The Drama of Coronation

Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England

Alice Hunt

CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE www.cambridge.org/9780521885393

This page intentionally left blank

THE DRAMA OF CORONATION

The coronation was, and perhaps still is, one of the most important ceremonies of a monarch's reign. This book examines the five coronations that took place in England between 1509 and 1559: those of Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, Edward VI, Mary I and Elizabeth I. It considers how the sacred rite and its related ceremonies and pageants responded to monarchical and religious change and charts how they were interpreted by contemporary observers. Hunt challenges the popular position that has conflated royal ceremony with political propaganda and argues for a deeper understanding of the symbolic complexity of ceremony. At the heart of the study is an investigation into the vexed issues of legitimacy and representation which leads Hunt to identify the emergence of an important and fruitful exchange between ceremony and drama. This exchange will have significant implications for our understanding both of the period's theatre and of the cultural effects of the Reformation. The book will be of great interest to scholars and students of late medieval and early modern history and literature.

ALICE HUNT is Lecturer in English at the University of Southampton.

THE DRAMA OF CORONATION

Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England

ALICE HUNT

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

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

© Alice Hunt 2008

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

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 has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

Preface — *page* vi
Note on style and dates — viii
List of abbreviations — ix

Introduction: the ‘idol’ ceremony of coronation — 1

1 Why crown a king? Henry VIII and the medieval coronation — 12

2 ‘Come my love thou shalbe crowned’: the drama of Anne Boleyn’s coronation — 39

3 ‘But a ceremony’: Edward VI’s reformed coronation and John Bale’s *King Johan* — 77

4 ‘He hath sent Marye our soveraigne and Quene’: England’s first queen and *Respublica* — 111

5 ‘A stage wherin was shewed the wonderfull spectacle’: representing Elizabeth I’s coronation — 146

Epilogue: ‘Presume not that I am the thing I was’ — 173

Notes — 178
Bibliography — 218
Index — 236

Preface

The image on the jacket of this book is known as 'The "Coronation" Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I'. It marks this book's starting point: Elizabeth I and her contested coronation ceremony in Westminster Abbey on 15 January 1559. The portrait is remarkable for being the only formal coronation portrait of any Tudor monarch to survive. It was painted by an unknown artist in about 1600, and is either a copy of an earlier coronation portrait or was commissioned at the end of Elizabeth's reign. In either case, this painting chooses to remember Elizabeth as the young, newly anointed queen she once was and recalls a ritual of transformation. The survival of ceremony in Reformation England is the subject of this book. Moving backwards from Elizabeth, it examines the coronation ceremonies of four of her predecessors. Since there are very few visual records of Tudor coronations, the book considers how these rites have been described and represented in words, from court documents to pageants and plays.

This book began as a doctoral thesis and I would like to acknowledge and thank my supervisor Tom Healy for his unfailing support, guidance and encouragement. For reading and commenting so thoughtfully on all or parts of the book, at different points, I'd like to thank Tom Betteridge, Patrick Collinson, Harriet Jaine, Louisa Joyner, Ita Mac Carthy, Gordon McMullan, Toby Mundy, Kiernan Ryan, Richard Scholar, Charlotte Scott, Greg Walker and Anna Whitelock.

I would also like to thank the staff, students and graduates of Birkbeck College; colleagues at the University of Southampton, in particular Ros King and John McGavin and all at the Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Culture; the London Renaissance Seminar; and the Institute of Historical Research's Religious History of Britain and Tudor and Stuart seminars. My thanks too to staff at the British Library, the Society of Antiquaries and Westminster Abbey for their help and patience, and to Sarah Stanton, Rebecca Jones and Linda Randall at Cambridge University Press. The research could not have been undertaken without a doctoral

award from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, for which I am very grateful.

Finally, I thank my family and, above all, James McConnachie who has believed in me and this book throughout.

Note on style and dates

Quotations from manuscripts and early printed books follow original spelling, capitalisation and punctuation apart from ‘u’, ‘v’, ‘i’, ‘j’ which have been regularised according to modern-day typography. The thorn is represented by ‘th’. Superscripts, abbreviations and contractions are written out in full.

All dates follow the modern dating system.
All early, pre-1800 publications are London unless otherwise noted.

Abbreviations

APC	*Acts of the Privy Council of England*, New Series, II (1547–50) (London, 1890)
AR	*The Antiquarian Repertory*, ed. Francis Grose, 2nd edn, 4 vols. (London, 1807–9; first published 1775), I, pp. 296–341: 'Her beginnith a Ryalle Booke of the Crownacion of the Kinge, Queene'
BL	British Library, London
CSP: Domestic	*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth* (1547–80) (London, 1856)
CSP: Milan	*Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Milan*, I (1385–1618) (London, 1912)
CSP: Spanish	*Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere* (London, 1862–)
CSP: Venetian	*Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy* (London, 1864–)
ECR	*English Coronation Records*, ed. Leopold G. Wickham Legg (London: Archibald Constable & Co., 1901)
EETS	Early English Text Society
Hall	*Hall's Chronicle Containing the History of England, during the Reign of Henry the Fourth, and the Succeeding Monarchs, to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which Are*

	Particularly Described the Manners and Customs of those Periods, Collated with the Edition of 1548 *and* 1550, ed. Henry Ellis, 2 vols. (London, 1809), II
Holinshed	*Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, ed. Abraham Fleming, 6 vols. (London, 1807–8)
L&P	*Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII* (London, 1862–1932)
Machyn's Diary	*The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London from A.D.* 1550 *to A.D.* 1563, ed. J. G. Nichols (London, 1848)
NA	National Archives
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (www.oxforddnb.com/)
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
Schramm	Percy Ernst Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937)
STC	A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, eds., *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad* 1475–1640, 3 vols., 2nd edn, revised by W. A. Jackson, F.S. Ferguson and K.F. Pantzer (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976–91)
TRP	*Tudor Royal Proclamations*, ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, 3 vols. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964–9)
Wriothesley's Chronicle	Charles Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors* 1485–1559, ed. W. D. Hamilton, 2 vols. (London, 1875–7)

Introduction
The 'idol' ceremony of coronation

In Shakespeare's *King Henry V*, Henry puzzles over the purpose of royal ceremony. Addressing ceremony as if it were a separate being and uncertain god, he imploringly asks, 'And what art thou, thou idol ceremony?'[1] His question plays on the words 'idol' and 'idle', on the distinction between false and meaningful worship and on ceremony's simultaneous awe and poison. Even as Henry invokes ceremony as proud, unhealthy, unhappily futile, he also grants it power through the plenitude and urgency of his language: ceremony is 'adoration', 'thrice-gorgeous', vital and inevitable: it is 'the tide of pomp / That beats upon the high shore of this world' (IV. I. 242, 263, 261–2).

This book asks 'what art thou?' of the coronation ceremony in the sixteenth century, the moment when the 'balm, the sceptre and the ball, / The sword, the mace, the crown imperial, / The intertissued robe of gold and pearl' (IV. I. 257–9) were consecrated and bestowed on the new monarch, transforming the rightful heir into divine ruler. Unusually, a total of five coronations – those of Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, Edward VI, Mary Tudor and Elizabeth I – took place between 1509 and 1559, years during which England underwent a series of profound changes. The relationships between ceremony and religious reformation, and between ceremony and monarchical power, were increasingly contested during this period, and this book presents a new understanding of the survival of the 'idol' ceremony of coronation and its role in early modern English culture. In order to track the shifting political and cultural functions of this pivotal but complex royal ritual, the book situates the five coronations in their historical *and* literary contexts. It pieces together what happened at each ceremony, and then examines how each event was described and represented in contemporary records, from eyewitness accounts and ambassadorial letters to procession pageants and accession plays. This is not only the first full-length history of the Tudor coronation ceremonies, but the first account of how they were perceived, and written about.[2]

The book begins with the coronation of Henry VIII and ends with that of his daughter, Elizabeth. It seeks to interrogate what has become a familiar assumption about the fate of ceremony during the English Reformation. When Henry V challenges 'idol' ceremony on the Elizabethan stage, he speaks as a late sixteenth-century monarch, and as one of many Elizabethan and Jacobean player kings who question their power, and their rites of power. But, by the time of Shakespeare's play, what exactly *was* ceremony? What had happened for it to end up on the stage in this way, questioned and scrutinised? And what is the relationship between real ceremonies and their playhouse representations? Does the representation of ceremony *change* ceremony? The dominant historical position is that sixteenth-century Protestant England brought about the death of ceremony via the denial of effective religious ritual and the successful banishment of the spiritual from the material sphere. This narrative charts a shift from a medieval, superstitious and Catholic view of ceremony's place in the world to a more rationalist, albeit disenchanted, one which consequently 'abolished the traditional props of community identity'.[3] Formal ceremony, having being abandoned, was suddenly available for playful appropriation by the popular stage. Thomas M. Greene, for example, writes of the 'unravelling of the ceremonial fabric' and the 'death of ceremonial symbolism', and describes how redundant ceremonies slid readily into the ludic, creative space of the theatre.[4] Stephen Greenblatt asserts that there was an 'evacuation of the divine presence from religious mystery, leaving only vivid but empty ceremonies'. He describes how the theatrical performance of ceremony completed this emptying-out process because the theatre 'evacuates everything it represents'.[5] Representing and interrogating ceremony on the stage, therefore, signals the death of ceremony in that culture because real ceremonies can only be undermined by their dramatic counterparts. And, in the case of sixteenth-century England, the cause of this death, the story goes, was Protestantism.[6]

As with the established ceremonies of the Catholic Church, the coronation ceremony is assumed to have suffered a similar fate; the Reformation reduced it to a 'symbolic drama' whose symbols were 'degraded ... into tokens'.[7] According to Richard McCoy, by Elizabeth I's coronation in 1559, the medieval inauguration ritual was 'an obscure side-show' whose capacity to affirm royal power was no longer believed in.[8] Similarly, Albert Rolls has described the 'Elizabethan disregard' for the purpose of a coronation and writes that 'the English, at least those with Protestant leanings, had accepted the delegitimization of the coronation enacted as Elizabeth assumed the throne'.[9] Instead, it has been argued that Elizabeth turned the

occasion of her traditional coronation procession through London into a spectacular piece of political theatre, knowingly disregarding the empty power of religious ceremony in favour of a public 'theatrical apparatus of royal power'.[10] Similarly, David Starkey has argued for the degeneration of the symbols of coronation and monarchy into 'mere signs', as power transferred from sacred ceremony and sacred monarchy to the cult of the monarch's personality.[11] It is these sorts of statement about the fate of coronation and the subsequent relationship between ceremony and monarchy – and the assumption that this is a uniquely Protestant position – with which this book engages. It is inadequate to claim that the coronation ceremony had been delegitimised by the accession of Elizabeth I in 1559. It had changed, but it is its reformation and its survival that warrant closer consideration. Accounting for the continuity of this 'obscure side-show' is more troublesome than alleging its decline.

The Reformation, of course, overthrew many of the established ceremonies of the Roman Church, but the coronation was no ordinary Catholic ceremony. It was a sacred rite that revolved around the sacrament and a material transmission of God's grace in the form of the oil with which the monarch was anointed. But it was also a political event whose purpose was to render monarchy and its power legitimate, to articulate monarchical godly duty and popular obedience.[12] By being both an efficacious ritual in which the heir was anointed with holy oil and transformed into the king, and a constitutional and legal act in which the monarch swore a solemn and binding oath to Church and country, the coronation found itself in a strange position vis-à-vis the Reformation. For some historians, reformed sacramental doctrine is simply incompatible with the notion of sacred monarchy: coronation could no longer in any sense be understood to 'make' a king and, anyway, this compromised the hereditary principle of English monarchy. Paul Kléber Monod writes that 'like a whirlwind, reformed teachings blew strong against the magnificent state props of Renaissance rulership and rudely shook the sacred body of the king'.[13] Helen Hackett, however, is right to note the paradox that the Henrician concept of the royal supremacy in England served to augment the sacred nature of the king and his symbols. She writes that the 'Reformation had, if anything, served to enhance the sacred authority of secular rulers by attributing to them the power to protect the true Church'.[14] The Tudor coronations, then, pull in two diverging directions. On the one hand, the ceremony, and the nature of the power that it bestowed, were necessarily affected by doctrinal change, and those involved with organising the ceremonies of Edward VI, Mary I and Elizabeth I had to confront and

navigate such change. On the other hand, as a ceremony that was about the divine and earthly power of the monarch and his – or her – relationship with God and the Church, the supremacy instituted by Henry meant that the English coronation ceremony underwent a particular type of reinforcement during the sixteenth century. Percy Ernst Schramm, in *A History of the English Coronation*, points out that the fate of the coronation ceremony across Europe was not necessarily linked to Protestant reform or to eucharistic theories. A belief in the 'real presence' was not necessarily coterminous with a belief in the divine body of a monarch. Catholic Spain, for example, had abandoned the coronation ritual by the fourteenth century, while Denmark and Sweden both crowned kings according to Protestant rites in the 1520–30s, and in Calvinist Scotland, James VI was crowned according to the traditional rite with mass only omitted.[15] The story of the English coronation, then, is not one that illustrates Whiggish versions of the Reformation. Instead, it constitutes a new thread in the pursuit of understanding the shaky process of Reformation in England.

Steeped in the liturgy of the medieval Church and the devotional logic of kingship, the coronation was the major ceremony in a suite of ceremonies that the Tudor monarchs inherited from their medieval predecessors, and relied upon for broadcasting their legitimacy and divinity. English kingship, as John Adamson has described, was underpinned by a 'choreography of religious devotion' and this persisted throughout the sixteenth century, and into the seventeenth.[16] All the Tudor and Stuart monarchs, for example, except perhaps Edward VI, continued to touch for the king's evil, or scrofula.[17] The office of king was inextricably bound up with the Church's ritual calendar, and the king's ordinary household ceremonies infused with liturgical symbolism to such an extent that reformed doctrine would find hard to touch. As John Adamson writes, 'A small number of "popish" feast-days such as Corpus Christi, were pruned from the calendar after the Reformation; but otherwise the pre-Reformation calendar remained virtually unchanged, with twelve major court days forming an annual cycle', from Michaelmas to Midsummer.[18] Fiona Kisby's work on the Chapel Royal has similarly focused on the continuities, rather than discontinuities, in the private household ceremonies of the Tudor monarchs, and on their inextricability from the liturgical rhythms of the year.[19] It is in this context that the Tudor monarchs' coronation ceremonies need to be placed, as royal rituals whose traditional roots and liturgical foundations run deep.

The study of coronations began at the end of the nineteenth century. It has since been subject to ongoing debates between those who advocate

continuity and those who advocate change.[20] Early studies that argued for continuity were often driven by a particular version of English history and the Reformation: tradition and an inherent 'Englishness' tended to be emphasised over revolution and division.[21] Leopold Wickham Legg, for example, in his indispensable collection of English coronation documents writes that 'in spite of the religious confusion in the sixteenth century, the service itself remained the same from 1307 to 1685. Details in ceremony of slight importance may indeed have changed, but the text of the prayers was identical.'[22] Here, the Reformation is 'religious confusion', and the continuity of form in the coronation ceremony illustrates the unbroken and inevitable trajectory of English history – and religion. The only comprehensive historical overview of the English coronation to date, Schramm's *A History of the English Coronation*, is marked by a similar conservatism. Schramm offers a constitutional reading of the coronation, contending, quite rightly, that the English coronation is an invaluable 'reflection of her [England's] constitutional history'. Due to its political necessity, the coronation's survival is ensured. But Schramm also writes that 'there is no gap between the Middle Ages and our own time, between the Catholic and the Protestant period'.[23] The English coronation is asserted as an uncontested and timeless fact of English monarchy and English history. Writing in the context of turbulent 1930s Germany, Schramm accounts for the survival of the ceremony by invoking 'the feeling of the English for tradition'.[24] This nostalgia for tradition has persisted. In anticipation of Elizabeth II's coronation, in 1953, the Dean of Westminster also appealed to the model of continuity. He wrote that

> the girding with the Sword, the clothing with the Royal Robe, the presentation of the Orb with the Cross, the Ring, and the two Sceptres (emblems of Justice and Mercy) – all these, with the culminating act of Coronation, are charged with spiritual meaning and intent which have remained constant for the past twelve hundred years, no matter how greatly outward circumstances have changed.[25]

Continuity and the mirage of tradition were, of course, important features of the Tudor coronations. Elizabeth I's coronation on 15 January 1559 would have been recognisable to those who witnessed her grandfather's ceremony in 1485. The form and language of the ceremonies remained largely unchanged ever since the order of service was enshrined in the fourteenth-century coronation text book, the *Liber Regalis*, and in Henry VI's 'Ryalle Book'.[26] All the Tudor monarchs were anointed according to the same Latin rite, crowned with St Edward's crown and invested with

the consecrated regalia. The same Latin prayers were spoken and the same anthems sung. (It was not until James I's coronation in 1603 that the *Liber Regalis* was translated and the service conducted wholly in English, for the first time.) Yet the political and religious circumstances surrounding Elizabeth I's coronation were very different from those of her father's in 1509 – and indeed from her mother's and siblings' coronations. Elizabeth was only the second queen regnant England had ever seen; her sister, Mary, was the first. The circumstances of four of the five Tudor coronations in this book were anomalous (they concerned three controversial women and a little boy) and these contexts impinged on the form and function of the ceremony as much as doctrinal debates. While we do need to acknowledge continuities, we also need to acknowledge that subtle but significant changes were made to the ceremonies, and, importantly, to the ways in which they were perceived and written about. The relationship between continuity and change is complex, and continuity of outward form does not imply continuity of interpretation or purpose. Although the coronations looked and sounded largely the same, they did not all *mean* the same. It is, then, only by reading these ceremonies in their contexts that seemingly innocuous and minor alterations and changes of emphasis emerge as significant political, religious and rhetorical acts. Looking at a sequence of similar and repeated events – in this case, five chronological Tudor coronations – enables us to detect what Paul Strohm calls 'the gap or lapse in sequence – which signals a change, a shift of intent, the end of something and the beginning of something else'.[27]

At the heart of coronation ceremonies, and of their study, is the legal conundrum: when does a king become a king? Does it matter? The answer to the latter question is, of course, 'Yes': it matters constitutionally and symbolically. The answer to the first question is one that sixteenth-century commentators battled with, and which modern-day historians continue to analyse. Ralph Giesey's work on French Renaissance royal funerals is pertinent for the study of the Tudor coronations: when exactly does the old king die, and when does regal power actually transfer to the successor? As England hovered between the earlier medieval theory that kingship was bestowed at the moment of ritual anointing, and the later medieval theory that kingship was transmitted directly to the heir on the predecessor's death, these questions became increasingly urgent, and the coronation's purpose increasingly paradoxical. For, despite England's legal fiction of the 'king's two bodies', meaning that the office of kingship never dies, there remains, nonetheless, the need for and a belief in a moment of 'transference'.[28] According to the *Liber Regalis*, the effigy of the old king

bore a set of the regalia that would be granted to the new monarch at his or her coronation and, during the sixteenth century, no more than three months elapsed between one monarch's death and the successor's coronation.[29] Chronicles hint to a ritual order that marks the transition from one reign to another: the opening of a new monarch's reign traditionally begins with a report of the coronation.[30] Law, then, may state that the king is king from the moment of death; the coronation ceremony enacts something rather different and more complex.

Tudor coronations were not, however, limited to the ceremony of anointing and crowning that took place in Westminster Abbey, before a select audience on a chosen day. Indeed it is the counterpart to the sacred, private rite – the monarch's procession through the city of London on the eve of the coronation – that has been more commonly studied. The coronation procession was the public event when the monarch rode bareheaded through the streets of London, surrounded by his or her lords spiritual and temporal, the household, foreign ambassadors and diplomats, and the Mayor of London. The streets were hung with decorated banners, and elaborate pageant stages and arches were erected at traditional stations along the procession route. Pageant scenes were acted out, and actors declaimed verses and orations. As the lavish, spectacular and public part of the troubled and often poorly documented religious rite, Tudor coronation processions have often been regarded as magnificent vehicles of Tudor state propaganda. Sydney Anglo's seminal *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy*, the first full-length detailed study of Tudor state ceremonies, reads coronation processions as tightly controlled propaganda exercises whose intricate, and now inaccessible, symbolism expressed centralised policy, what Anglo calls the 'Tudor Idea'.[31] Roy Strong's work has similarly read ceremony in terms of propaganda, 'art' as 'power'.[32] Where Anglo sees the decline of state pageantry in the sixteenth century as a direct result of Reformation, Strong sees the replacement of religious ritual with successful and scripted state spectacle. Of Elizabeth's reign, he writes that in 'the new Protestant society of Elizabethan England', the secular state festival of her Accession Day 'was deliberately developed as a major state festival' to 'redirect' the energy of religious worship towards the 'virgin of reform'.[33] For a long time, the propaganda model proved hard to shift, partly because it accounts rather neatly for the troublesome survival of certain ceremonies. It informs Richard McCoy's account of Elizabeth I's procession. According to McCoy, the propagandist opportunities available in the form of the procession were exploited perfectly by Elizabeth, the consummate

actress-monarch. The coronation may have been an obscure and religious side-show but she more than made up for this because she 'clearly appreciated the political value of secular pageantry', McCoy writes, 'and sought to exploit it'.[34] This emphasis on a symbiotic relationship between spectacle and power owes much to anthropological enquiry into state ceremonies, notably Clifford Geertz's analysis of the Balinese 'theatre-state'.[35] It relies on the assumption that the centre of power controlled its expressions of power. 'Court ceremonialism', Geertz writes, 'was the driving force of court politics.'[36] State ceremonies, therefore, were decoded for their 'symbolics of power', informed by the belief that symbols have single, unchanging, meanings that would be readily understood.[37] Of Elizabeth I's coronation procession, Clifford Geertz denies the possibility of interpretative frustration when he writes that 'That imagination was all allegorical, Protestant, didactic, and pictorial . . . Elizabeth ruled in a realm in which beliefs were visible.' Singularity of purpose takes precedence over plurality and diversity; a ceremony is understood as representative of a coherent political, religious and cultural world-view.[38]

As more recent work has shown, interpreting English royal ceremonies in this way is limiting and anachronistic. Sydney Anglo himself revised his views in his later book, *Images of Tudor Kingship*. He writes that 'there is little evidence to support the view that the English monarchy employed a propaganda machine other than sporadically, and the notion that there was a carefully thought-out systematic sales promotion of recondite imagery to the nation at large is a wholly modern, academic invention'.[39] Comparative work on European royal rituals has also stressed the importance of considering England within an international context of shifting monarchical power and Church–state relations: popes and kings were both attempting to assert their relative supremacy. At the same time, comparative work reveals differences between England and European states that are illuminating.[40] We also know now that divisions between Catholicism and Protestantism remained much more ambiguous and inchoate during the sixteenth century than has been previously claimed, and therefore the ways in which the Tudor coronation ceremonies and processions were reshaped and reformed – because there is no doubt that they were – demand more nuanced analysis.[41] While we can agree that it is no longer adequate to read the ceremonies in terms of propaganda, it is true that coronations, and the pageants and descriptive texts that accompany these events, employed complex, and sometimes contradictory, rhetorical strategies. This book attempts to engage with this range of rhetorical tropes – if a coronation ceremony was deliberately changed, who did this,

why and for whom? And who exactly was in charge of orchestrating the events that accompanied a coronation, such as the procession and other forms of entertainment?[42] This book argues that we need to read ceremonies in multifaceted ways – as religious rituals, as power-brokers, as constitutional keys, as legal contracts, as private rites, as civic traditions and as social events – and as both susceptible and resistant to historical change.[43] At the same time, there is also the inevitable and thwarting element of chance, as Ralph Giesey disarmingly notes. 'Time and time again,' he writes,

> I have emerged with the conviction that some crucial innovation in the ceremonial first occurred quite haphazardly, although a contemporary chronicler may have tried to give it some plausible explanation *ex post facto*, and later generations when reenacting it embellished it with clear-cut symbolism. That is to say, on the level of the events themselves, chance frequently reigned.[44]

A large part of this study is devoted to placing close analysis of the coronation ceremony alongside the monarch's pre-coronation procession through London, and other dramatic forms, such as a coronation play.[45] Putting the ceremony and the procession back together acknowledges the dialogic relationship that existed between these two partner events and challenges distinctions conventionally drawn between the sacred space of the church and the secular space of the city. Furthermore, looking at the suite of events that constitutes a monarch's period of accession reveals certain dramatic strategies at work which, this book argues, are integral to understanding the reformation of ceremony during the sixteenth century. One such dramatic strategy is the performance of good counsel. Increasingly, this book shows, the ceremonies and processions of the Tudor monarchs became opportunities for people to address and counsel the monarch, and to play out divergent types of sacred kingship (or queenship, in the cases of Mary and Elizabeth) and legitimate power.[46] Rather than expressions of a consensus about monarchical power, the Tudor coronations began to negotiate, critique and offer new, even competing, definitions of monarchical authority. Ceremonies such as coronations could not endorse any particular notion of monarchical power because, as John Guy writes, there was no 'authentic' view of monarchy, but a 'range of opinions on kingship and tyranny, virtue and civic duty, nobility and meritocracy, political participation and representation, "counsel" and the "best state" of a *respublica*'.[47] In addition, as the ceremonies and processions themselves began to engage with the definition of monarchical

power, they also engaged with the very idea, and purpose, of ceremony. These anxieties about monarchy and ceremony were refracted through drama, either in accession plays – such as *Respublica* of 1553 – or in plays that featured religious and royal rituals, such as John Bale's 1530s play, *King Johan*.[48] This book, then, identifies the emergence of a very particular exchange between ceremony and drama in this period which has implications for the ways in which both genres – and the impact of the Reformation on both – have been understood. Rather than seeing sacred ceremonies collapsing into secular drama, this book shows instead how ceremonies borrowed from drama (and, in doing so, survived) and how pageants and plays, for their part, retained deeply ceremonial, and liturgical, tropes and strategies.[49]

A book on coronations needs to be clear about what exactly the 'idol' ceremony of coronation was, and what it was meant to achieve. Chapter 1 discusses the history and the medieval legacy of the English coronation ceremony and asks a central question: 'why anoint and crown a king?' It reconstructs Henry VIII's coronation on 24 June 1509, piecing it together through analysis of the *Liber Regalis* and the manuscript 'Device' drawn up specifically for Henry's coronation. It looks at the language and structure of the prayers, the king's oath and the rite of anointing, and examines the order in which the objects of the regalia are consecrated and bestowed. It also considers what the language employed in the Device reveals about what was understood to happen, and why, in the ceremony. Chapter 2 examines the contentious coronation of Anne Boleyn in 1533. Anne was the only one of Henry's subsequent wives to be crowned, and her coronation took place when she was six months' pregnant with Elizabeth. While this chapter argues for the political and cultural importance of this unprecedented ceremony, it argues against overly Protestant readings. This chapter also introduces the tradition and the purpose of the coronation procession through analysis of Wynkyn de Worde's *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne, wyfe unto the moost noble kynge Henry the viii*, and the Latin and English pageant verses composed by Nicholas Udall and John Leland. Chapter 3 examines Edward VI's coronation which took place in February 1547, when the king was only nine years old. Despite the fact that Edward VI's coronation is often cited for Archbishop Cranmer's celebrated address in which he declared that 'the solemn rites of coronation have their ends and utility; yet neither direct force or necessity . . . The oil, if added, is but a ceremony', this chapter shows how Edward's coronation was reformed, but not, as is often argued, rendered redundant.[50] This chapter also introduces connections between the

reformation of ceremony and its dramatisation during the 1530s and 1540s. It looks in detail at John Bale's *King Johan* and investigates the ways in which this play uses ceremony to critique monarchical authority. Chapter 4 turns to the coronation of England's first queen regnant: Mary Tudor. There was no precedent in the coronation annals for anointing a queen, albeit one whose legitimacy had been questioned and who was Catholic to boot. Through reassessing evidence, this chapter argues that Mary's coronation represented a seismic shift in the power of Parliament over monarchy, fundamentally reconfiguring the legitimacy and purpose of a monarch's coronation. This is explored further through fresh analysis of Nicholas Udall's play *Respublica* and its dramatisation of the problems of female governance and a queen's relationship with her country and her God. Concerns about monarchical legitimacy, parliamentary power and female rule at Mary's accession had implications for the rest of her reign and, crucially, were still prominent when Elizabeth inherited the throne in November 1558. The last chapter of the book examines Elizabeth I's coronation in January 1559. It argues that her crowning was not the triumphant Protestant moment that it is generally portrayed as, by both sixteenth-century commentators and later writers, but shows instead how Elizabeth turned this ceremony into a deliberately ambiguous piece of theatre. Far from being a ceremony that had been successfully 'delegitimised', Elizabeth's coronation was as scrutinised, problematic and crucial as those of her ancestors. This chapter also offers a fresh interpretation of *The Quenes majesties passage*, the text that describes Elizabeth's pre-coronation procession and that has been published, not unproblematically, as a dramatic script in a recent anthology of Renaissance plays.[51] This final chapter argues that we need to read Elizabeth's procession as both a type of ceremony, and as a very particular type of play.

CHAPTER I

Why crown a king? Henry VIII and the medieval coronation

In 1838, during a debate about Victoria's forthcoming coronation, Earl Fitzwilliam declared that 'coronations were fit only for barbarous, or semi-barbarous ages; for periods when crowns were won and lost by unruly violence and ferocious contests'.[1] Fitzwilliam's contention was that when a monarch's legitimacy is not in doubt, and he or she earns the English crown through divine right alone, there is simply no point to a coronation. But the 'semi-barbarous' ages to which he refers were long gone, and yet the coronation continued during the medieval period, unruly deposition or peaceful succession notwithstanding. Henry VII won his crown on Bosworth Field but the legitimacy of his second son and heir, Henry VIII, was not in doubt and both Henrys were crowned according to the 'usual ceremonies', as the Venetian ambassador described of Henry VIII's coronation in June 1509.[2] The survival of the coronation ceremony in England is a unique story. As Paul Kléber Monod points out, only the French coronation can compare in its claims for the sacred body and the healing powers of the anointed king.[3] Despite its Frankish origins and shared characteristics with Byzantine imperial crownings in imitation of ancient Rome, the coronation throughout Europe fulfilled different cultural roles which were not necessarily indicators of how sacred the office of monarchy was held to be, suggesting instead divergent attitudes towards the function of the ceremony. Spanish kings, for example, inherited the throne through hereditary right and ruled by divine right but the Spanish coronation was abandoned in the fourteenth century, and with it the rite of anointing and the regalia. In Sweden, on the other hand, where hereditary monarchy was introduced only in 1534, the coronation did not centre on the sacred body of the monarch, but on transforming an elected man into a legitimate ruler.[4] In England, the doctrine of divine right, developed during the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries, pledged the already-sacred nature of the king and the legitimacy of his rule but this did not alter the ceremony's insistence on transformation through anointing or its political and cultural

prominence. Why, then, did English monarchs continue to need a coronation, and what exactly were the 'usual ceremonies'? To what extent were they ever understood to confer, rather than to confirm, the right to rule?

AN UNCERTAIN HISTORY

The purpose and effect of a coronation became a site of contest between rulers and the Church as the office of kingship became increasingly liturgified. While rulers throughout Europe had always celebrated their accession with some form of ceremony, it was not until the mid-eighth and ninth centuries that this ceremony became sacred and bound up with the authority of the Church: kingship became an ecclesiastical office, not an elected one.[5] The introduction in the West of the anointing of the new monarch with holy oil enforced this, drawing distinct parallels with the Christian tradition of anointing priests and bishops and the Old Testament precedents of the anointing of David and Solomon.[6] In 751, the Frankish king, Pepin, was the first king to receive unction at the hands of bishops before enthronement. As Ernst Kantorowicz writes: 'With Pepin's anointment the royal inauguration was shifted, once and for all, to the sacramental or at least liturgical sphere. Henceforth this action was dominated by sacerdotal functions and the model of Samuel, the prophet and high priest anointing David, enchanted the minds of layman and priest.'[7] Subsequently, popes began to perform the anointing of the kings and emperors. In 781 Pope Hadrian added the act of coronation, influenced by the crowning of Byzantine emperors, and, in 800, Charlemagne was anointed and crowned emperor by the pope and thereby set the precedent emulated by rulers throughout western Europe.[8] The oldest extant order for an English coronation service dates from the tenth century and is known as the 'Ordo of St Dunstan', after the Archbishop of Canterbury under King Edgar who was to transform the coronation rite. This order combines anointing, crowning and mass, legitimising the king's power through Biblical precedent and unction rather than popular election and assent.[9] The king is thus transformed inside a church into the 'Lord's Anointed'.[10]

The rise of hereditary monarchy and the doctrine of divine right in England necessarily impacted on the idea of liturgical kingship, problematising the coronation's function as maker of kings, and the purpose of the anointing. In 1272, Edward I began to rule on the day of his father's, Henry III's, funeral. In 1308, Edward II began to rule on the day after his father's death. Thus the king was king before the coronation.

Kantorowicz argues that the Church now had to signify, rather than render; its function was to make visible and tangible the divine power that had already been granted: the 'live essence of liturgical kingship evaporated' and kingly anointing devalued.[11] At the same time, though, the anointing of priests and bishops was enhanced.[12] And yet the English coronation, what Kantorowicz terms the 'crowded symbolism and courtly-religious pomp of the pageantry', still encased the office of kingship in the mass, the king was still anointed and legitimised through sacred ceremony.[13] Sacred power was beckoned and transferred to the king via the service's language in conjunction with its visual imagery. Furthermore, it was at the coronation that the king's oath was sworn and thus the constitutional purpose of the ceremony remained paramount. But what exactly was understood to happen during coronation when the officiating bishop blessed the oil and anointed the monarch on his hands, back, breast, elbows and head was the subject of debate that persisted during the sixteenth century, and into the seventeenth. While these questions became critical during the Reformation, it is essential to be reminded of the degree of ambiguity and anxiety surrounding the ceremony that the sixteenth century inherited. It is misleading to assume that there was a medieval consensus about the function of a coronation that the Tudor monarchs appropriated or adapted – and it was the anointing that had been and continued to remain especially problematic.

The power granted to the monarch via unction had to be distinguished from sacerdotal powers conferred when priests and bishops were anointed. The coronation placed the monarch in a relationship with the Church that had serious constitutional implications: he or she is anointed at the hands of the Church but does this subordinate the monarch to that Church, or the Church to the monarch? The office granted to anointed priests and bishops fell recognisably within the established hierarchy of the Church in relation to Rome, but the place of the king in this hierarchy needed clarification. Were kings also granted priestly powers by virtue of the act of anointing? Could they perform priestly offices such as administering the sacrament? Should the king be anointed with chrism, like bishops, or with the less special oil of catechumens?[14] To what extent is royal unction a sacrament, and therefore able to impart divine grace? Charlemagne famously asked, 'What does the Sacrament of Coronation make me?'[15] The answers to such a question are based on shifting degrees of literal and metaphorical interpretation. Thomas Becket, for example, maintained that anointing a king was a symbolic act that 'denoted glory, strength, and wisdom in the King'.[16] Henry II, however, favoured a more ritually

efficacious interpretation. One of his courtiers, Peter de Blois, declared in a letter to him that 'the King is the Lord's Anointed' and that the effectiveness of this sacrament can be 'ascertained by any one who is ignorant or doubtful on the subject, because, after the King has laid his hands on the sick, inflammation in the groin goes down and scrofula is cured'.[17] Records of this touching for 'the king's evil', alleged to have begun with Edward the Confessor, exist right up to the eighteenth century in England, the ceremony being fixed by Henry VII and continued by the Stuarts in exile as proof of their legitimate claim to the English throne.[18] In 1245, Henry III echoed Charlemagne and puzzled over the effect of his anointing. Even though it was not one of the seven sacraments, was it nonetheless sacramental, meaning that supernatural grace was imparted, elevating a man or object into the realm of the sacred? Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, explained to Henry III in a letter that the sacrament of unction was a gift and special privilege that bound the monarch to and put him in mind of his kingly duties. It added to his dignity and set him apart, but was not a *necessity* and did not confer special priestly powers. Grosseteste, careful to flatter the king, took the opportunity to define the nature of the sacrament, and to remind the king of the hierarchy of spiritual and temporal rulers. At the same time, however, an anointed king was still 'bound in more especial manner than those kings who are not anointed':

> But as to that which you commanded at the end of your letter, to wit, that we should inform you in what manner the sacrament of unction increased the royal dignity; our modesty is unable to satisfy it, as there are many kings who are in no way adorned with the gift of unction. But of this we are not ignorant, that the royal anointing is the sign of the privilege of receiving the sevenfold gift of the most Holy Spirit, and by this sevenfold gift the anointed king is bound in more especial manner than those kings who are not anointed, to carefulness in all his royal actions and those of his government; that is to say, by the gift of fear he is not by ordinary means, but with vigour and courage, to restrain from all illegal acts, in the first instance himself, and, secondly, those subject to his government ... Therefore the sacrament of unction adds this duty to the dignity of a king, in that the king, anointed above his fellows must, as I have shown, by virtue of the sevenfold gift, in all acts of his rule excel in godlike and heroic virtues. This privilege of unction, however, does not in any way raise the dignity of a king above, nor even to the level of that of the priest, or give the power to perform any prestly office. For Judah, the son of Jacob, the chief of the royal tribe, distinguishes between himself and his brother Levi, the chief of the priestly tribe, and says: 'The Lord has given me a kingdom, to Levi the priesthood; to me he has given the things of earth, to him the things of heaven; and as the heaven is higher than the earth, even so is the priesthood of God higher than a kingdom of the earth.'[19]

As this long explanation suggests, what exactly happened during the coronation ceremony was a matter of great importance – and uncertainty – for the nature of the king's power and governance, particularly in relation to the Church, rested upon it. Grosseteste's interpretation of the purpose of unction was recalled in 1547 when Thomas Cranmer, in his address to Edward VI at his coronation, declared that the 'oil, if added, is but a ceremony'.[20] Cranmer, then, was not the first bishop to offer an explanation of the anointing to a king.

Concomitant with, perhaps even a consequence of, this ambivalence surrounding the anointing is its tenacious legitimising power for monarchs. David Sturdy argues for a link between a regime's sense of its own legitimacy and its attachment to efficacious ceremony. He describes how the Yorkists

> exploited all ceremonials in the drive to validate the legitimacy of their rule. For them the coronation was indispensable to legitimation; hence the emphasis they placed on unction, that visible sign of divine approval of the 'chosen one'… circulating the story that the oil used at their coronations was none other than that transmitted miraculously to Thomas Becket by the Virgin.[21]

The legend is that holy oil was delivered to Thomas Becket by the Virgin Mary with the prophecy that the fifth king of England from the one then reigning (Henry II, making the fifth king Richard II) would be anointed with this oil and would subsequently recover the Holy Land.[22] Paul Strohm shows how this Yorkist myth was reappropriated by the Lancastrians and their claim that Becket's holy oil was in fact intended for Henry IV, since Richard II's reign was a slip, an aberration. Henry IV, at his coronation, makes much of his anointing by not concealing himself underneath a canopy as is stipulated in the *Liber Regalis* and by insisting on being carried from the altar to his throne rather than walking there himself – elevated and transported like the consecrated host.[23]

The circumstances of the accession of Henry VII meant that the Tudor dynasty was similarly plagued by concerns about its own legitimacy: Henry VII had not become king through irrefutable divine right but through war. Coronation as election is emphasised in the account in Richard Grafton's *A Chronicle at large* of Henry VII's defeat of Richard III. On Bosworth Field, Thomas Stanley, when he 'saw the good will and gladnesse of the people, he toke the Crowne of king Richard which was founde amongest the spoyle in the field, and set it on the Erles heade, as though he had been elected king by the voyce of the people, as in auncient

tymes past in divers realmes it hath been accustomed'.[24] Apocryphal tale or historical fact, this report nonetheless illustrates the authority of coronation, pre-empting here its appeal to the past, its ability to mask illegitimate means and define a moment when a king becomes legitimate by invoking popular election. The chronicle account goes on to relate that this 'was the first signe and token of hys good luck and felicity', as if being crowned by Stanley on Bosworth Field retrospectively proved Henry's divine authority and legitimacy. Sydney Anglo notes that Henry VII proceeded quickly to his coronation in order to legitimise his rule by invoking the hand of God:

> The order adopted by Henry for the important public ceremonies at the beginning of his reign is very significant: he had already been crowned on the field of battle by a sort of popular election; and he had presented his standards at St Paul's as though emphasizing the divine inspiration of his victory. The next ceremony was to be his solemn coronation, prior even to the assembling of the Parliament which would sanction his regal position.[25]

However, Anglo implies here that Henry manipulated sacred ceremony, aware that it would be socially and politically expedient. He writes that Henry VII presented his standards '*as though* emphasizing the divine inspiration of his victory' and proceeded to coronation 'prior even to the assembling of the Parliament', suggesting that the sacred ceremonies had no real sanctioning power (in the mind of the monarch) but would constitute effective propaganda. In fact, though, Parliament never preceded a coronation and was not understood to make kings. Furthermore, Anglo denies the possibility here that the presentation of the standards at St Paul's and the coronation were necessary signs and proof that Henry's victory was indeed sanctioned and approved of by God. As the account in Grafton's *Chronicle* indicates, this is a logic that interprets ceremonies as the will of God: if Henry is crowned king, then he was meant to be crowned king. The paradigm suggested by Anglo, and invoked by Sturdy above, whereby a regime's sense of its own legitimacy is in inverse proportion to its ceremonial activities, implies a knowing exploitation of sacred ceremony that is devoid of sincere belief. What remains unresolved is the lingering notion that coronation *does* something, both for those in power and those witnessing power. Henry IV's adjustment to the procedure of anointing at his coronation, for example, is both exploitative and entirely reverential of the power of this ceremony. More than an appeal to the persuasive theatre of the sacred, Henry VII needed the reality of the sacred to make itself visible and present at his coronation to prove that his

claim to the English throne was legitimate. He also needed coronation because he needed the acclamation of his clergy, and this would be articulated in the ceremony.

