintained. In other words, Elizabeth is not regarded so highly by historians just because of her able rule of England (Burleigh and Walsingham deserve at least some of the credit for this), but for the successful public image she created. It would be very hard for a twentieth-century historian not to favor those sovereigns whom subjects adored. Elizabeth had a sort of universality which unified her subjects and made her beloved by all. It is interesting to note that Elizabeth could be adept at making her subjects believe her public face; yet, in the intimacy of her court, she could be a formidable adversary if sufficiently angered. Her successor, despite his lack of success in creating a good public image, could show real affection for selected courtiers, a quality Elizabeth reserved mostly for the multitudes of her countrymen.

Although their success as public figures differed, Elizabeth and James shared some attitudes concerning their constant exposure to their subjects. Both shared, at times, frustration at being always in the public view. Elizabeth, however, realized that "We Princes are set on stages in the sight and view of all the world duly observed."[7] She understood the political expediency of playing up to the public, and she willingly sacrificed her privacy to obtain the political advantages of a public life. James, on the other hand, never enjoyed being in the public view and refused to sacrifice privacy for popularity. Whereas Elizabeth had often had her carriage taken to where the crowd stood thickest, James detested and feared crowds, even while they cheered him. He was always afraid of potential assassins. James' distrust of his subjects was a luxury that a sovereign could ill-afford, especially if he followed that artful showman, Elizabeth I. When reminded that the public very much wanted to see their King, James replied "God's wounds, I will pull down by breeches and they shall see my arse."[8] James put up with his public duties only because they were expected of him.

Numerous other instances can be cited to compare Elizabeth's public image to that of James. Elizabeth's coronation prayer revealed her gladness at her accession; she had little thought of ever receiving the Crown as she was third

---

[7]Lacey Baldwin Smith, This Realm of England 1399-1688 3rd ed. (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Co., 1976), p. 172.

[8]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland, I of England, p. 97.

in line of succession. England was fortunate that Edward's and Mary's deaths allowed England's greatest monarch to achieve success. Elizabeth had never dared to claim any queenly aspirations (for fear of her life); James, on the other had, had been impatiently waiting for Elizabeth to die so that he could assume the monarchy.

Elizabeth had several weaknesses to overcome at her accession that James did not; she was young, female, and unmarried. Shortly before Mary's death, John Knox had published The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women which maligned female sovereigns. Elizabeth had, in addition to this, the image of Bloody Mary and the medieval Matilda to overcome. Her response was "Although I am a woman, nevertheless I am the daughter of predecessors who knew how to deserve this kingdom."[9] Elizabeth proved her point admirably, and frequently used her femininity to political advantage.[10] Her favorite image was the "marriage" to her kingdom (coronation) as an excuse for not marrying. "Four days after Elizabeth's accession to the throne, the Count

---

[9]Frederick Chamberlain, The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth, p. 130.

[10]Elizabeth frequently used her womanhood to political advantage. Her marriage negotiations with various European Princes allowed her to court alliances and to keep each nation at peace with England. She also made excuses for her famous indicision by attributing it to a female's notoriously indecisive mind.

de Feria, Spanish Ambassador in England, reported to his master Phillip II that the new Queen was 'very much wedded to the people and thinks as they do.'"[11] This very image of a dedicated, loving sovereign deeply endeared her to her subjects. What a contrast to James' fear of his subjects as assassins! A.L. Rowse speculates that one reason Elizabeth got along so well with her subjects was that she had more English blood than any English monarch either before or after her for centuries and therefore, had an innate understanding of the English people.[12]

By contrast, James at his accession was an experienced ruler; he was male, married, and had several heirs. His subjects were glad for a male sovereign and eagerly welcomed him.[13] Once officially installed in office, however, James disappointed his subjects by his indifference to public adoration. His subjects soon learned that he did not make the loving gestures that Elizabeth had.

James' lack of desire for public attention caused many subjects to look back with nostalgia to the days of Gloriana.

---

[11]Alan G.R. Smith, The Government of Elizabethan England (London: Edward Arnold, 1967), p. 1.

[12]Rowse, The England of Elizabeth: The Structure of Society, p. 18.

