HI203 Referencing Examples

Footnote Examples:

[1] Alice Hunt, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 151.
[2] Aidan Norrie, 'Elizabeth I as Judith: Reassessing the Apocryphal Widow's Appearance in Elizabethan Royal Iconography', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.5 (November 2017), 707–722 (p. 719).
[3] Susan Doran, 'Did Elizabeth's Gender Really Matter?', in *Queens Matter in Early Modern Studies*, ed. by Anna Riehl Bertolet (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), pp. 31–52 (p. 46).
[4] Elizabeth I, 'Letter to Katherine Parr', in *Elizabeth I's Italian Letters*, ed. and trans. by Carlo M. Bajetta (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 1–8 (p. 5).

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Elizabeth I, 'Letter to Katherine Parr', in *Elizabeth I's Italian Letters*, ed. and trans. by Carlo M. Bajetta (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 1–8

Secondary Sources:

Doran, Susan, 'Did Elizabeth's Gender Really Matter?', in *Queens Matter in Early Modern Studies*, ed. by Anna Riehl Bertolet (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), pp. 31–52

Hunt, Alice, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Norrie, Aidan, 'Elizabeth I as Judith: Reassessing the Apocryphal Widow's Appearance in Elizabethan Royal Iconography', *Renaissance Studies*, 31.5 (November 2017), 707–722

Monograph

THE DRAMA OF CORONATION

Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England

ALICE HUNT

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK
Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521885393

First published in print format 2008

ISBN-13 978-0-511-43697-0 eBook (EBL)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-88539-3 hardback

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Page to be Referenced:

presbyterianism was doctrinal heresy', as well as itself being a shifting and debatable concept.[13] The increased emphasis on Elizabeth as a parliamentary queen and the role of counsel are being increasingly acknowledged by historians of Elizabethan politics as inextricable from and, to a certain extent, enabled by her status as a female prince. As John Guy writes, 'The crux is increasingly gender.'[14] Anne McLaren has argued for a direct link between the development of 'mixed monarchy' in Elizabeth's reign and Elizabeth's gender. She writes that '[t]he "mixed monarchy" was defined as a corporate body politic; one in which the wisdom of the many . . . "bridled" and imparted grace to a female prince'.[15] As the last chapter showed, these questions also circulated around Mary. What happens in Elizabeth's reign, which is demonstrated at her coronation, is that Elizabeth as a parliamentary queen is also linked to a Protestant discourse, and good counsel serves as a particularly godly counsel. In Aylmer's *An Harborowe*, Hales's 'Oration' and Foxe's 'The miraculous preservation of Lady Elizabeth', the emphasis on Elizabeth's election by God and her position in Parliament is double-edged: it serves to pressurise Elizabeth into bringing about the godly reformation that they envisaged.[16] How would such a godly queen be anointed and crowned?

Since the early twentieth century, Elizabeth's coronation has been interpreted variously by historians. The debate centres principally on what has become the supposed scandal of the coronation mass and the implications of this for Elizabethan England's religion. Opinion remains divided on whether or not the consecrated host was elevated and, if it was, whether Elizabeth shunned this gesture by getting up and withdrawing into a hidden 'traverse', thereby rejecting Marian and Catholic ceremony and demonstrating commitment to the 'new' religion.[17] The controversy stems from the fact that ambassadors' letters, eyewitness reports and court records offer confused and often contradictory accounts of the ceremony. Furthermore, unlike the previous Tudor coronations, there is no extant 'Device' for Elizabeth's coronation that anticipates the order of the ceremony.[18] It is not certain who celebrated the mass – Bishop Oglethorpe or Dean Carew, the newly instated Dean of the Chapel Royal – whether the consecrated host was elevated or not, how the host was consecrated, and whether, or how, Elizabeth took communion.[19] It is unclear, then, whether Elizabeth's coronation followed the order for a Catholic mass or reintroduced Protestant communion. The problem, though, is one of reading the ceremony correctly. Just as historians today still seek to decode and unscramble accounts and records of the coronation, looking for clues to Elizabeth's personal beliefs, and thus to the religious policy and