Edward Hall's report of Henry VII's coronation suggests several levels on which the coronation legitimised Henry's kingship, entwining divine will, tradition, ceremonial efficacy and popular acceptance. Henry was anointed and crowned king, 'with all ceremonyes accustomed', and this was executed 'by provision of devyne purveyaunce'. Hall also writes that these ceremonies were enabled by 'the whole assent as well of the comons as of the nobilitie':

> he with great pompe was conveighed to Westmynster, and there the thirtye daye of Octobre was with all ceremonyes accustomed, enoynted & crouned kyng by the whole assent as well of the comons as of the nobilite, & was named kyng Henry the vii of that name . . . Which kyngdome he obteyned & enjoyed as a thyng by God elected & provided, and by his especiall favoure and gracious aspecte compassed and acheved.[26]

Henry was 'enoynted & crouned kyng', named 'kyng Henry the vii', but this was by assent and approval, displayed by the nobility's acceptance and the 'great pompe' of the procession to the Abbey. At the same time, Hall acknowledges – and shrewdly since he is writing for his patron Edward VI – that Henry's right to rule was ordained by God: 'a thyng by God elected & provided'. This word 'provided' is countered by the attendant idea that Henry also 'obteyned' and 'acheved' the kingdom, and that God's election was also due to Henry's previously established grace: 'by his especiall favoure and gracious aspecte compassed and acheved'. Hall presents Henry's legitimacy as resting on these seemingly conflicting but interdependent elements: divine election, divine grace, personal achievement, popular assent and ceremonial efficacy: 'enoynted . . . kyng', 'was named kyng'. At the same time, the 'ceremonyes accustomed' invoke the legitimising precedence of the past. The coronation is thus represented as the site where these combined elements converge to establish the new king, and it is within this intricate convergence that the ceremony's legitimising power resides.

The coronation of Henry VIII is often glossed over in conventional histories of his reign, despatched in a few lines with minimal description.[27] In this, these histories follow many chroniclers. Charles Wriothesley, for example, records that 'in June followinge the king was married to Queene Katherin, late wife of his brother Prince Arthure, and were both crowned

on Midsommer day'.[28] Similarly, Edward Hall records how Henry and Katherine were anointed and crowned 'accordyng to the sacred observaunce, and auncient custome . . . by the Archebusshop of Cantorbury' and the Venetian ambassador reported that 'the new King was crowned with the usual ceremonies'.[29] Even Sydney Anglo's work proceeds swiftly to focus on the military prowess of the tournaments and the opulence of future diplomatic displays such as the Field of Cloth of Gold of 1520 to fit his thesis of Henry's 'policy of deliberate ostentation'.[30] Jennifer Loach, on the other hand, has studied Henry VIII's coronation in more detail and argues for the important reciprocal function of ceremonial and the material and economic benefits for nobility and city alike.[31] Certainly, as has been noted, Henry's legitimacy was not in dispute and thus the political context of his accession was not unduly strained. But his coronation ratified Henry VII's act for the establishment of the crown which decreed that 'the inheritance of the crown of this realme of England' should be passed to 'the heires of his bodie lawfullie coming, perpetuallie, with the grace of God so to indure, and in none other'.[32] Henry VIII's coronation thus emphasised the legitimacy of his birth and of divine right. The fact that he married and was crowned with Katherine of Aragon was subsequently to place these principles of monarchical legitimacy under intense scrutiny. When, in 1533, Henry divorced Katherine and crowned Anne Boleyn, when he revised his coronation oath and commissioned a new coronation painting for the palace at Whitehall, what was the ceremony that he recalled? What were the 'usual ceremonies' of his coronation?

A MEDIEVAL TEXT

The 'usual ceremonies' of Henry VIII's and Katherine of Aragon's coronation on 24 June 1509 are those specified in the *Liber Regalis*, the bound order of service kept at Westminster Abbey along with the coronation regalia. It specifies the rites for the crowning of English kings and queen consorts, but not for queens regnant, from the late fourteenth century up to the coronation of James II in 1685.[33] The logic of all the Tudor coronations is embedded in the history of this text.

The Latin rubrics, prayers and anthems that constitute the coronation service and are contained in the *Liber Regalis* were probably first used in a truncated form in the early fourteenth century, for Edward II's coronation in 1308. This coronation order is available via several manuscript versions and itself grew out of various English coronation orders transmitted through 'ordos' found in liturgical manuscripts, the earliest of which dates

from the ninth century.[34] Prior to 1308 and the *Liber Regalis*, there are three main versions or recensions of the English coronation order.[35] The *Liber Regalis* constitutes a fourth recension but was probably not expanded and written for a specific coronation. Indeed, the exact date of its composition is unknown. While its order of service is similar to that contained in what is known as the Litlyngton ordo, a missal made for Abbot Nicholas Litlyngton of Westminster Abbey in 1383–4, the *Liber Regalis* itself is probably closer to 1390.[36] The book consists of thirty-four leaves of thick vellum and details the order of service for the coronation of a king, the coronation of a king and queen, a queen consort, and the funeral of a king. The theory of the king's two bodies is bound in this book of kings: the king persists through coronation, funeral and coronation again. Each order of service is prefaced by a relevant general illustration.[37] The *Liber Regalis* was only first translated and delivered in English for James I's coronation in 1603.[38] The Latin service stipulated in the fourteenth-century *Liber Regalis* thus spanned three centuries and comprises the foundations for the order of service for every Tudor coronation.

The *Liber Regalis* not only contains the liturgy the clergy should follow, but also describes the correct form of the entire coronation ceremonies, from the procedure the king should follow the night before to instructions for the preparation of the 'stage' in the Abbey, erected before the high altar: 'there is to be prepared a stage somewhat raised between the high altar and the choir'. The text begins emphatically, seemingly leaving no room for flexibility or adaptation: 'This is the order according to which a king must be crowned and anointed'.[39] The *Liber Regalis*, too, is not restricted to the day of the coronation, but, as well as including the liturgy for the funeral of the deceased monarch, it stresses the necessity of the new monarch's procession through London, bareheaded, on the eve of the coronation. The public coronation entry is inextricable from the private religious service, and is integral, it is implied, to the making of the new king: 'Now the king on the day before his coronation shall ride bareheaded from the Tower of London through the city to his royal palace at Westminster in suitable apparel offering himself to be seen by the people who meet him.'[40] The *Liber Regalis* is more than a prompt book for the key players: it articulates an agreement between Church and crown that was intended to last. The language with which a king – and a queen – was anointed and adorned with the regalia is frozen into text, and thus the meaning of the ceremony is similarly fixed. The words of the Recognition, the king's oath and pardon, the bishops' homage and noblemen's fealty are stipulated. The book itself, along with the regalia, belonged to and was

held at Westminster Abbey. It thus almost constituted part of the regalia. But whether or not it appeared or was actually used during the service cannot be ascertained. Indeed, despite the rarity and beauty of the *Liber Regalis*, its existence cannot guarantee that its decreed order was followed to the letter at every coronation. Furthermore, as Paul Binski has shown, other fourteenth-century manuscripts were also held at Westminster Abbey that contained related but variant coronation orders.[41] In the *Liber Regalis* itself there are some marginal notes that have been attributed to William Cecil and Archbishop Richard Bancroft.[42] The seemingly codified 'order according to which a king must be crowned' was, then, open to variation and adaptation. Indeed, as these marginal notes would indicate, the coronation did not become a redundant or neglected ceremony through Reformation, but a ceremony whose grounding in precedence but ability to be interpreted and reinterpreted would become its defining features.

For a more accurate picture of an individual coronation, we need to turn to other texts: specific manuscript orders known as 'Devices', or 'Little Devices'.[43] The order of service enshrined in the *Liber Regalis* provides a base script, but a Device tailored the service for the individual monarch and his consort, if relevant, and for the moment in the liturgical year. Henry VIII was crowned on Midsummer's Day and, according to the *Liber Regalis*, the appropriate office of mass should therefore be sung.[44] The Devices detail the order of the pre-coronation procession, the monarch's dress and the names of the clergy and nobility who would play key parts in the ceremony, therefore indicating the profile of the new regime. Each Device was copied from a previous Device by heralds, and was probably intended to be submitted to the king for approval, and to then serve as scripts for those participating in the ceremony. Often, several copies of a Device exist, with minor variations and variable dates, suggesting that they were not only copied for a particular coronation but for antiquarian interests. One of the extant manuscript Devices for Henry VII's coronation in 1485 was written over a Device prepared for Richard III. At the moment when the archbishop shows the king to the four sides of the church for the Recognition, Richard's name is struck through and 'Henry' inserted above. This Device also assumes that the queen consort was to be crowned, but Elizabeth of York, Henry VII's wife, was not crowned until November 1487, two years after Henry.[45] Therefore, this Device probably represents an early version of the order for Henry VII that was subsequently updated. But the substitution of Henry's name for Richard's indicates the commitment to precedence. The legitimacy of

Henry VII's coronation derives in part from its likeness to Richard's – hence the deposed king's name can be struck out and replaced by the new, legitimate one. At the same time, however, the Devices also indicate the opportunity for alteration and inconsistency, and highlight the extent to which our knowledge of coronations rests precariously on the existence of and variations between these texts. Henry VIII's Device, 'The coronacion of kyng henry the viiith', bears a close resemblance to the extant Devices for Henry VII's coronation. It is not original, but a copy, written in a careful and professional hand.[46] Establishing the form of Henry VIII's coronation necessitates piecing together the text of his Little Device, the *Liber Regalis*, and chronicle accounts.[47]

'THE MANER AND ORDRE OF THE CORONACION': 24 JUNE 1509

Henry VIII's Device opens by emphasising Henry's hereditary right to the throne and, at the same time, invokes the approval and consent of the three estates of the realm. The language echoes Edward Hall's in his report of Henry VII's accession, where divine right and popular consent are uttered in the same breath; indeed the former is only put into motion by the latter:

> Here foloweth a devyse for the maner and ordre of the Coronacion of the mooste high excellent and christian prince kyng henry the viiith rightfull and undoubted enheritour of the Corone of England and of Ffrance with all their appurtenunces which is only by the hoole assent and consent of all and every of the thre estates of this his Reame. (fol. 90r)

The conflicting notions of popular election and irrefutable divine writ are immediately interconnected. The *Liber Regalis* refers to the service as the 'consecration and election of the new king', but defines this 'election' as divine: 'Now the said prince on the night before the day of his coronation shall give himself up to heavenly contemplation and to prayer, meditating to what a high place he has been called, and how he through whom kings reign has appointed him.'[48] This establishes the king as king by divine ordinance. But this tension between the two legitimising claims runs throughout the service, as shall be shown.

The day of Henry VIII's coronation – 24 June 1509 – began at six o'clock in the morning in Westminster Hall. Henry, in the presence of his nobility all dressed 'in their robes' (fol. 92v) sat 'under cloth of estate in

the marble cheyer . . . as it apperteyneth' (fol. 92v), known as the King's Bench. He was dressed in crimson velvet and silk parliamentary robes, furred with miniver and ermine, and with a crimson cap of estate on his head. Katherine of Aragon, also dressed in crimson robes, sat beside him, on a slightly lower throne, wearing 'on her bare hed a riche cercle of golde' and her 'heare feyr liyng aboute her shuldres' (fol. 93r), a crucial, if ironic, symbol of her future fertility and a requirement from the *Liber Regalis*: 'her hair must be decently let down on her shoulders'.[49] From Westminster Hall to the pulpit in the Abbey, the route was covered with blue ray cloth, upon which the king and queen processed, unshod. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York – William Warham and Christopher Bainbridge – were dressed in pontificals, as for mass. The Abbot of Westminster had brought the regalia from the Abbey to be carried in the procession to the altar, where it would stay prior to the investiture part of the ceremony. The king's coronation regalia, claimed to belong to the patron saint of kingship, Edward the Confessor, consisted of St Edward's stone chalice, paten, staff and crown, the sceptre with the cross (later known as the orb), the rod with the dove, three swords and the spurs. Katherine's regalia consisted of a crown, a 'septre of golde with a dove in the top' and a 'rodde of ivere having also a dove in the top' (fol. 93v).[50] In the procession to the Abbey, Archbishop Warham carried the ancient stone chalice before Henry who was supported by the Bishop of Exeter to his right and the Bishop of Ely to his left. The Barons of the Cinque Ports held up a gold canopy over Henry during the entire procession, 'wheresoever the king goo' (fol. 93r). Ahead of the Archbishop of Canterbury was the Duke of Buckingham, Edward Stafford, bearing St Edward's Crown as lord high steward of the coronation (a great privilege) and, on Buckingham's right, the Earl of Surrey (Thomas Howard) bearing the sceptre and, on Buckingham's left, the Earl of Arundel (William Fitzalan) bearing the rod. Before him the Earl of Essex (Henry Bourchier) 'bering the king's swerde in a scabarde' (fol. 93v) and 'iii Erles going together': the Earl of Shrewsbury (George Talbot) bearing Curtana, the sword of mercy, the Earl of Kent (Richard Grey) a second naked sword and the Earl of Devon (Henry Courtenay) a third naked sword. The procession was fronted by the newly appointed Knights of the Bath and 'other lordes Barones and Officers' (fol. 93v). The queen followed with her train, 'under a sele of Bawdekyn' (fol. 93v).

The sacred body of the monarch was made apparent outside of and prior to the service. A function of the coronation is to render the invisible visible, to make outward appearances reflect inward reality, and this begins

in Westminster Hall. The *Liber Regalis* states how the king is raised to the marble seat 'with all gentleness and reverence, after having first bathed as is the custom'. This bathing is 'to be observed in every way, that, as the prince's body glistens by the actual washing and the beauty of the vestments, so his soul may shine by true and previous confession and penitence'.[51] Before he processed to the Abbey, Henry VIII was censed and the cloth on which he walked cut up and distributed to the poor – expensive cloth and sacred relic in one. As is reported in Holinshed, 'the which cloth was cut and spoiled by the rude and common people, immediatlie after their repaire into the abbaie'.[52] In this context, the clothes which are described with such care and in such detail in the Device, do not appear ostentatious, superfluous or only as indicators of wealth and therefore power. Instead, the clothes acquire a more sacred and less material symbolic purpose: they are to reflect the truth of the king's inner legitimacy. While Henry VIII's Device serves as a vivid visual record of dress, the details of the swathes of crimson satin, velvet, gold braid and fur-lined capes also serve as an index of monarchical legitimacy through their correctness. These are Henry's robes that he wore to the Abbey:

> Firste with two shirtes that oon of lawne that other of crymesyn . . . and lased with amelettes of silver and gilte . . . A payer of hosen of Crymesyn sarsonet vampeye and all, a coote of crymsyn saten largely opened as the shirtes . . . his hosen shall be laced with riband of silke. A Surcote closed furred with menyver pur. Whereof the Colar handes and the Speres shall be garnisshed with ryband of golde, a hoode of estate furred with menyver pur and purfilled with Ermyne. A grete mantell of Crymesyn Saten furred also with menyver pur with a greate lace of Silk. With ii tarselles also in colour Crymesyn. A littil cappe of estate of crymesyn Saten, ermyned and garnysshed with rybande of golde. (fol. 92v)

Similarly, the objects of the regalia embody sacred kingship through recalling St Edward, and via their prominence in the procession. The most important object is St Edward's chalice, and this is carried by the most important prelate, the Archbishop of Canterbury, preceded by St Edward's Crown borne by the Duke of Buckingham. The objects are carried aloft by their bearers, and the bearers' position in the hierarchy is indicated by the part of the regalia that they carry. Indeed, the Device prioritises the objects of the regalia over the noblemen. The Earl of Kent is described as being 'uppon the right hande of the seid swerde [Curtana]' (fol. 93v) rather than on the right hand of the Earl of Shrewsbury and on 'the right hande of the Corone' is the Earl of Surrey 'bering the kings

Septre ...' (fol. 93v). The authenticity of the heritage of St Edward's regalia – which the king only wears at coronation, having another set of regalia in store in the Jewel House – is doubtful but, nonetheless, it is the notion of the regalia's connection with the past and the role that each piece will fulfil in the forthcoming sacred service that the language of the Device draws attention to.

Once inside the Abbey, the coronation begins with the Recognition, a formula that echoes the days of elective monarchy. Henry and Katherine were led up to the stage that had been built before the altar and upon which two thrones had been placed, covered with 'cloth of golde and quysshynes of the same' (fol. 94r). Archbishop Warham showed Henry to the four sides of the Abbey. The wording of the Recognition entwines Henry's status as 'Elect chosen and required by all the thre estates' with his also being the 'undoubted Enheritour by the lawes of god and man':

> the Cardinall as Archbisshop of Caunterbury shewing the king to the people at the iiii partes of the seid pulpyt shall seye in this wyse Sires here present henry rightfull and undoubted Enheritour by the lawes of god and man to the Coronne and royall dignitie of Englande. With all thinges therunto annexed and apperteynyng, Elect chosen and required by all the thre estates of this lande to take uppon him the seid Coronne and royall dignitee. Whereuppon ye shall understande that this daye is prefixed and appoynted by all the pyeres of this lande for the Consecracion enunction & coronacion of the seid mooste excellent prince henry. Will ye here at this tyme and geve your wills and assents to the same Consecracion enunction and Coronacion. Wherunto the people shall sey with a grete voyce, ye, ye, ye. So be it kyng henry, kyng henry. (fol. 94r)

The wording hovers between positing the sovereign as the people's elect and as God's chosen. If Henry is first the undoubted inheritor, this at least has to be consented to by the congregation in the Abbey, made up of the clergy, nobility, royal household and foreign ambassadors and visitors. The Recognition is, to borrow Paul Strohm's term for elements of Richard II's coronation, a redundant remnant of the days of elective monarchy: it does not actually do what it says it does.[53] The wording of the Recognition moves from 'prince henry' to 'kyng henry, kyng henry', but Henry is not 'Elect chosen and required' and thus made king through Recognition. He is already king through royal blood and lawful succession. In 1485, the words of the Recognition 'elect chosen and required' would have carried a great deal of power; in 1509 it was the declaration of Henry as 'rightfull and undoubted Enheritour by the lawes of god' that mattered. The *Liber Regalis*

turns election into custom with the following: 'the Bishop addresses the people, who give their consent, as is customary'.[54] Furthermore, the service is referred to in the Recognition as the 'Consecracion enunction and coronacion': the undoubted heir and the people's elect will nonetheless be made sacred (consecrated) through unction and crowning.

The coronation service is encased in the office of mass. After the Recognition, the *Liber Regalis* specifies that the bishop celebrating the mass should dress himself for mass before the high altar, and the king should be brought before the altar where he offers a pall and a pound of gold before lying prostrate upon the floor before the altar, 'grovelyng' as the Device specifies for Henry (fol. 94v) in reverence and humility to God. The prayer that is said over the king is 'Deus humilium', which appeals to the descent of God's grace (fol. 94v).[55] This prepares the king for the sermon. Whether a sermon was delivered and by whom is not known for Henry's coronation; either it was omitted or not reported. The Device simply stipulates that the archbishop 'may at his pleasur comaunde som short sermon to be seyde' (fol. 94v) by another bishop. The oath-taking, sworn upon the sacrament on the altar, follows the sermon, 'yf any such be' (fol. 94v). The placing of the oath in the order of the service is indicative: not until the monarch has sworn on the sacrament can or will he be anointed king. The oath is followed by the pardon, which is the king's promise to the Church. Henry VIII's Device specifies that Henry is to declare that 'with good will and devoute soule I promitte and perfitely graunte that to you and every of you and to all the Churches to you comitted I shall kepe the privileges of the lawe of Canon and of holy Church', sworn upon 'these holy Evangelistes by me bodily towched uppon this hooly awter' (fol. 95r). The placing of the oath and pardon prior to the anointing brings the latter within the power of the clergy, and makes it contingent and therefore a privilege, a gift, rather than an irrefutable right of the king's. The first English coronation order, from the ninth century, had designated the oath-taking for the end of the service; thus the king swore as an anointed king.[56] To move the oath to the beginning of the service makes the rites that follow contingent upon the king's promises; he is anointed because he has promised, not because he is already king.

The oath that Henry VIII swore dated from the reign of Edward I and was first used at Edward II's coronation.[57] The oath defines, and limits, the king's powers in relation to past and present laws, and his power over laws that shall be made subsequently during his reign. It is the contract between king and clergy, king and people, king and law, and ties him to promises for which he can subsequently be held accountable. Richard II and Charles I

were both found guilty of reneging on their coronation promises.[58] The monarchical power as defined by the oath provides the key to understanding the language employed during the rest of the ceremony: the oath articulates the nature of the pact between God, king, Church, people and law that the subsequent gestures and prayers confer and reiterate. The coronation oath sworn by Henry, and documented in the Device, placed Henry under the law. Executed in a question and answer format, it bound him to

> graunte and kepe to the people of England the lawes and the Custumes to theym as of olde tyme rightfull and devoute kings graunted, and the same ratefye and confyne by your othe, and the spirituall lawes Custumes and libertees graunted to the Clergye & people by your noble predecessors and glorious Kyng Seint Edward. (fol. 94v)

Henry further promised 'hoole peace and goodely concorde', 'equall and rightfull Justice ... and Jugementes and discrecion with mercy and trouthe'. Finally he was asked to 'graunte the rightfull lawes and Custumes to be holden and promitte ye after your strength and power such lawes as to the honor of god shall be chosen by your people by you to be strengthed and defended' (fol. 95r). It is this latter that ties the king to observing laws and customs that 'shall be' made, as well as those 'of olde tyme'. Henry was placed, by this wording, below Parliament and its law-making capacities. He promised to strengthen and defend laws that his people had already made and will make. It was precisely this dynamic that Henry attempted to reverse when he revised his coronation oath twenty years later, as the next chapter discusses.

However, when the anointing begins, the logic of the ceremony swerves to locate Henry's power as granted from God and identifiable with the grace of God transferred to the king via the act of anointing. Henry lay prostrate ('grovelyng', fol. 95v) before the altar while the choir sang 'Veni Creator Spiritus', an anthem sung at the ordination of priests and consecration of bishops since the eleventh century, and at coronations since 1307, paralleling the kingly and ecclesiastical offices and suggestive of sacerdotal powers. Evidence suggests that 'Veni Creator Spiritus', 'Come, Holy Ghost', was also sung at Whitsuntide in the tenth century, which stresses this anthem's expression of the tangibility of the descent of the Holy Spirit.[59] This anthem, and the prayers that enclose it in the coronation service, repeatedly emphasise the sevenfold gifts of grace imparted by God via unction. These sevenfold gifts are wisdom, understanding, counsel, strength, cunning, pity, fear, and they constitute the gifts that the king

is to rule by: 'Governe ye hereby' is the marginal note next to the list of the seven gifts in an early English primer.[60] The subsequent prayers uttered by the Archbishop of Canterbury and that precede the actual act of unction echo the choir's anthem in their allusions to the descent of the Holy Spirit, the 'finger of god's hand', and the granting of 'gratie superne', 'supernal grace'.[61] The subsequent prayers 'Omnipotens sempiterne', 'Benedic domine', 'Deus ineffabilis' and 'Deus qui populis' similarly refer to the gifts of grace and invoke the Biblical precedents of Abraham, Moses, Joshua, Solomon and David. The language of the prayers appeals to the tangibility of grace in the efficacy of the oil. Henry is anointed king by God, infused with his grace and equated with his anointed Biblical forefathers. It is the oil that makes priests and kings and it is through anointing – 'per hanc olei unctionem'[62] – that Henry is blessed and made legitimate. In the 1603 translation of the *Liber Regalis*, the words 'by the Anointing of this oile' were struck out.[63]

The prominence of the anointing and its role in establishing Henry as king in his coronation liturgy is repeated again as the anointing begins – on the palms of the king's hands, as Samuel anointed David. The anthem 'Zadok the Priest' follows, invoking the precedent of Zadok and Nathan the prophet's anointing of Solomon as king.[64] After the anointing of his hands, Henry, kneeling before Archbishop Warham, was anointed on his breast, back, shoulders, elbows and head. He had previously taken off his crimson parliamentary robes so that he was clothed in only two shirts, a crimson one over a linen one, both of which were unlaced at the chest, shoulders and elbows. He was anointed twice on his head in the shape of a cross, the first with holy oil, the second time with the more special chrism, usually reserved for the anointing of bishops. The *Liber Regalis* stipulates that 'the sacrist is to provide that the phials for the oil and for the chrism be ready, of which one is to be gilt and to contain the holy chrism. But the other is to be only of silver, and to contain only the holy oil.'[65] Reverence for the oil and the preservation of its sanctifying powers are indicated by the linen gloves that were put on Henry's hands and the coif (an ecclesiastical cap) placed on his head, to remain there for a further eight days until a special mass sanctioned its removal:

And it is to be remembred that the Abbot of Westminster after the kings enunction shall dry all the places of his body wher he was annoynted with som coton or som lynnen cloth, which is to be brent, and furthwith close and lace ageyne the openyngs of the kyngs seid shirtes and coote puttyng on the kyngs handes a peyr of lynnen gloves . . . And he shall put upon the kings hed a coyfe . . . whiche shall

contynuelly abyde on the kings hed to the viiith daye next folowing at whiche viii dayes after a solempne masse seyd by a Bisshop before the king. (fol. 96r)

The prayer following completion of the anointing stresses Henry's physical transformation, brought about by the oil, into king and a 'typus Christi' – he will reign in heaven as he has reigned on earth. This is how the prayer 'Deus dei filius' was translated in 1603:

God the sonne of god Christ Jesus our Lord which is annointed of his ffather with the oile of gladnesse above his fellowes, hee by his holy annoynting power downe uppon thy head, the blessing of the holy ghooste, and make it enter into the bowells of thy harte, so that by this visible guifte thow maiest receave invisible grace, and having justly executed thy temporall Kingdome, thow maiest raigne with him eternally, Who onely beeing without synne, doth Live in glorie with god and the ffather and the holie ghooste.[66]

The verb in the Latin rendered in the above by 'make it enter into the bowells of thy harte' is 'penetrare', translated as to 'perce' (pierce) in Thomas Elyot's 1538 Dictionary.[67] And the gift is 'visibili et tractabili', 'visible and tangible', which is altogether more insistent on the palpability and materiality of the oil. The oil is not invoked as a symbol of God's grace, it *is* God's grace in material form.

Further physical transformation of the body of the king is invoked through the visible dressing of the king in his coronation robes. Seated in front of the altar, Henry was built up layer by layer, object by object, before the congregation's eyes. He was clothed in a 'colobium sindonis', a tunic similar to the dalmatic worn by deacons, and occasionally bishops. The coronation robes, blessed by the archbishop, were placed on top of this ecclesiastical garment – the 'long cote to the heles wrought before and behynde with grete ymages of golde' (fol. 96r) – and hose, sandals and spurs were brought from the altar. Each garment and piece of regalia has an ascribed function, articulated by the archbishop. Following the spurs, the king's sword was blessed and consecrated for the defence of the Church, then the armill, 'in maner of a Stole wovyn with golde and sette with precious Stones' (fol. 96v), of sincerity and wisdom – 'Accipe armillas sinceritatis et sapientie' – followed by the mantle or pall, representative of the earthly monarchical power derived from God.[68] St Edward's crown was then censed, blessed and consecrated and placed on Henry's head:

Heruppon the Cardinall shall blesse the Coronne of Seint Edward sette on the high aultar, seying this Orison, 'Deus tuorum'. And first casting holy watre and

sensyng the same, shall sett the seid Corone uppon the kings hed, then sittyng in his Chayer before the high aulter, the seid Cardinall seying thise wordes, 'Coronet te Deus'. (fol. 96v)

As the prayer 'Coronet te deus corona glorie' makes clear, it is God who crowns the king.[69] The symbolism is precise; there is a direct correlation between inner and outer: the jewelled crown symbolises the 'manifold graces' that Henry has been granted.[70] The ring 'with a rubye' and sign of the faith is then blessed and consecrated, and 'to be sette on the iiiith finger of the right hande' (fol. 96v). The language accompanying the giving of the ring alludes to the conferral of sacerdotal powers, beseeching that whatever the king sanctifies and blesses may also be holy and blessed: 'quecunque benedixerit spirituali benedictione benedicantur'.[71] Henry then offered the sword with which he was girded 'to god and the aulter', only to take it back again 'in token that his strength & power shulde first come from god and holy Church' (fol. 97r), before passing it back to the Earl of Essex. Next he was invested with the 'Septr of golde with the dove in the top' in his right hand, and the 'golden rodde with the crosse in the top' in his left (fol. 97r), symbols of his regal office. Still wearing St Edward's crown, and bearing the sceptre and rod, Henry was seated again on his throne on the erected stage, and the Archbishop of Canterbury began the 'Te Deum laudamus', praising God for the king.

The undressing of the king, the anointing of his bare exposed flesh and the subsequent reclothing of him play out a particular logic and process of king-making in the ceremony. He is unmade and rebuilt again. It is the anointing that subsequently enables the dressing in the robes, particularly the 'colobium sindonis', the crowning and the bestowal of the rest of the regalia. In this way, the office of kingship is synonymous with and inextricable from the robes and the regalia: the blessing of each garment and object and the accompanying consecratory prayers transfer the gifts and virtues of kingly governance, as if held in their very fabric. The language does not express the bestowal of royal clothes as symbols of kingly virtues already possessed, but bestows them as consecrated objects, as sacred embodiments of those virtues. Similarly, the objects of the regalia are inextricable from the rights of the office that they symbolise: they constitute those very rights. The king is forever identifiable with coronation. Significantly, the *Liber Regalis* stipulates that he is also to be buried in a set of coronation robes.[72]

The existence of Henry VIII's Little Device, its careful, thorough prose and wealth of detail are indicative of a sincere commitment to the

coronation ceremony, and the need for correct protocol to be observed from one coronation to the next, for precedent to be followed. Beneath the layers of silk and velvet and the endless repetition of certain details that characterises the Device – such as Katherine's 'white damaske Cloth of golde', reference to which is repeated five times in as many lines (fol. 91v) – is the notion that the legitimacy of the ceremony, and therefore of the kingship that it bestows, may be threatened if certain details are omitted, if the clothing is not as it should be, if the wrong people play the wrong parts or the objects of the regalia are not handled correctly. The purpose and legitimising power of the ceremony reside in faithful observance. The Device instructs that the Abbot of Westminster should be always at the king's side 'for his informacion in such thynges as concerneth the Solempnitee of his Coronacion' (fol. 94r). Similarly, the *Liber Regalis* stipulates that the abbot 'must be always at hand at the king's side to instruct the king in matters touching the solemnity of coronation, so that everything may be done aright'.[73] The word 'solemnity' has a particular meaning in the sixteenth century. It is synonymous with ceremony, denoting correct observance and regularity of performance rather than sobriety of mood.[74] Indeed, the Latin 'solemne' is translated by Elyot in 1538 as 'accustomed'.[75] Thus, the accounts of Henry's coronation – such as Hall's 'accordyng to the sacred observaunce, and auncient custome' and the Venetian ambassador's 'usual ceremonies'[76] – constitute more than a convenient shorthand way of describing the lengthy ceremonies; they are signalling the legitimacy of the ceremony, and thus of the king. The legitimacy implicit in correct protocol is also suggested by the codification of royal ceremony laid out in what is known as the 'Ryalle Booke'.[77] This document includes brief orders for the coronation of a king, the procession and coronation of a queen consort, the christening of a prince, the creation of the Prince of Wales, the funeral rites, among other household ceremonies such as the making of the king's bed. Dated to the Lancastrian period, the 'Ryalle Booke' was copied and reissued in both Henry VII's and Henry VIII's reigns, thus suggesting the endurance and continuity of ceremonies through the Lancastrian, Yorkist and Tudor courts, and the reliance on their transmission via text.[78]

The anointing and investiture of the king are completed by the prayer 'Sta et retine', translated in 1603 as 'Stand and hould faste'.[79] This prayer, which echoes the king's oath sworn before the anointing, limits and defines the king's position in the hierarchy relative to the Church. 'Sta et retine' refers to the monarchical authority granted by God, but emphasises the clergy's mediating role in transferring this authority. The prayer,

addressed to the king, reminds him that the clergy are 'the mediator of god and man' ('mediator dei et hominum') and that it is they that have established the king on his throne. Moreover, they have established him as the mediator between 'cleri et plebis', between the clergy and the laity.[80] This final and important prayer negotiates the logic of the anointing by reiterating the king's position relative to and contract with the clergy and the people. In doing so, it brings the end of the anointing and investiture back round to the beginning of the service.

As the Device stipulates, once 'Sta et retine' has been said, the clergy and peers 'shall make fealtre and homage' to the king and 'shall offre them self to susteyne defende and supporte the kyng and his Corone' (fol. 97v). This has a visual counterpart. The Device continues: 'yf nede be, the seid Bisshoppes of Excetor & [blank] may sette their handes to the seid Crowne in helpyng hym to bere the same, and in like Wyse two of the grettest lordes of his bloode bering the septre and the rodde' (fol. 97v). After this, Katherine of Aragon was anointed, but in two places only, 'first in the forehed with holie oyle' and secondly 'with the same oyle in her brest' (fol. 97v). Like Henry, she was invested with a ring, 'the Quenes corone', and sceptre and rod. 'Veni Creator Spiritus' was also sung, but the prayers and blessings from the *Liber Regalis* are shorter, and adapted. The *Liber Regalis* specifies that, at the anointing, the archbishop simply utters 'In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti' and, with the bestowing of the regalia, 'Accipe anulum', 'Accipe coronam'.[81]

After both Henry and Katherine were anointed and crowned, the ceremony closed with the celebration of mass, encasing the coronation in the logic of the eucharist: the consecration of the monarch and his regalia pre-empt the consecration – and transformation – of the bread and wine. While the choir sang the Creed, the 'boke of the Gospell' was brought before the king and queen 'for to kysse' (fol. 98r). Henry and Katherine took communion (bread only) in privacy behind a silk cloth. The Device stipulates:

> And after the Cardynall hath commoned his self, he having betwene his handes the same Chalice wheruppon the holy sacrament shall be leyed, shall turne hym self unto the king and the Quene. And theye lying prostrate before hym shall sey their Confiteor . . . that done the king and the quene shall sumwhat aryse knelyng and with grete humylitee and devocion receyve the Sacrament by the handes of the seid Cardynall, two the grettest estates then present holding before the kyng and the Quene a longe towell of Silke. This so done, the kinge and the Quene shall stande up, and take wyne of the above . . . chalice by the handes of the abbot of Westminster. (fol. 99r)

The office of mass would, according to the requirements of the *Liber Regalis*, have followed the office appropriate for 24 June – the Feast of the Nativity of St John the Baptist. Thus, this feast's association with the descent of the Holy Spirit and the coming of Christ would reflect on the anointing and crowning of Henry, reinforcing the gift of grace and the idea of Henry as Christ-like. After mass, Henry and Katherine were led to St Edward's Shrine, situated behind the high altar, where they were disrobed, the clothes and regalia laid on the shrine's altar, and offered back to God: 'pece by pece deliver theym to the Abbot of Westminster, the same by hym to be layed uppon the seid Awlter' (fol. 99v). Only the sceptre and rod are borne by the king out of the Abbey. For the recession, Henry and Katherine were dressed in purple imperial robes and crowned in closed, imperial crowns. At Henry's death, the state imperial crown consisted of five crosses and five fleurs-de-lis, each decorated with images of Christ, the Virgin and St George.[82] As the next chapter shows, the significance and iconography of the imperial crown grew during Henry VIII's reign and would feature prominently in the coronation procession of Anne Boleyn in 1533.

The form of the coronation service which emerges from piecing together Henry VIII's Device and the rubrics and prayers from the *Liber Regalis* is a composite one, drawing together a number of strands that contribute to the office of kingship, and thus the function of the ceremony. The kernel of the ceremony – the anointing and investiture – expresses the making of the king and the imparting of God's grace, turning him into the 'Lord's Anointed' – but the shell around this evocative and intensely visual part of the ceremony serves to contain and limit the powers conferred. The Recognition recalls elements of election, the oath binds the monarch to the laws of the Church and of his people, and the final prayer 'Sta et retine' places the king as second to the clergy, not to God. The coronation service thus has an important contractual nature. Owing to this, the nature of the power being brokered during the ceremony, and the interpretation of the language and symbols that are doing the brokering, could be altered. In certain contexts certain elements could, either consciously or unwittingly, be emphasised or played down. As a form, the coronation ceremony has the capacity for subtle alteration, different interpretations and changes of emphasis, while still remaining vital for the legitimisation of power. In addition, commentaries, accounts and representations of a coronation – including the Devices – may select to emphasise one or more of its constituent parts, and for any variety of reasons.