[13]This is not to imply that Elizabeth's subjects were any less happy at her accession, only to state that she, at the time of her accession, had problems to overcome due to her sex, whereas James inherited a much more healthy kingdom and simply did not face the same problems as Elizabeth.

Even during the last years of her reign, Elizabeth was revered by many, adored by almost all. Roy Strong, in The Cult of Elizabeth, suggests that Elizabeth-worship assumed cult-like proportions. According to Strong, the cult of Elizabeth was carefully created by the covernment to replace the pre-reformation cult of the Virgin. The religious pageantry associated with the latter was transfored into secular pageantry to express adoration of the Queen.[14] Elizabeth was known to her subjects by many names, all of them flattering: Eliza, Good Queen Bess, Gloriana, Fair Cynthia, Diana, Belphoebe, and Astraea; James tried to create the analogy of himself with the biblical King Solomon, but had only limited success.

Several factors can be blamed for James' lack of popular appeal, in particular, his appearance and his stubbornness. His appearance was far from that expected of a Renaissance King. He "demanded the divinity that surrounds a throne but he neither looked like a god nor acted like one."[15] A contemporary described James:

> Clear talking was made difficult for him by a tongue too large for his mouth-- though in spite of the defect he was incorrigibly garrulous, using the broadest of Scots speech. His gait was an awkward stumble... James I was as sharp a contrast to the kingly and Queenly Tudors as could well be imagined.[16]

It was no wonder that such a person was not especially

---

[14]Strong, The Cult of Elizabeth, p. 16.

[15]E.S. Turner, The Court of St. James (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1951), p. 120.

[16]S. Reed Brett, The Stuart Century, 1603-1714 (London: George G. Harrap, 1966), p. 23.

interested in public ceremonial. James' stubbornness and inability to deal effectively with people also did little to endear him to his English subjects. He relentlessly pursued his dream of unifying England and his native Scotland against the advice of his advisors. He infuriated the Scots when he informed the Scottish Parliament that he desired the Scots to imitate the English in every way. In addition, James continued to fill the English court with the Scottish nobility, despite the protests of the English peers. The moral degeneracy of James' court did not add to his popularity with the conservative English who remembered the propriety of Elizabeth's court. The English peers were also alarmed that the King vastly inflated the peerage. E.S. Turner states that James "hunted everything that ran and knighted everything that crawled."[17] In short, James greatly enjoyed the prestige and power of being a king, but seemed less willing or unable to accept the ceremonial responsibilities associated therewith. He enjoyed expressing the absolutist ideas of Renaissance Kingship, but was unable to understand the necessity of creating a good public image through pageantry. One gets the opinion that James sincerely believed he had a good image based on his acclaimed wisdom and religious studies. Perhaps he simply did not believe that he needed to use propaganda pageantry.

By contrast, Elizabeth liked to be Queen. She revelled

---

[17]Turner, The Court of St. James, p. 116.

in public attention, and was a true artist at getting even the troublesome Puritans to adore her. Elizabeth clearly understood the necessity of propaganda pageantry to support her public image, and she simply had an uncanny ability to evoke admiration and loyalty from her subjects. The Queen's simple gestures expressing love of and respect for her subjects made her revered. Many of the same differences between Elizabeth's and James' attitudes toward pageantry were reflected in the ways they dealt with the House of Commons. Both monarchs had to deal with the growing power of this representative body. Once again, Elizabeth exhibited political savoir-faire.

> Elizabeth had the art not only of appealing to the emotional bonds tha linked her with her people but also of skillfully mixing anger and graciousness. She did not hesitate to rebuke... [but in doing sostressed] the themes of forgiveness, love and unity.... Her achievement depended very much upon her unique personality,... she was often content to maintain a principle by giving way in practice, but in a legalistic age, her actions were precedent more binding that her words.[18]

James' failure to compromise or inability to divert attention from the real problem was reflected in his dealings with Parliament. Two cases, in particular, illustrate this point. The issues were the same: freedom of speech within the House Commons. In 1576 Peter Wentworth declared that the sovereign must not intervene in Parliamentary debates because that limited the freedom of speech for Parliamentary members. The House of Commons was so outraged at Wentworth it sent him to the Tower for this declaration against the Queen's prerogatives.

---

[18]Lockyer, Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1471-1714, p. 210.