Journal Article

RENAISSANCE STUDIES

VOLUME 31 NUMBER 5 NOVEMBER 2017

Contents

Renaissance Studies Vol. 31 No. 5 DOI: 10.1111/rest.12258

Elizabeth I as Judith: reassessing the apocryphal widow's appearance in Elizabethan royal iconography

Aidan Norrie

Historians and literary scholars have long noted and analysed the appearance of biblical analogies as part of Tudor and Stuart royal iconography. Using the example of a biblical figure, monarchs demonstrated the divine precedent for their decisions, and subjects in turn could counsel their monarch to emulate the actions of a divinely favoured biblical figure. Queen Elizabeth I of England was the subject of the greatest number of biblical analogies drawn in the early modern period: analogies were drawn both by apologists and by Elizabeth herself throughout the entire span of the queen's reign, and for almost a century after her death.[1] Elizabeth's comparisons with Deborah the Judge, Queen Esther, Daniel the Prophet, King Solomon, and King David have all received varying levels of attention in the existing scholarship: but the analogy to Judith, the chaste widow of the Apocrypha, has generally escaped detailed analysis.[2]

Judith was invoked in various ways throughout Elizabeth's reign, and the diverse analogies reflect the changing religio-political climate of the time. This article offers a re-examination of the comparisons drawn between Elizabeth and Judith during the queen's life. In doing so, I argue that contrary to claims in some of the existing scholarship, Judith was routinely and consistently offered to Elizabeth as biblical precedent for dealing with Roman Catholics – with violence, not just diplomatic rhetoric – and for the providential

This article has greatly benefited from the insightful feedback of Dolly MacKinnon, Jo Oranje, Nicola Cummins, Lyn Tribble, Lawrence Clarkson, Ruth Knezevich, Robert Norrie, and the anonymous readers.

[1] For more background on this phenomenon, see my '"Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste" – Queen Elizabeth I's Biblical Analogies After Her Death', *Royal Studies Journal* 2.2 (2015), 25–44.

[2] For the analogies drawn to Solomon during Elizabeth's reign, see Linda Shenk, *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); for Solomon and David, see Susan Doran, 'Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King', in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock, *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); for David and Deborah, see Michele Osherow, *Biblical Women's Voices in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009); for Deborah, see Alexandra Walsham, '"A Very Deborah?" The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch', in Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, *The Myth of Elizabeth* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); and for Esther, see Michele Osherow, 'Crafting Queens: Early Modern Readings of Esther', in Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz (eds.), *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009).

Page to be referenced:

daies of Judith, nor a long time after her death.'[55] Etkins' verse would have reminded the new king that should he honour the memory of Elizabeth – as the Israelites did Judith's – England would continue to enjoy the providential protection it had under Elizabeth.

***

It is not particularly surprising that analogies between Elizabeth and Judith are not consistently visible in the literature published during the queen's reign. Protestant apologists and supporters were able to draw on a multitude of biblical figures to counsel the queen, in addition to Judith. Nevertheless, despite statements to the contrary, and a lacking, chronological analysis in the historiography, it is clear from the surviving primary sources analysed here that Judith and her actions were routinely offered up as examples for Elizabeth to emulate – particularly in her dealings with Roman Catholics. Like Deborah and Solomon, Judith served as a powerful image of how God both endowed strength on his chosen ones, and also sanctioned violence against his enemies in order to save his people. This was particularly visible in Judith's use as biblical precedent for the execution of Mary Queen of Scots, and also in exhortations to see off the Catholic threat of the 1590s. The story of Judith diverges greatly from the other biblical figures Elizabeth was often compared to. Being praised primarily for murdering a drunk general hardly seems an astounding legacy. But, in a society that believed God was not an 'idle, inactive spectator upon the mechanical workings of the created world, but an assiduous, energetic deity who constantly intervened in human affairs',[56] the thought that their queen was endowed with the same strength that had allowed Judith to kill the Israelites' enemy was altogether reassuring.

University of Otago

[55] Judith 16:25.