BEYOND THE CEREMONY

The coronation Devices are state documents and their appearance at the end of the fifteenth century indicates an anxious desire on the part of the regime concerning protocol and its documentation. The Devices are also suggestive of the coronation's growth out of the confines and control of the Abbey and the increased importance attached to the procession through London. Almost half of Henry VIII's Device is devoted to describing the form for the day before the coronation, when the king creates 'the knyghtes of the Bath after the forme of the Auncient Custume of kyngs of England' (fol. 90v) and then processes, with Katherine of Aragon, from the Tower of London to Westminster Hall through the city of London. According to the Device, the 'Serymonyes of the Solempnitee' of the coronation are not reserved for the church service alone but are 'departed into two dayes that is to wite the day next before the Coronacion whiche is called the even of the Vigill of the Coronacion and the self day of Coronacion' (fol. 90v). Furthermore, for Henry VIII's coronation, as Hall records, the coronation was followed by the 'high and long solempnitie' of the banquet in Westminster Hall, followed by jousts, tournaments and pageant entertainments.[83] The following account from Hall invokes the imperial crown of coronation topping the pageant castle and comments on the genealogical iconography of the ceremonial moment through the blending of Henry and Katherine's emblems, the rose and the pomegranate:

> For the more honor, and ennoblyng of this triumphaunt Coronacion, there were prepared, both Justes and Turneis, to be dooen in the Palaice of Westminster, where, for the kynges grace, and the Quene, was framed a faire house, covered with Tapisstrie, and hanged with riche clothes of Arrais, and in thesaied Palaice, was made a curious Fountain, and over it a Castle: on the toppe thereof, a greate Croune Emperiall, all the imbattelyng with Roses, and Pomegranetes gilded: and under and aboute thesaied Castle, a curious Vine, the leaves and grapes thereof, gilded with fine Golde, the walles of the same Castle coloured, White and Grene losengis. And in every losenge, either a Rose or a Pomegranet, or a Sheffe of Arrowes, or els H and K gilded with fine Gold, with certain Arches or Turrettes gilded, to support thesame Castle . . . Then folowed a devise, (caried by strength of menne, and other provision) framed like a Castle, or a Turret, wrought with fine clothe of Gold: the toppe wherof, was spred with Roses and Pomegranates, hangyng doune on every said, of thesaied devise, wherein was a Lady, bearyng a shilde of Christall named Pallas.[84]

Preparations for and accounts of the pre-coronation procession serve as a prism through which various elements of coronation are refracted. Aspects

of the sacred spill out on to the streets of London for the procession of Henry and Katherine from the Tower to Westminster. As Gordon Kipling has described, the medieval entry procession of the king is a type of *adventus*: London is transformed into a New Jerusalem that welcomes the Christ-like king: 'The very city is transformed: angels and spirits appear among the earthly citizens; they cense the procession, spread the streets with flowers, sing psalms, and fill the air with musical harmonies. Even as angels become citizens, so citizens become angelic.'[85] The sacramental logic and miracle of transformation borne out by the coronation ceremony are anticipated here. As the stipulation in the *Liber Regalis* suggests, the king needs to be seen by the people and publicly acclaimed. But this civic acclamation celebrates the divinity of the king. Edward Hall describes Henry VIII's procession as a sacred event:

And the morowe folowyng, beyng Saterdaie, the xxiii day of the said monethe, his grace with the Quene, departed from the Tower, through the citie of London, against whose comyng, the streates where his grace should passe, were hanged with Tapistrie, and clothe of Arras. And the greate parte, of the Southe side of Chepe, with clothe of gold, and some parte of Cornehill also. And the streates railed and barred, on the one side, from over against Grace Churche, unto Bredstreate, in Chepeside, where every occupacion stode, in their liveries in ordre, beginnyng with base and meane occupacions, and so assendyng to the worshipp-full craftes: highest and lastly stode the Maior, with the Aldermen. The Goldsmithes stalles, unto the ende of the Olde Chaunge, beeyng replenished with Virgins in white, with braunches of white Waxe: the priestes and clerkes, in riche Copes, with Crosses and censers of silver, with censyng his grace and the quene also as they passed. The features of his body, his goodly personage, his amiable visage, princely countenaunce, with the noble qualities of his royall estate, to every man knowen nedeth no rehersall.[86]

This describes the earthly hierarchy: all the citizens are 'in their liveries in order, beginnyng with base and meane occupacions, and so assendyng', ending with the lord mayor of London and the aldermen. The heavenly creatures that mingle with the earthly are the Virgins, bearing 'braunches of white Waxe', and the clergy then cense the king and queen who pass above and beyond the observing crowds. This is a sacred procession. Henry, pointedly bareheaded in anticipation of the coronation, was 'arrayed in a doblet of Grene or White Cloth of golde saten', riding on a horse saddled 'with a Sadell of estate covered with Cloth of golde', under a 'Seale of cloth of golde Bawdekyn' (fol. 91r). Henry's sword was carried aloft before him (fol. 91v). Katherine of Aragon followed Henry, but

seated in a litter 'uppon Quysshyne of White Damaske Cloth of gold bareheded wering a rounde sercle of golde sett with perles and precious stones arrayed in a kirtell of White Damaske . . . cloth of golde' (fol. 91v). Holinshed describes her with 'hir haire hanging downe to hir backe of very great length, beautifull and goodlie to behold'.[87] There are no pageants recorded for Henry VIII's coronation procession, unlike for Katherine of Aragon's 1501 entry into London for her marriage to Arthur.[88] In 1533, the pageants devised for Anne Boleyn as she processed through London, dressed in cloth of gold, would be recorded in great detail.

The coronation banquet in Westminster Hall echoes the service through repetition of the Recognition, and the potential for the king's legitimacy to be challenged. The king's champion – an hereditary office belonging to the Manor of Scrivelsby and the Dymoke family – rides into the hall and issues a challenge to anyone who doubts the legitimacy of the newly anointed king. Of course, its position after the service shunts this office into a curiously redundant and theatrical role. But the Champion's challenge brings the sacred service into the secular space. In doing so, it establishes the coronation as an ongoing process of recognition, consent and legitimation. In 1509, the king's champion was Sir Robert Dymoke. His challenge was as follows:

> 'Sir, the place that I come from, is not materiall, nor the cause of my repaire hether, is not concernyng any matter, of any place or countrey, but onely this.' And there with all, commaunded his Heraulde to make an O yes: then saied the knight, to the kyng of armes, now shal ye here, the cause of my commyng and pretence. Then he commaunded his awne Herauld, by Proclamacion to saie: if there be any persone, of what estate or degree souer he be, that wil saie or prove that king Henry the eight, is not the rightfull enheritor, and kyng of this realme, I sir Robert Dimmoke here his Champion, offre my glove, to fight in his querell . . . After whiche severall proclamacions doen, and offers made, thesaid knight or champion, eftsones repaired to the kynges presence, demaundyng drinke, to whom the kynges grace sent a cup of gold, with wine, wherof after this knight had dronke, he demaunded the cover of thesaied cuppe, whiche, to hym was also delivered: that doen, he departed out of the halle, with thesaid cup & cover as his awne.[89]

On Henry VIII's coronation, Stephen Hawes wrote and presented *A Joyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall soverayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght*.[90] Hawes invokes Henry's divinely sanctioned power and the language of anointing. He draws a parallel between God 'alone in heven werynge crowne' (l. 29) and the

crowning of Henry and Katherine. Referring to God's 'dyvyne grace', Hawes bestows on this grace that is 'cast adowne' (ll. 35, 31) tangibility and materiality. It is 'the dewe of grace', echoing the word 'rore perfunde' (falling dew) from the prayer 'Deus ineffabilis', uttered before the unction.[91]

> Englonde be gladde / the dewe of grace is spred
> The dewe of Joy / the dewe holsome and soote
> (ll. 57–8)

This 'dewe of grace' is imparted to the new king, and emanates from him:

> Who is the floure that doth this grace dystyll
> But onely Henry the viii kynge of his name
> With golden droppes all Englonde to fulfyll
> (ll. 64–6)

At the same time, the poem stresses Henry VIII's undoubted right to rule, and thus connects the tangibility of grace with rightful inheritance. But this lineage is God's will; 'thou' in the following is God:

> Two tytles in one thou dydest well unyfye
> Whan the rede rose toke the whyte in maryage
> Reygnynge togyder ryght hygh and noblye
> From whose unyd tytyls and worthy lygnage
> Descended is by ryght excellent courage
> Kynge Henry the viii for to reygne doutles
> (ll. 36–42)

Henry is celebrated by the patronage-seeking Hawes as a legitimate and divinely ordained king and as an anointed body; he is infused with divine grace that takes on a liquid tangibility in this poem in a way that recalls the anointing from the coronation. But it is also England that is addressed in this poem, and England that is described as enabling the coronation of Henry and Katherine. Thus, the notion of popular acceptance and election appears in the celebration of Henry's kingship:

> Wherfore Englonde thou nedes not complayne
> Syth thou hast crowned openly in syght
> This kynge and quene by good true love and ryght
> (ll. 47–9)

Finally, Hawes's poem echoes the promises of coronation in its reassurance of the Church that the king is Defender of the Faith:

> Holy chirche rejoyse / with all your lybertees
> Withouten dommage / the kynge wyll ye encreace
> And be your shelde from all adversytees
> (ll. 155–7)

As a meditation on coronation, and an appeal to Henry ('Go lytell treatyse submyt the humbly / To our soverayne lorde' (ll. 204–5)) Hawes's poem responds to the concomitant, even contradictory, elements that comprise coronation. Far from being fixed or static, the coronation encompasses a contractual space where a king's power and sacredness are celebrated, created, negotiated, interpreted and limited. What emerges is a ceremony that in its very form contains tensions and contradictions, that oscillates between being a power-maker and a power-broker. It is perhaps this very uncertainty that guarantee its continued legitimacy – it could be safely altered and reinvented, as was to happen in 1533.

CHAPTER 2

'Come my love thou shalbe crowned': the drama of Anne Boleyn's coronation

The crowning of the visibly pregnant new queen, while contentious, contributed to the establishment and legitimation of the new Tudor supremacy and to constructions of imperial England. It was, in many ways, a second coronation for Henry. Shortly before the ceremony, Henry redrafted his own coronation oath – a manuscript copy of which is still extant. Contrary to expectation, perhaps, this key royal ceremony of the Reformation period did not triumphantly usher in the new religion; to argue that it did so conflates the supremacy with doctrinal reform. But neither was Anne's coronation a straightforward opportunity or excuse for Henry to promote and enforce his new supremacy. The accounts of this coronation are suggestive of a more complex and sincere belief in the necessary legitimising power of ceremony and pageantry. The day before the coronation in Westminster Abbey, Anne participated in an elaborate procession through London whose accompanying dramatic pageants constituted an important counterpart and response to the sacred rite. The contemporary descriptive account, *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne, wyfe unto the moost noble kynge Henry the viii*, published by Wynkyn de Worde, and the English and Latin pageant verses composed by Nicholas Udall and John Leland, indicate that a dynamic existed between court and city which meant that important state ceremonies were not one-way affairs, and hence presented opportunities for cultural invention and interpretation.[1]

A PROTESTANT CROWNING?

Despite its status as one of the most important ceremonies of Henry's reign, and of the Reformation, Anne's coronation and procession have received little critical attention, and even less praise.[2] When they have been discussed, the sacred ceremony is sidelined in favour of the procession pageantry, which is cited as a supreme example of Henrician pomp and

propaganda. Retha Warnicke, for example, writes that 'not only did they offer the king the opportunity to introduce his new queen officially to his subjects and to the rest of Christendom but they also gave him and his subjects a chance to display publicly their wealth, their scholarship, and their gift for ceremonial extravaganza'.[3] According to Eric Ives, however, the elaborate procession pageantry was Anne's doing and an indication of her influential role at court and participation in the 'cult of majesty' and 'image-building'. In this way, she anticipated, Ives claims, the publicity skills of her daughter.[4] Dale Hoak's work has rightly stressed the political vitality of Tudor coronations, particularly their contribution to evolving ideas of imperial, and Protestant, majesty, but he does not include Anne's coronation in his account, despite the prominence of the imperial theme in both the ceremony and the pageants.[5] Yet while Anne's coronation responds to the context of supremacy and imperial majesty, it does not link these with Protestant reform, and it is as part of the story of the Protestantisation of England that representations of Anne's coronation have been most misleading.

Henry's divorce from Katherine of Aragon, the establishment of a spiritual supremacy and future religious reform of the 1530s should not be conflated, as if each was an inevitable consequence of the other. The divorce and the break with Rome are not evidence in themselves of a rejection of the Catholic faith and a move towards Lutheranism. Henry did not divorce Katherine in order to break with Rome, and did not subsequently break with Rome to establish a new religion. The relationships between the divorce, supremacy and political and ecclesiastical revolution are messy and inconsistent.[6] While there were figures, such as Cromwell and Cranmer, who advocated the divorce and evangelical beliefs, there were also those who supported the divorce, but not the consequences of the spiritual supremacy. In 1535, Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, argued against the authority of Rome in the divorce proceedings in his *De Vera Obedientia*.[7] Gardiner did not, however, support the jurisdictional independence of the English Church. Anne's coronation is a tableau of this complexity. Thomas Cranmer anointed and crowned Anne Boleyn, but Bishops Stephen Gardiner and John Stokesley 'bare up the lappes of ye quenes robe' as she processed into Westminster Abbey. Neither Gardiner nor Stokesley, however, were to accept later doctrinal changes.[8]

In many histories of the Reformation, Anne Boleyn's accession is often perceived as pivotal through analysis of her – and her family's – evangelical sympathies.[9] Yet, despite the difficulties of ascribing beliefs and motives to

clear-cut confessional categories, equating Anne's accession with the advent of Protestantism is a historiography that began in the sixteenth century. For the imperial ambassador, Eustace Chapuys, the divorce and the break with Rome were synonymous with Lutheranism and he labelled Anne a 'Lutheran' in his reports.[10] Nicholas Sanders later effectively constructed Anne as a Protestant whore and monster in his *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism.*[11] On the other, more positive, hand, in Elizabeth's reign, William Latymer's chronicle of 1559 and John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* depict Anne as a Protestant martyr, as the pious, evangelical and godly queen.[12] John Aylmer in his *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes* explicitly connects Anne with the breach with Rome and establishment of Protestantism. He writes: 'Was not quene Anne, the mother of this blessed woman, the chief, first, and only cause of banyshing the beast of Rome, with all his beggerly baggage? Was there ever in Englande a greater feate wrought by any man then this was by a woman?'[13] The occasion of Anne's coronation has been subsumed into this historiography and hagiography as auguring Elizabeth's reign and the establishment of the Protestant faith. William Latymer's 'Chronickille' begins with an account of Anne's coronation, which was 'to the greate admiracion of the beholders, and wonderfull comforte of the realme'[14] and Thomas Heywood's *England's Elizabeth* similarly begins with an invocation of Anne's coronation and 'all the pompe, state and magnificence therto belonging'.[15] The preface to William Camden's *Annales*, translated as *The Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth*, also opens with Anne's coronation, depicting it as a prophecy for Elizabeth's reign.[16] Shakespeare and Fletcher's *King Henry VIII (All is True)* offers a representation of Anne as both godly queen and usurping whore, and her coronation is used to illustrate this contrast.[17] As the royal train passes, the second gentleman exclaims, 'Sir, as I have a soul, she is an angel' (IV. 1. 44) and, during the service, it is reported how she 'Came to the altar, where she kneeled and, saint-like, / Cast her fair eyes to heaven and prayed devoutly' (IV. 1. 83–4). The bias of the gentlemen's reports is, however, highlighted in the very next scene where Katherine of Aragon has a vision of an assumption and heavenly coronation: she is crowned three times with the same garland before she 'holdeth up her hands to heaven' (IV. 2. SD 82.15).

The identification of Anne's coronation with the birth of Protestant England has persisted. The first edition of J. G. Nichols's *The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth* opens with an account of Anne's coronation, prefaced by the 'Verses and Dities Made at the Coronation of Queen Anne Boleyn'.[18]

Edward Arber introduces his edition of *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* with the following description: 'This Triumph was a much greater matter than a simple Coronation pageant. It was the official recognition of the Revolt from the Papacy; and all who took a prominent part in it favoured the new Faith.'[19] Similarly, Helen Hackett equates the faith referred to in the pageantry poetry as the faith of 'the newly-established Protestant English Church' and Gordon Kipling interprets the pageants as anticipating 'a triumphant Protestant king to rule a Protestant English people'.[20] John King in *Tudor Royal Iconography* puzzles over the disjunction between the medieval and Marian iconography of the pageantry and the 'Protestant' context. He writes that 'Anne Boleyn, despite the "Protestant" context of pageantry . . . was praised as the Virgin Crowned and as a type of Saint Anne.' Likewise, Helen Hackett notes the 'perpetuation of the iconography of medieval queens consort, including the use of Marian terms – even though Anne was the first Protestant Queen of England, and was actively associated with the patronage of Protestant reform'.[21]

The context of June 1533, however, was not unequivocally 'Protestant', as the work of Diarmaid MacCulloch, among others, has so successfully shown.[22] Not only was the term itself fledgling, unstable and in the very process of being defined, but the Dispensations Act of 1534 confirmed, as John Guy has argued, England's commitment to Catholic doctrine.[23] A new 'Protestant' faith cannot be said to have been established or confirmed by Anne's coronation. Indeed, what could a Protestant coronation be or mean in 1533? We would do better, as Tom Betteridge has advocated for the reading of texts, to ask 'what *is* Protestantism in this ceremony?'[24] We cannot assume that a coherent religio-political plan lay behind the coronation and the procession, and we should beware of imposing a blinkered version of Protestant ceremony that finds the representation of Anne as a medieval queen consort puzzling and incongruous. In fact, it is the image of Anne as a traditional, Catholic queen and the power of medieval precedent that are insisted upon in this ceremony, and in the pageants and verses that accompany it. Considered in the context of Henry's recently asserted supremacy, rather than in the context of future reformation, Anne's Catholic coronation plays a critical part in defining, legitimising and understanding that supremacy.

CROWNING THE SUPREMACY

Anne Boleyn's coronation was the first state ceremony following England's assertion of its independence from papal jurisdiction, as expressed in the

Act in Restraint of Appeals with its much-quoted preamble, 'this realm of England is an Empire' and the naming of Henry as its 'supreme head and king'.[25] It was the first major London ceremony since Henry VIII's and Charles V's joint entry in 1522 and was, by all accounts, an ostentatious and expensive affair. As Francis Godwyn, Bishop of Hereford, reported later, 'The Coronation of the new Queen, and other passages of entertainment, had exhausted the Treasury.'[26] Anne was also the only one of Henry's successive wives to be crowned (plans were made for the coronation of Jane Seymour in 1536 but they were aborted due to plague).[27] Anne's coronation was the culmination of several years of research into how Henry could legitimately, and with the support of the pope, divorce a queen who was unable to bear a male heir and who had already been married to his brother. The important Biblical arguments against the legitimacy of the king's first marriage were published in *A glasse of the truthe* in 1531, a book with which Henry had been involved.[28] In 1529, Thomas Cranmer, already an acquaintance of the Boleyn family, first suggested that the king did not necessarily need Rome to authorise the divorce and that the pope's supremacy could therefore be dispensed with. As John Guy has shown, it was Cranmer's and Edward Foxe's research into the divorce that fired the concept of an historical English supremacy: from seeking to legitimise the divorce the supremacy of past English kings and their imperial rule were uncovered.[29] The coronation of Anne Boleyn, then, was a critical moment that fused dispute over legitimate Tudor succession, monarchical versus papal authority and English imperialism. On one level, it was a clear statement that England believed that the English king could determine and legitimise the future of its monarchy without authorisation from Rome. It set out to rewrite history by replacing the Spanish queen with the English Anne, transferring the Tudor succession from Princess Mary to Anne's as-yet unborn baby.

The timing of Anne's coronation argues for the legitimising power of ceremony, and for the part it would play, in conjunction with parliamentary law, in the establishment of Henrician supremacy and the new succession. Prior to the divorce and the coronation, a series of acts had displaced the authority of the pope in England and asserted Henry VIII's supremacy over the English Church. In March 1532, Parliament passed the Act in Conditional Restraint of Annates, which ended the clergy's payments to Rome and stated that should the pope deny a bull of consecration this could be overridden, allowing a bishop or archbishop to be consecrated by English authority. The same act decreed that, should the pope excommunicate the king or place interdicts on England, the English could

still continue to attend services and participate in the sacraments. Excommunication, in effect, was rendered meaningless and the offices and ceremonies of the English Church protected and placed under the authority of independent English law. In April 1532, Henry VIII presented the Supplication of the Commons against the Ordinaries to Archbishop Warham, a pivotal step in the destruction of the legislative independence of the English Church. Henry VIII went on to legislate that convocation could pass no new law without the approval of a royal commission (consisting of thirty-two men, half of whom were laymen) and that all existing laws be submitted for their approval. Then, in April 1533, Parliament passed the Act in Restraint of Appeals. This act prevented Katherine of Aragon from appealing to Rome in the divorce case by officially ending the jurisdictional power of the pope in England and asserting the 'King's jurisdiction and authority' over 'causes of matrimony and divorces, rights of tithes, oblations and obventions':

> In consideration whereof the King's Highness, his Nobles and Commons . . . doth therefore by his royal assent and by the assent of the Lords spiritual and temporal and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, enact, establish and ordain that all causes testamentary, causes of matrimony and divorces, rights of tithes, oblations and obventions, (the knowledge whereof by the goodness of princes of this realm and by the laws and customs of the same appertaineth to the spiritual jurisdiction of this realm) already commenced, moved, depending, being, happening, or hereafter coming in contention, debate, or question within this realm or within any the King's dominions or marches of the same or elsewhere, whether they concern the King our sovereign lord, his heirs, or successors, or any other subjects or residents within the same of what degree soever they be, shall be from henceforth heard, examined, discussed, clearly finally and definitely adjudged and determined, within the King's jurisdiction and authority and not elsewhere.[30]

This act authorised Cranmer to proceed with the divorce trial, held at Dunstable Priory and at which both Henry and Katherine were expected to testify. The trial began on 10 May, but Katherine never appeared to testify. On 23 May, Cranmer was able legally to pronounce the divorce, but this was just six days before Anne's coronation festivities were scheduled to begin. John Tregonwell wrote in haste to Thomas Cromwell to inform him that, 'aftre dew commendacyons thes shalbe t'advertyse you that my Lord of Canturbury, this day, at x of the cloke before noon, hathe gevin a sentens yn this great Cause of Matrimonye, wherby he hathe declaryd the same Matrimonye to be agenst the lawe of Godd: and therfor

hathe devorsyd the Kyngs Highnes from the noble Lady Katheren'.[31] Before the coronation could take place, the marriage between Henry and Anne had also to be declared officially valid, which Cranmer duly did on 28 May. But this was now only hours before the water procession from Greenwich was due to start on 29 May.

Ceremony, however, had already preceded law: Henry and Anne had married on 25 January and, on 12 April, Easter Eve, Anne had appeared as queen at the Chapel Royal at Greenwich. As Wriotheslely records, she 'offred that daie in the Kinges Chappell as Queene of Englande'.[32] This asserts a supremacy that is not only independent from Rome, but from the English Parliament.[33] The declaration of the divorce at the eleventh hour indicates that the coronation was not entirely dependent on or sanctioned by the legal pronouncement. Indeed, the trial and the legal recognition of Henry and Anne's marriage seem purely 'ceremonial' in the sense that Anne was already married and pregnant and her coronation arranged. Henry's letter to the mayor 'signifying . . . that his pleasure was to solempnise and celebrate the coronacion of his moste deare and welbeloved wyfe Quene Anne at Westminster the Whitsonday nexte ensuyng' was sent at the beginning of May.[34] In these circumstances, the ceremony played a role in the process of legitimising the Act of Appeals of April 1533 by only displaying Henry's supremacy, in advance of the Acts of Succession and Supremacy of 1534. It anticipated the latter's official declaration that 'the King's Majesty justly and rightfully is and oweth to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognised by the clergy of this realm'.[35] It did not await the recognition of Anne as queen from the pope, which was still hoped for, but denied in July.[36] It therefore enacted, as the preamble to the Act of Appeals declared, that

> this realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and king . . . unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by names of spiritualty and temporalty, be bounded and owen to bear next to God a natural and humble obedience.[37]

Participating in the coronation could constitute a political act. Thomas More, for example, famously refused to attend the ceremony.[38] However, this struggle over correct authority – papal, monarchical, parliamentary – was distinct from matters of religious doctrine.

The legitimacy of Anne's coronation relies on acknowledged reconfiguration of the authority understood to underpin the ceremony. As Cranmer

was to declare at his trial, papal authority erroneously appropriated the bestowal of power on kings and queens:

> He is like the devil in his doings ... Thus he took upon him to give that which was not his own. Even so the bishop of Rome giveth princes their crowns, being none of his own: for where princes either by election, either by succession, either by inheritage obtain their crown, he saith, that they should have it from him.[39]

In 1521, Henry VIII had acknowledged to Thomas More that his royal authority derived from the pope and declared that 'we will set forthe that aucthoritye to the uttermost. For we receaved from that Sea our crowne Imperiall.'[40] The balance and shifting of power that, as Chapter 1 demonstrated, the coronation ceremony articulates between God, clergy, king and people are reset by the supremacy's reorganisation of this hierarchy. Recalling the homage sworn by the clergy at coronation, Henry VIII expressed the contradiction inherent in the clergy's oaths of allegiance. Addressing the House on 11 May 1532, he declared:

> Well-beloved subjects, we thought that the clergy of our realm had been our subjects wholly, but now we have well perceived that they be but half our subjects: yea, and scarce our subjects; for all prelates at their consecration make an oath to the Pope, clean contrary to the oath that they make to us, so that they seem to be his subjects, and not ours.[41]

It was the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who receives his office from the pope, to anoint and crown kings and queens. On 30 March 1533, Passion Sunday, Thomas Cranmer was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in St Stephen's College, Westminster Palace. Before entering the chapel, Cranmer swore the oath of loyalty to the pope, but he immediately qualified this oath. He protested that he did not intend, by this oath, to do anything contrary to the laws of God, the king's prerogative or the laws of England, that he would not impede the 'reformation of the Christian religion', meaning here 'the government of the English Church'.[42] However, Cranmer was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury via the authority of a papal bull and his ordination therefore only recognised to be legitimate if conducted under the auspices of Rome. Cranmer's retraction of his oath rejects the very authority that underpins his office as archbishop, and replaces the vacuum left by the dismissal of the pope with the person of the king. He promised to 'renounce and utterly forsake all

such clauses, words, sentences, and grants, which I have of the pope's holiness in his bulls of the archbishoprick of Canterbury, that in any manner was, is, or may be hurtful, or prejudicial to your highness, your heirs, successors, estate or dignity royal'.[43]

The authority that legitimises Cranmer's office as archbishop is the king's, and therefore the authority that legitimises Cranmer's consecration of Anne as queen is also the king's. This significant shift of emphasis impacts on Anne's coronation, but also on Henry's own coronation of 1509. It is not surprising to find that, concomitant with the establishment of his supremacy, Henry revised his coronation oath. In 1509, Henry had sworn to uphold the established laws and religion, to recognise the independence of the Church and to defend 'such lawes as to the honor of god shall be chosen' by the people.[44] In addition, as we recall, the coronation prayer from the *Liber Regalis*, 'Sta et retine', reiterated the limitations on monarchical authority that the oath and pardon articulate, emphasising that the monarch is the mediator between clergy and layman, not between God and clergy, and that it was via their authority that he was crowned king. Counter to the Act of Appeals' assertion that the king is second 'next to God', Henry's kingship owed its authority to God via Rome and her prelates. Coronation and monarchical authority needed to be accurately aligned. The amendments that Henry made to the oath indicate his desire both to secure the oath for future coronations and to retract his earlier promises. The revisions to the oath inscribe a conception of the supremacy and of coronation that must inform interpretations of Anne's coronation.

A manuscript copy of the English coronation oath, amended in Henry's own hand, is still extant.[45] Entitled 'The Othe of the kinges highnes at every coronation', the text of the oath has been transcribed, probably from the *Liber Regalis*, into charter form for the king – i.e. as a series of statements and not in the question-and-answer format that the *Liber Regalis* records. The base text corresponds with the oath that Henry swore in 1509, as is noted in the Little Device, and Henry has added and deleted words. It is not known exactly when this transcript and the revisions were made, and there is no evidence to suggest that this altered form of the oath was ever sworn at any subsequent coronation. Walter Ullmann suggests that Henry made these amendments in 1509, in anticipation of his own coronation, and cites it in evidence of the precocious eighteen-year-old's early imperialist ambitions.[46] But, as the text of the oath sworn by Henry in his coronation Device strongly suggests, an amended oath was not sworn by Henry VIII in 1509. There was no reason or opportunity for Henry to

revise his powers of jurisdiction in 1509 and, furthermore, the revisions to the oath articulate a conception of monarchical power in relation to the Church and Parliament that would not have been possible at the beginning of the reign; the changes are so far-reaching that their ramifications could not have gone unnoticed. The language of Henry's revisions concurs with the repudiation of papal authority and assertion of English supremacy as they were expressed in the late 1520s and early 1530s, in particular mirroring terms used in the Act in Restraint of Appeals of April 1533, such as the monarch's 'royal dignity' and 'imperial jurisdiction'. Diarmaid MacCulloch refutes Ullmann's claim that the oath was revised in 1509, and argues instead that Henry revised it in anticipation of Edward VI's coronation, thus dating it to the later years of Reformation.[47] However, as Pamela Tudor-Craig has noted, a later date is not persuasive as the revisions are neither referred to nor incorporated in Edward's oath of 1547. Instead, she dates the revisions to the 'years of crisis' during which the divorce was debated. Similarly, Dale Hoak dates the revisions to the late 1520s.[48] Indeed, a date even closer to Anne's coronation is most plausible. Not only do the revisions correspond with the 1532–3 Acts of Annates and Appeals, but there is also evidence that Henry, at about this time, conceptualised his supremacy in terms of coronation – both his own, retrospectively, and Anne's forthcoming ceremony.

The manuscript amendments to the oath constitute crucial documentation of this conceptualisation. The hand-written deletions and insertions articulate a personal supremacy, invoking Henry's personal royal prerogative, his 'dignite ryall'. The promise to 'kepe and mayntene the lawfull right and the libertees of old tyme graunted by the rightuous Cristen kinges of Englond' will be maintained as long as it is 'not prejudyciall to hys Jurysdiccion and dignite ryall'. He also inserted that he shall 'according to hys conscience . . . mynystere equytee right justice shewyng wher is to be shewyd mercy justice and mercy', deleting the 'without discression' of the original text. Where the original declared that the king 'shall kepe the peax of the holie churche and of the clergie and of the people', Henry altered this to the following: 'he shall *Indevore* hymselfe to kepe unite in hys clergye and temporell subjects' (my italics). Since the time of Edward I, the oath had restricted the king's parliamentary powers, binding him to uphold and affirm the laws and customs of the kingdom that the people 'shall' choose.[49] Henry, however, inserts the word 'approved' before customs and adds that only those laws that are not 'prejudiciall to hys crowne or Imperiall Jurisdiction' and that 'the noblys and people have made and chosen with hys consent' will be upheld.

This 'with hys consent' alters the sense of the former oath entirely: the king has the final word over law. This is the amended oath in full:

> The king shall then swere that he shall kepe and mayntene the lawfull right and the libertees of old tyme graunted by the rightuous Cristen kinges of Englond to the holy chirche of ingland nott prejudyciall to hys Jurysdiccion and dignite ryall and that he shall kepe all the londes honours and dignytes rightuous [an addition by Henry, subsequently struck through by him] and fredommes of the crowne of Englond in all maner hole without any maner of mynyshement and the rightes of the Crowne hurte decayed or lost to his power shall call agayn into the auncyent astate. And that he shall Indevore hymselfe to kepe unite in hys clergye and temporell subjects. And that he shall according to hys conscience in all his judgementes mynystere equytee right justice shewyng wher is to be shewyd mercy. And that he shall graunte to holde lawes and approvyd customes of the realme and lawfull and not prejudiciall to hys crowne or Imperiall Jurisdiction to his power kepe them and affirme them which the noblys and people have made and chosen with hys consent. And the evill Lawes and customes hollie to put out and stedfaste and stable peax to the people of his realme kepe and cause to be kept to his power in that whych honour and equite do require.[50]

'Imperiall Jurisdiction' here refers to the king's powers and supremacy within his own realm. It invokes the jurisdictional powers of the 'rex' as 'imperator' – the king as a Roman emperor in his own realm, able to legislate in both the temporal and spiritual spheres.[51] It echoes the Act of Appeals' celebrated assertion that 'this realm of England is an Empire' and the 'dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown'. England's imperial sovereignty is further expressed in the revised oath by the following addition, where the 'holie churche' becomes 'the holie chirche of ingland': 'The king shall then swere that he shall kepe and mayntene the lawfull right and the libertees of old tyme graunted by the rightuous Cristen kinges of Englond to the holy chirche of ingland.' This language of royal dignity, supreme jurisdiction and prerogative further echoes the Act of Appeals' declaration of the 'plenary, whole, and entire power, preeminence, authority, prerogative, and jurisdiction' of the king: 'he being also institute and furnished by the goodness and sufferance of Almighty God with plenary, whole, and entire power, preeminence, authority, prerogative, and jurisdiction to render and yield justice and final determination to all manner of folk residents or subjects within this his realm'.[52]

The concept of imperial England and royal supremacy were established as truths rooted in the authority of England's past and English history, as

in the Act of Appeals' opening phrase: 'Where by divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles.' England as an 'Empire' reached back to historical claims that the first kings of England enjoyed the same sovereignty and jurisdictional control in their kingdoms as the first Christian Roman emperors.[53] Their status in their kingdoms was second only to God, not to the pope. Importantly, though, and as Ullmann shows, this emulation of Roman emperors, notably Constantine, and Roman law was not incompatible with the practices and doctrines of the Catholic Church, and would not necessarily interfere with them. Indeed, the foundations of the 'chirche of ingland' were argued to reflect a pure Roman Catholicism, as instituted by Constantine. The distinction between a king's sovereignty and his powers of jurisdiction over matters of doctrine was crucial, and formed 'the substructure of the Henrician plan'.[54] Henry's revisions to his coronation oath appeal to a lost English past and the restoration of correct monarchical authority. The changes match the oath to that of the very early English coronation order, the 'Ordo of St Dunstan'. Revising the coronation oath recovers the English tradition of coronation. In the early order, the oath is scripted for the end of the service, following the anointing and crowning of the monarch.[55] Henry VIII, in 1509, had sworn his oath at the beginning of the service, as the *Liber Regalis* specifies. In this way, he was anointed king because he had made certain promises; the authority conferred through the anointing had already been circumscribed. Would reversing this logic also have been in Henry's mind as he redrafted his oath, thus amplifying the sacrament of the anointing and the relationship that this establishes between monarch and God? The 'Imperiall Jurisdiction' inscribed in the revised oath is God-given and inextricable from the king's 'dignite ryall'. The Act of Appeals asserts that the body politic 'be bounded and owen to bear next to God a natural and humble obedience' to the king, who himself is 'institute and furnished by the goodness and sufferance of Almighty God with plenary, whole, and entire power'. The descent of divine grace, the authorisation of sacred majesty and the sense of the English past inherent in the very form of coronation, could grant supremacy the authority of precedent and divine law that it claimed. As expressed in *A glasse of the truthe*, 'the ceremonyes of the popes law' are defeated by divine law. It is 'by goddes lawe' that the people 'be bounde to the obedience of their prince' whose supremacy is 'no newe allegatyon of mans invention or imagination: but onely taken of the scripture of god of the counsels and ordinances of the churche universall'.[56] Kingly ceremonies, then, can be reclaimed as God's ceremonies, as proof of 'goddes lawe' and a king's divine authority. A correct

coronation, then, was an ideal way to express a historical, spiritual and personal supremacy.

The chosen date of Anne Boleyn's coronation, Whitsunday, emphasises Anne's crowning as proof of 'goddes law', and as sacramental. As the *Liber Regalis* states, the coronations of kings and queens should take place 'always on a Sunday or some Holy-day'.[57] But Whitsunday was the second most important festival in the Church after Easter. It has already been noted how Anne had first appeared in public as queen in Greenwich at Easter. Whitsunday celebrates the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles on the fiftieth day after Easter and is associated with the foundation of the first church. Integrating Anne's coronation with the church's liturgical calendar, and with this most significant of festivals, links Anne's queenship to God's will, and to the establishment of the Catholic faith. Furthermore, the descent of the Holy Spirit on Whitsunday becomes inextricable from the descent of divine grace that accompanies the anointing of Anne as Henry's queen. By extension, claiming divine and sacramental legitimation for Anne is tantamount to expressing the same for the supremacy. Furthermore, it is the concept of the supremacy – and Cranmer's authority as archbishop only through recognition of this supremacy – that controls Anne's coronation. Somewhat paradoxically, Henry's absence during Anne's coronation festivities emphasises the nature of his supremacy. As Cranmer notes, 'his grace came always before her secretly in a barge, as well from Grenewich to the Tower, as from the Tower to York-place'.[58] A sketch outlining the seating plan in Westminster Hall for the coronation banquet shows Henry in a hidden closet, high on the right-hand side of where Anne Boleyn is seated under her canopy.[59] A manuscript list of requirements for Anne's coronation indicates that a stage should be erected in the Abbey upon which, should he desire, the king may watch the ceremony.[60] However, Henry's presence during the service is not mentioned in any of the extant coronation accounts. Henry as the Christ-like king, beckoning Anne to her heavenly coronation, is duly emphasised.

Perhaps in accordance with the notion of the restoration of English monarchy and the English coronation, Anne's crowning is described as adhering to tradition and precedent, and a remarkable novelty is left unreported.[61] Cranmer wrote to Archdeacon Hawkins describing how he 'received the queen apparelled in a robe of purple velvet, and all the ladies and gentlewomen in robes and gowns of scarlet, according to the manner used before time in such business' and how he 'did set the crown on her head'.[62] Similarly, *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* reports how the

service in the Abbey proceeded 'with all the serymonyes therof as therunto belongeth'.[63] Like her predecessor, Katherine of Aragon, Anne was anointed twice, on the breast and head, crowned with the queen's crown and invested with the queen's sceptre and rod. But, unlike Katherine – and unlike any of her predecessors – Anne was crowned with St Edward's crown. This crown that was reserved only for the crowning of monarchs, not consorts. St Edward's crown was, second to St Edward's chalice, the most revered object of the regalia. Claimed to have belonged to Edward the Confessor, it was carried aloft from Westminster Hall to the Abbey by the lord high steward of the coronation. In the ceremony, it was blessed and consecrated and worn, briefly, by all newly anointed English monarchs before it was replaced at the end of the service on the altar in St Edward's chapel, and returned to the Abbey store. It was not part of the queen consort's regalia and, oddly, its appearance at Anne's coronation is not commented on as an anomaly. This is Hall: 'the archebishop set the croune of saint Edward on her head' and then, after 'Te Deum' had been sung, as per the service for a queen consort, 'the bishop toke of the croune of saint Edward beyng hevy and sette on the croune made for her, and so went to Masse'.[64] To set St Edward's crown on Anne's head recalls the crowning of a male monarch – Henry – and, more contentiously, risks equating Anne's authority as consort with the authority of a reigning monarch. Not until Mary I's coronation in 1553 would a woman and the first queen regnant be crowned with St Edward's crown. This unprecedented deviation from the rules of coronation articulates Anne's lawful right to be queen by placing her in the succession of English monarchs, through the visual link to St Edward. It explicitly brings the authority of the past, and the ancient ideals of sacred kingship, into this coronation. At the same time, this visual emblem of legitimate succession links Anne's coronation to the future coronation and supremacy of the legitimate heir, assumed to be male, now visible beneath Anne's coronation robes. As Cranmer declares, Anne was now 'somewhat big with child'.[65] An archbishop who has sworn his allegiance to the king and not to Rome, and the placing of St Edward's crown on the pregnant mistress's anointed head align this coronation with a new authority. The appropriation of St Edward's crown for a queen consort reconfigures the legitimacy of the ceremony and sets up a new precedent of multiple crowning. Edward, Mary and Elizabeth would subsequently all be crowned with St Edward's crown first, then the imperial state crown and then a personal imperial crown.

After Anne was crowned with St Edward's crown, Hall reports that 'the bishop . . . sette on the croune made for her'. Usually the consort would

have been crowned with one crown only. In the *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Existing in the Archives and Collections of Milan*, there is a curious notice about Henry's visit to the keeper of the queen's crown, to request Katherine of Aragon's crown for Anne's coronation. It is reported that Sadocho, somewhat implausibly, refused to give up the queen's crown 'because of the oath he had previously taken to the said queen, that he would guard that crown faithfully' and that he would rather risk his own head than break the oath and surrender the crown. This is the full report:

> Accordingly, the king wrathfully sent to the one who has charge of the queen's crown, Master Sadocho by name, a great man in that island, requiring the crown for the coronation of the new queen. Messer Sadocho replied that he could not give it up because of the oath he had previously taken to the said queen, that he would guard that crown faithfully. The king then went to see him and expressed his desire. At this Master Sadocho, who is a man of ripe age, took off his cap and flung it to the ground, without saying a word. When the king saw this he asked him what moved him to do a thing like that, to which Master Sadocho replied that rather than give him that crown he would suffer his head to lie where his cap did . . . As he is a great personage and has a son who is a man of great worth and has a great following in that island, the king took no further steps, but had another crown made for the coronation of the new queen, who has been pregnant for five months.[66]

This desire reported on the part of the king to appropriate Katherine's crown for Anne indicates that Anne's legitimacy as queen was bound up with her coronation and its symbols. To wear Katherine's crown, which may well have referred to the queen's state crown of the regalia, would complete Katherine's demotion, stripping her of her queenship and transferring it to Anne. Anne's coronation would thus also be inscribed as part of a natural order of succession: the queen's crown was hers by legitimate right. Furthermore, this anecdote reveals the extent to which this legitimacy derives power, sometimes wrongly, from precedent and appropriation. Rather like Henry VII's name replacing Richard III's in his coronation Device, Anne's coronation would write over Katherine's. In a similar vein, the imperial ambassador, Eustace Chapuys, scornfully notes 'the seizure of the Queen's own barge' for the water procession to the Tower and how Anne, 'the Lady', 'unscrupulously made use of it at this coronation of hers, and appropriated it for her own use'.[67]

That the royal supremacy was bound up with ideas of coronation is suggested by the commissioning of a new coronation painting for Whitehall in 1532. A book of payments 'for building at the King's manor

of Westminster' dated 20 April 1532, and covering payments from May 1531, lists an entry for 'wages of painters working upon the Coronation of our said Sovereign Lord, made and set out in the Low Gallery', known as the Orchard Gallery.[68] A total of forty-seven painters are mentioned and a later entry details a payment to 'William Southwood of London, goldbeater, for 300 of fine gold delivered to the painters working on the Coronation, at 5s. 4d. a 100'.[69] The painting is lost, and there are only a few references to it, which suggest that it formed part of a sequence of wall paintings depicting scenes from Henry's earlier reign, such as the Field of Cloth of Gold.[70] The coronation panel would certainly have omitted Katherine of Aragon, thereby deleting her from history and reappropriating the coronation of 1509 as Henry's own. It is also certain that the painting would have reflected Henry's newly asserted imperial status; perhaps prominence was given to the imperial crown and to the divinity of his office, with the clergy's role sidelined. Westminster Palace, soon to become known as Whitehall, already had strong associations with coronation. A painting of St Edward's coronation, commissioned by Henry III, hung over the king's bed in the Painted Chamber.[71] As York Place was rebuilt and renamed Westminster, almost the entire area of Westminster became a major royal residence, and one connected to the place of coronation, Westminster Abbey.[72] In the private, removed space of the new supreme monarch, a new coronation painting suggests a relationship with coronation that apprehends it as the space that justifies and legitimises a God-granted supremacy. In this context, the grand coronation prepared for Anne Boleyn is a performance of this understanding of coronation, and a re-enactment of Henry's own coronation. As with the revisions to the coronation oath that recall earlier English kings and coronations, the coincidence with Whitsunday, and the appropriation of St Edward's crown in Anne's coronation, it is the sacred element of coronation that is being augmented: it is the king's historical and divine right to be supreme head, and this is expressed and confirmed by the act of coronation.