Elizabeth ahd clearly created a loyal and loving Commons that sent one of its own members to prison for championing the cause of the House.

By way of comparison, a similar case occurred at James' 1621 Parliament. The House of Commons, upset with James' plan to marry his heir, Charles, to a very Catholic Spanish Princess, asked the King to abandon this plan. James was outraged by the fact that the commons had debated the issue at all, and formally told them to discontinue debate on matters that he considered part of his royal prerogative. Undaunted, the Commons once again boldly petitioned the King. James was so outraged that he had the journals of the House brought to him where he childishly ripped out the pages, hoping to obliterate the incident. He did not try to compromise, or even discuss the issue with Parliament. Most likely, Elizabeth would have listened to their arguments considered them, and yet not have changed her mind. She would have appeared to have, in theory, accepted their requests, but in fact, would not have changed her original viewpoint. Her personality so endeared Elizabeth to her Commons that they sent a member to the tower for disobeying their Queen; James' Commons had so little respect for him that they openly defied him. These incidents not only show how the subjects respected each monarch, but they also further reveal James' stubbornness and inability to deal with people. The clumsiness with which he dealt with this issue was simply an extension of the awkwardness of his popular appeal.

Perhaps if James had been king of England during the

Middle Ages he would have been more popular. Medieval kings were not required to exhibit as much political pageantry as Renaissance sovereigns. James would not have had to deal with the economic, constitutional and diplomatic problems faced by Renaissance monarchs. Especially in the heyday of Angevin hegemony, when kings did not have to appeal to the masses, James probably would have been more successful. His love of the hunt and passion for religion would have made him a capable Medieval ruler. He probably would not have been a Henry II, but James was fairly adept at running the government. Unfortunately, political adeptness was only one-half of the necessary requirements for successful Renaissance kingship.

Two renowned historians have summarized the differences between Elizabeth and James. Antonia Fraser states that "The cozening of the common people, which results from a curious adrenalin at contact with the masses, which Elizabeth had possessed to perfection, James neither had nor wished to have."[19] Charles M. Gray has similar conclusions.

> James I was a net failure; many of the problems he faced were not his fault, but he lacked both the judgement to make the best of things and the art of distracting people from the issues. Elizabeth was a hard act to follow...[20]

Elizabeth had a very good public image, but she worked hard to achieve it. James was not so successful at

---

[19]Fraser, King James VI of Scotland, I of England, p. 94.

[20]Charles M. Gray, Renaissance and Reformation England, 1509-1714 (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch, 1973), p. 75.

creating a good image for himself. He was never treated rudely, but neither was he treated with the rapturous joy with which the subjects treated Elizabeth. In conclusion, Elizabeth lived up to the requirements of Renaissance kingship, whereas James failed to recognize the importance of creating a strong public image.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Adamson, John. The Muses Welcome to the High and Mighty Prince James by the Grace of God King of Great Britaine, France, Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc., at His Majesties hapie Returne to his Olde and Native Kingdome of Scotland after fourteen Yeeres absence, in anno 1617. Edinburth: J. Adamson, 1618.

Burghley, William Cecil. The Execution of Justice in England, 1584. Edited by Robert Kingdon. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Camden, William. Camden's Brittania. Oxford: Edmund Gibson, 1695.

_____. The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England. Edited by Wallace MacCaffrey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Carey, Robert. The Memoirs of Robert Carey. Edited by F. H. Mares. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Cecil, Robert. The Correspondence of King James VI of Scotland with Robert Cecil and Others in England During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by John Bruce. Westminster: J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1861.

Chamberlain, Frederick. The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth. London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1923.

Chamberlain, John. The Chamberlain Letters. Edited by Elizabeth Thompson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965.

E'Ewes, Sir Simonds. The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. 2 vols. Edited by James Halliwell. London: Richard Bentley, 1845.

D'Ewes, Sir Simonds. The Secret History of the Reign of King James I, A Discourse of Passages Between the Earls of Essex, Somerset, and Northampton, the Countess of Essex, Sir Thomas Overbury, and others; with their Risings and Falls; Together with Divers other Affairs, as they occurred During the Late Reign of King James; and also in the Duke of Buchingham, his first Coming into Favor. 1615. In The Autobiography of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. vol. 1. Edited by James Halliwell. London: Richard Bentley, 1845.