[56] Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 2.

With this analogy, Davies compared Judith's providential victory over Holofernes with Elizabeth's protection from the many attempts on her life, and from the threat of expansionist Catholics. The analogy also highlights how Judith was granted strength by God to kill Holofernes after requesting it, and how God would also help Elizabeth as he had previously 'against hir enimies'. Davies concluded the analogy by wishing that God would continue to 'helpe hyr still' against her enemies, demonstrating that the perceived Catholic threat was not yet abated.

'SO HIS MERCY CAN MAKE HER MAJESTIE POWERFUL.'

Just as the analogy to Judith had been used to urge Elizabeth to execute Mary Queen of Scots, Judith was again cited as reason for Elizabeth to deal with the rising Roman Catholic threat of the mid 1590s. A Spanish raid on Cornwall in August 1595 saw the towns of Mousehole, Newlyn, Paul, and Penzance razed; and the Spanish, in thanksgiving for their victory, celebrated a Catholic mass on British soil.[45] The Roman Catholic threat was now no longer purely speculation: Spanish Catholics had successfully attacked England, and had escaped unharmed. Against this backdrop, Charles Gibbon, in his 1596 pamphlet, *A watch-worde for warre Not so new as necessary*, urged the queen to act against Philip II of Spain as Judith had against Holofernes:

> If the Spanyard [Philip II] dyd beare the minde of a man, he would never molest a woman, a Virgine, a Queene, whose lyfe and religion is a light to all the world, whose disposition and dayes requier quiet, but as God brought . . . *[H]Olifernes* to destruction, by the hand of *Judith* a woman, . . . so his mercy, can make her Majestie powerful, by some meanes or other, to spoyle the Spanyard; hee which hath delivered her from so many secret villanies at home, will protect her from the open violence of her Enemies abroad.[46]

Gibbon clearly states that the providential strength Judith was granted to defeat Holofernes would also be granted to Elizabeth: God would 'make her Majestie powerful . . . to spoyle the Spanyard'. He also points out that the God who had 'delivered her from so many secret villanies' – that is, the Northern Rebellion of 1569; and the Ridolfi (1571), Throckmorton (1583), and Babington (1586) plots – would surely protect his anointed sovereign from Spanish invasion. The sexual nature of Gibbon's text also cannot be overlooked. By invading England, Philip was violating the sacred bond between Elizabeth and her country that had been established at her coronation. Likewise, Gibbon reinforced the belief

[45] John Jeremiah Daniell, *A Compendium of the History of Cornwall* (Truro: Netherton and Worth, 1880), 27.

[46] Charles Gibbon, *A watch-worde for warre Not so new as necessary: published by reason of the dispersed rumors amongst us, and the suspected comming of the Spanyard against us. Wherein we may learne how to prepare our selves to repell the enemie, and to behave our selves all the tyme of that trouble. Compendious for the memorie, comfortable for the matter, profitable for the matter, profitable for the tyme* (Cambridge, 1596), sig. G2v.

Chapter in an edited collection

Anna Riehl Bertolet
Editor

Queens Matter in Early Modern Studies

palgrave
macmillan

Editor
Anna Riehl Bertolet
Auburn University
Auburn, USA

Queenship and Power
ISBN 978-3-319-64047-1 ISBN 978-3-319-64048-8 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64048-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017949193

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Contents

Page to be referenced:

a loss of authority during the war against Spain, especially as her preference was for a limited form of warfare, deemed "womanish" by hawkish commanders like the second Earl of Essex.[59] Although she retained ultimate control over policy-making, there were several occasions when her commanders ignored or even disobeyed her express commands once on their campaigns. But we should not forget that disregard for royal orders could also happen to kings who did not accompany their troops on an expedition, as Henry VIII found to his cost during the 1512 campaign in Aquitaine when his army returned home "without his command."[60]