At the same time, however, the purpose of coronation was under scrutiny, particularly among humanists who debated its function when kings are made legitimate through birthright rather than ceremony. Thomas Elyot, for example, in his *The Boke Named the Governour*, published in 1531, as he puzzles over the meaning of a monarch's public coronation, avoids mentioning sacramental properties and claims that witnessing a monarch's coronation inspires due reverence and, crucially, obedience which, in turn, rewards the monarch with necessary honour and authority.

Elyot's argument also recalls the elective element of coronation, because 'reverence' and 'obedience' imply acceptance and recognition by the people, which cannot otherwise be guaranteed. 'Honour' may be the 'reward of vertue', but it is also granted by 'the estimation of people, which estimacion is nat every where perceyved'. This is the relevant paragraph in full:

For what purpose was it ordayned, that christen kynges (all though they by inheritaunce succeded their progenitours kynges) shulde in an open and stately place before all their subjecte receyve their crowne and other Regalities, but that by reason of the honorable circumstances than used, shulde be impressed in the hartes of the beholders perpetuall reverence: whiche (as I before sayde) is fountayne of obedience, or els mought the kynges be enoynted and receyve their chare in a place secrete, with less payne to them, and also their ministers? Lette it be also considered, that we be man and nat aungels, wherfore we knowe nothinge but by outwarde significations. Honour, wherto reverence pertayneth, is (as I have said) the reward of vertue: whiche honour is but the estimation of people, which estimacion is nat every where perceyved, but by some exterior signe, and that is either by laudable reporte, or excellencie in vesture: or other thinge semblable: But reporte is nat so commune a token, as apparayle. For in olde tyme kynges ware crownes of golde and knyghtes onely ware chaynes.[73]

Elyot's anxious, uncertain discussion about the point of a public coronation insists on the importance of seeing ceremony, of the need for 'some exterior signe' and visual symbols – such as 'apparayle' – as opposed to second-hand report ('reporte is nat so commune'). He cannot entertain the possibility of no coronation at all and concedes the power of representation and the veiled mystery and truth behind this representation – something that only angels, and not men, can see: 'Lette it be also considered, that we be man and nat aungels, wherfore we knowe nothinge but by outwarde significations.' 'Outwarde significations' here are not substitutions or convenient but arbitrary symbols, but instead they seem to embody inner truth: the 'excellencie in vesture' *is* the monarch's excellence of virtue. Erasmus, in *The Education of a Christian Prince*, places a similar emphasis on the truth and necessity of the symbols of coronation:

let the prince learn to take a philosophical interest in the very insignia with which he is adorned. What does the anointing of kings mean except great mildness of spirit? What does the crown on his head mean except a wisdom supreme among innumerable people? The interwoven chain put round his neck stands for the harmonious combination of all virtues; the jewels shining with multicoloured

brilliance and beauty mean the perfection of virtue and that every kind of goodness must stand out in the prince; the glowing purple robes signify his intense affection towards his subjects; his official decorations indicate that he will either equal or surpass the achievements of his ancestors.[74]

This is to be distinguished, however, from excessive display and meaningless 'pomp'. Erasmus continues: 'But some have the absurd belief that the way to be valued by their subjects is to display themselves with the greatest possible clamour, pomp, and extravagance.'[75] The outward trappings of royal ceremony, it is implied, must be accompanied by inner sincerity and virtue.

PRECEDENT, PROPHECY AND PAGEANTRY

The period of Anne's coronation began with the traditional water pageant from Greenwich to the Tower on Thursday 29 May, followed by the creation of Knights of the Bath, the royal procession through the city of London to Westminster on 31 May, the service in Westminster Abbey on 1 June, and ending with the coronation banquet and jousts and entertainments on Monday 2 June.[76] The water pageant consisted of a fleet of decorated barges belonging to the city's crafts who escorted Anne, seated in her own decorated barge among her nobility. *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* describes how 'to beholde the wonderfull nombre of people that ever was sene that stode on the shore on bothe sydes of the ryver Was never in one syght out of the cyte of London sene' (Aiir). Similarly, Hall writes of the water procession that 'he that saw it not would not believe it'. Of the procession from the Tower to Westminster, the Venetian ambassador, Carlo Capello, describes how Anne 'passed from the Tower to Westminster, with very great pomp' and how the crowds were there 'in number truly marvellous'.[77] These accounts are marked by allusions to precedent and established custom. In the unprecedented context of the supremacy and this coronation, this is not only a shorthand descriptive technique that appeals to cultural memory, but is indicative of the legitimising power of precedent. Of the coronation in the Abbey, *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* reports that Anne was crowned according to correct tradition: she received her crown with 'all the serymonyes therof as therunto belongeth' (Biir). We have already seen how Cranmer, with the Bishops of York, London, Winchester, Lincoln, Bath and St Asse, the Abbot of Westminster and several other abbots, all received 'revested in our pontificalibus' the queen 'in a robe of purple velvet' and 'according to

the manner used before time in such business'.[78] This 'manner used before time' refers to the protocol stipulated in the 'Ryalle Booke' for the coronation of a queen consort: 'And at morn to be araid with kirtille, sircot, and mantelle of playne purpille velvett, and hir hed dischevellid with a riche sercle.'[79] If the procession and coronation follow protocol, with everything 'as therunto belongeth' and 'according to the manner used before time' then the legitimacy of the ceremony, and what the ceremony is legitimising, are enhanced. In May, when Henry wrote to the Mayor of London, Stephen Pecocke, to request to 'see the citie ordered and garnished with pageauntes in places accustomed', he expressed a desire for the legitimising power of precedent.[80]

In processing by water to the Tower and from the Tower to Westminster, Anne followed in the footsteps of other queen consorts: Henry's mother Elizabeth of York in 1487, who had also enjoyed an elaborate water pageant and was crowned separately from Henry VII, and, more pointedly, Katherine of Aragon who was greeted with an elaborate procession when she arrived in London in 1501, in celebration of her forthcoming marriage with Prince Arthur, and again on the occasion of her coronation with Henry VIII in 1509.[81] The precedent for a queen consort's procession is set out in the 'Ryalle Booke': 'the cete muste ressave hir in the moste honorable wise with a greter yeste for there own worschipe; and so convey hire throughe the cete unto the touyr of London'.[82] For the procession to Westminster, Anne sat 'in a litter of white cloth of golde', dressed in a 'circot of white cloth of Tyssue & a mantle of the same furred with Ermyne', with her hair loose, as custom dictated.[83] Here is the 'Ryalle Booke':

> she muste have a sircott of whit damaske, or of whit clothe of gold, with a mantelle of the same poudred with ermyne; she must have a riche pursene about her neke, with iii labelles yt muste hynge doun upon her bake with the trayne; then her hed must be dischevellid with a riche sercle on hir hed.[84]

The loose hair is a symbol of the queen's future fertility – rather apt considering Anne was six months' pregnant. Similarly, certain orders are given for the procession route in the 'Ryalle Booke':

> And at the condit in Cornylle ther must be ordined a sight with angelles singinge, and freche balettes yron in latene, engliche, and ffrenche, mad by the wyseste docturs of this realme; and the condyt in Chepe in the same wyse; and the condit must ryn bothe red wyn and whit wyn; and the crosse in Chepe muste be araid in

the most rialle wyse that myght be thought; and the condit next Poules in the same wyse.[85]

Accordingly, for Anne's procession, even though the 'sight with angelles' had by this time been expanded to several pageant stations, actors playing angels were in attendance, verses and ballads were composed by scholars Nicholas Udall and John Leland, and the Cross in Cheapside was 'newe garnisshed' (Aivv). There were in total twelve individual pageant stations along the route, but this was more than for any previous London entry.[86] Five of these stations were developed pageant scenes – 'mysteries' as a French eyewitness records[87] – constructed at Gracechurch Street, Leadenhall, Cornhill, Cheapside and Paul's Gate. At the other stations – the Great Conduit, the Cross and Standard in Cheapside, Ludgate, and the Standard and Conduit in Fleet Street speeches and songs were delivered. In St Paul's Churchyard 200 children presented verses and the fountain at the Great Conduit, following the 'Ryalle Booke', 'ranne whyte wyne claret & reed great plenty all that after noone'(Aivv).

Recalling the past, however, can also serve to highlight the irregularity of the present. Correct and familiar procedure jars with the unfamiliar and uncomfortable context. The foreign ambassadors also describe Anne's coronation by referring to previous ceremonies, but their comments are more pointed. On 7 June 1533, Carlo Capello wrote to the Signory about the 'triumphal arches, pageants, and other decorations, as usually made on similar occasions'.[88] But this 'usually made' pastes over the juxtaposition of outward regularity and hidden dissent. In another letter to the Signory, Capello writes that, 'By a royal order, all the "city crafts" have been warned not to dare to speak otherwise than well of this new marriage and Queen Anne, and to prepare the entertainments and expenditure usually made for the Queen's coronation.'[89] It is also reported how Henry VIII ordered all noblemen, whose income could support it, to take up knighthoods so as to fulfil certain duties at the coronation and 'do honour to the coronation of his Lady'.[90] Those who refused were, as Carlo Capello claims, 'to pay a certain sum according to their revenues; by which means he will realise a great sum of money, and his Court will be increased by a large amount of gentry'.[91] The presence of the knights, so proudly named and listed in de Worde's *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon*, and processing 'clothed in vyolet garmentes edged with armyns lyke juges', appears less marvellous in the light of this letter (Aiiiv). The imperial ambassador, Eustace Chapuys, in his letter to Charles V dated 16 June 1533, describes the coronation as 'a cold, poor, and most unpleasing sight'.[92] Another

account (possibly also by Eustace Chapuys) describes how 'though it was customary to kneel, uncover, and cry "God save the King, God save the Queen", whenever they appeared in public, no one in London or the suburbs, not even women and children, did so on this occasion'. He goes on to describe how the joined letters 'H' and 'A' that decorated the procession route provoked many observers to laugh (Ha! Ha!).[93]

One hundred years later, Lord Herbert of Cherbury in his history, *The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth*, is more explicit about the disjuncture between the display and its reception. He writes of Anne Boleyn's coronation: 'And the rather that the murmure of those who objected against the irregularity and deviation of our Kings proceeding herein might be hidden and cover'd in the Pompe.'[94] 'Pomp' here is circumspect; grand ceremony is invoked as a disguise and a silencer, cynically employed to conceal the illegitimacy, according to Cherbury, of Anne's queenship. But can we project from this that Henry and his court approached ceremony equally cynically? Conceptions of ceremony's legitimising power seem more complex than Cherbury's dismissive account would allow. Cranmer, for example, alludes to a deviation from custom in the making of the Knights of the Bath before Anne's coronation. In his letter to Archdeacon Hawkins about the coronation he describes how on the Friday, in the Tower, Henry VIII made eighteen Knights of the Bath, 'whose creation was not alonely so strange to hear of, as also their garments stranger to behold or look on'.[95] Cranmer, central to the divorce and the supremacy, seems particularly anxious about correct protocol and legitimate procedure. He justifies the order of ceremonies, and his part in them, as follows:

> But now, sir, you may not imagine that this coronation was before her marriage; for she was married much about St Paul's day last, as the condition thereof doth well appear, by reason she is now somewhat big with child. Notwithstanding it hath been reported throughout a great part of the realm that I married her; which was plainly false, for I myself knew not thereof a fortnight after it was done.[96]

The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon's language is insistent on precedent: 'degree and ordre', 'auncyent', 'olde fassion', 'after an olde custome', 'ryght', 'proper', 'as aperteyneth', 'as therunto belongeth', 'their servyce to them apoynted' are words and phrases that are repeated throughout the text. In the light of the more sober accounts of Capello and Chapuys, and with the knowledge of certain deviations from 'olde custome', it is a commonplace to note this text's propagandist rhetoric. *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* eulogises Anne and emphasises the visual wonder of the

spectacle. The water pageant was 'a wonderfull goodly syght to beholde', the barges are 'comly besene' in 'ryche cloth of golde' (Aiv), the pageants are 'costly', 'proper' and 'sumptuous' (Aivv, Bir). *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* stresses universal joy and acceptance. After the water pageant to the Tower, Henry 'gave thankes and prayse to all the cytezyns for theyr great kyndnesse & lovynge labour and paynes in that behalfe taken to the greate joye and comforte of all the cytezyns' (Aiir). Along the banks of the river stood 'the wonderfull nombre of people that ever was sene' and during the procession to Westminster she was received by the aldermen 'with great reverence & honour salutynge her grace' (Aiir, Aivv). Anne is presented as gracious, thankful, joyful. When she receives the gift of 'a ryche and costly purse of golde and in it a thousande marke in golde coyne' from the recorder of London, she 'gave great thankes bothe with herte and mynde' (Aivv) and responds to the verses spoken to her by 200 children in St Paul's Churchyard with 'Amen with joyful smylyng countenaunce' (Bir). This portrayal pre-empts Richard Mulcaster's descriptions of Elizabeth during her coronation procession in *The Quenes majesties passage* of 1559. It is not surprising, then, that Eric Ives finds a precedent for Elizabeth's behaviour in Anne, but to do so conflates reality with report and assumes that Anne was in control of this representation, rather than this being a code of behaviour imposed on her by this text. Furthermore, Ives writes that the pageants 'were officially commissioned; they represented what she and Henry wanted'.[97] The description of the procession and the pageants – *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* – and the actual pageants are, however, different things. Moreover, as shall be shown, a reading that favours propaganda too heavily misses the different ways in which de Worde's text and the pageantry poetry choose to represent Anne, as well as their dynamics of conditionality and reciprocity. While the queen's interests are certainly represented, and while it was Henry who requested to 'see the citie ordered and garnished with pageauntes in places accustomed', the procession text and pageantry should also be read as responses and interpretations – and, as such, the element of risk cannot be ignored. The incentive may have come from the court, but this does not imply that the court maintained complete control.

The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon belongs to a new tradition of printed ceremonial texts, often anonymous, but whose genre and status as political propaganda are complex. Wynkyn de Worde was not the king's printer in 1533 (this office belonged to Thomas Berthelet), but he had established a reputation for publishing commemorative texts. In 1509, he had printed Stephen Hawes's supplication to Henry VIII, *A Joyfull medytacyon to all*

Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall soverayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght and, in 1532, *The maner of the tryumphe at Caleys and Bulleyn* to commemorate Henry and Francis I's meeting at Boulogne in October 1532.[98] In 1500, Richard Pynson had published, in advance of the event, *The traduction & mariage of the princesse* for Katherine of Aragon's entry into London for her marriage to Prince Arthur and, in 1522, *Of the tryumphe, and the verses that Charles themperour & the most myghty redouted kyng of England, Henry the viii were saluted with.*[99] On the continent too, there was a tradition of translating royal entries into books. Pierre Gringore designed a pageant series for Mary Tudor's entry into Paris in 1514, in honour of her marriage to Louis XII. A brief contemporary pamphlet about the entry was published anonymously as *Lentree de tresexcellente Princesse dame marie dangleterre*. Gringore also prepared a manuscript which he may have presented to the queen herself, in which he described and interpreted his verses and pageant designs, and included illustrations of them.[100] There is no record of the author of *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* and neither do we know how the pamphlet was commissioned – whether it was a court or a city initiative, or a publishing decision taken by de Worde himself. As the colophon indicates, de Worde printed the book for the stationer John Gough, indicating that the book was available for sale at Gough's outlet on Fleet Street.

We cannot be certain, therefore, about the extent of court control over de Worde's publication and, as with Gringore's *Lentree de tresexcellente Princesse dame marie dangleterre*, *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* may have been written to be directed as much at the queen and court as at the buying public. This should alert us to considering the ceremonial vocabulary that the text employs in a more nuanced way – as a *response* to and *interpretation* of the problem of Anne's legitimacy. While it undoubtedly aims to please and flatter the new queen, the language with which this text selects to convey her legitimacy is not necessarily a language of spectacle knowingly employed by the court to gloss over, as Herbert of Cherbury's interpretation suggests, historical irregularity. *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* does not refer explicitly to the break with Rome or the new supremacy, and it certainly does not make any references to a new faith. Instead it portrays Anne's coronation as the most traditional, authentic and correct Catholic ceremony that England had ever seen – as the following, particularly measured and even sober passage describes:

The abbot of Westmynster with his rygals came into the hall in pontificalibus with his monkes in theyr best copes, the kynges chapel in theyr best copes With the

bysshops rychely a[d]urned in pontificalibus . . . And so every man procedynge to the mynster in the best order every man after theyr degree apoynted to theyr order & offyce as aperteyneth came unto the place apoynted Where her grace receyved her crowne with all the serymonyes therof as therunto belongeth. And so al the serimonyes done with the solempne masse they departed home in their best orders every man to the hal of Westmynster. (Biir)

The pageant scenes and the poetry, which is not transcribed in *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon*, are described in terms of the honour and reverence they bestow – such as 'many goodly verses to her great prayse and honour' (Aivr). Legitimacy in de Worde's text derives from the fusion of 'goodly armony' and 'goodly verses', 'goodly aray' and 'best ordre', and from the harmonisation of the procession's various features. The possibility of any political discord is displaced by the text's evocation of musical concord, through repeated use of the word 'armony'. The music provides a vocabulary of legitimacy. At the Great Conduit in Cheapside, there was 'great melody with speches' and, at Ludgate, 'swete armony of ballades . . . with dyverse swete instrumentes' (Aivv, Biv). The nine muses at the pageant of Apollo played on their instruments and there was 'great plenty of swete instrumentes with chyldren syngyng' by the Standard on Fleet Street (Biv). Hall's report similarly describes the 'mervailous swete armony both of song & instrument' at the Standard in Cheapside and, of the castle pageant in Fleet Street, 'in the myddes of the tower closely was suche several solempne instrumentes, that it semed to be an heavenly noyse, was muche regarded and praised'.[101] Likewise, for the water procession, Hall describes 'virgyns singyng & plaiyng swetely' in one of the barges.[102] The pageant at St Paul's Gate, one of the procession's most traditional pageants, is described in particular detail in *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon*. This 'proper & a sumptuous pagent', featuring the three 'fayre ladyes virgyns costly arayde', links the 'table of golde' held by the middle virgin, the 'close crowne of golde' held by two angels and the message imprinted on the pageant that, when Anne bears 'a newe sone of the kynges bloode there shalbe a golden worlde unto thy people'. This prophecy is then printed in 'letters of gold' on a 'multytude of wafers with rose leaves', which are cast over Anne as she passes (Bir). Anne is represented here as a type of the Virgin Mary, the mother of a future saviour. Furthermore, with the reference to the golden world, Anne is also represented as the Virgin of the Golden Age: Astraea. This resurrection of a golden world is linked here to a pure English and Catholic tradition. Anne is crowned by heaven and showered with wafers,

as if such physical embodiment of the prophecy is tantamount to its realisation.

The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon emphasises that the coronation is not limited to the service in the Abbey but that it is a five-day event, beginning with the water pageant and ending with the jousting on the Monday. It is the procession from the Tower to Westminster that is related in most detail in the text and that is therefore understood to play a crucial role in the legitimising process. Again, however, we cannot be entirely certain about the extent of court decree or censorship over the pageantry and the accompanying verses, written by John Leland and Nicholas Udall. Critical opinion is divided: where Eric Ives identifies the court as the official commissioners, heavily influenced by Anne's taste and requests, Sydney Anglo cites the civic authorities.[103] Henry's letters to the mayor in May 1533 ordered that pageants be erected 'in places accustomed', but the cost lay in the hands of the city authorities. On 18 May, Chapuys wrote to Charles V:

> The Londoners wish to make all the inhabitants contribute to the costs of the coronation, which will be a charge to them of about 5,000 ducats, of which 3,000 are for a present to the Lady, and the rest for the ceremonial. Formerly there was no opposition to the said contribution; now they compel even foreigners to contribute; but I hear they will have the decency in this case to exempt the Spaniards.[104]

As Lawrence Manley notes, this gift of 3,000 ducats, presented to Anne by the recorder of London between the Cross and the lesser Conduit in Cheapside was a ceremonial innovation.[105] That this is a new 'tradition' is not recorded in any of the accounts. *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* describes it as 'a free gyfte of honour' and as indicative of the city's 'reverence & honour' (Aivv). But at whose initiative was this gift-giving? Even if it was a compulsory form of tax, this moment in the procession sets up a dynamic of exchange between the city and the monarch. The procession is thus represented as a voluntary performance by the city for the monarch. Certainly, the chronicle accounts portray the procession as a civic affair, as the city's reception of the new queen: in Hall, for example it is described as 'The receivyng and conveiyng of the quene through London'[106] and *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* relates how 'all the aldermen & the craftes of the cyte prepared aray in a good order to stande & receyve her' (Aiiir). The procession is not presented as a performance of the court for the city and, implicit in the notion of the city's

reception is recognition of the city's pivotal role in contributing to the legitimisation of Anne.

Rather than being the responsibility of either the court or the city, Anne's procession was collaborative, which complicates propagandist readings of both the pageants, their verses and *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon*. The city of London records show that a court–city committee was set up to discuss the pageantry. This committee was made up of four representatives from the Court of Aldermen and two influential councillors: Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk (Anne's uncle) and Thomas Cromwell who had just been made Chancellor of the Exchequer. On 14 May, the Court of Aldermen met to discuss the water pageants and the procession through London. They agreed to construct three main pageant scenes.[107] Gordon Kipling argues that it was Howard and Cromwell who initiated the eventual elaboration to six pageants and that this was an active demand for 'more pomp and ceremony for the new Queen' and that Nicholas Udall and John Leland were commissioned by Howard and Cromwell to oversee these new pageants. This leads Kipling to pit a medieval Catholic, and reluctant, city against a humanist and Protestant court by suggesting that the classical pageants reflected the court – Anne's interests in particular – while the city stuck to their traditional iconography.[108] A manuscript memorandum records the city's request to be loaned the king's minstrels and some costumes from the Wardrobe for the pageants 'be cause the tyme is verye shorte'.[109] Certainly, then, the city was in consultation with the court but, as the above memorandum indicates, it was not a given that the court would lend musicians and costumes, and there is no conclusive evidence to imply that the court would have been informed of the pageants' final content. Indeed, the 'verye shorte' time would have made extensive collaboration and consensus an impossibility and the city's last-minute request for musicians and costumes suggests that they were, for the most part, expected to organise the procession and its pageantry for themselves. Furthermore, this collaboration between court and city should not imply that the pageants' modes of representation necessarily pulled against each other.

Whether Nicholas Udall and John Leland were commissioned by the city or the court to compose the English and Latin verses and ballads, both men had connections with the court – and with the Boleyn family. John Leland had been tutor to Lord Thomas Howard, the Duke of Norfolk's son and, as library keeper to the king, had just been given the title 'Historiographer Royal'. It was also in 1533 that he was commissioned to begin his *Collectanea*. Leland was also a former pupil of William Lily who had

composed the Latin verses for six of the nine pageants for Charles V's and Henry VIII's celebrated entry into London in 1522.[110] Nicholas Udall was acquainted with Leland, and it is likely that he became involved with Anne's coronation through Leland. It has also been suggested that Udall was known to Anne who intervened in the scandal of the heretical books at Cambridge.[111] The collaboration with Leland certainly won Udall court favour: in early 1534, his *Floures for Latine Spekynge* was first published by the king's printer, Thomas Berthelet, and, later that year, he became headmaster of Eton.[112] He went on to write plays and dedicate works and translations to Edward VI and Mary I. In 1537 he brought his Eton pupils to perform before Thomas Cromwell; in 1548 he collaborated with Princess Mary on a translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*, decreed to be placed in every church.[113] More surprisingly, in 1553, Udall appears in connection with Mary I's coronation as the author of the accession play, *Respublica*.[114]

Both Leland and Udall drew heavily on their classical scholarship for Anne's coronation pageants and, while the use of English in pageantry was not without precedent – Katherine of Aragon's entry in 1501 was entirely in English – Anne's was the first procession to introduce classical, humanist themes.[115] Should we, though, equate the writers and their interests with a crafted proto-Protestantism in the procession? The 'classical' pageants and the poetry do not, in actual fact, reflect a context of religious change. Rather than identifying tension and incompatibility, or a neat split – such as Gordon Kipling's division between Catholic city and reformist humanist court – the procession's genesis should alert us to the jostling of personalities, interests and elements that necessarily informs these ceremonies, but that are not necessarily politically motivated or in competition with one another. The pageantry's combination of classical and medieval scenes, for example, is also indicative of change impacting on the symbolic tradition of royal entries that need not have a conscious political or religious agenda. Furthermore, the procession's combination of the classical with a more traditional medieval iconography does not mean that the court resisted and opposed the more medieval scenes. Indeed, as will be shown, both representational modes were crucial in legitimising Anne and Henry's supremacy. The procession was a combination of interpretations and responses to Anne and the context, reflecting the interests, requests and particularities of both city and court. It is an error of a particularly conspiratorial type of history to expect ceremonies to promote a single interest or adhere to a coherent policy. To do so misrepresents the manifold and mysterious nature of ceremony – its ties to tradition, the pull of

precedent, its ability both to absorb and to stand apart from its political context and thus bring together what may seem incongruous elements. In Anne's procession the medieval precedent of the royal entry of a queen consort, with its insistence on Marian (Catholic) iconography, meets the inventive use of classical mythology, images of the Golden Age and references to a new English imperialism.

Since the fourteenth century, the royal entry of a queen, both in England and on the continent, appropriated the images and themes of Annunciation and Assumption.[116] The new (virgin) queen is a type of Mary: she is represented in pageantry as the mother of Christ-like kings and the bride of Christ, on her way to join her Christ-like king on the earthly equivalent of the heavenly throne. As the 'Ryalle Booke' specifies, she is transported through the city in a silver and gold litter, dressed in white and with her hair down. The procession moves through secular and sacred spaces: from the streets and conduits to St Paul's Churchyard. London is transformed into a celestial space and the spiritual and the temporal worlds collide: mock castles and heavenly thrones are erected and, as the people look up, mechanical angels burst through the pageant clouds, bearing a heavenly crown. Anne's procession follows in this tradition. She is carried in a litter of gold, under a canopy through a heavenly London. Like Richard II's procession in 1377, François I's entry into Lyons in 1515, Charles V's entry into Mantua in 1530 and Anne's predecessor Katherine of Aragon's entry into London in 1501, on her way to meet Prince Arthur, a crown is delivered from heaven.[117] In Anne's procession, it is delivered by an angel who bursts from the Leadenhall pageant's heavenly roof – described as if real: 'so from the hevenly roufe discended a whyte faucon and lyghted upon the said stocke & roote and incontynent discended an angell with goodly armony havynge a close crowne bytwene his handes and set it on the faucons heed' (Aivr). Visually, the procession would have recalled street performances of *The Coronation of the Virgin* as part of the Corpus Christi cycle of plays. Informing the entry of a queen consort is the invocation from the liturgy of the Feast of Assumption: 'veni coronaberis'.[118] In Anne's procession, one of the three virgins in the pageant at St Paul's Gate holds a tablet upon which 'Veni amica coronaberis' is written – 'Come my love thou shalbe crowned' (Bir).

In the 1533 context of the new supremacy and the imminent birth of a new heir, these traditional themes of Annunciation and Assumption have enormous resonance and poignancy. They serve to legitimise elements of the supremacy through emphasis on God's divine scheme, historical and Biblical precedence, the king as Christ, and the queen as bride and mother

of Christ-like supreme kings. Even Anne herself, long before the coronation, appropriates the role of the mother of Christ. In an illuminated book of hours, inscribed below an image of the Annunciation is the following couplet, identified as having been written in Anne's hand: 'By daly prove you shalle me fynde, / to be to you bothe lovyng and kynde.'[119] For her coronation in 1533, the idea of Anne as the mother of a Christ-like child is made explicit through her visible pregnancy: the birth of an heir is already a reality and the pageants play on this. The second pageant, at Leadenhall, plays on Anne's name to represent the legendary St Anne: 'on the said flour sate Saynt Anne in the hyest place on that one syde her progeny with scripture that is to wete the thre Marys with their issue, that is to understande: Mary the mother of Christ, Mary Salome the mother of Zebedee . . . also Mary Cleophe' (Aivr). In this pageant, Anne is connected to the holy family and holy motherhood, and placed in a scheme of Annunciation. Her unborn child is anticipated as a type of saviour, a second Christ. The accompanying English verses make this clear:

ffor like as from this devout Saint Anne
Issued this holy generacion,
ffirst Christ, to redeme the soll of man,
Then James thapostle, and thevangelist Jhon,
With these others, whiche in suche fascion,
by teaching and good lif, our faithe confirmed,
That from that tyme yetto it hathe not failed,

Right soo, dere ladie, our quene most excellente,
highly endued with all giftes of grace, –
As by your living is well apparente, –
Wee the Citizens, by you in shorte space
hope suche issue and descente to purchace,
Whereby the same faith shalbee defended,
And this Citie form all daungers preserved.[120]

In anticipation of the coronation service, it is as a shadow of Biblical mothers that Anne will be crowned, as the mother of a legitimate, male saviour. This shall preserve the old established faith – 'the same faith shalbee defended' – not contribute to establishing a new faith.

Through its emphasis on motherhood, the Leadenhall pageant legitimises Anne's forthcoming coronation through the role that she will play in the Tudor succession. The success of her coronation – and, by extension, the supremacy – is dependent on this succession. It is assumed in the pageantry and the verses that the unborn child is a boy who will follow

in the footsteps of Christ and bring salvation: 'Whiche tyme that wee maye right shortely see, / to our great coumforte, joye, and solace' (Furnivall, p. 389). The possibility that the child might not be a boy is not an option. Similarly, at Paul's Gate, where the three fair virgins sit enthroned, the birth of a boy saviour is prophesied. In this pageant, Anne is at once the Virgin of the Assumption, and of Annunciation. Behind the invocation 'Veni amica coronaberis' lies the Christ-like king – Henry – and the authority of God, urging the queen towards her heavenly coronation. As already noted above, at the base of the pageant scene, underneath where the three virgins sat enthroned, was 'a long roll' upon which the prophecy of a son's birth was written. Through identification with Annunciation and Assumption, and with the Virgin of the Golden Age, Anne's coronation is legitimised because it is understood as God's will. Consequently, the supreme monarch who is absent during the procession but positioned on his heavenly throne beckoning Anne – 'Come my love' – is also represented as part of God's plan. The symbols of Christ's body, the wafers, are cast down with rose leaves, thereby scattering the emblem of the Tudor dynasty with the sign of God's grace.

God-granted supremacy makes its presence felt in Anne's procession through frequent invocation of the imperial crown, both in the pageant scenes and the poetry. As has been noted, the bearing of a crown from heaven in coronation pageantry is not new, but it is expressly identified in descriptions of Anne's pageants and in the poetry that it is an imperial crown. Just two months after the assertion of England as an 'Empire' and as part of the conscious evocation of imperial kingship, the presence of the imperial crown is symbolically potent. The Act in Restraint of Appeals links the supremacy to the symbol of the imperial crown. England is 'governed by one supreme head and king having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown'.[121] As suggested in this formula, ownership of the imperial crown is synonymous with the truth of the supremacy. Dale Hoak has shown how the imperial crown acquired imperial meaning through the middle ages, from Henry V and into the sixteenth century, and how representations of the monarchy placed increasing emphasis on the imperial crown. It was in the reign of Henry VII, for example, that coins began to represent the monarch wearing an imperial crown.[122] Unlike St Edward's crown, the crown with which monarchs (and Anne) were crowned during their coronations, the imperial crown is a 'closed' crown because of its closed arches.[123] Monarchs traditionally wore the imperial crown for the coronation recession and the following banquet, dressed in the purple imperial robes. In 1509, Edward Hall described how

an imperial crown topped the castle pageant in Westminster Palace as part of Henry's coronation entertainments: 'and in thesaied Palaice, was made a curious Fountain, and over it a Castle: on the toppe therof, a great Croune Emperiall'.[124] The imperial theme, therefore, was already associated with English kingship and coronation and, as this legacy suggests, is not to be conflated with religious reformation. In 1533, at Anne Boleyn's procession, however, the imperial crown enjoys its first extended association with coronation, and with a woman.

In the pageant scene at Leadenhall of St Anne and her progeny, a white falcon descends from the heavenly roof, followed by an angel who crowns the falcon with the imperial crown: 'incontynent discended an angell with goodly armony havynge a close crowne bytwene his handes and set it on the faucons heed' (Aivr). The white falcon was instated as Anne's emblem at her marriage to Henry, and was depicted crowned with an imperial crown and with a sceptre.[125] Through her emblem, Anne is iconographically linked to coronation and the concept of divine imperial majesty. The crowning of her emblem in the pageant – the 'empire-worthy bird' as the Latin abstract declares (Furnivall, p. 392) – as opposed to Anne herself, or a representation of Anne in the pageant scene, shifts the focus from her being crowned as queen to the crowning of the concept of imperial majesty. It is the poetry that expressly identifies this 'close crowne' as the imperial crown, and 'Imperiall' is rhymed with 'Celestiall':

Honour and grace bee to our queene Anne,
ffor whose cause an Aungell Celestiall
Descendeth, the ffalcon as white as swanne
to croun with a Diademe Imperiall!
In hir honour reioyce we all,
ffor it cummeth from God, and not of man.
Honour and grace bee to our Queen Anne!
(Furnivall, p. 389)

Throughout the procession and its poetry the imperial crown features in both the 'classical' and the 'medieval' pageants, and thus blurs distinctions between these two representational modes. For the first 'classical' pageant in Gracechurch Street, representing Apollo and his Nine Muses and for which only Latin verses were composed, a sketch by Hans Holbein shows two imperial crowns topping the two decorated columns at the side of the pageant. Apollo himself is shown seated on a throne under a bower whose arches are shaped like an imperial crown, on top of which is the imperial eagle.[126] It is towards a Catholic coronation that the classical figures usher

Anne. Melpomene, for example, declares, 'O every one that sees these shows, that sees Anna in her passing beauty riding through the city, do you bring incense; and pray first that the crown may sit well on her forehead' (Furnivall, p. 374). Visually, as the Holbein sketch suggests, this crown is identified as the imperial crown. Similarly, at the pageant at the Little Conduit in Cheapside, the classical scene representing 'The Judgement of Paris' is fused with the forthcoming sacred coronation. Anne's reward for being fairer than Juno, Pallas and Venus is the English imperial crown, which replaces the reward of the golden apple that belongs to the classical myth. As the poet-child declares:

Noo, noo, an other rewarde there is
Ordeined for the worthynes of hir grace,
And not to bee disposed by you, Paris,
Nor to bee geven here in this place.
Queene Anne, moste excellent that ever was,
Ffor you is redy a Croun Imperiall,
To your joye, honour, and glorie ymmortall.
God, that of his goodness all thing dooethe us send,
Hathe sent us your grace, our hartes to make glad.
(Furnivall, p. 396)

Finally, at Paul's Gate, two angels hold a 'close' crown between them, identifying the crown with which Anne will be crowned as the imperial crown. The imperial crown and all that it implies for kingship – and queenship – derive from heaven.

Through the prominence of the imperial crown, Anne is linked directly to the genealogy claimed for imperial majesty in England. It is also appropriate that the imperial descent is annexed by a woman: it was through his mother, Margaret Beaufort, that Henry VII traced his right to the throne back to Henry V, and from there to Arthur and Constantine whose union of English imperialism was claimed through his English mother, Helena.[127] Anne Boleyn here, as another mother, will continue the legitimate descent of the English monarchy's imperial claim. The pageantry and the verses together emphasise that this imperial claim is God-given through the imperial crown's descent from heaven. Both Anne's right to be queen (she is heaven-sent) and the concept of imperial monarchy are legitimised through divine ordination. In the Leadenhall pageant, the 'Didademe Imperiall' is borne by the angel and is specifically identified as a gift from God: 'it cummeth from God, and not of man'. Similarly, at Paul's Gate, the imperial gold crown is supported by two angels. The poet-child in

'The Judgement of Paris' emphasises that the 'Croun Imperiall' is a gift from God – 'God, that of his goodness all thing dooethe us send' – and invokes the forthcoming coronation. The imperial crown will not be 'geven here in this place', but tomorrow, in the Abbey. The muses in the Apollo pageant similarly stress that the coronation is God's will, and that the imperial crown is heaven-sent. Urania sings: 'Tis Heaven gives her to thee, happy Britain . . . Therefore at the behest of Heaven go, Queen, where your lot calls you; take your sceptre, take to you your crown!' (Furnivall, p. 375).

Through the pageants that evoke a classical Roman past and those that present Anne as a type of Virgin Mary, and the associations of both with the imperial crown, Anne emerges as an Imperial Virgin. Both the 'classical' and the more traditional pageants of Annunciation invoke the birth of the future heir and saviour, and both identify this with the restoration of the Golden Age. *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* describes how the Nine Muses in the Apollo pageant were 'acordyng to the discryption of poetes and namely of Virgyll' (Aivr), and the attendant Latin verses prophesy that Anne and the birth of her son will usher in the return of Saturn's age: 'Saturn's age shall come back; the free city shall be yet freer. Presently she shall bear a little son who long years hence shall reign' (Furnivall, p. 375).[128] The Golden Age refers to the age of the Roman Emperor Augustus, under whose rule Christ was born, and here recalls Virgil's fourth *Eclogue* and the prediction of a new Golden Age: 'iam redit et virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna' (now the virgin returns, now returns the reign of Saturn).[129] Anne, predicted to give birth to her boy-saviour, is therefore invoked as Astraea: the Just Virgin of the Golden Age. In the St Paul's Gate pageant, where Anne is associated with the Virgin Mary through the beckoning 'Come my love thou shalbe crowned' and where she is crowned by angels with a gold imperial crown, this is also linked to a new Golden Age. The prophecy written under the throne and on the wafers reads: 'there shalbe a golden worlde unto thy people' (Bir). England will enjoy a new imperial era with the restoration of a Golden Age, enabled through a heaven-sent Virgin and the birth of a new saviour, under the auspices of a Christian emperor-king, Henry. Across the pageants, imperial and sacred majesty is represented as inextricable from Anne as Astraea and as the Virgin Mary. Indeed, as Gordon Kipling notes, the association of the Just Virgin of the Golden Age with the Virgin Mary recalls Emperor Constantine, and thus the roots of English imperialism, since it was Constantine who apparently first interpreted Virgil's verse as prophesying the advent of Christ.[130] But Kipling identifies Anne as an Imperial Virgin

with Protestant reformation. Anne is thus a Protestant Imperial Virgin. Not only does this misrepresent the context of 1533, but neither the pageants nor their poetry seek to address or celebrate religious reform in what we might call 'Protestant' terms. The imperial crown and Anne as Imperial Virgin invoke England's restored imperialism and the monarch's supremacy which, in 1533, before the advent of reform, are distinct from matters of confessionalisation.