Dugdale, Gilbert. "The Time Triumphant, Declaring in Brief the Arrival of our Sovereign Liege Lord King James, into England, His Coronation at Westminster; together with His late Royal Progress from the Tower of London through the Ciry to His Highness's Manor of Whitehall." London: R. B., 1604. In Stuart Tracts 1603-1693. Edited by C. H. Firth. New York: Cooper Square, 1964.

Firth, C. H., ed. Stuart Tracts, 1603-1693. New York: Cooper Square, 1964.

Graham, Victor and Johnson, William, eds. The Royal Tour of France by Charles IX and Catherine de Medici: Festivals and Entries 1564-6. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, of the Reign of Elizabeth I, vol. 88 (1572): 2 July 1572.

Harrison, G. B. ed. A Second Jacobean Journal Being a Record of Those Things Most Talked of During the Years 1607-1610. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Hayward, Sir John. Annals of the First Four Years of the First Four Years of the Reign of Elizabeth. Edited by John Bruce. London: John Bowyer, Nichols and Son, 1839.

Hoby, Lady Margaret. Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby. Edited by Dorothy Meads, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1930.

Jesse, John, ed. Memoirs of the Court of England During the Reign of the Stuarts, Including the Protectorate. vol. 1. Boston: Chester F. Rice, n.d.

Klarwill, Victor Von, ed. Queen Elizabeth and Some Foreigners, Being a Series of Hitherto Unpublished Letters from the Archives of the Hapsburg Family. London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1928.

Knox, John. The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women. 1558. Edited by Edward Arber, New York: AMS Press, 1967.

Laneham, Robert. "Queen Elizabeth's Visit to Kenilworth Castle in 1575." Coventry: H. H. Thompson, 1575.

Legg, Leopold, ed. English Coronation Records. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1979.

Millington, Thomas. The True Narration of His Royal Majesty From the Time of His Departure from Edinburgh till His Receiving at London: With All or the most Special Occurrences. In Stuart Tracts, pp. 11-52. Edited by C. H. Firth, New York: Cooper Square, 1964.

Naunton, Sir Robert. Fragmentalia Pegalia, or Observations on the Late Queen Elizabeth, Her Times, Her Favorites. London: G. Dawson, 1653, In English Reprints. vol. 5. New York: AMS Press, 1966.

Nichols, John, ed. The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivals of King James I, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court. Collected from Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, Comprising Forty Masques and Entertainments, Ten Civic Pageants, and Numerous Original Letters. 4 vols. 2nd ed. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

_____. The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth Among which are Interspersed Other Solemnities, Public Expenditures, and Remarkable events during the Reign of that Illustrious Princess Collected from Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, etc. 3 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

Plowden, Allison, ed. As They Saw Her...Elizabeth I. London: George G. Harrap, 1971.

Rice, George, P., ed. The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth, Selections From Her Official Addresses. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Rye, William, ed. England as Seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967.

Savile, John. "King James, his Entertainment at Theobalds With his Welcome to London together with a Salutatory poem." London: Thomas Snodham, 1603. In Stuart Tracts, pp. 53-68. Edited by C. H. Firth. New York: Cooper Square, 1964.

Scott, A. F., ed. Everyone A Witness: The Stuart Age, Commentaries of an Era. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1974.

_____. Everyone A Witness: The Tudor Age, Commentaries of an Era. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1976.

Strong, Roy, and Trevelyn, Julia, eds. Elizabeth R. London: Seeker and Warburg, 1972.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Aikin, Lucy. Memoirs of the Court of King James the First. 2 vols. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1822.

_____. Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth. 2 vols. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818.

Aikin, William A., and Henning, Basil D., eds. Conflict in Stuart England: Essays in Honor of Wallace Notestein. New York: New York University Press, 1960.

Akrigg, G. P. V. Jacobean Pageant, or the Court of King James I. New York: Atheneum, 1978.

Anglo, Sydney. Spectacle Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1969.

Ashley, Maurice. England in the Seventeenth Century 1603-1714. 3rd ed. London: Cox and Wyman, 1962.

Barker, Brian. Symbols of Sovereignty. Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979.