To compensate for her inability to take on an active military role, Elizabeth became a figurehead for a nation at war. Famously, at the time of the 1588 Armada scare, she went to Tilbury to review her troops, perhaps dressed—as it was later reported—"as armed Pallas", and her oration to the soldiers, though not printed at the time, became iconic from the 1620s onwards. Asserting her strength and limitations as a female ruler, the Tilbury speech has become a model of inspiring martial rhetoric. Its language exploited her womanhood by identifying her natural body with the body politic, and this metaphor was again skillfully employed in the Armada portraits, which celebrated the English victory over Spain.[61] Nor did it end there. Throughout the war, Elizabeth appropriated the "masculine" virtue of courage in her speeches: at the end of the 1593 Parliament, in referring to the renewed fears of a Spanish attack, she asserted that "For mine owne part, I protest I never feared: and what feare was, my heart never knew"; and during the 1601 session, she declared that "I blesse God he hath given me never this faul[t] of feare."[62]

More gender-neutral were other forms of personal interventions and public propaganda designed to raise her subjects' morale. In August 1588, Elizabeth instructed that her special thanks should be delivered to

[59] Levin, *Heart and Stomach*, 139–140; Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and her Circle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 178–179, 191.

[60] *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A. D 1485-1537*, ed. and trans. Denys Hay, Camden Series 74 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1950).

[61] For an excellent gendered analysis of the Armada speech and portrait, see Louis Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 148–150.

[62] Hartley, *Proceedings*, iii, 28, 293. There are several versions of the 1601 speech but all state Elizabeth's lack of fear.

Edited Primary Source

Elizabeth I's Italian Letters

Edited and translated

by

Carlo M. Bajetta

Modern Language Association MLA
An Approved Edition
Committee on Scholarly Editions

palgrave
macmillan

Queenship and Power

ISBN 978-1-137-44232-1 ISBN 978-1-137-43553-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-43553-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016962734

Cover illustration: George Gower. The Plimpton 'Sieve' portrait of Queen Elizabeth I. Oil on panel, 1579. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Nature America Inc.
The registered company address is: 1 New York Plaza, New York, NY 10004, U.S.A.

Document and Page to be Referenced:

Contents

still not being content, has divested me of that same good, which would be intolerable to me if I did not think to enjoy it again soon. And in this my exile I know surely that your highness' clemency has had as much care and solicitude for my health as His majesty the King would have had. For which I am not only bound to serve you, but also to revere you with daughterly love, since I am aware that your most illustrious highness has not forgotten me every time you have written to His majesty the King, which would have been for me to do. This is why, heretofore I have not dared to write to him, and why at present I humbly entreat your most excellent highness that when writing to his majesty you will deign to recommend me to him, ever entreat his sweet benediction and likewise entreat the Lord God grant him every success in gaining victory over his enemies so that your highness, and I together with you, may the sooner rejoice at his happy return. I entreat nothing else from God but that He may preserve your most illustrious highness, to whose grace, humbly kissing your hands, I offer and commend myself.

From Saint James on the thirty-first of July.

Your most obedient daughter and most faithful servant. Elizabeth

3 **divested:** rather than 'to rob,' this may be the meaning for 'spogliare' Elizabeth had in mind, similar to the *OED*, 'divest,' *v.* 2a: 'To strip (a person or thing) of possessions, rights, or attributes; to denude, dispossess, deprive' (the first occurrence given here, however, is the *Myrrour for Magistrates*, 1563).

4 **soon**: cf. *Vocabolario Treccani*, s.v. 'bentosto.'

10 **This is why**: the Latinate sense of 'però,' deriving from 'per hoc'—'for this'—is well attested in Italian (Cf. *Vocabolario Treccani*, 'però,' *cong.*, 2; see also the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, which notes the similarity between this and Latin 'ideo,' 'idcirco.'). It is present in a well-known line of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* 'tempo non mi parea da far riparo Contra colpi d'Amor: però m'andai Secur, senza sospetto' (III, ll. 5–7). This meaning makes very good sense in Elizabeth's letter instead of 'however,' which would undermine the rhetorical (and logic) crescendo of her text. One may also want to note that she used 'però' in this way in her letters to Maximilian II (nos. 5 and 6 below).