The pageants and their poetry, then, respond to and serve to legitimise central themes of the supremacy. The recitation of the Bible, the recollection of Virgil and the imitation of past poets root the procession to the past through text. Equally, the visual representations of Biblical figures such as St Anne or characters from antiquity – Apollo, the Three Graces, Paris, Juno, Pallas and Venus – connect the pageants to a legitimate history. This sense of restoration, of a return to a former world are woven through the procession, suggestive of the revival of something long-awaited and preordained. It is about the repetition and the restoration of the past, rather than the advent of the new. Anne's accession is represented as expected, overdue even, as in the ballad of the allegory of the falcon: 'And where by wrong / She hathe fleen long, / Uncertain where to light' (Furnivall, p. 391). Calliope too refers to 'Our now long widower'd king' in the Apollo pageant. The pageantry appeals to the legitimacy of the past in the same way that *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* does, with its insistence on all 'the serymonyes therof as therunto belongeth'. Similarly, the 'divers sundry old authentic histories' of the Act of Appeals are recalled.

At the same time, there is a dynamic in the procession poetry that is conditional, and that speaks to Anne, rather than to the people. Just as the innovation of the gift of money to Anne in the procession indicates an element of exchange, there is an element of expectancy in the way the poetry interprets the pageants. On the one hand, certain legitimising claims of the supremacy are reflected: Anne is sent from heaven, her accession is preordained, the imperial crown is divinely sanctioned. However, on the other hand, Anne's coronation is represented as contingent upon the succession. Consequently, the legitimacy of the supremacy that has enabled Anne's marriage and her coronation rests precariously on the unborn child that she carries. *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* describes the crowning of the falcon by the angel in the Leadenhall pageant before it describes the figures representing St Anne and her progeny. The explanatory verses are then described quickly as addressing 'her great prayse & honour' (Aivr–v). The verses, however, interpret the pageant scene, and

make it clear that the union of the falcon and the rose, and the falcon's subsequent crowning by the angel are contingent upon, indeed rewards for, the birth of the male heir. The words pronounced by a child denote warning: 'ffor of you, depende the sure felicitee, / And hope, both of vs and our posteritee' (Furnivall, p. 388). Not until the poetry has expressed these expectations of Anne does the pageant sky open to release the falcon, the imperial crown and the angel. The crowning takes place as a spontaneous response to the words about the anticipated saviour-king: 'This spoken, opened a cloud, and leatt doun a white ffalcon' (Furnivall, p. 389). A pact is alluded to between the City and Anne: if she fulfils her expected role, she will be rewarded by the City's recognition and honouring of her as queen. The child at Leadenhall articulates this expectancy and interdependency: 'Wee the Citizens, by you in shorte space / hope suche issue and descente to purchace' and 'ffor of you, depende the sure felicitee, / And hope, bothe of us and our posteritee'. As the falcon descends, Anne is beseeched to 'Behold and see the ffalcon white' who 'for *our* coumforte to take hir flight', where 'our' refers to the people (Furnivall, pp. 388–9). If Anne fulfils the prophecy, then the coronation and this procession – and the divorce and the supremacy – may be rendered legitimate.

There are other messages of supplication and warning in the verses. The English abstract of Leland's Latin verse that accompanies the Leadenhall pageant reads: 'Your name, Anne, suggested to the citizens this pageant; the falcon was added as being the token of your family . . . While there he gazes with fond eyes, an angel from heaven decks his head with a gorgeous crown. Be gentle then, Anne, to your citizens, who by any and every way do honour you' (Furnivall, p. 376). Reciprocity is also implored in the Apollo pageant. As the muses extol Anne's virtues and assure her that her marriage and crowning are sanctioned by heaven, they also demand recognition of their show of honour. Polyphymnia sings: 'See! Apollo has descended to salute you . . . Tis you the world comes to see, and can never see enough.' She implores Anne, 'Do you return its glances?' (Furnivall, p. 375). In this way the procession is performative: it relies on Anne's participation and on the slippage between drama and ceremony. She is represented as participating in the Judgement of Paris pageant – 'yet, to bee plain / Here is the fouerthe ladie now in our presence' (Furnivall, p. 396). As Anne is pulled across the invisible line that separates the processing court and the staged pageant, she redirects the plot of this scene in her triumph over the classical goddesses. At the pageant of the Three Graces, Anne is urged to 'behold your servauntes, the three Graces, / Gevinge unto

your grace faithfull assistence' (Furnivall, p. 393). It is Anne's presence that releases the graces: 'Thei attend with their contynuaall presence / Where your grace goeth, absent in your absence; / While your grace is here, thei also here dwell' (Furnivall, p. 393). At the standard in Cheapside, a Latin verse describes how Anne's presence has transformed London and gilded the standard: 'The face of the city is changed; all things have revived. The pillar which was but of late all squalid, now on your advent, noble Anne, glitters and shines' (Furnivall, p. 377). This sacramental representation of the procession – in the sense that it enacts change – is tempered by the city's demands of the new queen. This is neither straightforward panegyric description nor propaganda. As Lawrence Manley has noted of Anne's procession, it employs a discursiveness that would recur in subsequent Tudor coronations.[131] In 1533, it would seem that this new-found emphasis on reciprocity and expectancy is in direct response to an anxiety surrounding the legitimacy of the supremacy. Where *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* responds to this by emphasising the coronation's adherence to precedence, the pageant verses negotiate the supremacy via texts – the 'goodly' and 'poetycall verses sayd and songe' (Aivr), pinned up on pageant scenes and printed on wafers to be read. And these words interpret the coronation's legitimacy as conditional on Anne's role as a mother.

Anne's procession is represented as pivotal in sanctioning the forthcoming coronation. The pageantry and poetry beckon Anne towards her epiphany: 'On to your crown, fair Queen!' This dependency was already a latent feature of English royal entries because tradition decreed that the procession should take place before the coronation ceremony. In France, by contrast, the new monarch's or consort's entry took place after the coronation. In 1514, Mary Tudor processed through Paris on 6 November 1514, the day after she had been crowned.[132] As such, its dynamic confirmed and celebrated the consecration that had already taken place. Anne Boleyn's procession anticipates the crowning in the Abbey to such an extent that it determines how the forthcoming coronation should be read. As Anne is enticed to proceed towards her crown, the pageantry and poetry make it clear that it is as a mother that she will be anointed and crowned Queen of England. Furthermore, the procession has contributed to legitimising this ceremony.

It is testament to this procession's belief in its own prophesying power, and indicative of the contingent and precarious notion of supremacy, that Anne's unborn child is assumed to be a boy; the possibility that it might be a girl is not admitted. The irony that quivers underneath this coronation

procession first became apparent on 7 September, when Anne gave birth to Elizabeth. In a further ironic twist, the bare head that was entreated to wear the golden imperial crown and that was so proudly crowned with the blessed and consecrated St Edward's crown was cut off in 1536. As the beginning of this chapter demonstrated, some histories rehabilitate Anne, and her coronation, as the forerunner of Elizabeth I and the beginnings of Protestant England. The preface to William Camden's *The Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth*, like William Latymer's 'Chronickille' of Anne Boleyn and Thomas Heywood's *England's Elizabeth*, begins with Anne's coronation, and with the following tale of a prophecy:

Before her Birth (as some say), even while shee was in Her Mothers Wombe, were those Golden dayes which wee so many yeares enjoyed under her Gracious Governement foretold of in these Verses following, inscribed as well upon one of the tryumphall Arches erected in the streetes of London when that most Vertuous Queene Anne passed to her Coronation, beeing then with Child of this most blessed Infant, as also on certaine Wafer Cakes cast at the same time among the people.

ANNA Regina, paris Regis de sanguine natam:
Et Partes populis aurea secta tuis

Queene Anne, thou bringest forth a Daughter,
Begotten by a Royall King:
And to thy people that come after,
Thy Wombe shall golden ages bring.[133]

The wafers that were cast over Anne's head with rose leaves at the pageant at St Paul's Gate, and that predicted so unequivocally the birth of a boy, are mis-transcribed and mis-interpreted here to predict the birth of a girl, Elizabeth. In 1533, Anne's coronation was appropriated to respond to its particular political moment; this is also true of the ceremony's after-life. Coronation is still represented to legitimise, even bring about, the future. Elizabeth I's coronation on 15 January 1559 cannot be examined without placing it in the context of the past coronation that it, not unproblematically, recalls: her mother's.

In 1533, the coronation was reclaimed from papal authority and inscribed as the space where the truth of a supreme English monarchy is sanctioned and even, via the collaborative and multivocal coronation pageants of the procession, defined and negotiated. The context and establishment of the supremacy were not unequivocally linked with religious reformation, and indeed the sacred ceremony and the imperial

iconography and the classical landscape of the procession relied on the legitimacy of Catholic tradition. When Edward VI was crowned in 1547, as the next chapter shows, imperial kingship was fused with the evangelical religion, but the association of coronation with supremacy that was forged at Anne's coronation is problematic when this supremacy, now part of English law, belongs to a child.

CHAPTER 3

'But a ceremony': Edward VI's reformed coronation and John Bale's King Johan

On 20 February 1547, Edward VI was anointed and crowned by Thomas Cranmer in Westminster Abbey. He was nine years old. On the following Tuesday, Shrove Tuesday, plays and masques were performed as part of the traditional post-coronation entertainments. The Revels' accounts record payments for the 'newe making and altering of Sundry maskes, and garmentes for players agenste the Coronacion of our soveraigne lorde Edward the Sixth'. Players included children and gentlemen of the Chapel Royal, and even King Edward himself.[1] No further details about the play texts are extant, but the costumes and props itemised are highly suggestive: the plays featured cardinals, priests, popes and monarchs. Costumes included orders for 'Silk lace and Tasselles for Cardynalles hattes for players', 'the making of Crownes & Crosse for the poope in playe' and 'iii Cappes of Crimson & black satten for prestes in pley'.[2]

Edward VI's coronation was subjected to substantial revision and interpretation. He was the first monarch to be formally proclaimed king prior to his coronation and the Recognition and the oath were redrafted by his Privy Council. Archbishop Cranmer delivered an address before he anointed Edward in which he declared that the 'solemn rites of coronation have their ends and utility; yet neither direct force or necessity' and that 'the oil, if added, is but a ceremony'.[3] The Privy Council's revisions to Edward's ceremony and Cranmer's notorious sermon transformed the sacred rite into a type of drama, albeit a necessary one. Edward was also the first English monarch to be anointed Supreme Head of the English Church, and his coronation engaged with the politics of supremacy and imperialism, as well as with the Protestant polemics of ceremony, as expressed by ardent reformers such as John Bale. But John Bale was also a playwright and his *King Johan*, first performed in 1538–9, was possibly one of the plays performed for Edward's coronation and noted in the Revels' accounts. Bale's play dramatises Catholic rituals and parades Imperial Majesty and his royal ceremonies across the stage. At the moment

when a key ceremony – Edward's coronation – turns into drama, ceremony itself is represented and critiqued in drama. But this dramatisation of ceremony is not equivalent to its demystification and devaluation. On the contrary, Edward's coronation and Bale's play represent reformed versions of ceremony that open up new possibilities for and new interpretations of the purpose of ceremony.

THE REFORMATION OF CEREMONY: CRANMER'S SERMON

Henry VIII had died on 28 January, leaving a will that had been drawn up on 30 December 1546. This will nominated sixteen executors who would constitute the new Privy Council and with whom royal authority would reside. These councillors included Thomas Cranmer, Edward Seymour, William Paulet, John Dudley and William Paget. Not since Henry VI had a boy-king inherited the English throne and, in 1547, England again became a protectorate. However, whether or not Henry decreed this protectorate, or whether it was subsequently inserted into the will by members of the Council remains contentious.[4] The *Acts of the Privy Council* relate how Henry's will bestowed

> unto us [the executors and councillors] and the more parte of us, or to the more parte of the survivoures of us, full powre and auctorite nat only to take the charge uppon us of thorder and gouvernance of our said Souveraigne Lordes persone that nowe is till he comme to thage afforesaide, with thorder of all his affaires in all his realmes, dominions and cuntreys, but also to do any Acte or Actes whatsoever that may tende to the honour and suretie of our saide Souveraigne Lordes persone, or to thadvancement of his affayres, with many other poynctes of greate truste bothe towching his succession in thimperial crowne of this realme and sundry other thinges in the same wille more at large conteigned.[5]

On 31 January, Edward Seymour, the Earl of Hertford and Edward VI's uncle, was sworn in as Lord Protector, declared as a 'special man . . . preferred in name and place before others'.[6] He was created Duke of Somerset in February, just before the coronation. Seymour was, however, to remain part of and bound by the Council at large.[7] Until Edward's eighteenth birthday his authority as Supreme Head, which was now the title of English kings by law, would be refracted through the power of his Privy Council, and subject to its own power struggles.[8]

From the time of Henry's death – its announcement was delayed until 31 January once the terms of the will had been agreed – to Edward's

traditional coronation procession from the Tower to Westminster on 19 February, the Privy Council installed itself in the Tower's Council Chamber. As well as drawing up and confirming the structure of the protectorate, the Council determined the form of Edward's forthcoming coronation. On Sunday 12 February, the proceedings of the Privy Council announced that

> This day the Lorde Protectour and others his coexecutours whose names be hereunto subscribed apon mature and depe deliberacion had amonges them, did finally resolve that forasmuche as divers of the old observaunces and ceremonies toforetymes used at the Coronacions of the Kinges of this realme were by them thought meate for sundry respectes to be correctid, and namely for the tedious length of the same which shuld weary and be hurtsome peradventure to the Kinges Majeste being yet of tendre age fully to endure and bide owte; and also for that many poinctes of the same were suche as by the lawes of the realme att this present were nat allowable; the Kinges Majestes Coronacion shuld be doone and celebrated apon Shrove Sonday next ensuyng in the Cathedral Churche of Westmynstre.[9]

The result of this 'mature and depe deliberacion' was a revised 'fourme and ordre' of the coronation. This constitutes a kind of Device, modelled on, but quite different from, Henry VIII's Device from 1509.[10] As the above passage anticipates, the traditional form of the ceremony was 'correctid', its 'tedious length' and 'old observaunces' adapted to suit Edward's 'tendre age' and conform to the new 'lawes of the realme', particularly concerning the abolition of papal authority. The supremacy that, as the previous chapter showed, was implicit in Anne Boleyn's coronation in 1533, was made rather more explicit in the ceremony in 1547. In fact, as it turns out, Edward's coronation was not substantially shortened due to Edward's 'tendre age'. Instead the significant amendments were concerned with articulating a new conceptualisation of the authority of coronation and the legitimacy of ceremony. Furthermore, the adiaphoric notion implicit in Cranmer's words 'the oil, if added, is but a ceremony' encompasses a complex and ambivalent interpretation of the function of ceremony, especially when applied to coronation. Whereas this is often read as Protestant denial of Catholic ritual efficacy, 'but a ceremony' actually offers a redefinition of ceremony that still believes in its necessity. What emerges in 1547 is a reformed version of coronation that is both subject to and beyond Protestant and Catholic classification: to read Edward's ceremony in terms of its reflection of religious reformation proves too limiting. His coronation had also to negotiate the nature of his supreme power. Since it was the

Privy Council that settled and authorised the revisions to ‘divers of the old observaunces and ceremonies’, this had far-reaching implications for the supremacy, the power of the Council and the authority that orchestrates ceremony. Edward’s coronation was, in short, a coronation by Council.

Importantly, though, as examinations of Edward’s Council have revealed, the idea that the councillors were united behind a uniform and coherent Protestant policy needs qualification. While Cranmer wrote and delivered the coronation address, and while, as Dale Hoak plausibly argues, he may have been the principal architect behind the revisions, it cannot be assumed that his address or the amendments met with unanimous consent or were not, as ‘mature and depe deliberacion’ from the *Acts of the Privy Council’s* report suggests, the result of debate and compromise.[11] Jennifer Loach questions the extent to which the Council was organised according to religious beliefs. She asks, ‘Is it even the case that the list of executors had a radical bias?’ Hoak also points out that ‘this was not a council in which even the reformed Church carried much independent weight’ and that the picture of Somerset ‘guiding a like-minded council forward towards the realization of “true religion”’ fails to account for the divisions of sympathies.[12] Edward’s coronation, rather than reflecting an established political or religious plan, used the legitimising space of the ceremony to stage a new type of coronation ceremony and sanction a new version of monarchical power. When Henry VIII was buried in Windsor on 16 February, he was buried with traditional obsequies. His will, too, had requested that masses be sung for his soul.[13] In 1547, England still neither saw itself nor was identified as Protestant; the religious reforms would not be labelled as ‘Protestantism’ until the mid-1550s.[14] The Germans at Henry’s funeral were identified as the ‘Protestants’ and Van der Delft, the imperial ambassador, puzzled over what the ‘Protestants’ would do after Edward’s coronation. He writes:

> With regard to the Protestants I have been unable up to the present to find out what is being negotiated here with them . . . It is quite true that the Protector and those principally associated with him in the government are much attached to the sects, the result being that at present the common people, unrestrained by reason of the late King’s death, publicly and undisguisedly confess their sentiments quite contrary to our religion, of which they make all sorts of farces and pastimes, above all of the good bishops.[15]

Der Delft’s identification of a public and anti-papal sentiment here is revealing, but the political situation remains unreadable. Strikingly, and

perhaps surprisingly, Van der Delft also rode alongside Archbishop Cranmer in Edward's coronation procession.[16] The 1530s and 1540s had been marked by dissent, debate and compromise over the nature and implications of the spiritual supremacy and the extent of ecclesiastical and doctrinal reform. Historians who emphasise popular resistance, and those who argue for Reformation as a purposeful, planned movement, also recognise that reformists and traditionalists were divided among themselves as well as from each other; Henry VIII was consistent with neither.[17] With regard to the sacraments and religious ceremonies, their necessity and purpose were debated and redebated. In 1537, 'The Bishops' Book' attempted to explain and formulate the largely traditional expression of faith in the Ten Articles of 1536, but was itself a compromise, reflecting disparity rather than uniformity.[18] Where the Ten Articles recognised only three of the traditional seven sacraments – baptism, the eucharist and penance – the Act of the Six Articles of 1539 reinstated the banished four. The preface to the Ten Articles distinguishes between those ceremonies that are 'necessary to our salvation' and those 'honest and commendable' ceremonies, 'rites and usages now of long time used and accustomed' that are necessary for 'a decent order and honest policy'. In the distinction, however, an anxiety surrounding what exactly 'necessary' means is discernible, and the text draws considerable attention to 'long and mature deliberation':

For the which cause [to bring about 'unity and concord in opinion'], we being of late, to our own regret, credibly advertised of such diversity in opinions, as have grown and sprung in this our realm, as well concerning certain articles necessary to our salvation, as also touching certain other honest and commendable ceremonies, rites and usages now of long time used and accustomed in our churches . . . have not only in our own person at many times taken great pains, study, labours and travails, but also have caused our bishops . . . for the full debatement and quiet determination of the same. Where, after long and mature deliberation, and disputations had of and upon the premises, finally they have concluded and agreed upon the most special points and articles, as well such as be commanded of God, and are necessary to our salvation, as also divers other matters touching the honest ceremonies and good and politic orders, as is aforesaid.

To this end, the preface continues, it was agreed that

the said articles to be divided into two sorts; whereof the one part containeth such as be commanded expressly by God, and be necessary to our salvation; and the other containeth such things as have been of a long continuance for a decent order and honest policy, prudently instituted and used in the churches of our realm, and

be for that same purpose and end to be observed and kept accordingly, although they be not expressly commanded of God, nor necessary to our salvation.[19]

In the Ten Articles and the subsequent 'Bishops' Book', ceremonies that are distinct from the sacraments are defined as such because they were not instituted by Christ and do not impart invisible grace; outward form is not related to inner truth, as in the fallacy of the sacrament of the altar. Repeating the Ten Articles, 'The Bishops' Book' declares that

under the fourme and fygure of breade and wyne, whiche we there presently do see, and perceyve by outwarde senses, is verayly, substancially, and really conteyned and comprehended the veray selfe same body and bloude of our saviour Jesu Christ, which was borne of the virgine Marye, and suffered uppon the crosse for our redemption. And that under the same fourme and fygure of breade and wyne, the veray selfe same body and bloudde of Christe is corporally, really, and in the veray same substance exhybyted, distributed, and receyved unto and all of them, whiche receyve the sayde sacramente.[20]

Other rites and ceremonies derive a necessity from tradition, repetition and instruction. Representation is understood here as something valuable and advantageous. Of these ceremonies, 'The Bishops' Book' says:

The continuall observation wherof has alwayes thought unto the holy fathers very necessarie: for asmoche as suche traditions, and ceremonies be as a certayne necessarie introduction, or lernynge expedient to induce and teache the people reverentely to use them selfe in their outewarde worshyppynge of god, and be also (as you wolde say) certayn peynted hystories, the often sight & contemplation wherof, causeth the people the better to remembre the thinges sygnified, and represented in the same.[21]

Ceremony is here instituted as a way of representing and memorialising history. The codification and definition of ceremonies, however, breed interpretative difficulties and problems of expression: 'necessary to our salvation' meets 'a certayne necessarie introduction' or a 'lernynge expedient'. Some ceremonies, like '(as you wolde say) certayn peynted hystories', seem to have a 'certayne' necessary effect; through their contemplation, they 'causeth the people the better to remembre', but exactly how this happens is beyond definition. But what the above seems to articulate is a connection between certain ceremonies and the communication of history – the legitimate ceremonialisation of history. Similarly, as expressed in the Ten

Articles, the enactment of certain ceremonies is to 'put us in remembrance'. So, the 'sprinkling of holy water' is 'to put us in remembrance of our baptism', the bearing of palms on Palm Sunday, is 'in memory of the receiving of Christ into Jerusalem', creeping to the cross at Easter is 'in memory of our redemption by Christ'. These 'rites and ceremonies' do not bring about forgiveness in themselves but should be 'used and continued as things good and laudable, to put us in remembrance of those spiritual things that they do signify'.[22]

It is the nuances and degrees of interpretation and reinterpretation surrounding ceremonies that are significant. 'The King's Book' of 1543 reflected further revisions and definitions, followed by the Act of Uniformity of 1549 and the first publication of the *Book of Common Prayer* in the same year.[23] In addition, the Articles and Acts indicate the extent to which the codification of ceremonies had become a matter of law and Parliament. The relationship between one's conduct in church and one's salvation was enforceable by law. Where, though, does coronation fit into this intense examination of ceremony, occupying as it does that hybrid space between religious rite and political contract, complicated further by the supremacy and its amplification of sacred monarchy? In 'The Bishops' Book', twenty-four pages (as opposed to the barely full page on the sacrament of the altar) discuss 'The sacrament of orders'. Still recognised as a sacrament concerning the transmission of grace, the article nonetheless distinguishes between the authority of priests and bishops as the mediators of grace, but not the givers of grace:

> the priestes and bysshoppes, althoughe in the execution of theyr offyce and ministration they doo use and exercyse the power and auctorytie of god committed unto theym, and doo supplye and represente his roume and place: yet they be not the principall, nor the sufficient or efficient causers or gyvers of grace, or of any other spirituall gyfte, whiche procedeth, and is gyven of god.[24]

By extension, what authority did the bishops have at coronation?

Edward's coronation occurs at a critical point in the uncertain process of Reformation. For some writers, it provided the opportunity for religious radicals – headed by Cranmer – to advance openly their vision of Reformation. Diarmaid MacCulloch, for example, writes that, despite the traditional funeral followed for Henry VIII,

> the mask . . . began to crack in the planning of the coronation of Edward; the Privy Council's plans for it abridged some ceremonies on the pretext of avoiding

strain on the boy, and although there was magnificence enough, no one who was present on 20 February could have been left in any doubt that radical change was soon to come.[25]

According to MacCulloch, then, Edward's coronation was the promise (or threat) of future reform. The 'radical change' to which MacCulloch refers, in spite of the 'magnificence enough', was the undermining of the ceremony's purpose, through curtailment, revision and disavowal of ritual efficacy: Cranmer's words, 'the oil, if added, is but a ceremony', imply that Edward is filled with the grace of God whether he is anointed or not. This is an essentially Protestant theological premise. The coronation's role, then, is dramatic rather than effective: nothing happens.

Rather aptly, Edward's coronation has frequently attracted theatrical metaphors. Sydney Anglo writes of Cranmer's words 'but a ceremony' that they were 'nothing more than ad hoc justification of a ritual which Parliament, nobility, ecclesiastics, and the Crown itself, wished to retain – not least because, as Schramm points out, "there must always have been present the thought that the coronation was the great *drama* in which the King appeared before the people in all his glory"'.[26] Indeed, Anglo considers that 'the whole question of the relevance of a coronation ceremony – with its elaborate ritual, and vast accretion of medieval traditions relating to a universal Christian Church – might well have been raised. But it was not.'[27] Similarly, Dale Hoak refers to the coronation as 'symbolic drama', rendered an 'empty form' because the supremacy, and a specifically Protestant supremacy, 'forever diminished the meaning of a royal coronation'.[28] That the question of relevance was not raised, however, is precisely the point. The necessity of Edward's coronation was never in doubt, not least because it would have provoked an outcry, but, as the Council's deliberations and subtle but striking revisions suggest, it was fundamental that Edward's coronation correctly expressed the nature of Edward's supremacy, and the correct purpose of ceremony. The reformation of ceremony that Edward VI's coronation exhibits is not synonymous with its devaluation but concerned with its redefinition. Furthermore, renegotiating the legitimacy of ceremony still adheres to the legitimising power of the form. It is not, then, the epithet of 'symbolic drama' that is the problem, but the implication that, because Edward's coronation reflects evangelical ideals and seems to resemble the artifice of drama, it is thereby 'empty'.

The *Liber Regalis* decrees that a sermon may form part of a coronation, to be delivered by a bishop chosen by the archbishop 'in a lofty place on the present matter' after the Recognition and prior to the king's oath.[29]

Henry VIII's 'Device' allows for a sermon, but we have no further proof that one was delivered. Indeed, before 1547, no coronation sermon text is extant. The text that survives from 1547 is in the form of an address to Edward.[30] It emphasises Edward's supremacy and the banishment of papal authority. It also, crucially, links Edward's supremacy to religious reform, and likens him to the iconoclastic Josiah. Contrary to the form of the *Liber Regalis*, Cranmer seems to have delivered his address after Edward had sworn his oath. He refers to 'the promises your highness hath made here'. It is likely, though, that it was delivered before the anointing since it anticipates this ritual, which marks the beginning of the coronation service proper. Instead of preparing the king for his oath-taking, Cranmer's address interprets and qualifies the oath that Edward had already sworn on the holy sacrament. Cranmer takes the opportunity to define Edward's supremacy. His kingship is not defined by or tied to a conditional set of promises and, unlike his father Henry VIII, he will never be held accountable in the future because 'this promise reacheth not at your highness' sword'. This is the beginning of Cranmer's address:

> Most dread and royal sovereign: the promises your highness hath made here, at your coronation, to forsake the devil and all his works, are not to be taken in the bishop of Rome's sense, when you commit anything distasteful to that see, to hit your majesty in the teeth, as Pope Paul the Third, late bishop of Rome, sent to your royal father, saying, 'Didst thou not promise, at our permission of thy coronation, to forsake the devil and all his works, and dost thou turn to heresy? For the breach of this thy promise, knowest thou not, that it is in our power to dispose of the sword and sceptre to whom we please?' We, your majesty's clergy, do humbly conceive that this promise reacheth not at your highness' sword, spiritual or temporal, or in the least at your highness' swaying the sceptre of this your dominion, as you and your predecessors have had them from God. Neither could your ancestors lawfully resign up their crowns to the bishop of Rome or to his legates, according to their ancient oaths then taken upon that ceremony.[31]

Coronation, according to the above, is presented as the confirmation of Edward's divine authority, rather than an occasion of papal or clerical authority. Cranmer goes on to explain that, although 'The bishops of Canterbury, for the most part, have crowned your predecessors, and anointed them kings of this land', it is nevertheless 'not in their power to receive or reject them'. The oil with which he himself will anoint Edward, the sword and sceptre that will be bestowed, do not grant the archbishop, or by extension the pope, authority over the monarch. The unction and investiture do not turn men into kings at the hands of

the clergy. Cranmer recuperates the authority of coronation, reclaiming it from the tyrannous power of the Bishop of Rome, and consequently away from the English clergy – including himself. The reorganisation of the hierarchy of authority and the elevation of the supremacy that we saw implicit in Anne Boleyn's coronation are given explicit verbal expression here in Cranmer's address.

At the same time, just as the ceremony does not sanction the clergy's authority over the monarch, neither does the act of anointing bring about the transfer of grace: Edward is already infused with the grace of God and thus the 'rites of coronation have . . . neither direct force or necessity'. Edward is king without the authority of the Church and regardless of the ceremony. Cranmer says:

> The solemn rites of coronation have their ends and utility; yet neither direct force or necessity: they be good admonitions to put kings in mind of their duty to God, but no increasement of their dignity: for they be God's anointed; not in respect of the oil which the bishop useth, but in consideration of their power, which is ordained; of the sword, which is authorized: of their persons, which are elected of God, and endued with the gifts of His Spirit, for the better ruling and guiding of His people.
>
> The oil, if added, is but a ceremony: if it be wanting, that king is yet a perfect monarch notwithstanding, and God's anointed, as well as if he was inoiled. Now for the person or bishop that doth anoint a king, it is proper to be done by the chiefest. But if they cannot, or will not, any bishop may perform this ceremony.[32]

These words deny any link between the act of anointing and the king's authority: there is 'no increasement' of Edward's dignity because his invisible grace does not need ceremony to make it visible and therefore true. Instead, anointing confirms the supreme power – spiritual and temporal – of the monarch that is already present. Cranmer reinterprets 'God's anointed' to mean something quite different from its Biblical echo. It is metaphorical, and not literal. Edward is 'God's anointed, as well as if he was inoiled'; he is invested with the grace of God before he is literally anointed ('inoiled' does not mean '*un*oiled' here).[33] So, to anoint the king at his coronation is to outwardly perform the truth that he is already 'anointed' on the inside. It is a ceremony that declares status, rather than transforms status.

It would be possible to interpret Cranmer's words as incontrovertible proof of the evacuation of the purpose of coronation, as empty justification for a ceremony in which there was no sincere belief. Schramm, for example,

writes that to define the anointing as the confirmation of status 'was a very jejune concept'.[34] But Cranmer's address does not render the ceremony redundant: the 'rites of coronation' have 'their ends and utility'. Far from 'jejune', to push the ceremony into a confirmatory and symbolic role indicates a complex perceptual shift. Cranmer presents the anointing as the reminder of an inner invisible truth: to anoint Edward on his head, breast, elbows and back serves as a visual prompt that he is already 'God's anointed' and the legitimate monarch. Cranmer's address does not seek to undo the ceremony but presents a new way of reading the ceremony and of understanding its words and symbols. The coronation is turned into a representation of history, rather than a maker of history. Edward is anointed because he is already 'endued with the gifts of His Spirit', and he is presented with the sword because his power has already been divinely ordained. The fact of kingship is given dramatic expression through this ceremony and its regalia, and the notion investigated in Chapter 1 – that kingly authority is synonymous with and embodied in its symbols – is recast. Indeed, the experience of watching the ceremony and listening to the liturgy of the anointing and investiture would be determined by Cranmer's words. In this way, Cranmer's address uses the legitimate form of the ceremony to critique and teach about ceremony.

The ceremony opens up a space in which the monarch can be taught about ceremony and the duties of kingship and governance. As Cranmer declares, the 'solemn rites of coronation . . . be good admonitions to put kings in mind of their duty to God'. Rather than being transmitters of actual power, the 'rites of coronation' serve as definitions of the nature of that power. Cranmer's address articulates Edward's kingship as an imperial contract with God; he is crowned as an imperial ruler, and named as the pope is: 'Your majesty is God's vicegerent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions.'[35] While Cranmer undermines his own authority in relation to Edward, he also asserts his authority to 'declare what God requires at the hands of kings and rulers, that is, religion and virtue'. Acknowledging that his own authority derives 'not from the bishop of Rome, but as a messenger from my Saviour Jesus Christ', Cranmer's address moves from praise and elevation of Edward's untouchable supremacy and metaphorical anointed state to unequivocal warning. He begins to 'humbly admonish your royal majesty what things your highness is to perform' as follows:

Your majesty is God's vicegerent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josias, God truly worshipped, and idolatry

destroyed; the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed. These acts be signs of a second Josias, who reformed the church of God in his days.[36]

Edward's coronation becomes an opportunity for Cranmer to deliver legitimate counsel. The negotiation and contractual understanding of kingly power contained within the composite form of the coronation – the Recognition, oath, possibility for sermon, a prayer such as 'Sta et retine' – are reworked in Cranmer's address to define Edward's supremacy and imperial kingship as inextricable from religious reformation. Edward is invoked as Josiah, the Biblical boy-king who destroyed pagan idols.[37] Cranmer states that he has 'no commission to denounce your majesty deprived, if your highness miss in part, or in whole, of these performances' but continues to state that 'for precedents on those kings who performed not these things, the old law shows how the Lord revenged His quarrel; and on those kings who fulfilled these things He poured forth his blessings in abundance'.[38] It is, then, as a second Josiah that Edward will be anointed and crowned, and the purpose of his coronation, the duty that it should put him in mind of, is explicitly associated with religious policy. A year later, in 1548, Nicholas Udall inserted into his preface to his translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases*, a copy of which was ordained by the Council to be placed in every church, Erasmus's comment to Charles V that 'the Emperors are anoynted sacred for this very purpose, that they may eyther maynteyne or restore, or elles enlarge and spredde abrode the religion of the gospell'.[39] The purpose of coronation and the rite of anointing are linked directly to promotion of the 'religion of the gospel'. The ceremony of coronation is not a redundant nor an empty form when it occasions and sanctions advice about the nature of the monarch's supreme power and its relationship to religion.

As noted above, Cranmer's address follows the oath-taking and thus provides a gloss on Edward's coronation oath. Despite Cranmer's assertion that the promises 'reacheth not at your highness' sword' or 'the sceptre of this your dominion', Edward was the first monarch since the fourteenth century to swear a revised form of the oath. This is documented in the proceedings of the Privy Council. If Cranmer and the rest of the Council had been aware of Henry's extensive revisions to his coronation oath (as discussed in the previous chapter), these were ignored in 1547: Edward's supremacy necessitated a different expression. It has been argued that Edward's oath enforces the supremacy and royal prerogative by tying

the people (instead of the monarch) to new laws. In fact, in comparison to Henry's proposed changes to his oath, the amendments in 1547 are more subtle and ambiguous.[40] This is the key phrase: 'Do ye grawnte to make no newe lawes but such as shalbe to thonour and glory of God, and to the good of the Commen Wealth, and that the same shalbe made by the consent of your people as hath been accustumed?'[41] This is a delicate alteration: the oath that Henry VIII swore in 1509 required him to promise to strengthen and defend the laws that his people 'shall have chosen'. As Chapter 2 showed, Henry wished to alter this to the opposite extreme: he would swear to uphold laws and approved customs that his 'noblys and people have made and chosen *with hys consent*'.[42] Edward VI's revised oath grants the king power to make laws, but this is limited by 'such as shalbe to thonour and glory of God, and to the good of the Commen Wealth' and, crucially, is dependent on 'the consent of your people'. The alteration is also cloaked by the appeal to precedent: 'as hath been accustumed'. This is neither the extreme of 1509 where Henry promised to consent to the people's laws, nor the opposite extreme of Henry's later revisions. Instead, Edward's oath presents the king as consulting with his people: his supremacy does not extend quite so far as to override all laws. That the coronation articulates and sanctions this oath is crucial, and it was evidently in the Council's interests that Edward's supremacy was limited in this way. At the same time, it needs to be taken into account that the oath could not be revised to the extent that it would bind the monarch to the 'religion of the gospel'.[43] The careful but significant revisions to the oath in 1547 indicate how important it was for the oath to correctly reflect Edward's power, and the continued importance of coronation as the space where this power is sworn to and made legitimate.

In addition to the revised oath and Cranmer's address, three other substantial changes were made to the form of Edward's coronation ceremony. These amendments, like Cranmer's sermon, serve to push the ceremony towards a dramatic, symbolic role. On 31 January, Edward was proclaimed king by formal proclamation throughout London. The proclamation of Edward as 'supreme head' also announced the death of Henry, thereby formally linking Edward's accession to lawful succession. This, despite the accepted and established doctrine of divine right in England, had never before been articulated via the formula used in 1547.[44] Edward's proclamation begins:

> Edward VI, by the grace of God King of England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith and of the Church of England and also of Ireland in earth the supreme

head, to all our most loving, faithful, and obedient subjects, and to every of them, greeting.

Where it hath pleased Almighty God, on Friday last past in the morning to call unto his infinite mercy the most excellent high and mighty prince, King Henry VIII of most noble and famous memory, our most dear and entirely beloved father, whose soul God pardon; forasmuch as we, being his only son and undoubted heir, be now invested and established in the crown imperial of this realm.[45]

Through proclaiming Henry's death at the same time, Edward's automatic and undoubted right to the throne as 'his only son' is emphasised. The supremacy is part of his inheritance, as is 'the crown imperial of this realm', the symbol of imperial majesty. Neither are Edward's title nor imperial crown contingent upon the act of coronation. Edward is proclaimed to 'be now invested and established in the crown imperial'. A second copy of this proclamation, dated 1 February 1547, stresses this point further. 'Be now' is amended to 'now thereby' in the following: 'the King's majesty, now being his only son and undoubted heir, is now thereby invested and established in the crown imperial of this realm'.[46] It is via the language and utterance of proclamation that Edward is made king. This anticipation and displacement of the coronation is evident in *Wriothesley's Chronicle*. For the first time in this chronicle, a monarch's reign opens with the report of the proclamation. Emphasis is placed on the automatic transition from successor to heir by the word that opens Edward's reign, 'Imediatlie':

Imediatlie the said lordes in their ordre, with Garter, the King of Haroldes, and other, in their cote armors, came out of the Perliament Chambre into the Palace of Westminster Hall with a trumpett, and their proclamation was made by the said Garter under the Kinges brode seale. Edward the Sixth, sonne and heire of our late Soveraigne Lord, to be King of this realme of England, France, and Ireland, Defendour of the Faith, &c., and of the churches of England and also of Ireland the Supream Head, ymediatlie under God, on earth.[47]

Wriothesley goes on to relate how the proclamation was sounded, with trumpet fanfares, at 'Sainct Magnus Church corner', 'Leaden Hall [by] the Standard in Cheepe' and at 'the conduite in Fleet Streete'.[48]

The legal status, the legitimacy, of the proclamation is indicated by the fact that the Council, nobility and clergy swore their oaths of allegiance to Edward before his coronation, thus recognising Edward as king

and pre-empting the act of homage that traditionally formed part of the coronation service. On 1 February, the Acts of the Privy Council record how the councillors

> did furste take their othes to the Kinges Majestie, our Souvaigne Lorde, and after ymmediately sware to the due and faithfull observacion of the saide wille as the day before they had resolved . . . This day it was also ordred that on Thursdaye next all the Temporal Lordes shuld take their othes to the Kinges Majeste before the Lorde Chauncellour and others to be appoincted for that purpose at the Sterre Chambre, and on Frydaye all the Busshopes to do the like in the same place.[49]

This impacted on the coronation. A herald's narrative account of Edward's coronation reports how the ceremony of homage in the Abbey was subsequently amended to save time. The 'Lord Protector kneled downe before his grace and made his homage', so did the Archbishop of Canterbury and 'all the nobylitie of the realme, as well of spiritualty as temporalty'. The latter, however, did not pay homage in the usual way. The herald reports that 'because that tyme wolde not serve for every of them to declare their homage particularly, they kneled down all together, and my Lord Protector declared their homage in generall unto his Majesty, and they held up their hands and assented unto the same'.[50] As the oaths of allegiance are pulled out of the sacred context of the service and into the political space of the Tower, the homage traditionally performed in the Abbey is cast as a symbolic, repeated display of oaths already sworn, to a monarch already proclaimed as king.