Baumer, Franklin L. The Early Tudor Theory of Kingship. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966.

Bindoff, S. T., Hurstfield, J., and Williams, C. H., eds. Elizabethan Government and Society: Essays Presented to Sir John Neale. London: Athelene Press, 1961.

Brett, S. Reed. The Stuart Century 1603-1714. London: George G. Harrap and Co., 1966.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. Vexed and Troubled Englishmen 1590-1642. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Chamberlain, Frederick. The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth. London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1923.

Churchill, Randolph. The Story of the Coronation. London: Derek Verschoyle, 1953.

Clark, Sir George. Three Aspects of Stuart England. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Dunlop, Ian. Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I. London: Jonathan Cape, 1962.

Elton, G. R. England Under the Tudors. London: Methuen and Co., 1975.

_____. Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Feiling, Sir Keith. England Under the Tudors and Stuarts 1485-1688. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Fraser, Antonia. King James VI of Scotland, I of England. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975.

Gray, Charles M. Renaissance and Reformation England, 1509-1714. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch, 1973.

Hughes, Paul L., and Fries, Robert F. Crown and Parliament in Tudor-Stuart England, A Documentary Constitutional History. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.

Hurstfield, Joel, ed. The Historical Association Book of the Tudors. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1973.

Jones, William. Crowns and Coronations, A History of Regalia. London: Chalto and Windus, 1902.

Lockyer, Roger. Tudor and Stuart Britain 1471-1714. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

Luke, Mary. Gloriana: The Years of Elizabeth I. New York: Coward, McCann, and Geoghegan, 1973.

Lyon, Bryce. A Constitutional and Legal History of Medieval England. 2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1980.

MacNalty, Sir Arthur. Elizabeth Tudor: The Lonely Queen. New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1961.

Mathew, David. James I. n.p.: University of Alabama Press, 1968.

Milton, Roger. The English Ceremonial Book: A History of Robes, Insignia, and Ceremonies Still in use in England. London: C. E. Dawkins, 1972.

Morse, H. K., ed. Elizabethan Pageantry: A Pictorial Survey of Costume and its Commentators from c.1560-1620. London: The Studio, 1934.

Neale, J. E. Queen Elizabeth I. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957.

Parkes, Joan. Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970.

Roberts, Clayton. The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Rowse, Alfred L. and Harrison, G. B. Queen Elizabeth and her Subjects. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, 1970.

_____. The England of Elizabeth: The Structure of Society. New York: Macmillan, 1951.

Saunders, Beatrice. The Age of Candlelight: The English Social Scene in the Seventeenth Century. Philadelphia: Dufour Editions, 1961.

Scott, Otto. James I. New York: Mason-Charter, 1976.

Seton-Watson, R. W., ed. Tudor Studies Presented by the Board of Studies in History in the University of London to Albert Frederick Pollard Being the Work of Twelve of His Collegues and Pupils. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.

Smith, Alan G. R. The Government of Elizabethan England. London: Edward Arnold, 1967.

_____. The Reign of James VI and I. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.

Smith, Lacey Baldwin. Elizabeth Tudor: Portrait of a Queen. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1975.

_____. This Realm of England 1399-1688. 3rd ed. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Co., 1976.

Stafford, Helen G. James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1940.

Steeholm, Clara, and Steeholm, Hardy. James I of England, the Wisest Fool in Christendom. New York: Covici-Friede, 1938.

Strickland, Agnes. Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest; With Anecdotes of their Courts, now First published from Official Records and other Authentic Documents, Private as well as Public. vol. 7. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1849.

Strong, Roy. The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry. n.p.: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

Tillyard, E. M. W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York: Vintage Books, n.d.

Turner, E. S. The Court of St. James's. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1951.

Williams, Neville. All the Queen's Men: Elizabeth I and her Courtiers. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

_____. Elizabeth I, Queen of England. London: Sphere Books, 1972.

_____. The Life and Times of Elizabeth I. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.

Willson, D. Harris. King James VI and I. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1956.

Wilson, Elkin C. England's Eliza. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

Wilson, Violet. Queen Elizabeth's Maids of Honour and Ladies of the Privy Chamber. New York: E. P. Dutton, n.d.