A third substantial alteration to Edward's coronation lies in the revision of the formula of the Recognition, uttered at the beginning of the service by the Archbishop of Canterbury as the king is shown to all four sides of the Abbey. As Chapter 1 showed, the Recognition formula from the *Liber Regalis* and Henry VIII's coronation Device retained elements of the notion of kingship by popular election as opposed to divine right. Recorded in the *Acts of the Privy Council* and in the herald's account, Edward's revised formula deletes the remnants of election and consent. The original assertion that the rightful heir was 'Elect chosen and required by all the thre estates of this lande to take uppon him the seid Coronne and royall dignitee' was omitted.[51] Instead, the congregation in the Abbey was reminded that they 'be bownde' to give their 'good willes and assentes' by their 'dwetyes of allegeance'. These 'dwetyes of allegeance' refer to the oaths already sworn in the Tower prior to the coronation. The 1509

formula, 'Will ye here at this tyme and geve your wills and assents to the same Consecracion enunction and Coronacion', was subtly amended in 1547 to 'Wille you *serve* at this tyme and geve your good willes and assentes.'[52] The role of the witnesses shifts from a voluntary and participatory one to a duty-bound, passive and subservient role. These subtle linguistic shifts fundamentally reconfigure the king's relationship with his subjects. Finally, as with the proclamation, the Recognition specifies that it is the 'Crowne Imperiall' that Edward has inherited. This is the Recognition for Edward in full, as documented by the Privy Council's proceedings:

Furste, thearchebushope of Canterbury shall shew the King to the people at fowre partes of a great pulpet or stage to be made for the King, and shall saye on this wyse: – Syrs; here I present King Edwarde, rightfull and undoubted enheritour by the lawes of God and man to the Royal Dignitie and Crowne Imperiall off this realme, whose Consecracion, Enunction and Coronacion is apoincted by all the Nobles and Peres of this lande to be this daye. Wille you serve at this tyme and geve your good willes and assentes to the saide Consecracion, Enunction and Coronacion as by your dwetyes of allegeance ye be bownde to do?

The people taunswer;
yea, yea, yea, King
Edwarde, King Edwarde,
King Edwarde![53]

Dale Hoak has written of the Council's proclamation of Edward as king prior to the coronation that 'with one stroke of the pen, the council had rendered the traditional coronation ceremony an empty form'.[54] Similarly, Schramm has stated that, with the proclamation, the 'coronation became an empty form, and might well be abandoned as in Spain and elsewhere'.[55] The proclamation, the revised Recognition and Cranmer's sermon reposition the legitimising force of the ceremony and claim legitimacy through other, verbal, means: a printed proclamation, a spoken address. The coronation is transformed into a shadow and performance of truths already known and facts already claimed – the truth of Edward's supremacy, the truth that he is a legitimate king whether anointed or unanointed, the fact that oaths of allegiance had already been sworn. But at the same time, in all their careful detail, these amendments and the revised oath reveal a conscientious desire for the coronation to articulate correctly Edward's monarchical power and for this to be conveyed accurately. Transformed into a type of drama, it is nonetheless a drama whose correct performance is crucial. In addition, there is a self-interested aspect to the

Council's 'long . . . deliberation' over the form of Edward's coronation. The proclamation, Recognition, oath and sermon augment and herald Edward's supremacy, but because of the context of Edward's minority and England's status as a protectorate, this supremacy would remain theoretical. Instead, to exalt Edward's supremacy and to tie it to religious reformation serve to amplify and legitimise the Council's power. Edward's supreme headship, at nine years old, would work to the advantage of those directing his prerogative. We might wonder how the supremacy would have been declared – and what oath would have been sworn – if Edward had not been a child-king. Edward's supremacy could be safely declared because, in reality, it was a supremacy that would be negotiated by his Council.[56]

Edward's coronation gave legitimate and powerful expression to the authority of his Council, and to Cranmer and Somerset in particular. Although the ceremony was supposedly truncated on the grounds of the king's youth, the crowning part of the ritual was embellished, establishing a new precedent that future coronations would follow. In 1533, Anne Boleyn was crowned with two crowns: St Edward's crown (unprecedented for a consort) and a crown made purposely for her and which was probably imperial in style. Edward was crowned with three crowns: St Edward's crown, the imperial state crown and a third personal, but imperial-shaped, crown. This is the herald's account:

> Then they set hym agayne in his chaire before the high alter, and the archbushop of Caunterbury and my Lord Protector, with great reverence, brought him three crownes, viz. one, Kynge Edwardes crowne, the other the imperyall crowne of his realme of Englande, the third a very ryche crowne which was pourpossely made for his grace. Then they set them one after another upon the Kynges hede, and betwixte the puttynge on of every crowne the trumpetts blewe.[57]

The imperial state crown was not part of the regalia bestowed during the coronation service. It was traditionally bestowed on the monarch in St Edward's chapel, prior to the recession, as the *Liber Regalis* stipulated and as happened at Henry VIII's coronation in 1509. Although Edward was too little to bear St Edward's crown for the duration of the singing of 'Te Deum', and the imperial state crown was similarly too heavy for him to wear for the entire recession (therefore justifying the wearing of a personal crown), the inclusion of the imperial state crown as part of the crowning ritual would have had enormous symbolic resonance. Not only did it make visible the imperial crown of Edward's proclamation and title, but

the fact that Edward underwent a triple crowning echoed papal crownings. The pope's tiara consisted of three crowns, and he was identifiable by this fact.[58] Both Mary and Elizabeth would be crowned with three crowns at their coronations. At the same time as Edward is visibly crowned as a supreme monarch, a further amendment incorporates the Duke of Somerset into the crowning ritual. In the above account, the herald notes how the Archbishop of Canterbury and 'my Lord Protector' both set the crowns on Edward's head. Somerset as the Lord Protector takes a prominent and symbolic ceremonial role. The triple crowning emphasises Edward's imperial power, but it is made manifest that this will be mediated through the protectorate.

The changes made to Edward's coronation, then, are far more complex than is often claimed. They are concerned with how the ceremony is interpreted rather than with its form and choreography. The liturgy of the coronation remained unchanged, adhering to the rubrics in the *Liber Regalis*, as did the anointing and investiture, apart from the triple crowning and Somerset's part in it. But, by all accounts, Edward swore his oath on the holy sacrament and lay prostrate before the high altar. He was anointed with the holy oil and with chrism; 'Veni Creator Spiritus' was sung and mass conducted in the usual manner, with the clergy dressed 'in pontificalibus'.[59] Edward's coronation was not perceived, or at least not reported, as being 'reformed' or lacking in correctness or splendour in ambassadors' reports or chronicle accounts. Were the deviations unnoticed or deemed insignificant? Does the veneer of tradition and precedent override minor alterations? The French ambassador, for example, relates how Edward processed through London 'en grand triomphe' and how he was 'couronne et sacre a Westmester avec le plus grand triumphe et solennite qu'il est possible'.[60] Grafton's *A Chronicle at large* reports that Edward was crowned 'with all the solemnitie and honour that might be, the perticulers whereof I overpasse because the lyke hath bene rehersed in this booke in other kinges tymes', and Holinshed's account describes how the 'coronation was solemnized in due forme and order, with all the roialtie and honour which thereunto apperteined.'[61] Wriothesley reports, with similar brevity, that on 'the twentith daie of Februarie, being the Soundaie Quinquagesima, the Kinges Majestie Edward the Sixth, of the age of nyne yeares and three monthes, was crowned King of this realme of Englande, France, and Irelande, within the church of Westminster, with great honor and solemnitie, and a great feast keept that daie in Westminster Hall which was rychlie hanged, his Majestie sitting all dynner with his crowne on his head'.[62]

It serves as an important corrective to the notion of coronation pageantry as planned and effective official propaganda that Edward's procession through London on 19 February is not mentioned at all in the *Acts of the Privy Council*'s plans for the coronation. Indeed, the pageants for Edward's procession reflect a number of different responses to the event. They have been described as hastily constructed, 'totally undistinguished . . . perhaps the most tawdry on record'.[63] Their accompanying poetry is, certainly, mostly unremarkable, but it is, perhaps paradoxically, precisely the pageants' lack of coherence and their juxtaposition of tradition, history and present context that are significant in 1547, indicating political, religious and ceremonial fragility rather than confidence. The relatively poor extant accounts, and the absence of a published pamphlet – compared to, for example, Wynkyn de Worde's *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* for Anne Boleyn in 1533 – are not necessarily proof of a lack of importance attached to Edward's procession, but we perhaps need to consider the procession on different terms than might be expected, particularly in the light of the revisions made and attention paid to the consecration ceremony. The Council did not, for example, reject the religious ceremony in favour of an opportunity to promote reformation via a public ceremony. Indeed, while there is no evidence that a descriptive pamphlet was ever published, one of the few extant visual records of Tudor coronations is of Edward's procession. Significantly, the centrepiece of this visual representation is the Cross in Cheapside, newly gilded and decorated with images of Christ and the Virgin Mary. Edward is depicted passing by the Cross, traditionally dressed 'in a gown of cloth of gold, wearing his hat and feather, mounted on a stately courser, richly caparisoned, and under a canopy of cloth of gold'.[64]

The chronicles are curiously quiet about Edward's procession, probably due to the lack of a published descriptive account. Stow's *Annales* only mention the entertainment at St Paul's, where a 'man of the nation of Arragosa' descended 'from the battlements of the Steeple of Paules church upon a cable'.[65] Wriothesley notes in passing the 'riche cloathes and divers pageantes' and 'the conduites running wyne', but he does also record that Edward was given 'a purse of cloath of gould for a present from the cittie, which he thanckfullie tooke', a precedent created at Anne's procession in 1533.[66] The imperial ambassador, Van der Delft, who rode alongside Cranmer, reports that Edward 'was carried with a great train of courtiers towards his palace at Westminster' but that '[t]here was, however, no very memorable show of triumph or magnificence'.[67] The Council's coronation revisions suggest that the religious service was their main concern,

which further implies that the design and control of the procession lay predominantly in the hands of the city authorities. As with Anne, Londoners were requested to pay a tax to contribute to the pageantry costs and the city records note the names of the craftsmen allocated to each individual pageant. There does not seem to have been a court–city council overseeing the entire procession as in 1533 and the pageantry was required to be ready within only two weeks of the announcement of Henry's death.[68]

In contrast to the innovations made to the religious service, Edward's pageantry – and the lack of sufficient preparation time would have influenced this – followed precedent inasmuch as it appropriated and doctored Henry VI's entry into London in 1432 after his coronation in France.[69] Henry VI was, of course, another boy-king. The Seven Gifts of Grace formed the structure of this medieval procession, gifts that underpin sacramental ceremony and were understood to be conferred through the anointing – as the anthem sung at coronation, 'Veni Creator Spiritus', makes clear. As Edward processed, he was censed by the 'prestes and clarkes' who lined the streets of Cheapside 'with their crosses and sensers, and in their best ornamentes'.[70] On the other hand, Edward was not borne aloft in a litter like the consecrated host in a Corpus Christi procession. The herald's account describes how he was 'richly apparelled with a riche gowne of clothe of silver all over embrodered with damaske golde', but that he was 'walking a lyttel before his canapy, because the people might the better see his grace' (p. cclxxx). The pageantry, too, builds on the precedent of Anne Boleyn's coronation procession – the gift of money has already been noted, but the 1533 procession's visible iconography of the imperial crown is also repeated, although this is, interestingly, not as consistently articulated in Edward's procession. The pageant at the Great Conduit featured a 'crowne imperyall of golde, garnished as it stode with ryche perle and stones' atop a 'sumptuous founteyne' (p. cclxxxiii) and the Imperial 'dyademe' appeared in the pageant of Sapience and the 'seven Sciences liberall' (p. cclxxxiv). Recalling but replacing Anne's falcon device of 1533, a phoenix (Jane Seymour's emblem) descended from a pageant roof and then 'a Lyon of gold crowned, making semblance of amyty unto the bird, moveing his head sundry tymes, between the which familiarity as it seemed there came forth a young Lyon that had a crowne imperiall brought from heaven above, as by ii angelles, wich they sett upon his head' (p. cclxxxvi). The anachronistic representation of Edward the Confessor at the Little Conduit in Cheapside refers to imperial English kingship: 'an auncyent man setting in a chere, apparelled with a gowne of clothe of gold,

and a crowne imperiall upon his hede, who had in his right hand a scepture of gold, and in his left hand a ball with a crosse, representing the state of Kyng Edward the Confessor' (p. cclxxxviii). However, when Edward VI himself is represented in another pageant in Cheapside – where the actor is seated on a 'sumptuous throne' – he is not described as wearing the crown imperial (p. cclxxxvi). While the procession does reflect an Englishness, even a proto-Britishness – the Scottish ambassadors are described as processing with the members of the Council (p. cclxxix) – only one pageant in the entire procession refers explicitly to religious change. This is the representation of Truth, in the pageant at the Great Conduit in Fleet Street, who speaks about the suppression of idolatry. Accompanied by Faith and Justice, Truth addresses Edward as follows:

> I, auncyent Trewth, which long time was suppressed
> with hethen rites and detestable idolatrye,
> have in thy realme been in great part refreshed
> by God's servant my defender king Henry,
> who moe than once, tendering God's glory,
> hath made me free, whom abuses long kept bound,
> and hath therefore God's mercy allways found.
>
> Wherefore if you wyll me lykewise embrace,
> as did your father, most loving kynge Edward.
> (p. ccxci)

Where we might expect extended imperial iconography and comprehensive promotion of the 'true' religion, it is sporadic and disjointed. However, a striking but subtle shift from previous processions lies in the self-conscious language of representation. The pageant scenes and characters are described, for the first time, as representations, as actors, marking a departure from the descriptive language of Wynkyn de Worde's *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon*, for example. This language of distance rather than immediacy is apparent in the pageantry poetry, and in the herald's narrative account. A person 'resemblynge . . . wylde Urson' at the Great Conduit in Cheapside declares: 'For I wylde Urson dothe here syngnefye / an emperour's son of excellent majestye' and, similarly, Valentyne says: 'Also noble Valentyne I doo here represent' (pp. cclxxxii, cclxxxiii). The child-actors in the pageant near the conduit in Cheapside are described as 'representing Grace, Nature, Fortune, and Charity' (p. cclxxxiii) and the child in the throne depicted as 'representing the Kinges Majestie' (p. cclxxxvi). Just as Cranmer's address in Edward's coronation serves to position the ceremony as a type of dramatic

representation rather than effective ritual, the pageantry poetry and the herald's description draw attention to the removed status of the pageant scenes, to their status as representations and substitutions. In addition, Edward is presented with an image of himself as king in the pageant in Cheapside. Rather than a Biblical forefather such as Josiah as Cranmer referred to in his coronation address, Edward sees a representation of himself on the pageant stage. It is this dramatisation of ceremony and representation of majesty that the next part of this chapter explores, through consideration of *King Johan* by John Bale.

CEREMONY AND IMPERIAL MAJESTY ON STAGE: JOHN BALE'S *KING JOHAN*

The appropriation of dramatic language for discussion of Edward's coronation – as this chapter has done – is pointed. Much reformist polemic of the 1530s and 1540s discussed ceremonies in terms of drama: popish ceremonies were criticised as deceitful plays, juggling tricks and devilish disguisings. John Bale, dramatist under the patronage of Thomas Cromwell and zealous writer of evangelical prose, was an extreme critic of popish ceremonies.[71] His play *King Johan*, written and first performed in the 1530s, stages the theatrics of the Roman Church and, in doing so, problematises the relationship between ceremony and the stage.

Most of Bale's plays were written in the 1530s and, as many of the titles suggest, coincide with ceremonial events. For example, the lost *On the King's Two Marriages* must have referred to the marriage and accession of Anne Boleyn, and *The Betrayal by Thomas Becket* is thought to have been performed before Henry VIII at court the night of the symbolic and ceremonial destruction of Becket's shrine on 8 September 1538.[72] Bale's mystery-cycle plays present reformed versions of religious ceremonies, such as baptism in his *Johan Baptystes Preachynge*, published with *God's Promises* and *The Temptation of our Lord* in Wesel in 1547–8.[73] In Kilkenny, Ireland on 20 August 1553, the day Mary I was proclaimed Queen of England, Bale preached on obedience but records how his anti-papal plays *God's Promises*, *Johan Baptystes Preachynge* and *The Temptation of Our Lord* were performed:

> On the xx. daye of August was the ladye marye with us at kylkennye proclamed Quene of Englande, Fraunce and Irelande with the greatest solempnyte that there coulde be devysed of processions musters and disgysinges . . . What a do I had that daye with the prebendaryes and prestes abought wearinge the cope croser and

myter in procession it were to muche to write . . . I toke Christes testament in my hande and went to the market crosse the people in great nombre folowinge. There toke I the xiii chapter of S. Paule to the Romans declaringe to them breveley what the autoritie was of the worldly powers & magistrates what reverence & obedience were due to the same.

In the mean tyme had the prelates goten ii disgysed prestes one to beare the myter afore me and an other the croser makinge iii procession pageauntes of one. The yonge men in the forenone played a Tragedye of Gods promises in the olde lawe at the market crosse with organe plainges and songes very aptely. In the afternone agayne they played a Commedie of sanct Johan Baptistes preachinges of Christes baptisynge and of his temptacion in the wildernesse to the small contentacion of the prestes and other papistes there.[74]

There is sound evidence that Bale's most-discussed play, and the first English history play, *King Johan*, was performed before Cranmer during Christmas 1538–9.[75] The play was not printed in Bale's lifetime, but was corrected and revised sometime between 1547 and 1560. The extant manuscript consists of a revised early text of the play, corrected in two hands, one of which has been identified as Bale's. This text merges with an incomplete ending of the play, which is written entirely in Bale's hand and on paper that bears a 1558 watermark.[76] The first part of the manuscript includes the inserted Interpreter's speech – dividing the play into two acts – which refers to 'our late kynge Henrye' (and therefore must have been added after Henry's death in 1547), and the incomplete ending includes an epilogue addressed to a female monarch (Elizabeth) and a reference to a recent proclamation against Anabaptists, possibly that published on 22 September 1560.[77] It has been suggested that an earlier round of revisions were made with Edward VI in mind, and that the role of Imperial Majesty may have been expanded, added indeed, to represent Edward.[78] The highly suggestive and appealing idea that the play was revised for performance at Edward's coronation, and that the entertainment documented in the Revels' accounts featuring cardinals, popes and monarchs prepared 'agenste the Coronacion of our soveraigne lorde Edward' is actually Bale's *King Johan* must remain, as Pafford also concludes, unsubstantiated, indeed unlikely. Bale did not return from exile until 1548 and the references in the Revels' accounts are too vague.[79] While neither text nor performances post-1538–9 can be dated, it nonetheless remains a possibility that *King Johan* underwent revision during Edward VI's reign. We know, for example, that Bale revised his other plays while abroad in exile in the 1540s and, on his return in 1548, Bale presented Edward VI with his catalogue of English writers: *Illustrium Majoris*

Britanniae Scriptorum ... Summarium.[80] Would Edward VI, then, also have known Bale's drama? As the example of the Irish performances in 1553 suggests, Bale's plays continued to be staged. *King Johan* would certainly have been topical in Edward's reign. In his coronation address, Cranmer alludes to King John, citing him along with Henry VIII as an example, and warning, of a king who surrendered his crown to the Bishop of Rome: 'I have no commission to denounce your majesty deprived . . . much less to draw up indentures between God and your majesty, or to say you forfeit your crown with a clause for the bishop of Rome, as have been done by your majesty's predecessors, King John, and his son Henry of this land.'[81] *King Johan* dramatises and comments on the supremacy, imperial England and religious reformation through its depiction of John as a proto-Protestant king and the appearance of Imperial Majesty – evidently as a sixteenth-century monarch – at the end of the play. Greg Walker has argued convincingly that *King Johan*, as performed in 1538–9, provides a radical critique of a fragile political moment and attempts to perform persuasive counsel to a conservative-leaning Henry.[82] Similarly, staged before Elizabeth I in 1560–1, the play could also be understood to deliver political and religious counsel to a moderate-leaning queen. Indeed, Imperial Majesty, as the embodiment of an abstraction, could represent the historical King John, Henry VIII and Edward, Elizabeth, even Mary. Although it is not possible to argue for the performance of *King Johan* at one particular time, or to link Imperial Majesty to a specific monarch, Bale's play uses the stage to critique ceremony and to represent a particular concept of monarchy. His play demonstrates how the reformation of ceremony at this time seems to be tied up with its dramatisation.

King Johan stages the struggle for supremacy and reformation through demonisation of the traditional church and criticism of papal authority. The pope (Usurped Power) and vices disguised in clerical costume are paraded and parodied across the stage, and the ceremonies of excommunication, absolution and praying for souls in purgatory are revealed to be corrupt, unauthorised and hollow. Imperial Majesty appears triumphant at the end of the play, to complete King John's thwarted 'godly' reformation (l. 1401). King John insists on his divine authority: 'it ys a charge gevyn me from God allmyghtye' (l. 406) and, when Private Wealth disguised as Cardinal Pandulphus confronts John to excommunicate him, John declares:

> The powr of princys ys gevyn from God above,
> And, as sayth Salomon, ther hartes the lord doth move.

God spekyth in ther lyppes whan they geve jugement.
The lawys that they make are by the lordes appoyntment.
(ll. 1342–5)

The play stages the same struggle over the ownership of the crown invoked by Cranmer's address to Edward at his coronation. Sedition demands that John surrender his crown to the pope – 'Tush, gyve upp the crowne and make nomore a do' (l. 1668) – which Cranmer recalls: 'I have no commission . . . to say you forfeit your crown with a clause for the bishop of Rome, as have been done by your majesty's predecessors, King John, and his son Henry of this land'. King John and Imperial Majesty are depicted as anointed and God-sent kings, successors to King Solomon and David, and ordained explicitly to promote evangelical religion. The Interpreter, at the end of Act I, announces, setting up the play as a mirror:

In thys present acte we have to yow declared,
As in a myrrour, the begynnynge of kynge Iohan,
How he was of God a magistrate appoynted
To the governance of thys same noble regyon,
To see maynteyned the true fayth and relygyon.
(ll. 1086–90)

Imperial Majesty's appearance is prepared by Verity – Truth – who chastises Civil Order, Clergy and Nobility for slaying and misrepresenting an anointed and proto-Protestant king (John):

Ye have raysed vp of hym most shamelesse lyes,
Both by your reportes and by your written storyes.
He that slewe Saul through fearcenesse vyolent
Was slayne sone after at Davids just commaundement,
For bycause that Saul was anoynted of the lorde.
The seconde of kynges of thys beareth plenteouse recorde.
He was in those dayes estemed wurthie to dye
On a noynted kynge that layed handes violentlye.
(ll. 2289–96)

Unlike the 'lyvnge wurde of the lorde', Scripture and the Gospel, the ceremonies of the Roman Church are 'dead' (l. 1119) – silent and superstitious dumb-shows compared to the lucidity, authority and edification of the Word. As Treason admits to King John at the end of the play: 'In the place of Christe I have sett up supersticyons; / For preachynes, ceremonyes; for Gods wurde, mennys tradicyons' (ll. 1823–4). Of widow

England's despair, King John tells Clergy that 'Yt is yow, Clargy, that hathe her in dysdayne / With yowr Latyne howrs, serymonyes and popetly playes' (ll. 414–15). Disguise, deception, abused liturgical language (such as absolving 'In nomine domini pape' instead of 'in the name of the Lord') and hyperbolic gesturing are linked in *King Johan* to dramatic misrepresentation. The priests are 'dysgysyd shavelynges' (l. 429), Sedition is the consummate actor, 'playing the knave', and Dissimulation boasts 'Thowgh I seme a shepe, I can play the suttle foxe' (l. 714) and how:

> To wynne the peple I appoynt yche man his place:
> Sum to syng Latyn and sum to ducke at grace,
> Sum to go mummyng and sum to beare the crosse,
> Sum to stowpe downeward as ther heades ware stopt with mosse.
> (ll. 698–701)

The 'serymonyes and popetly playes' held in contempt by King John are performed on the stage and exposed as farce: nothing happens. Accused by the Pope – alias Usurped Power – of being a 'blabbe', Dissimulation pleads for absolution in corrupt Latin: '*Mea culpa, mea culpa, gravissima mea culpa!* / Geve me yowr blyssyng *pro deo et sancta Maria*' (ll. 1028–9). The Pope kneels and, offhandedly, blesses Dissimulation – 'Thow hast my blyssyng, aryse now and stond asyde' (l. 1030). Dissimulation then parodies the tangibility and efficacy of the ritual: 'My skyn ys so thyke yt wyll not throw glyde' (l. 1031). Earlier, Dissimulation, Sedition, Private Wealth and Usurped Power move across the stage in a mock religious procession that breaks down in front of the audience. Dissimulation brings in Usurped Power and Private Wealth who enter, singing from the Latin office of the dead. Sedition satirically interprets the procession for the audience:

> Sures, marke well this gere, for now yt begynnyth to worke:
> False Dyssymulacyon doth bryng in Privat Welth,
> And Usurpyd Powr, which is more ferce than a Turcke,
> Commeth in by hym to decayve all spyrytuall helth
> (ll. 770–3)

The order of the procession is ridiculed as Sedition exclaims to Dissimulation 'But by whom commyst thou?' (l. 779), and then tells Usurped Power to go out and come in again, 'Nay, Usurpid Powr, thou must go backe ageyne', so that he can re-enter, this time bearing Sedition 'on thi backe' in order

> That yt maye be sayde that fyrst Dyssymulacyon
> Browght in Privat Welth to every Cristen nacyon,

And that Privat Welth browght in Usurpid Powr,
And he Sedycyon, in cytye, towne and tower
(ll. 793–6).

To which Dissimulation replies, 'Nay, Usurped Powr, we shall bare hym all thre.' Dissimulation, Private Wealth and Usurped Power then process across the stage, bearing Sedition, who declares: 'Yea, thus it shuld be. Mary, now I am alofte / I wyll beshyte yow all yf ye sett me not downe softe' (ll. 803–4).

The scene following this farcical procession sees Usurped Power, Private Wealth and Sedition enter ceremoniously, dressed as Pope, Cardinal and the monk Stephen Langton. They bear a cross, Bible, bell and candle for the excommunication of King John, a ceremony that will strip John and England of their ways of worship in order to reinstate the Pope's. Ceremonies are the manifestation of authority. As Dissimulation declares:

The popys powr shall be abowe the powrs all,
And eare confessyon a matere necessary.
Ceremonys wyll be the ryghtes ecclesyastycall.
He shall sett vp ther both pardowns and purgatory;
The Gospell prechyng wyll be an heresy.
(ll. 1019–23)

The excommunication speech takes place just after Dissimulation's mocking response to the Pope's blessing: 'My skyn is so thyke yt wyll not throw glyde.' The sincerity of the cursing ceremony is immediately undercut. However, as E. S. Miller has noted, it is performed with the correct ritual props of cross, book, bell and candle and is an accurate, and solemn, representation of an authentic ceremony.[83] The Pope's words signal how the objects perform:

For as moch as kyng John doth holy church so handle,
Here I do curse hym wyth crosse, boke, bell and candle:
Lyke as this same roode turneth now from me his face,
So God I requyre to sequester hym of his grace;
As this boke doth speare [shut] by my worke maanuall,
I wyll God to close uppe from hym his benyfyttes all;
As this burynyng flame goth from this candle in syght,
I wyll God to put hym from his eternall lyght;
I take hym from Crist, and after the sownd of this bell,
Both body and sowle I geve hym to the devyll of hell.
(ll. 1034–43)

The speech ends with Dissimulation, the Cardinal (Private Wealth) and Sedition (Stephen Langton) singing.

For King John, the Pope's ceremony is rendered ineffective because it lacks scriptural authority: 'That sentence or curse that scriptur doth not dyrect / In my opynyon shall be of non effecte' (ll. 1432–3). This 'In my opynyon' betrays the anxious and uncertain debate about ceremonies that runs throughout this play. The charge is not that the ceremony is ineffective *per se*, but that it lacks correct or legitimate authorisation. King John goes on to tell the Clergy: 'Prove yt by scriptur, and than wyll I yt alowe' (l. 1435). It is King John's response to it that declares it 'of non effecte', and the Interpreter's commentary which immediately follows the excommunication scene ensures that the facts of history are interpreted correctly:

> Upon a goode zele he attempted very farre
> For welthe of thys hys realme to provyde reformacyon
> In the churche thereof. But they ded hym debarre
> Of that good purpose, for by excommunycacyon
> The space of vii yeares they interdyct thys nacyon.
> These bloud suppers thus, of crueltie and spyght,
> Subdued thys good kynge for executynge ryght.
> (ll. 1093–9)

In terms of the structure of the play, the ceremony of excommunication signals a turning point. It closes the first act with the interpolated Interpreter's speech and the play proceeds to demonstrate the effect of excommunication as John is rendered powerless and forced to surrender his crown. It may, in his opinion, be 'of non effecte' but, when Clergy says 'I wyll spere up the chalyce, crysmatory, crosse and all, / That masse they shall have non, baptym nor beryall. / And thys I know well wyll make the peple madde' (ll. 1253–5), the result is that John cannot remain King. Through Clergy's comment, the play gives voice to this contentious power of ceremony. *King Johan* stages an inverse coronation, and, later in the play, a second king-making ceremony. John's authority may be declared to derive from God but it is shown on the stage to be more contingent than this. The King surrenders his crown to Sedition in a ceremonial fashion: 'To hym I resynge here the septer and the crowne / Of Ynglond and Yrelond, with the powr and renowne, / And put me wholly to his mercyfull ordynance' (ll. 1729–31). He is then re-made King at the end of the

play through absolution. Cardinal Pandulphus says to King John, who is on his knees:

Than here I releace yow of your interdictyons all,
And strayghtly commaunde yow upon daungers that maye fall
Nomore to meddle with the churches reformacyon,
Nor holde men from Rome whan they make appellacyon,
By God and by all the contentes of thys boke.
(ll. 1967–71)

After King John's death, Imperial Majesty, pre-empted by Verity, appears as the embodiment of divine power and justice, and the image of a sixteenth-century monarch crowned, undoubtedly, in an imperial crown. With Verity's departing words, 'Well, than, I doubt not but the lorde wyll condescende / Adewe to ye all' (ll. 2315–16), Imperial Majesty appears – descends – on stage. The final scene repeats the ceremonies that have previously been derided: Imperial Majesty forgives and blesses, and has the power to grant absolution (which Sedition, however, is denied); Nobility, Clergy and Civil Order swear new oaths of allegiance. Imperial Majesty's authority is clearly defined by Verity, who presents Imperial Majesty and confirms his power in a ceremonial declamation that is reminiscent of the Recognition and act of homage in coronation. The poetry is measured and repetitive and the following speech ends with Nobility, Clergy and Civil Order agreeing, in unison, to bestow on their King 'hys due supremyte':

For Gods sake obeye lyke as doth yow befall,
For in hys owne realme a kynge is judge over all
By Gods appoyntment, and none maye hym judge agayne
But the lorde hymself. In thys the scripture is playne.
He that condempneth a kynge condempneth God without dought;
He that harmeth a kynge to harme God goeth abought;
He that a prynce resisteth doth dampne Gods ordynaunce
And resisteth God in withdrawynge hys affyaunce.

. . .

I charge yow, therfor, as God hath charged me,
To gyve to your kynge hys due supremyte
And exyle the pope thys realme for evermore.

Nob. / Cler. / C. Ord. } We shall gladly doo accordynge to your loore.
(ll. 2346–61)

In the above, the play makes this declaration of monarchical power authentic by placing it in a ceremonial context. The rest of the scene negotiates this supreme governance. As Clergy solemnly promises to 'exyle usurped powre / And your supremyte to defende yche daye and howre', Imperial Majesty promises to 'exyle sedicyon' (ll. 2447–8, l. 2441). In contrast to the oaths sworn and then abused in the play up to this point, and the absolution and forgiveness granted via the Pope's hollow ceremonies, the play asks us to read the final ceremonial scene of *King Johan* as sincere and legitimate. If we project Henry VIII – or Edward – into Imperial Majesty then this scene and its enactment of supreme power becomes even more relevant and representative of actual contemporary ceremony.

It has been said that Bale's theatrical project impales itself 'on the horns of a dilemma' because it relies on the notion that drama is inherently demystifying in order to critique the theatre of the Catholic Church, while still depending on and exploiting the symbolic language of drama.[84] David Scott Kastan has written of *King Johan* that 'if papal untruth is presented in terms of its manifest "ipocrisy", its deceptive "serymonys and popetly plays", the singular truth of John's proto-Protestantism can be maintained only by impossibly asserting it as something plain and immediate, as something unfeigned; that is, it can be maintained only by repressing the fact of the play itself'.[85] Paul Whitfield White notes the aptness of using the stage to ridicule Catholic ritual, since the stage was where 'according to the reformers, such pageantry belonged in the first place'. White goes on to comment of the Pope's curse in *King Johan* that 'the incongruous context of the ritual holds it up for ridicule and shows it for what Bale thought it was: a piece of good theatre'.[86] This, however, is to assume that drama as a medium, as a context, is inherently illusory and insubstantial and that, in attempting to use the stage to teach truth, Bale confronts an irreconcilable problem.[87] But how Bale understands drama is important. White's quotation would be more applicable to Bale if 'a piece of good theatre' were replaced by 'a piece of bad theatre'. It cannot be assumed that the context of the stage was 'incongruous' and that the mere staging of ceremony was tantamount to its degradation. As the Corpus Christi plays and a conversion play such as *The Croxton Play of the Sacrament* suggest, the representation of religious ceremony in plays was neither unusual nor inherently demystifying. Indeed, an outcome of the *Play of the Sacrament* is its instruction about sacramental ceremony, both mass and baptism: identifying the difference between the actual ceremony and the dramatic representation of the ceremony is not

problematic and the play moves from outside space to conclude in a church for the christening of the Jews. The Bishop declares:

> Now wyll I take thys Holy Sacrament
> Wyth humble hart and gret devocion,
> And all we wyll gon with on consent
> And beare yt to chyrche wyth solempne processyon.[88]

The properties, costumes and rites of the Roman Church were quite used to being pulled out of their sacred ceremonial context, without impacting on that ceremonial context. Furthermore, as evidence accumulates for the continued performance of plays – including Bale's – in churches in the sixteenth century, distinctions between the stage as an inherently secularising space compared to the sacred space of the church become increasingly difficult to make.[89] It is not the case, then, that sacred ceremony is replaced by a secular counterpart, or that the idea that the liturgy was a type of drama was a novelty that served to expose that liturgy as redundant.[90]

Bale himself articulates notions of drama that challenge further a straightforward understanding of the affinities between corrupt ceremonies and meaningless theatrics. Comparing the ceremonies of the Roman Church to plays was not uncommon in mid-sixteenth-century reformist propaganda, and Bale's own prose works are peppered with theatrically charged insults. The ceremony of mass is described as a 'juglyng playe' complete with meaningless props and gestures: 'Ffor there standeth the preste disgysed lyke one that wolde shewe some conveyaunce or juglyng playe. He turneth his back to the people / and telleth a tale to the walle in a foren language.'[91] It is the trickery, fraud, exclusivity and inaccessibility of the mass's drama that Bale criticizes. Crucially, Bale wants ceremonies to represent truth and historical – Biblical – accuracy. The popish deceit lies in imaginative corruption. In *A mysterye of inyquyte* Bale writes: 'What is yowr Masse els but a gawdishe sopperye or a toye of yowr owne ymaginacyon: Nomore is it lyke the holye supper of Christ than the earthe is lyke heaven or fylthye dyrt like golde.'[92] As ceremony should represent and reenact Biblical truth, so should a particular and godly type of drama that Bale promotes. In *The Epistel Exhortatorye*, he defends his plays as follows:

> None leave ye unvexed and untrobled No, not somuch as the poore minstrels and players of interludes, but ye are doing with them. So long as they played lyes & sange baudy songes blasphemed God and corrupting mens consciences, ye never

blamed them, but were verye well contented. But sens they persuaded the people to worship theyr Lord God a ryght accordyng to hys holie lawes & not yours, and to acknoledge Jesus Chryst for their onlye redemer and saviour, without your lowsie legerdemais, ye never were pleased with them whan they tell you as the truth is, that your Romysh father hathe played the cruell Antychryste, and you his false physicions in holdyng the Christen multitude so many hundreth yeres in such damnable darknes of sprite without repentaunce ye take it unpatientlye sekyng their destruccion for it.[93]

Good plays, like correct ceremonies, should 'tell you as the truth is' and persuade 'the people to worship theyr Lord God a ryght'. Bad plays – 'lyes' – are like corrupt ceremonies. The 'lowsie legerdemai[n]s' in the above echoes the 'juglyng playe' of mass and its deviation from the real historical mass, whereas correct ceremonies are correct representations, and correctly read representations. Bale's play *Johan Baptystes Preachynge* stages not the ceremony of baptism as known from the Church, but the baptism of Christ as it was first performed by John the Baptist – with water, not oil – therefore insisting on its historical precedent and thus its legitimacy as a ceremony, while not adhering to its magical efficacy. Baleus Prolocutor declares in the play's prologue: 'Ye shall se Christ here submyt hymselfe to Baptym / Of Johan hys servaunt in most meke humble wyse.'[94] The rite is declared to be a 'preparacyon / Unto faythe in Christ wherin rest your salvacyon' (ll. 121–2), a 'sygne' to be learnt from (l. 124), a 'token of repentaunce' linked to a 'remembraunce' (ll. 146, 147) – representative of Christ's remission of sins as John the Baptist says: 'I washe in water, but remyssyon is of him' (l. 190). His baptisms are a 'sygne of outwarde mortyfyenge' rather than 'inwarde quyckenynge' (ll. 191, 192), performed as 'but a shaddow' of Christ's baptism (l. 389). Bale's play represents ceremony to teach 'newe lernynge' (l. 207) – a new version of the ceremony of baptism, of 'mennys tradycyons' (l. 441) which is based, neatly, on the ceremony performing as instructive historical representation. *John the Baptist* from the Towneley cycle of mystery plays, for example, conflates the historical event with the future ritual: John baptises Jesus '*In nomine patris et filii*' and with 'oyle and creme'.[95]

John Foxe, in his prologue to his Latin apocalyptic play, *Christus Triumphans* (published in 1556), suggests a similar useful correspondence between ceremony and drama. He presents his play – which ends with the promise of a reconciliatory ceremony in the marriage of Christ to his Church – as a shadow: 'Perhaps it will not be long before stage representations will lie neglected; then indeed we will see all with our own eyes.' Watching drama, he writes, is 'to view through a netting the images of

things, which is all we play' and he implores his audience to 'indulge us with sacred silence, as you are wont to do in holy churches'.[96] The drama is not the real thing – and neither is a ceremony – but both can presage and prepare us for the real thing. A justification of both plays and ceremonies, then, lies in their shared status as re-enactments of a past truth or dramatised precursors of truths as yet unknown and undisclosed. In Foxe's formula, watching plays borrows from the experience of ceremony, and the correct reading of ceremonies borrows from the experience of drama.

While Bale's *King Johan* constitutes a devastating critique of the illegitimate and untruthful drama of the Roman Church, it uses the stage to pit corrupt ceremonies against correct ones and therefore attempts to teach a way of re-reading ceremonies and to recuperate their correct authority. At the same time as popish ceremonies are mocked and we are asked to equate clerical ceremonial disguise with inner depravity, we are also asked to read certain symbols and costumes as legitimate and sincere. Through the redeployment of certain properties in different contexts, this play asks us to read the symbols in different ways according to their context. King John's crown and sceptre, handed over to Sedition, are set against the Pope's triple crown, cross and keys which disguise his real self as Usurped Power. The book of the excommunication scene – the Bible – first appeared in the scene when Clergy, Civil Order and Nobility swear allegiance to King John. They kneel before him and kiss the book. King John declares:

> Ye shall fyrst be sworne to God and to the crowne
> To be trew and juste in every cetye and towne,
> And this to performe set hand and kysse the bocke.
> (ll. 519–21)

This ceremony is rendered legitimate by the action of the play. At the end of *King Johan*, in a scene that exactly mirrors this opening scene, Clergy, Civil Order and Nobility again appear on their knees, bowing this time before Imperial Majesty and swearing to uphold his supremacy. Even auricular confession, derided in the play, is recuperated at the end when Sedition is discovered through confession before Imperial Majesty, who delivers his final judgement. The dilemma of Bale's drama is not that the dramatisation of ceremony renders it redundant. Rather, what *King Johan* exposes through staging ceremony is its interpretability and contingency. Nobility, as he is being persuaded by Clergy to betray King John, remembers the oaths that they have sworn at the beginning of the play and asks

Clergy 'how wyll ye do for the othe that ye have take?' (l. 619). We also recall King John's own words on his excommunication that point to the dilemma of interpretation and competing versions of authority – 'That sentence or curse that scriptur doth not dyrect / In my opynyon shall be of non effecte' (ll. 1432–3) – and the interpolated role of the appropriately named 'Interpreter' who informs us that the excommunication ceremony that we have just witnessed is, in fact, illegitimate.

The reformation of ceremonies is bound up with their dramatisation. The reinterpretation of Edward VI's coronation brought about by the Council's amendments and Cranmer's address nudges the ceremony towards representation rather than effective magic, but Edward's coronation was still 'necessary'. It represented the 'truth' of his supremacy and sanctioned the delivery of acceptable monarchical counsel. Similarly, in John Bale's *King Johan*, as the representation of actual history dissolves into representing the abstract and timeless ideal of Imperial Majesty, the play turns outwards, like Edward's coronation, to counsel the monarch. Ceremony behaves like drama, and drama behaves ceremonially. And both are concerned with the critique and reformation of ceremony, not with its implosion.

CHAPTER 4

'He hath sent Marye our soveraigne and Quene': England's first queen and Respublica

In histories of the Reformation, the accession of Mary is often depicted as the stumbling block, a step backwards and an aberration. Unequivocally Catholic, her reign has been classified as disastrous, unimaginative and ineffective.[1] But Mary's coronation on 1 October 1553, and the extraordinary circumstances surrounding her accession, position her coronation as a crucial link between Edward VI's and Elizabeth I's ceremonies, with significant implications for the future of monarchical politics and purpose of sacred royal ceremonies.

Mary's reign is still traditionally viewed through the prism of her religion, but this chapter argues for the inextricability of three major issues surrounding Mary's accession: legitimacy of birth, legitimacy of gender and legitimacy of religion. Mary was England's first acknowledged queen regnant. She was also Catholic and, in some eyes, legally a bastard. Furthermore, the law meant that Mary could be declared Supreme Head of the Church of England. There was no precedent for a queen regnant, let alone for a female and Catholic supremacy. As a possible solution to this problem, Mary's newly formed Council came up with an unusual plan whose significance has, until now, been overlooked by critics. Certain key members of the Council proposed to postpone Mary's coronation until after Parliament had opened and safely declared her queen.[2] Such a reversal of the established sequence of events at the beginning of a monarch's reign was unprecedented, and it signals a fundamental turning point in the sixteenth century. Mary would be first and foremost a parliamentary queen; she would owe her authority to Parliament first, not to God. Even more than in 1547, Mary's coronation articulates an anxious struggle for meaning, truth and legitimacy: ceremony has shattered like a looking-glass, and different shards reflect different aspects and interpretations. It is not surprising, then, that for the first time we are presented with a play which provides such a reflection: Nicholas Udall's *Respublica*, a dramatisation of Mary's accession and the problem of legitimate female

governance, performed before the court during Christmas 1553, and possibly even commissioned as a coronation play. This play is a poignant echo of Anne Boleyn's coronation in 1533, for which Nicholas Udall composed the pageant verses, and recalls John Bale's *King Johan*. But in 1553 a protagonist monarch is replaced by Respublica, who represents a female body politic and a female head of state. Taken together, Mary's problematic coronation and Udall's play constitute a moment that can be identified, this chapter suggests, as the moment of a Marian monarchical republic.[3]

THE PROCLAMATION OF LEGITIMACY

The shift towards the legality of the proclamation of a monarch began, as the previous chapter showed, with Edward VI. It proceeds with increased ambivalence in 1553. The extraordinary events of July–August 1553 that brought Mary to the throne are accompanied by the urgency and competing legitimacy of Lady Jane Grey's and then Mary's proclamations. On 10 July, after Edward VI had died on the 6th, Jane – and not Princess Mary – was installed in the Tower of London and proclaimed Queen of England. On the same day, Mary had proclaimed herself queen from her house at Kenninghall in a letter to the Council in London. The papal despatch, G. F. Commendone, records how Northumberland and his supporters

> suspecting that she [Mary] might order to be proclaimed also in London, especially as the people showed her favour, being discontented with the election of Jane, hurriedly, at about 6pm, the Heralds, accompanied by 30 halberdiers of the King's body-guard, proclaimed Jane in three or four places of the town. Owing to lack of time they intended doing it the following day in more places.

Commendone continues to report that 'the people heard it with remarkable discontent'.[4] The attempted accession of Jane, brokered by the Duke of Northumberland and Edward before his death, fuelled a debate about the legitimate descent of the English crown that had begun in Henry's reign. Henry's first Act of Succession of 1534 had, following the marriage with Anne Boleyn, declared Princess Mary illegitimate. The second Succession Act of 1536 had subsequently declared Elizabeth illegitimate and devolved the crown to the as-yet unborn issue of Henry's third marriage to Jane Seymour, with the proviso that Henry could nominate his heirs as part of his royal prerogative should there be no such legitimate child. In 1544, due to the paucity of heirs (only Edward was named and he was a

child), a third Act of Succession was drawn up.[5] This act reinstated Princesses Mary and Elizabeth as legitimate heirs to the throne should Edward die childless. Should Elizabeth die with no issue, then, the act decreed, the crown should pass to the children of Henry VIII's younger sister, Mary – the Suffolk line – and not to the Stuart line through Margaret, Henry's older sister.

The proclamation of Lady Jane Grey as legitimate queen circumvented the terms of Henry's 1544 Act of Succession, also reiterated in his will of December 1546. Instead, it adhered to the third Act of Succession that had declared Mary and Elizabeth illegitimate and jumped immediately to the Suffolk line, to Mary Tudor's granddaughter, Lady Jane Grey. It was a coup engineered by both Edward VI and the Duke of Northumberland, who had succeeded Somerset as president of the Council in 1550. Whether Northumberland coerced Edward, whether it was the other way round, or whether it was collaborative, has been much debated, as have been their motives. Was Northumberland purely ambitious for power or were both he and Edward endeavouring to protect the new religion?[6] Northumberland had conveniently arranged a marriage between his youngest son, Guildford Dudley, and Jane in May 1553 which secured the subsequent succession of the crown for his family, and had planned to have Dudley crowned king at Jane's coronation – which would have been unprecedented for a king consort.[7] In early 1553 a device detailing the new succession was drawn up, and signed by Edward and his councillors, barring Mary and Elizabeth from the throne and nominating the descendants of Mary Tudor as lawful successors.[8] While this device privileged the 1536 Act of Succession, it also determined that Edward, as king and supreme monarch, could authorise his succession through his own royal will, following the precedent of his father. Henry, however, had decreed that he alone could exercise this prerogative, not his successors. Due to Edward's sudden illness, the 'devise for the succession' was never formally sanctioned by Parliament. Instead, letters patent dated 21 June 1553 declared Mary and Elizabeth bastards and summoned Parliament to legitimise the new succession.[9] The legitimacy of royal prerogative was thus in conflict with parliamentary authority. As the letters patent state, this 'declaracion and lymetacion concerninge the succession of the crowne' needed to be 'established, ratefyed, and confirmed, as well by authoritye of parleamente'.[10]

When Mary was informed of Edward's imminent death – and of the conspiracy endangering her succession – she moved to her house at Kenninghall, and then on to Framlingham Castle in Suffolk, accompanied by what has been called her 'Council of War'.[11] Mary and her war council

amassed the support of local nobility and summoned subjects to resist Northumberland and his allies. Figures such as Sir Richard Southwell and Sir Thomas Cornwallis, who had initially signed the Device in favour of Jane, capitulated and swore allegiance before Mary. Ten days later on 20 July, Northumberland, who had advanced as far as Cambridge, but who had been deserted by many of his supporters, surrendered and acknowledged Mary as the rightful Queen of England. Northumberland was arrested and imprisoned in the Tower as Mary and her now-expanding Council moved towards London.[12] On 19 July, in London, Mary was officially proclaimed Queen of England by the Earl of Pembroke (William Herbert), who had also formerly supported Northumberland, along with several other key Edwardian councillors including William Paget, William Paulet (Marquis of Winchester) and the Earls of Arundel (Henry Fitzalan), Shrewsbury (Francis Talbot) and Bedford (John Russell). Proclamations announcing Mary's accession then ricocheted throughout the kingdom. Henry Machyn, a Marian loyalist, records the first proclamation of Mary as queen at the Cross in Cheapside:

> The xix day of July was qwene Mare proclamyd qwene of England, France, and Yrland, and alle domy(ni)ons, [as the] syster of the late kyng Edward the vi and doythur unto the nobull kyng Henry the viii be-twyn v and vi of the cloke at nyght, and ther wher at proclamasyon iiii trumpeters and ii harold(s) of armes, and the erle of Arundell, the erle of Shrossbery, th'erle Penbroke, my lord Tressorer, my lord of Preveselle, my lord Cobham, my lord Warden, master Masun, and my lord Mare, and dyvers odur nobull men; and thys was done at the crosse in Chepe, and from that plasse thay whent unto Powlls and ther was *Te Deum Laudamus*, with song, and the organes playhyng, and all the belles ryngyng thrugh London, and bone-fyres, and tabuls in evere strett, and wyne and bere and alle, and evere strett full of bonfyres, and ther was money cast a-way.[13]

On 3 August, following the proclamation, Mary entered London, 'dressed in violet velvet' (imperial robes), to take 'possession of her kingdom'. As the imperial ambassadors report to Charles V:

> The Queen of England made her entry into this city of London on the 3rd of this month, and took possession of her kingdom. She was escorted by the nobility in great numbers; over a thousand men-at-arms, mounted and on foot, followed her train in their accoutrements of war, besides her body-guard . . . The Earl of Arundel carried the sword of state. The Earls of Pembroke and Shrewsbury, and the Treasurer, Lord St John by name, went to beg the Queen's pardon on the day before the entry . . . The joy of the people is hardly credible, Sire, and the public demonstrations made at the entry have never had their equal in this kingdom.[14]

This 'joy of the people' and Machyn's description of 'all the belles ryngyng thrugh London' have been invoked as illustrative of the popular resistance to the Edwardian Reformation and the welcome restoration of traditional religion and its practices – the ringing of bells, bonfires and singing of 'Te Deum' – that Mary's accession would supposedly promise.[15] Exactly how Mary successfully deposed Jane, and whether her bloodless coup was a victory for royal legitimacy or traditional religion, remain matters for debate. Simon Renard, in a letter to Prince Philip, described how, on Mary's entry into London, 'inscriptions were set up saying: *Vox populi, vox Dei*'.[16] G. R. Elton writes that the 'events of July–August 1553' did not constitute a vote against the Reformation but a victory for legitimism and for fear of civil war'.[17] On the other hand, Christopher Haigh argues that 'the English had not cared much for legitimism' and that Mary was 'swept to power by a revolution' – one that was led by the English people's instinctive and continued loyalty to the Catholic religion.[18] Jennifer Loach has similarly claimed that matters of religion, and not legitimacy, were decisive in bringing Jane and then Mary to the throne. She writes that it 'was not, in fact, primarily in terms of legitimacy and legality that contemporaries saw the struggle' and, furthermore, that '[n]o nobleman sympathetic to Protestantism supported Mary'.[19] Such a thesis polarises the terms 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' and presumes that they were not only available as categories of identification but also as categories that would determine political choices. Furthermore, this polarisation does not properly account for figures that migrated successfully from one regime to another (such as most of Edward's Council) and implies that such migration is explained by political opportunism rather than a genuine anxiety about correct legitimacy and its complex relationship with religion. As David Loades has shown, those whom we might call 'Catholic' and those whom we might call 'Protestant' were divided as much among themselves as they were between each other about the succession crisis. He writes that 'it is a fallacy to believe that there was a "catholic" party which supported the Queen and a "protestant" party which opposed her'.[20] Thomas Cranmer, for instance, was against the deviation of the succession, despite being one of the few that could safely be labelled 'Protestant'.[21] Many other Edwardian councillors were similarly wavering in their loyalty to Northumberland, despite having signed in favour of Edward's succession device. The Earls of Arundel and Pembroke, for example, were reluctant to accept Jane, and Sir William Paget, who had fallen out of Northumberland's favour in 1551, was not involved at all with the succession plot.[22]

The notion of a Protestant Edwardian council in favour of Jane versus the Catholic Mary and her Catholic noblemen and supporters needs to be

rejected in favour of a more nuanced and complex mix of loyalties to a legitimate monarch and religious beliefs. Indeed, to argue for the primacy of either legitimacy or religion misrepresents the relationship between the two issues: it was, for some, entirely logical to have evangelical views but to support Mary's claim to the throne. Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, for example, wrote of the proclamation of Jane that 'And, though I lik'd not the religion / Which all her life queen Marye hadd profest, / Yett in my mind that wicked motion / Right heires for to displace I did detest.'[23] Motives of legitimism cannot be helpfully disentangled from those of religion: Mary was brought to the throne by a complex mix of the two. As Dale Hoak has shown, matters of correct governance were of great importance and could cut across religious denominations. When Mary was proclaimed queen, her diverse Council comprised those men 'who had given her England' and those 'who had governed England' during Henry's and Edward's reigns – men such as Paget, Pembroke and Arundel.[24] The contentious issues raised by Mary's accession are the definition of legitimacy and what constitutes legitimate governance in relation to true religion.

In a speech made before the Council, the Earl of Arundel, Henry Fitzalan, argues for Mary's legitimacy.[25] He invokes the laws of 'direct succession' against 'violent action or succession' and moves from this to a definition of true religion. The true religion of Edward's reign re-emerges as annexed to legitimate monarchy. He says:

> And I am sure as well that you know that this Crown belongs rightfully, by direct succession, to My Lady Mary lawful and natural daughter of our King Henry VIII. Therefore why should you let yourselves be corrupted and tolerate that anybody might unjustly possess what does not belong to him? That will be really to look after the public welfare if you will reinstate the public liberties and everybody will rejoice at it, as well as they are distressed by such violent action or succession; and that will be true Religion, because you will enforce justice, restoring his right to the lawful heir.[26]

The laws that decree Mary to be rightful heir are not those of Parliament but are ancient laws of the land, instituted by God: disregarding them would be tantamount to disobeying God and committing a sin. This, in Arundel's speech, justifies how those who (like himself) had already proclaimed Jane as Queen could – and must – safely backtrack:

> And if by chance you should feel somehow guilty proclaiming now our Queen My Lady Mary, having acclaimed Jane only a few days ago, showing such quick change

of mind, I tell you that this is no reason to hesitate, because having sinned it befits always to amend, especially when, as in the present circumstances, it means honour for your goodselves, welfare and freedom for our country, love and loyalty to his King, peace and contentment for all people. But if you do not amend you show to have little care of yourselves, as you will fall into serfdom, you are ungrateful to your Country, disregard the laws and are responsible for this Kingdom continuing restless for many years with other endless evils which will ensue.[27]

Arundel's speech trumps religion with Mary's legitimate birthright – 'lawful and natural daughter of our King Henry VIII' – but, as his reference to the earlier proclamation of Jane indicates, this legitimacy is vulnerable and cannot be guaranteed to secure the throne for the rightful monarch.

The proclamations of Jane and Mary compete to secure and legitimise their respective claims in 1553. In each, what constitutes legitimate rule shifts. The proclamation of Jane appeals to the authority of Edward's royal will, and the ratifying signatures of his 'noble Counsellors, Judges and other wise and learned men':

our beloved cousin King Edward of blessed memory by letters patent signed by his own hand, and sealed with the great seal of England, the XXI day of June, in the VII Year of his Reign, in presence of most of his noble Counsellors, Judges and other wise and learned men, who have given their approval and signed with their own hands, for the benefit and security of the whole Kingdom.[28]

The proclamation acknowledges the 1544 Act of Succession and Henry's will which had reinstated Mary and Elizabeth in the succession, but it asserts the primacy of Parliament which had already authorised the divorces:

as it is common knowledge, the marriage between King Henry VIII and the Lady Catherine mother of the said Lady Mary, as well as the marriage between the said Henry and the Lady Anne, mother of the Lady Elizabeth were openly and legally made void by divorce judgements, in accordance with the words of God and the Laws of the Church, which divorces have been respectively ratified and confirmed by authority of special Parliament in the XXVIII year of the said King Henry's Reign, which ratification is still in force, power and effect.[29]

Mary and Elizabeth are illegal heirs 'by the old established laws and statutes and customs of this Realm' which authorised the divorces, and which can only be undone by Parliament – 'which ratification is still in force, power and effect'. This proclamation, then, argues for Edward's

supremacy over Parliament, and yet also invokes the tenacity of Parliament's authorisation in spite of an overriding royal will. Compared to Mary's Spanish blood, Jane is 'natural of and born in this Kingdom', where 'natural' is also equated with her legality. Jane is also defined as the 'natural and legal Queen and mistress'. Jane's right to the throne derives from the legality of Edward's letters patent, the irreversibility of the divorce judgements as sanctioned by 'special Parliament' and her pure Englishness.

By contrast, Mary's proclamation of 19 July, read out at the Cross in Cheapside, appeals to the authority of the equally old and established laws governing English succession. It is God's will and Edward's death that legitimise Mary's accession, and 'whereby' the imperial crown descends, automatically and immediately, to her. Her proclamation echoes that published for Edward in 1547; like Edward she is proclaimed 'supreme head' and is the rightful heir of the 'crown imperial'. In the place of sovereign lord and king, Mary is the 'natural and liege sovereign lady and Queen', the 'benign and gracious sovereign lady'. The proclamation begins:

> Mary by the grace of God Queen of England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, and in the earth supreme head of the Church of England and Ireland: to all our most loving, faithful, and obedient subjects, greeting.
>
> Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to call unto his mercy the most excellent Prince, King Edward VI, our late brother of most worthy memory, whereby the crown imperial of the realms of England and Ireland, with the title of France and all other things appertaining unto the same, do most rightfully and lawfully belong unto us.[30]

'Rightfully' and 'lawfully' refer here to the legitimacy of divine right. Mary, like Jane, is the 'natural and liege sovereign lady and Queen', but 'natural' is associated with natural birthright and the natural order of inheritance, rather than questions of nationality. But, despite the phrasing of Mary's proclamation and its attempt to inscribe a natural path for the imperial crown that cannot be intercepted, Mary was not automatically made queen on Edward's death. The proclamation of Jane exposed the fallibility of divine right claims. The purpose of a proclamation, as first articulated in 1547, was to assert the monarch's undoubted right to the throne and their divinely ordained supremacy. This was challenged by the circumstances of Mary's accession. To recall Cranmer's words at Edward VI's coronation, Mary was not queen 'notwithstanding': if key councillors

had not abandoned Northumberland, Mary might not have been a queen at all. In 1553, it is essential that the proclamation and the coronation constitute legal and legitimising acts, but to which authority should they appeal? Mary is proclaimed by Council, not by God. Mary herself is reported to have believed that she was not called to her office by God. Cardinal Pole's secretary Henry Penning writes that Mary had told him 'fervently that she did not believe herself called by God'.[31] Her accession, then, rests only precariously on the notion of God's will. A popular ballad printed in 1553, entitled *A Ninvectyve agaynst Treason*, expresses this sense of the fragility of a divinely ordained legitimacy. On the one hand, the ballad presents treason and deviation from 'lyneall dissent' as an inevitable part of 'this mortall lyfe' and of history; on the other hand, the restoration of legitimate kings is dependent on the will of God, but this cannot be guaranteed either. The ballad declares that, with the accession of Mary, 'god . . . shewed on us his grace: in gevyng a ryghtful queene', but anxiously acknowledges that this was only just in time: 'But at the last he helped us, though we thought it ryght longe'. Furthermore, the ballad also makes it clear that, although God 'at the last' came to help, it was 'The Nobles here proclaymed her queene.'[32]

The proclamation contributes to legitimising the monarch, but it does not constitute a definitive legal act. The privileging of the act of proclamation in 1547 – Fabyan's *Chronicle* of 1559 reports how Edward was 'proclaimed, annoynted, and crouned king'[33] – served to reorient the status of coronation, but it did not appropriate its total legitimising power. Neither Jane's nor Mary's proclamations were irreversible. Jane's pitiful epithet 'nine days Queen' is significant. As Commendone notes of Jane's instalment in the Tower:

> Any one who has to succeed to the English Crown, before his coronation, must forcibly dwell there 10 days and the reason of it is, as they say, that owing to its outstanding importance, he will be proved with certainty to be the rightful successor to the Crown once master of the Tower; otherwise the Council would refuse to grant its consent.[34]

Jane was a proclaimed queen, but she was not an anointed queen, and her claim could yet be challenged. The anxiety that Commendone unwittingly alludes to here is that, should Mary's proclamation have been delayed, the Council could not have withdrawn their consent to Jane. Instead, they may have been obliged to proceed with the coronation of Jane. The Council's power to reject and proclaim a monarch is possible, but

limited: ceremonial precedent is still a powerful legitimising force. Similarly, the imperial ambassadors refer to the necessary process whereby Mary's queenship will be secured, and the need for the coronation to take place quickly. On Mary's entry into London on 3 August, they write: 'Sire, the Queen accomplished two regal acts: she was proclaimed, and took possession; the third, remaining, is the coronation, which will take place as soon as the necessary preparations can be made.'[35]

The importance of Mary's proclamation as part of her accession – and the instability of this accession – is indicated by Richard Taverner's *An Oration gratulatory made upon the joyfull proclayming of the moste noble Princes Quene Mary Quene of Englande*, published as an eight-folio quarto by John Day in 1553.[36] It is significant that it is 'upon the joyfull' proclamation that a text was written and printed. No English publication describing Mary's procession and coronation has come to light; commemorative books were printed abroad, in Italy and Spain, illustrating the significance of Mary's accession for England's European and Catholic observers within the Empire.[37] Richard Taverner's pamphlet is an extraordinary defence of Mary's legitimacy, but it was not officially commissioned. Taverner was a clerk of the privy seal (appointed by Cromwell in 1536–7) and a translator and author of humanist and reformist works.[38] His *Oration gratulatory*, written in a strong personal voice, is dedicated to Mary, undoubtedly in an attempt to protect his position and favour at court. If this was the intention, it was unsuccessful: Taverner lost his place in the signet office. The printer of his work, John Day, was later to be imprisoned in October 1554 for the 'pryntyng of noythy bokes'.[39] Taverner's neglected text is remarkable for the way it presents Mary with a version of her legitimacy and her divine authority, and the way in which it moves from this to discussing 'true' religion. Taverner's text addresses the queen, and urges her to uphold the reformed religion as established by Henrician and Edwardian laws. In this, it inscribes Mary as bound by Parliament. We cannot be certain about the extent or nature of Taverner's evangelical beliefs or the truth of his response to Mary's accession. But his text is anxious, urgent and repetitious, and, as it lurches between anchoring Mary's legitimacy to the will of God and anchoring it to the authority of Parliament, it encapsulates the dilemma of a divinely sanctioned supreme (and female) monarch and her status vis-à-vis the law.

An Oration gratulatory begins by presenting Mary's accession as miraculous – 'What great and wonderfull joy is now sodenly and unloked for' (Aiir) – and as evidence of God's plan and deliverance for England: 'God, god, it is I saye O England that hath delivered the. Wherefore geve the

onely glorye to hym and prayse herof. God it is and none other that hathe of hys profounde wysdome broughte to passe, and wroughte thys whole matter' (Aiiiv). Comparable to Henry Machyn's diary report, Taverner confirms Mary's legitimacy through a description of the correlation between Mary's rightful proclamation and the people's gestures of confirmation and approval: bonfires and bells. Taverner writes:

> For the thing it self, the outward actes, the behavours, the gestures, and countenaunces of all honest & true englysh heartes cease not dayly wonderfully to declare & confirme thys my sayinge to be most true. For (O Lorde) what shoutinges, what castings up of caps, what bonfires, what laughings, what weepings for joy, what feastinges, what bancketings. What ringyng of bels, and all other tokens and signes of mirth & gladnes were not had and made universally throughout al England, Wales, and other her graces dominions, what tyme her highnes was proclaymed Quene. (Aiir–v)

The bonfires, bells and casting-up of caps constitute what David Cressy calls the 'vocabulary of celebration' in early modern England.[40] But in Taverner's text their purpose is more than descriptive: the bonfires and bells are 'sygnes and tokens' – proof – of the truth and legitimacy underlying Mary's proclamation. The 'outward actes, the behavours, the gestures' are not specifically associated with Catholic belief – as might be the case in Machyn's report – but are invoked as legitimate responses to the proclamation of the rightful monarch. It is as if they, as acts, reciprocate and enhance Mary's legitimacy: in this they constitute the vocabulary of monarchical legitimacy.

An Oration gratulatory stresses that the crime from which England has been delivered by God in the body of Mary is the deviation of the imperial crown (the crown as imperial has now been fully absorbed into political discourse) from its rightful owner, and not the deviation from true religion. In this it selects to emphasise legitimism over religion. Northumberland, never referred to by name, is the 'subtile ennemye of the Crowne' who had 'so craftely framed his matters, so tyrannicallye made him self stronge, & on the contrary side so weakened to the syght of man, the true and undoubted heire to the Crowne imperiall, that all hope was gone, al good men and women were in utter despayre and deploration' (Aiiir). Echoing the proclamation, Mary is insisted on as the 'moste rightful enheritoure of the crowne imperial of England' and 'our moste bening soveraigne Lady, most naturall and mooste rightful soveraigne Lady' (Aiiiir). Beneath the urgent repetition, however, is a tremulous

irony: God's will and Mary's undoubted right to the throne were very nearly circumvented by the enemy. The meaning of 'rightful enheritoure' is jeopardised when it does not guarantee power. It is not until the end of the *Oration*, when it has been repeatedly stressed that Mary is the rightful heir ordained by God, that Taverner turns to address the religious question and to link the truth of Mary's legitimacy with 'the true religion of Christe'. His text pauses:

> But here me thinke, I heare some saye, that albeit these thinges be most true, whych I have heare alledged for causes of high joy and gladnes: yet manye men wolde be muche more joyfull and inwardlye gladde in theyr hearts if they mighte be assured, that the true religion of Christe, whych is nowe receyved into thys realme, myghte, throughe hir graciouse goodnes, be reteyned & kept styll. (Avv–Avir)

Crucially, Taverner's answer appeals to the authority of Parliament, and to Mary's duty to observe this:

> To these men I briefly answere, that I nothing doubt, but that all lawes, concerninge religion, made uppon just and godlye groundes by aucthority of Parlyamente, in the time of hir graces father of noble memorye kynge Henry the eyght, or which were made sithens that time, or that here after shalbe made, by like authority, and upon like good, just and godly groundes hir highnes wyl confyrme, ratify and establishe. But on the contrary side, if anye thinges rashlye, by mennes pryvate aucthority, have been lately setfourth, without warrant of Parliament, or (which is chieflye to be regarded) wythoute warrant of gods worde, shall we desyre that such things may stand? or shall we not rather wishe that it wold please hir Maiesty, withal convenient spede, to se the same revoked? the true religion placed? the discipline of the church restored? wherby the erroniouse opinions maye be syfted out from the ryght & catholike. (Avir–Aviv)

The above is a clever piece of admonishing counsel. The language echoes the coronation oath in its allusion to laws past and future: 'all lawes . . . which were made sithens that time, or that here after shalbe made' and that Mary will surely 'confyrme, ratify and establishe'. Mary's authority hails from God, whose will has been miraculously restored, but she is represented in the passage above as subject to the authority of Parliament, a public authority as opposed to the 'pryvate aucthority' of men without 'warrant of Parliament'. Taverner's text therefore moves from the declaration of Mary as undoubted heir and God-sent queen to the authority of Parliament. For Mary to be a legitimate governor, this text implies, she

will need to understand her relationship to Parliament, and the relationship between supremacy, religion and Parliament that the Edwardian reformation established. 'True religion' in Taverner's text is that established justly and correctly by Parliament. It is not distinct from the Catholic religion, but is a purged, purified 'ryght & catholike' religion.

An Oration gratulatory does not make explicit reference to Mary's gender, but the presentation of England's first queen regnant as a distinctly parliamentary queen can hardly go unnoticed. Other commentators on Mary's accession, both traditionalists and radicals, openly justify her accession in terms of her gender. Writing from Italy to Edward Courtenay, Cardinal Pole declared that '[t]he whole world can see that it proceeded solely from Divine providence, which ordained that as the misery of that period, and all that ensued subsequently, came through a woman, so should reparation come through a virgin, their gracious Queen'.[41] Pole casts Mary as a second Virgin, and Anne Boleyn – as the cause of 'the misery of that period' – as a second Eve. In this view of history as a Christian story of redemption, Mary as a female monarch is totally fitting. Pole describes her accession as a Catholic miracle and as a 'manifest victory of God over the long cogitated malice of man'. According to him, God has chosen a woman to 'annihilate in one moment all these long cherished projects' and to restore 'justice, piety, and the true religion, which have hitherto been utterly crushed'.[42] For Cardinal Pole, the 'true' religion is the pre-Reformation Catholic religion. In George Marshall's *A compendious treatise in metre*, Mary is 'Gods chosen vessell', comparable but superior to 'the wydowe Judith, or that quene hester' – female Biblical deliverers of men. Similarly, Mary's accession is 'A wonderfull myracle' brought about to restore 'all trewe religion', 'the good men', and to depose 'the prowde'.[43] For zealous anti-reformers, Mary's accession could be seized upon as proof of the falsity of the new religion. John Christopherson, in his *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion* argues that the 'new doctrine' is proven false by Mary's accession which is ordained by God: 'And hereby it may easelye be perceaved, that it is not the spirite of God, because it stirreth men to fyghte agaynst God. For whosoever maketh warre agaynste hys prince, he maketh warre agaynst God, forasmuch as the prince is (as I sayd before) appoynted by God.'[44] Furthermore, as the ballad *An Ave Maria* suggests, salvation in the form of a woman called Mary was entirely appropriate.[45] For Protestant polemicists, on the other hand, the accession of Mary – a Catholic and a female – was cast as God's punishment, for why else would a Protestant and providential version of history ordain a tyrannous and idolatrous

Catholic queen? This would become the argument of John Knox's infamous *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous regiment of women* in 1558.[46] But for those who saw Mary as neither the Virgin incarnate nor as idolatrous usurper, the anomaly of female rule had immense political repercussions.

'THE BETTER TO ESTABLISH AND CONFIRM THE REIGN': PARLIAMENT BEFORE CORONATION

Henry VIII's Act of Supremacy meant that Mary, like Edward, was proclaimed Supreme Head of the Church of England, much to her dismay. Mary's supremacy was problematic for some members of her Council. On the one hand, it was imperative that her supremacy was emphasised as legal and irreversible in order to safeguard England's independence from Rome. On the other hand, stressing her supremacy risked endorsing her absolute (female) power. In 1547, Edward's supreme powers were limited by virtue of his minority and England's status as a protectorate. By 1553, the supremacy was tied into Parliament. In fact, Mary's supremacy was entirely dependent on Parliament because it could not be reversed without an act of Parliament.[47] Mary, therefore, needed and relied on the consent of Parliament: both she and her key councillors were aware of this. In September 1553, some members of Mary's Council came up with an unprecedented, but unsuccessful, proposal. They wanted to postpone Mary's coronation until after her first Parliament had sat. On 19 September, the imperial ambassadors reported that some 'novelty' was afoot in England:

> the kingdom of England is subject to changes, and its inhabitants capricious seekers after novelty . . . In particular, since our last letters to your Majesty were written, the Queen has sent us word through Scheyfve's secretary that certain Councillors now opine it would be better to hold the Parliament before the coronation, the better to establish and confirm the reign; to discover the intentions of the estates in general and the tendencies of individuals; to discover if there be opposition; to annul the declaration of bastardy made by the Parliament during the life-time of the late King Henry in the year 1535, and declare the late King Edward's testament null and void. We were informed also that there was a good deal of plotting going on against the Queen in this town of London; arquebuses, arrows and other weapons were being collected in various houses, giving cause to fear that during the ceremony of the coronation, as the Queen must proceed to Westminster through the streets of the town for a distance of an English mile or more, some attempt might be made against her person. The

Council were now of opinion that Parliament should be held before the coronation to avoid the likelihood of trouble; the Queen was distressed to hear of this alteration, and the Council could not agree as a whole with the opinion of Paget and others that the coronation should take place and the established order be followed. She asked our advice on the matter.[48]

The Council's proposal indicates that Mary's right to the throne is tied up with Parliament and that, despite her divine right, only Parliament – and not sacred ceremony – can retract Edward's will and the declaration of bastardy. The ambassadors describe how Mary's coronation procession through London and the subsequent consecration ceremony could be dangerous – 'some attempt might be made against her person' – which alludes to the unstable status of Mary's popularity as queen and casts doubt on the ambassadors' earlier report on Mary's proclamation that 'the joy of the people is hardly credible'. It is further implied that a parliamentary act – and not ceremony – would serve to correct this. This denotes a fundamental reconceptualisation of the function of the ceremony. In 1533, as discussed in Chapter 2, Anne Boleyn's coronation preempted law in announcing her legitimacy and Henry's imperial power. Twenty years later, in 1553, the Council's unprecedented proposal undermines the notion that Mary's coronation procession and consecration ceremony will legitimise her claim and secure her reign.

It is in terms of defining and limiting Mary's authority that the proposal is most incendiary. Reversing the order of coronation and Parliament would signal that a seismic shift had taken place in the relationship between monarch and Council, and monarch and Parliament. The adaptation and revision of the coronation in 1547, and the Council's claims on the supremacy of a minor, are taken a step further in 1553: the authority of a queen would be made dependent on Parliament, and her coronation would reflect this. Mary would be neither second next to God nor, as she would prefer, to the pope, but to Parliament. Hitherto, the monarch opened Parliament, not the other way round. If Parliament was sitting when a monarch died – as was the case in 1547 when Henry died – Parliament automatically dissolved, only to be opened again after the coronation with a state ceremony. As the order of the relation of events in the chronicles demonstrates, a monarch's reign begins with their coronation (this is preceded by the proclamation in 1547), swiftly followed by relation of the first opening of Parliament. The silent implication is that there is a correct order, that the coronation sanctions Parliament. Wriothesley, for instance, records the events of October 1553 in quick

succession: 'Sundaye the 1 of October the Queene was crowned at St Peters Churche in Westminster by the Bishop of Winchestre. Thursdaye the 5 of October the parlement began at Westminster.'[49] The inversion of the order of these two crucial events at the beginning of Mary's reign would magnify Parliament's power over her, since it would be to Parliament that her authority would be beholden. The logic follows easily that if Parliament is the 'better to establish and confirm' the reign, then Parliament could also restrict, even nullify, that reign. In this scheme, coronation is conditional rather than constitutional.

From the ambassadors' report, it is not clear who the 'certain Councillors' are who were in favour of the proposal, although it would seem likely that they comprised some of the experienced government men who made up Mary's Council at this time. Dale Hoak has argued for a transformation in the Council in the first few months of Mary's reign, and the shift of real power from her 'Council of War' to a core of experienced councillors and men of government from Henry's and Edward's Councils – notably William Paget, William Petre, the Earls of Arundel and Pembroke and William Paulet.[50] It was these councillors, too, who had proclaimed Mary the rightful queen on 19 July. But as the ambassadors' letter suggests, the proposal did not reflect coherent policy: 'the Council could not agree as a whole with the opinion of Paget and others that the coronation should take place and the established order be followed'. It cannot be assumed that the primary motivation behind the proposal was religious, and that the councillors involved wished to bind Mary to Edwardian ecclesiastical laws and thus secure the new religion. It is equally likely that 'traditionalists' in the Council at this time also wanted to use Parliament to reinforce Mary's right to rule and reverse the supremacy.[51] Either way, what remains startling is the Council's belief in their own authority, indeed in their own supremacy over the new queen. This is precisely what the ambassadors also feared.

In their letter to the emperor, the ambassadors refer to a pamphlet that the Council published in order to advertise the plan. The ambassadors enclosed a copy (not extant) with their letter, commenting that 'the publication of such leaflets, intended to bring about the Parliament before the coronation, is no doubt made with the object of traversing the Queen's affairs, and is not exempt of danger and suspicion'.[52] The ambassadors go on:

As far as we can make out the intention of those who counselled the changes was other than it appeared to be, namely, to cast doubts upon and put in question the Queen's right to the throne: to render her more dependent on Council and Parliament than she should be; bridle her so that she cannot marry a foreigner,

and bring about her marriage to Courtenay according to the Bishop of Winchester's design; prevent the establishment of religion and, generally, put their intrigues into execution.[53]

The prevention of 'the establishment of religion' is listed last, and follows the fear of Mary's dependency on Council and Parliament and the implications of this for her marriage. These are fears raised by Mary as England's first female sovereign, and it is highly improbable that such a bridling proposal would have been made had it been a male monarch ascending the throne.[54] Queen Matilda, daughter of Henry I, had effectively ruled England for a short period and was, apparently, crowned in Winchester Cathedral. She is not, however, listed in the annals of British sovereigns, and was only proclaimed a 'Sovereign Lady', and is therefore unacknowledged as a sovereign monarch in her own right.[55] Any precedent for an English queen regnant was suppressed. The medieval coronation textbook, the *Liber Regalis*, stipulated the order for the procession and coronation of a queen consort, but not for a queen regnant – as we looked at in Chapter 2. There was, then, no precedent determining the form and order of a queen's coronation – not surprising considering there was no consensus in sixteenth-century political thought about the legitimacy of female governance.[56] Henry VIII had eventually nominated his daughters as rightful heirs, but the deviation to the Suffolk line omitted Mary Tudor's daughter, Frances, and skipped to the (unborn) male issue of this line.[57] For some commentators, gynaecocracy was contrary to divine and natural law and in conflict with laws governing marriage – how could a woman rule her kingdom and obey her husband (for she must marry) at the same time? Cardinal Pole's invocation of Mary as a second Virgin, as an unexpected but miraculous event, nonetheless presents Mary as anomalous, as somehow beyond the established laws of succession. Arguing from the opposite perspective, John Knox in his *The First Blast* similarly describes female rulers as ungodly and anomalous and can only justify Biblical precedents such as Judith by invoking God's mysterious ways. He also uses the term 'bridle', as in 'woman oght to be repressed and brideled be times, if she aspire to any dominion'.[58] John Aylmer, in his response to Knox in Elizabeth's reign, would defend female rule but also acknowledge that it is 'for some secret purpose' that God 'myndeth the female should reigne and governe'.[59] With respect to Mary's powers, some of the most ardent Marian supporters, as Judith Richards has shown, used the argument that because she was female she was above existing parliamentary laws because no statutes made reference to a female prince.[60] The need for clarification

concerning a queen's power – made more acute when Mary married Philip in 1554 – is demonstrated by an act passed by Parliament in April 1554. This act declared that the 'Regall power of thys realme is in the Quenes Majestie as fully and absolutely as ever it was in anye her mooste noble progenytours kynges of thys Realme' and that 'the kingely or regal offyce of the realme . . . being invested eyther in male or female, are, and be, and ought to be, as fullye, wholye, absolutely and enteerlye demed, judged, accepted, invested and taken in thone as in thother'.[61] On the one hand, this presents Mary as an ungendered monarch, and bound by the same laws as her predecessors. On the other hand, it signals that Mary's office required definition and that this would need legitimising by a parliamentary act. The Council's proposal to defer the coronation in October 1553 could pre-empt some of these anxieties by hooking Mary's female authority into Parliament early on in the reign. It would turn her coronation into the representation of a legitimate and parliamentary – perhaps bridled – queen.

Somewhat paradoxically, the Council's proposal to declare Mary queen by Parliament prior to coronation still subscribes to the power of coronation. There is the latent fear that, should the coronation precede Parliament as usual, then Mary's relationship to that Parliament will have been sanctioned: Parliament could not, perhaps, manipulate a sworn-in and anointed queen as safely or as legitimately as an unanointed queen. The coronation, then, is no empty ceremony. The Council attempted to bind Mary to a revised coronation oath, just as they sought to bind Edward in 1547. Did they intend to use the same oath that was rewritten for Edward VI in 1547, or would it have been altered further? The proposed oath did not contain any references to the new religion. A copy of the oath that Mary swore is not extant, but the ambassadors (whose advice Mary consulted and who urged her to 'follow the old and accustomed' form of oath) report that Mary 'told us afterwards that she had seen the old form of oath wherein no mention was made of the new religion, but it was said that she should observe the laws of England; and in order to remove every uncertainty she would have the words *just and licit laws* added'.[62] A letter by Cardinal Pole's secretary, Henry Penning, also refers to the oath that Mary amended, and in such a way that her royal prerogative was preserved: 'Her Majesty gave me the copy of the oath taken by her at the coronation, which she had thoroughly considered beforehand, and added a few words having for object to maintain her Majesty's integrity and good-will; as may be seen by the identical copy.'[63] The oath that the Council wished Mary to swear did not seek to tie Mary to certain religious promises, but it did seek to make her comply with the established laws of England.

Importantly, the proposal to delay the coronation was rejected by Mary who thus asserted her independence from her Council, and her authority over her own ceremony. Indeed, her coronation proceeded counter to English law as established in Edward's reign. Nevertheless, Mary has shown herself to be remarkably vulnerable and anxious about her relationship with her Council: following the advice of her imperial ambassadors, the Council's proposal was not rejected outright, nor was the revised coronation oath. In fact, the reversal of coronation and Parliament could even have worked in Mary's favour, should she have been able to undo the supremacy and repeal certain Edwardian injunctions. Her actual coronation on 1 October encapsulated the contest for authority and the muddle in which ceremony and law had found themselves. Mary attempted to reassert the Catholic logic of the ceremony, but her private conscience and sense of her own status as a queen clashed with parliamentary law. Anxious that the holy oils consecrated by Edwardian ministers 'may not be such as they ought because of the ecclesiastical censures upon the country' Mary, desiring her coronation to 'be in every way regular', asked the imperial ambassadors to write to the Bishop of Arras in Brussels to prepare – secretly – special consecrated oil for her anointing.[64] On 13 September, the Bishop of Arras wrote to Simon Renard, enclosing three holy oils:

> I am sending you the three holy oils the Queen asked for, which are those that I usually carry about with me for the consecrations it is sometimes my duty to perform. I beg you to ask the Queen's pardon because the vessel is not more ornate; for I did my best to have a new one made, suitable to be placed in her hands, but I failed to find a master who would promise to finish it in less than three weeks, which would have been too late. I consequently preferred to obey her orders literally, rather than to risk failure by attempting too much.[65]

Despite the Second Act of Uniformity of 1552 and the publication of the second *Book of Common Prayer* (which had finally erased the word 'sacrament' and had turned mass into communion), Mary's coronation was performed as a full Roman mass. As Simon Renard reports, it adhered 'to the rites of the old religion'.[66] But Mary acknowledged the potential illegitimacy of her coronation: due to law, she would be crowned as a Supreme Head and in breach of Rome. She asked Penning to request that Cardinal Pole absolve her, and her bishops, on the day of her coronation so that they 'might be able to say mass and administer the sacraments without sin, until able to have the general absolution'.[67] Since Anne

Boleyn's ceremony in 1533, a function of the coronation had been to intensify the relationship between God and the monarch as Supreme Head of the Church of England, and to invest the ceremony with English imperialism. Mary wished to erase both of these by readmitting papal and foreign authority into the ceremony. But the Edwardian years had ensured that the ceremonies of the Church were a matter of law, and could only be restored through law. A similar conflict affected the funeral arrangements for Edward: should he be buried according to Henry VIII's 1546 will in which he specified that traditional funeral ceremonies should be observed, or should he be buried according to the laws of the religion in which he had lived and died? In the end, Edward was buried according to Protestant rites, but Mary held a private mass for him in the Tower, conducted by Stephen Gardiner.[68] Ceremony here is not a petty matter of confessional politics but an urgent matter of right and wrong: how Edward was buried would determine the salvation, or otherwise, of his soul.

Mary's attempt to reclaim both Edward's funeral and her coronation, to make ceremony stand outside of the realm of the law, exposes the extent to which ceremony had become subject to confessionalism and fractured by the vagaries of interpretation. The holy oils which she commissioned were exchangeable props whose role in the anointing ceremony would generate a host of different meanings. For some witnesses, Mary would be anointed in Edwardian terms, and according to an Edwardian understanding of the purpose of anointing (we remember Cranmer's 'but a ceremony'), as a divinely ordained English queen independent of Rome and of the act of consecration. For her, and for a few others, including Bishop Gardiner who anointed her and the imperial ambassadors who watched, she was being consecrated with Catholic oils and according to the authority of the pre-Reformation church. Like Edward, Mary was crowned with the imperial crown, but this was a symbol of English imperialism and (as the last chapter showed) religious reformation. And what of the mass, now authorised as communion? John Foxe reports that, because the communion was a mass at Mary's coronation, the Bishops of Lincoln and Hereford withdrew from the service at this point.[69] The stability of the ceremony is irretrievable, as is what it would herald for the country. As the imperial ambassadors sum up in their poignant phrase to Charles V: 'nothing is now certain, Sire, in this kingdom'.[70]

Chronicle and manuscript accounts of Mary's coronation record that she was crowned according to the usual ceremonies.[71] But what the usual ceremonies were in 1553, and what is implied by the phrase, is uncertain and particularly pointed.[72] Holinshed relates the 'coronation and other

ceremonies and solemnities then used according to the old custome', but adds caustically that they 'lasted from ten in the morning till five o'clock in the afternoon'.[73] For Simon Renard, 'old custome' constitutes the correct 'rites of the old religion'. Another eyewitness account describes the 'sondery ceremonyes' performed in the coronation in a particularly derogatory way, describing the orb as a toy, a prop, in Mary's hand:

> Note, she was ledde iiii or v tymes on the alter, with so many and sondery ceremonyes in anoynting, crowning, and other olde customes, that it was past iii almost iiii of the clocke at night or ever she cam from the church agayn . . . She was ledd likewise between the old bushope of Dyrom . . . having in hir hande a cepter of golde, and in hir other hande a ball of golde, which she twirled and tourned in hir hande.[74]

The phrase 'the old custome' also implies that Mary was crowned like a male monarch. The familiar phrasing appeals to a precedent for the crowning of a queen regnant that simply did not exist. An incomplete Device was drawn up before Mary's coronation, with blanks left for the names of the officiating archbishop (Cranmer was in the Tower), bishops and nobles, the wording of the oath and details of dress.[75] Accounts of Mary's coronation are inconsistent and contradictory, particularly relating to Mary's dress and certain procedures, which serve to blur the distinction between Mary as a reigning monarch and a queen consort. For the coronation procession through London on 30 September, a manuscript device describes Mary 'richly apparelled with mantle and kirtle of cloth of gold' and 'upon her head a circlet of gold set with rich stones and pearls, in her Grace's litter richly garnished with white cloth of gold . . . and all things thereunto appertaining, according to the precedents'.[76] This is close to the precedent for a queen consort.[77] The accounts in *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, however, and in Holinshed's *Chronicles* report that Mary 'sat in a gown of blew velvet, furred with powdered armeyn, hangyng on hir head a call of clothe of tynsell besett with perle and ston, and about the same apon her head a rond circlet of gold'. Moreover, it goes on to describe how 'the said call and circle' were 'so massy and ponderous that she was fayn to beare uppe hir hedd with hir handes'.[78] Where Commendone describes a simple 'head-dress', this English account draws attention to a cumbersome and, it is implied, ostentatious and unprecedented crown. A male monarch would have ridden bareheaded. On the day of the coronation, Mary processed to the Abbey in traditional crimson parliamentary robes.[79] Again, though, the English account differs and

describes a 'gown of blew velvett'.[80] There is further discrepancy in the procedure followed for the anointing. The imperial ambassadors report that she was anointed twice – this would match a queen consort's anointing.[81] Commendone, however, reports that she was anointed 'on the shoulders, on the breast, on the forehead and on the temples' – like a male monarch.[82] Like Edward, Mary was crowned three times: with St Edward's crown, the imperial crown 'of the realme' and a third crown 'to be purposlie made for her grace'.[83] She was also invested with the traditional regalia: ring, bracelets, sceptre, spurs and orb.[84] Commendone, however, also notes that, at the end of the ceremony, Mary had 'in her hands two Sceptres; the one of the King, the other bearing a dove which, by custom, is given to the Queen'.[85]

Mary was anointed and crowned as a male monarch and as a queen consort. She was also an imperial queen and a Catholic queen. She was anointed with oils consecrated according to the Roman rite but she was crowned, like her step-brother, with the imperial state crown. The wording of the Recognition transcribed in Mary's Device matches that revised for Edward VI: certain amendments to the ceremony would not – could not – be reversed. Finally, Commendone reports that a sermon was 'pronounced by a Bishop on the subject of the obedience which is due to the King'.[86] Commendone here uses 'King' to refer to Mary. The text of the sermon is not extant, but the Calendar of the Patent Rolls indicates that the Bishop of Chichester, the newly reinstated George Day, had been 'specially appointed' by Mary.[87]

The following year, Mary referred to her coronation in such a way that positioned her as a queen consort married to her realm, and that downplayed the ceremony compared to her election by Council and legitimisation by Parliament. In February 1554, she addressed the Guildhall to counter Wyatt's uprising against her Spanish marriage. She argued that her people owed her more obedience than is ordinarily due a monarch because not only was she consecrated queen at coronation but she was also queen 'by rightful law of succession' who was proclaimed and elected so by her Council. She says:

> If I had been established and consecrated as your Queen by the Grace of God only, as it happened to David, when he was called from the herd he was leading, you would be obliged to show me respect and due obedience solely on account of the holy unction. How much more entitled as I am now to expect all these from you, and it becomes you to tender your obedience to me, your Queen, who by the grace of God, by rightful law of succession, confirmed by your unanimous

acclamations and votes, have taken charge of the supreme authority and administration of the Realm of my forefathers, and was proclaimed your Queen.[88]

This is a crucial statement. It articulates a notion of monarchical legitimacy that is 'confirmed by . . . unanimous acclamations and votes' and uses this notion as persuasive rhetoric: she is both David and more than David. Mary may not, of course, have completely understood this to be the contract of her queenship but what this speech shows is that, for the Council, the representation of herself as a queen chosen by them and made queen by them and not by the 'Grace of God only', is the most powerful piece of rhetoric that she could employ. This speech emphasises the triangular structure (rightful inheritance, coronation and ' holy unction', and parliamentary acts) upon which Mary's power rests. In this following extract (also reported of the speech made at the Guildhall) Mary refers to her coronation as a marriage, points to her coronation ring and reminds her audience of their coronation oaths of allegiance – but also again of their 'actes of parliament':

at my coronation when I was wedded to the realme and to the lawes of the same (the spowsall ring whereof I have on my finger, which never hetherto was, nor hereafter shall be left of) ye promised your allegeaunce and obedience unto mee, and that I am the right and true inheritor to the crowne of this realme of Englande, I not onely take all Christendome to witnesse, but also your actes of parliament confirming the same.[89]

It is the acknowledgement of the role of Council, the shadow of a parliamentary queen being crowned in 1553 and the concept of a Marian 'republic' that are now explored in Nicholas Udall's play *Respublica*, which was probably performed before Mary and her court over Christmas 1553, just after the first session of Parliament had closed.

QUEENSHIP ON STAGE: MARY AS RESPUBLICA

Since composing the pageant verses for Anne Boleyn's coronation procession through London in June 1533, Nicholas Udall had maintained a favourable relationship with the court – despite an unresolved scandal and dismissal from his post as headmaster of Eton in 1541.[90] His translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*, under the patronage of Katherine Parr and which he worked on with Princess Mary, was

ordered to be placed in every church, and in 1550 he was commissioned by the Council to print Peter Martyr's discourse against the papal doctrine of the eucharist.[91] In 1551 he was appointed a canon of St George's Chapel, Windsor. Despite his humanist, reformist works, Udall is a migratory figure who muddies notions of clear Catholic and Protestant waters. His comedy *Ralph Roister Doister* was possibly performed before Edward in 1552, although it is also possible that it was not actually written until Mary's reign.[92] In 1555, although having lost the canonry in 1554, Udall was appointed headmaster of Westminster School and his involvement with the Marian office of the Revels is indicated severally in the records of accounts. A warrant from 1554 refers to 'our welbeloved Nicholas Udall' who 'haithe at soundrye seasons convenyente heretofore shewed and myndethe herafter to showe his diligence in settyng forthe of dyalogges & enterludes before us for our regall dysporte and recreacyon'. It grants him unlimited and privileged access to 'soche apparrell and necessaryes for his actours and other incydentes requysyte'.[93]

At some point during Christmas 1553, *Respublica* was performed, or a performance was at least intended, and possibly before Mary and her Council.[94] It has been argued that Udall was perhaps not considered a substantial enough threat by Mary, or by conservatives such as Gardiner, and that he masked his radical intent 'in the guise of apparently conformist counsel'.[95] Udall's successful bridging of three Tudor reigns reinforces this need for a subtle understanding of divisions and slippage between 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' confessionalisation. It calls, too, for a particularly nuanced approach to understanding how Udall's writings and, in particular, his drama worked for the court. *Respublica* dramatises and critiques legitimate monarchical rule in relationship to Council. Furthermore, it dramatises, for the first time, the problem of female rule. In the climate of Mary's coronation that this chapter has discussed, *Respublica*'s treatment of this theme is pivotal. *Respublica* represents Mary as both a sacred and divinely ordained monarch, and as a parliamentary queen.

The title of the original manuscript of *Respublica* – a 'merye enterlude entitled Respublica' – dates the play to '1553 and the first yeare of the moost prosperous Reigne of our moste gracious Soveraigne Quene Marye the first'. The play text itself refers directly to being performed at Christmas. The Poet in the Prologue declares: 'we that are thactours have ourselves dedicate / with some Christmas devise your spirites to recreate', and later identifies these actors as 'boyes', suggesting the Chapel Royal children.[96] It has also been suggested that the play may have been commissioned originally to celebrate Mary's coronation in October, but that

its performance was postponed until Christmas. The Revels documents note a warrant for costumes and properties for a play – untitled – 'to be shewen and played before the quenes majestie at her highnes coronacion', performed by the gentlemen of the Chapel but which 'upon newe determynacion surseased and lefte of as ageane wrowghte upon fynysshed and served att the christemas nexte ensuinge by some woorkemen and thofficers of the revells'.[97] A second warrant, dated 26 September 1553, signed by Mary, refers to the performance of this play 'at the feastes of owr coronacyon as in tymes paste haithe bene accustomed to be done by the gentillmen of the Chappell'.[98] However, a later note references a warrant for a play 'for the feastes of oure coronacion', but details costumes for the characters 'Self love', 'Genus humanum' and a good and a bad angel – this is certainly not *Respublica*.[99] But could *Respublica*, performed at Christmas, also have been intended for performance in October? The conclusions have been various: Feuillerat claims that only one play – that featuring Self Love – was performed, at the coronation and again at Christmas.[100] W. W. Greg also suggests that the play of Self Love was performed at the coronation, but that this bumped *Respublica* into the Christmas slot.[101] Greg Walker argues that no play was performed at the coronation because the play of Self Love was abandoned at the last minute and produced instead at Christmas. *Respublica*, according to Walker, was never intended for the coronation.[102]

The performance of a play as an appendage to Mary's coronation was, according to the warrant cited above, following precedent: 'as in tymes paste haithe bene accustomed to be done'. It recalls the 'making of Crownes & Crosse for the poope' for a play performed for Edward's coronation in 1547. From the evidence available, whether *Respublica* was intended for the coronation or not cannot be deduced. But Udall's play is, nonetheless, an apposite accession play. Mary's coronation had only taken place two months previously, and the first Parliament of the reign had just ended.[103] Mary had also, by the end of November, decided to marry Philip.[104] The play provides a critique of a new monarch's coming to power and represents Mary herself as Nemesis – the goddess of redress and correction who appears at the end of the play, to restore what has been depicted as the corruption and turmoil of the Edwardian regime. *Respublica*'s dramatisation of monarchical authority and the relationships between monarch and God and monarch and Council – indeed the dramatisation of issues previously discussed in this chapter – constitute a pointed accompaniment to and interpretation of Mary's period of coronation. It brings the coronation's negotiation of power into a dramatic space and the

performance of counsel that we saw take place in Edward's actual coronation in the form of Cranmer's address now takes place in a coronation play. Furthermore, the development of the role of coronation as an opportune critique of monarchical legitimacy, and the notion of the ceremony's plurality and increased interpretability, are reflected in this play. There are also echoes of the pageant scenes of Anne Boleyn's procession discussed in Chapter 2, in both the play's personification of certain female queenly virtues and the conditional nature of the pageant performances for Anne. Although the uncertainty of Mary's accession undoubtedly accounts for the paucity of detail available for her own coronation procession, it is interesting that, in 1553, we have a play rather than an elaborate procession. Nevertheless, the records that we do have indicate that it was not as a type of the Virgin Mary that Mary was represented, but as a female warrior and deliverer. Whether she was dressed in a silver and gold robe, as a virgin consort, or in blue velvet as a reigning monarch, no angels descended to crown Mary and there was no heavenly throne. The Latin inscription on the Genoese 'costlie' arch in Fenchurch Street evoked Mary as the triumphant restorer of the corrupt state: 'salus reipublicae restituitur' and the Florentines' pageant represented her as classical and Biblical female warriors and liberators: Judith, Pallas Athene and Tomyris. Mary's procession is not represented in terms of a heavenly assumption, but as a civic liberation.[105]

In *Respublica*, Respublica is the eponymous heroine – a widow mourning good government, prosperity and God. She recalls Widow England from John Bale's *King Johan* and the play shows her besieged by Avarice, 'allias policie the vice of the plaie' and his pointedly named accomplices Insolence (alias Authority), Oppression (alias Reformation) and Adulation (alias Honestie). But 'respublica' is a word with salient connotations, denoting not the geographical space of England, but an abstract concept: the state, the 'common weal'.[106] Respublica, as the title of the play, refers to both the play's protagonist – like a history play – and, since it is a general abstraction, to its allegorical status. The Poet in the Prologue says:

> the Name of our playe ys Respublica certaine
> oure meaning ys (I saie not, as by plaine storye,
> but as yt were in figure by an allegorye)
> To shewe that all Commen weales Ruin and decaye
> (ll. 16–19)

As Patrick Collinson has shown, it would be mistaken to understand this term as being incompatible with monarchy, as synonymous with the

modern-day meaning of 'republic'. He writes that '*republica* in sixteenth-century parlance did not mean, as it has meant since the late eighteenth century, a type of constitution incompatible with monarchy. It was simply the common term for what we call the state.'[107] This concept of the 'state', however, was not fixed but, having grown out of humanist discourses as Collinson shows, was in the process of being forged. John Guy remarks that 'It is striking that, whereas in 1500 the word "state" had possessed no political meaning in English . . . by the second half of Elizabeth's reign it was used to signify the "state" in the modern sense.'[108] This 'realm of England' gave way to the 'state' of England. Despite denoting 'common weale' in the 1552 edition of his Dictionary, *The Boke Named the Governour* begins with the 'signification of a publike weale'. Elyot makes a distinction between 'publike weale' and 'commune weale', between the Latin 'Res publica' and 'Res plebeia', between publicans and commoners.[109] 'Respublica' in Udall's play, as the Prologue indicates, refers to 'common weal', but what does the play understand by this? Respublica is distinct from the character 'People', representing, as the play's cast-list describes, 'the poore Commontie'. What is the relationship between Respublica, People, councillors and sacred majesty in this play?

Structurally, *Respublica* presents an idea of restorative, sacred monarchy, and an apocalyptic version of history. Nemesis's arrival is miraculous, prayed for by Veritas, granted by God. She is sent to rectify history and, therefore, end history, a 'once and for all redemption'.[110] The Prologue directly associates Mary with the play's Nemesis, and her accession with a Christ-like Second Coming. The language slips easily from 'the man that in the Lordes name dothe come' to 'hir' and 'She':

for whan Criste came rydinge into Hieresalem,
The yong babes with tholde folke cryed owte all and some,
blessed bee the man that in the Lordes name dothe come.
Soo for goode Englande sake this presente howre and daie
In hope of hir restoring from hir late decaye,
we children to youe olde folke, bothe with harte and voyce
maie Joyne all togither to thanke god and Rejoyce
That he hath sent Marye our Soveraigne and Quene
to reforme thabuses which hithertoo hath been,
And that yls whiche long tyme have reigned uncorrecte
shall nowe forever bee redressed with effecte.
She is oure most wise / and most worthie Nemesis
Of whome our plaie meneth tamende that is amysse.

(ll. 42–54)

The Prologue thus anticipates Nemesis's entrance at the end of the play as Mary, a newly descended and sacred queen, imbued with the grace of God: 'Leat us booth yong and olde to godde commend her grace' (l. 56). As Nemesis will restore Respublica and 'our plaie', Mary will restore England. This restoration is inextricable from the arrival and victory of Truth, the daughter of Time. As Mary's motto and emblem was 'Veritas temporis filia',[111] Mary is also reflected in the character Veritas in the play:

> yet tyme trieth all and tyme bringeth truth to lyght
> that wronge maye not ever still reigne in place of right.
> (ll. 27–8)

Like Imperial Majesty in *King Johan*, Nemesis appears at the end of the play: she is the merciful ruler, judge and heaven-sent queen who 'hath powre from a bove, and is newlie sent downe' (l. 1784). Her entrance is prepared by Veritas, and her authority to judge and rule and restore, which derives from God, is resonant with the authority granted at coronation, and of the civic deliverance represented in Mary's coronation pageantry:

> Nowe ye see, what thei are, the punishment of this
> muste bee referred to the goddesse Nemesis
> she is the mooste highe goddesse of correccion
> Cleare of conscience and voide of affeccion
> she hath powre from a bove, and is newlie sent downe
> To redresse all owtrages in cite and in Towne
> she hathe powre from godde all practise to repeale
> which might bring Annoyaunce to ladie comonweale.
> To hir office belongeth the prowde toverthrow /
> and suche to restore as injurie hath browght lowe.
> (ll. 1780–9)

Nemesis's arrival is described in terms of God's mercy and deliverance. Misericordia (Lady Compassion) embodies God's mercy: 'The masse of this worlde in his mercie did he frame, / the skie, yearthe, and sea his mercye replenished' (ll. 1189–90) which Nemesis then herself exercises. Truth, Mercy, Justice and Peace – monarchical virtues granted at coronation and implicit in its liturgy and the symbols of kingship – are female virtues that are united in Nemesis and, by extension, the body of Mary. The play's language, therefore, reflects the rhetoric of Mary's miraculous and divinely ordained accession that Richard Taverner, for example, invoked in *An Oration gratulatory*. The restoration of Respublica is God's will: 'For when pleaseth God such commonweals to restore.' This also

recalls *A ninvectyve agaynst Treason* and its line that God 'at the last he helped us, though we thought it ryght longe'.[112] It is to God that Respublica prays in the final act, and it is God, who 'thi praier harde' as Misericordia says (l. 1222), sends Nemesis. Respublica and her People, therefore, are saved by Nemesis and a country's wellbeing and governance shown to rely on the authority and justice embodied in a divinely sanctioned ruler.

Some critics have therefore associated this play with the endorsement of absolute monarchy. David Bevington, for example, has argued for the play's 'insistence on the divine right of kings' as 'a political deterrent to the theory of rule by human counsel', blaming Respublica's demise on the evil counsel of the vices. Nemesis, as Mary, endorses the single legitimacy of divine and absolute rule.[113] Douglas Rutledge argues that *Respublica* was intended 'to celebrate Mary's recent coronation' and he reads the play as itself a type of ceremony. More specifically, he argues that *Respublica* imitates the coronation ritual as it dramatises what he terms the 'status elevation' of the main subject, Mary.[114] The play, according to Rutledge, mirrors the purpose of the coronation by 'raising' Mary to the status of the goddess, Nemesis. Rutledge believes that the play constitutes an integral part of Mary's actual coronation ceremony by imitating its structure and climax: Nemesis/Mary appears on stage as an embodiment of divine majesty and absolute power.[115] While Rutledge is right to argue for the play as part of the process of Mary's coronation, his reading does not sit comfortably when the fragility of the context and circumstances of Mary's actual accession and coronation are recalled. Neither does it take full account of the fissures discernible in the surface structure of *Respublica*, choosing instead to perceive any critique of authority as finally contained by the stability of a known and legitimate theatrical structure that mimics the coronation service. But this static model of ceremony that Rutledge invokes does not match the form of ceremony borne out by this book – a form that is not stable and whose very structure and legitimising purpose has become open to question. Neither Bevington nor Rutledge fully investigates the extent to which *Respublica* problematises Mary as a divinely ordained queen, or the focus that the play gives to the central character Respublica. For if *Respublica*'s structure endorses restorative sacred monarchy, it also does not fully believe in its own plot of divine redemption.

The commonwealth to be restored, which is gendered female in the widow Respublica, is impoverished and destitute – 'hir welthe ys decayed hir Comforte cleane a goe / and she att hir wittes endes what for to saie or doe (ll. 239–40). Like England in Bale's *King Johan*, she laments her ruin. She appeals to God for mercy: 'my helpe and Comforte oh lorde must

come from thee' (l. 463). She is hijacked by the plot of the vices disguised as 'virtues' for their own material gain: Policie, Authoritie, Reformation and Honestie. In a redeployment of the morality play, the vices cloak themselves as their synonyms, therefore revealing rather than disguising their 'truth' and constituting the play's effective dramatic irony: Oppression is Reformation, Avarice wears the 'cloke of policie' (l. 85), Insolence is Authoritie and Adulation is Honestie. Their plot represents an allegory of the Edwardian years – a critical portrayal of the ransacking of church-wealth and land. As Oppression declares, 'I will looke to have parte of goodes landes and plate' (l. 295) and Adulation, 'I praie youe lett me have a goode Lordship or twoo' (l. 299). Respublica, in the final act, refers specifically to Edward's five-year reign when she exclaims 'O lorde howe have I bee used these five yeres past?' (l. 1776).[116] The terms Reformation, Policy Authority and Honesty or Truth are therefore turned on their heads: 'Reformation' is associated with oppression, greed, hypocrisy and deceit and will itself now be reformed – the play will 'reform th'abuses which hitherto hath been' (l. 50). A comic exchange between Avarice and Adulation exposes this slippage between meanings:

> *Adul:* O frende Oppression, *Honestie*, *Honestie*.
> *Avar:* Oppression? hah? is the devyll in thye brayne?
> Take hede, or in faithe ye are flatterye againe.
> Policie, Reformacion, *Authoritie*.
> *Adul:* *Hipocrysie*, Diffamacion, *Authorytie*.
> *Avar:* Hipocrisye, hah? Hipocrisie, ye dull asse?
> *Adul:* Thowe namedste Hipocrisie even nowe by the masse.
> *Avar:* Polycye I saide, policye knave polycye.
> Nowe saye as I sayd. *Adul:* Policie knave policie
> *Avar:* And what callest thowe hym here? *Adul:* Dyffamacion.
> *Avar:* I tolde the he shoulde be called Reformacion.
> *Adul:* veraye well. *Avar:* What ys he nowe? *Adul:* Deformacion.
> *Avar:* Was ever the like asse borne in all nacions?
> *Adul:* A pestell on hym, he comes of the Acyons.
> *Avar:* Come on, ye shall Learne to solfe: Reformacion.
> Sing on nowe. Re. *Adul:* Re. *Avar:* Refor. *Adul:* Reformacion.
> (ll. 396–411)

It has frequently been noted that the play does not refer explicitly to matters of religious doctrine and does not define a version of religious truth. David Bevington, for example, who reads the play as Marian propaganda and as a rejoinder to John Bale, is puzzled that the play 'makes no attempt to defend the beauty of the Catholic service' and 'spends little

time in answering Bale's satire of bell-ringing, ducking and censing'.[117] For other commentators, the play's reticence reflects the inability to address religious matters on the stage before Mary.[118] Matters of doctrine and confessionalisation are hidden and inconsistent in *Respublica*. 'Is Nemesis the representation of a Catholic queen?' may not even be the best question to ask of this play. Respublica is advised to cleave to Truth, but the accession of Mary – as we have seen – had complicated what Truth referred to: 'Enbrace veritee for Ever Respublica / And cleve fast to hir' (ll. 1353–4). The vices may be associated with Edwardian policy, but they swear by the mass and the saints, in what would seem to be a codeword for Catholic corruption (as with John Bale's characters in *King Johan*). Avarice asks 'Who ist? Respublica? yea by the marye masse' (l. 471) and is associated with his keys – 'alas where be my Cayes?' (l. 119) – which is reminiscent of corrupt papal authority. Similarly, Oppression invokes the saints, 'Wee call yowe our fownder by all holye Halowes' (l. 203), and Avarice swears 'By the crosse not aworde' (l. 230). *Respublica* is not overt in its allusions to true and false religion; Respublica is not corrupted in terms of religion – like *King Johan*'s England – but in terms of bad government. 'Truth' in *Respublica* seems inextricable from correct and legitimate rule.

Mary is represented not only by Nemesis but also by Respublica, via a convenient but crucial gender identification which is exacerbated by Respublica's designation as a widow. It is this single fact, that a female queen is identifiable in the first play of her reign with the female state, that makes this play such an extraordinary accompaniment to coronation – but it has been largely overlooked in discussions of the play. Mary is identifiable with both the sacred and the earthly, and the play encourages this double identification. Her female body is refracted throughout: in Respublica and Nemesis, and in the female virtues who anticipate Nemesis's arrival. Whereas *King Johan* could represent Imperial Majesty as a type of spouse for England, Respublica and Nemesis and the four virtues serve as mirrors for each other, as embodiments of various female attributes. As Nemesis is a mother to Respublica, Respublica is a mother to People, who declare 'wee beethe your children, and youe beethe our mother' (l. 988). When Respublica is surrounded and supported by the heaven-sent virtues Justice, Peace, Truth and Mercy she is represented as a queen might be at coronation: 'As soone as wee fowre sisters togither shalbe mette, / An ordre for your establishment shall bee sett' (ll. 1387–8). This also anticipates certain pageant scenes at Elizabeth I's coronation in 1559 where Truth, Justice and other virtues would be represented.[119]

At the end of the play, Mary's identification with Respublica is reinforced through Nemesis's disappearance. Nemesis – the fleeting presence of a sacred monarch – hands over to Respublica and employs an image of her surrounded by the virtues, which is again resonant with procession pageantry, and a conditional mood:

> Now dearling Respublica ye are in tholde goode eastate
> and they taken awaie that spoiled youe of Late.
> Nowe cleve to these Ladies from heaven to youe directe
> they from all corruption will youe safe protecte.
> Well I muste goe hens to an other countreye nowe.
> (ll. 1922–6)

The apocalyptic structure of a commonwealth restored and ruled by Nemesis is undercut; it is the widow Respublica who is left at the end of the play to govern the People, aided by the divine virtues.

That *Respublica* cannot fully support its own version of history that appeals to divine intervention and restoration has already been alluded to in the play's Prologue. The Poet declares that 'all Commen weales Ruin and decaye / from tyme to tyme hath been, ys, and shalbe alwaie' (ll. 19–20). This pragmatic view of the ebb and flow of history is at odds with the idea that the appearance of Nemesis will end all ruin and decay. Respublica's first words when she enters the stage are 'Lorde what yearethlye thinge is permanent or stable, / or what is all this worlde but a lumpe mutable?' (ll. 439–40). She goes on: 'But as the waving seas, doe flowe and ebbe by course, / So all thinges els doe chaunge to better and to wurse' (ll. 443–4). The notion of an absolute 'powre from godde' to 'redresse all owtrages in cite and in Towne' (ll. 1786, 1785) pulls against the play's actual plot of divine redemption. The structure of *Respublica* that celebrates the arrival of absolute and divine authority in the form of a goddess-monarch is rendered problematic by the play's opposing version of history.[120] A solution to the conflict is suggested in the closing lines of the play. Having praised God and 'Quene Marie', the virtues turn to 'hir Counsaile' and their role in governance:

> *Mia.:* Praie wee forre hir Counsaile to have long life and healthe.
> *Justice:* Theire soveraigne to serve. *pax.:* And to mainteine Comonwealthe.
> (ll. 1936–7)

Thus, the play punishes the evil counsellors who led Respublica astray, but it closes by acknowledging the need for good counsellors and by

confirming their power to support Respublica – now synonymous with 'Comonwealthe'.

Mary as Respublica is encouraged by the play's representation of Respublica's relationship with the male vices, referred to as councillors. As Nemesis asks Respublica at the end of the play, 'well, Respublica are these youre Late governoures, / whom ye tooke for faithfull / and trustie counsailours?' (ll. 1824–5). The play therefore dramatises the relationship between a monarch and her 'rewlers' (l. 973). This is particularly pointed when we recall the Council's proposal to postpone the sacred coronation, the ambassadors' fears that this would render Mary too dependent on a bridling Council, and Mary's own acknowledgement of her election by and need for experienced governors. Furthermore, at Christmas 1553, the first Parliament had just sat and Mary had expressed her plan to revoke the supremacy, reverse the breach with Rome and proceed with a marriage to Philip. Her authority in relation to Council and Parliament, therefore, was of critical concern. The play serves as both a 'history' of Edward's reign and as an allegory of governance and of Mary's future reign. In its representation of Respublica's past demise, it is also a warning tale of how a future Respublica could fall, and Respublica as female in the context of the first female reign solders this link. As the Prologue has made clear:

> oure meaninge ys (I saie note, as by plaine storye,
> but as yt were in figure by an allegorye)
> To shewe that all Commen weales Ruin and decaye.
> (ll. 17–19)

This resonates throughout the play and lingers at its end, despite the transient restorative role of Nemesis. It is certainly true that, on the one hand, the play challenges the success of counsel, and warns against it. Avarice wishes to 'crepe in to bee of hir Counsaille' (l. 252), to seduce Respublica as a 'ladye' and Respublica is easily corrupted by the male vices/councillors. Their first exchange is shot through with references to the fact that they are man and woman, as in Respublica's comment, 'Hee shewith himselfe aman of muche diligence' (l. 533). Later, Adulation tells how 'Ientle Respublica was soone pacified' (l. 939). The play then relies on a female goddess and her female virtues to correct the bad counsel. If indeed it was played before Mary's Council – which comprised many members of Edward's Council – this would have uncomfortable implications.

At the same time, *Respublica* tells a contrasting tale about 'trustie counsailours' and Respublica's reliance on them. In the following, Respublica does not even mention the figure of a monarch as a safeguard against the collapse of commonwealths:

> yet by all experience thus muche is well seen
> That in Comon weales while goode governors have been
> All thing hath prospered, and where suche men dooe lacke
> Comon weales decaye, and all thinges do goe backe.
> what mervaile then yf I wanting a perfecte staigh
> From mooste flourishing welth bee falen in decaye?
> (ll. 453–8)

Veritas also reassures Respublica that 'All this wilbee recovered in continent / and to better state also by good governement' (ll. 1359–60) and Nemesis is shown listening to and heeding the advice of her four virtues – 'we have harde all your descrete advises' (l. 1872). She passes moderate judgement on the councillors. Avarice is handed over to the people 'that he maie bee pressed' before he is given to the law (l. 1903); Adulation submits and is forgiven – we might think of Adulation as an embodiment of Counsel at the end of the play – promising to 'mooste duelie serve god and the Commonweale' (l. 1891). The authority of the law is invoked to punish Oppression and Insolence, as Nemesis declares 'Judge them by the lawse' (l. 1919). 'Good' governors then can ensure that a commonwealth will resist the ebb and flow of history, as opposed to bad governors who can contribute to its utter destruction. Mary, as Respublica, could fall victim to bad counsel and could be encouraged to eschew the advice of self-seeking policy-makers: the play thus addresses both Mary and her Council. Mary's status as a heaven-sent queen is not sufficient; she must embrace the divine virtues of Truth, Mercy, Justice and Peace – the daughters of God – but she cannot distance herself from her other role as Respublica, or from her governors. She must also behave as a mother to her People. As Nemesis devolves power to Respublica, a reminder to Mary that she is both sacred monarch and earthly governor, the play also recuperates the power of the People. They resist Authoritie, their complaints are proven right and they punish Avarice. Respublica has to heed her People and there is a dangerous warning in their comment: 'by gisse but chil loe, naie hoe thare, thought is free, and a catt they zaith maie looke on a king pardee' (l. 1165). Respublica, then, finds herself positioned between God, governors and People. She represents, in this play, not the people of England, but the governing body. A version of legitimate female

monarchy is shown to be refracted through a sacred being, an earthly widow and mother-figure, queenly virtues and male councillors. *Respublica* represents an idea of a female monarchical republic.

Respublica is also a play that delights in its own possibilities for interpretation, which ensures its success as both legitimate counsel and dramatic representation. In a play of double meanings and slippery vocabulary, that contains both a celebration and a critique of sacred monarchy, Mary can choose to identify with either a divine or an earthly queen, or both. The Poet alludes to the possibility of alternative or wrongful interpretation right at the beginning, and abdicates responsibility:

> In dede no man speaketh wordes so well fore pondred
> But the same by some meanes maye be misconstred,
> Nor nothinge so well ment, but that by somme pretence
> ytt maie be wronge interpreted from the auctors sence.
> (ll. 9–12)

This awareness of and capacity to contain plural meanings make *Respublica* an invaluable response to the circumstances of Mary's accession. It is not only the anomalous situation of female rule that the play responds to but the ambiguity and instability of truth and meaning. The ambivalence surrounding Mary's legitimacy and the interpretative possibilities that her coronation elicited are reflected in a play that itself offers an interpretation of the conundrum of her governance. In the next and final chapter of this book, these aspects of *Respublica* re-emerge in the context of another coronation ceremony. In January 1559, sacred monarchy, female governance, the commonwealth and drama converge in Elizabeth I's troublesome performance during her coronation ritual and her celebrated procession through London.

CHAPTER 5

'A stage wherin was shewed the wonderfull spectacle': representing Elizabeth I's coronation

The anxieties raised by the coronation of Mary Tudor in 1553 resurfaced in 1559. Elizabeth's legitimacy of birth, uncertainty about her religion, the re-establishment of the supremacy and the fact that she was another unmarried English queen were as problematic for Elizabeth as for her sister. Elizabeth's coronation contains echoes of her mother's and siblings' coronations. Certain images, themes and words reverberate. The procession pageantry of 1559 recalls Anne Boleyn and her procession of 1533, and alterations to the coronation liturgy, perhaps even the oath that Elizabeth swore, rekindle the revisions introduced at Edward's service. Most of all, the attempt to crown Mary as a parliamentary queen surfaces again at Elizabeth's coronation and is given explicit visual expression in a pageant scene reminiscent of Nicholas Udall's *Respublica*. In terms of the Reformation, Elizabeth's coronation service has become a fraught and contested site for meaning, fought over for its declaration of the regime's religious policy. The interpretative confusion and possibilities for plurality generated by Mary I's coronation were also present in 1559: at the centre of Elizabeth's ceremony is the intriguing but unsolved mystery of what happened during the mass. It is as an integral counterpart to the fragile context of Elizabeth's accession and coronation, and the ambiguity of the direction that religion would take, that Richard Mulcaster's celebrated procession text, *The Quenes majesties passage*, appears on the scene. Neither official court propaganda nor Protestant tract (as is often claimed), neither commemorative description nor civic dramatic script, this little book acts as a new type of ceremonial text that illustrates the changes that ceremony has undergone. In 1559, Elizabeth's coronation and procession demand to be read and interpreted as drama.

CROWNED BY CATHOLICS: THE AMBIGUOUS CORONATION

Elizabeth was proclaimed queen on 17 November 1558, the day of Mary's death. Unlike Edward and Mary, however, Elizabeth was not proclaimed

'Supreme Head' and the 'crown imperial' had been struck from the proclamation's phrasing. She was 'the only right heir by blood and lawful succession' to 'the crown'.[1] As with Mary, however, the 1536 Act of Succession that had declared Elizabeth illegitimate still threatened her right to the throne. Despite the 1544 Act of Succession, which had reinstated both Mary and Elizabeth as lawful heirs, the mark of bastardy from the previous act had not been legally repealed. Some of the issues of legitimacy from the summer of 1553 also surrounded Elizabeth. Mary, too, had attempted to bar Elizabeth from the succession, although Elizabeth had ridden behind Mary in her coronation procession of 1553 – a visual statement of the restored succession according to Henry VIII.[2] Whether Elizabeth, like Mary, would need parliamentary ratification of her legitimacy was debated by contemporary lawyers, such as Nicholas Bacon. William Camden was to record the anxiety as follows in his *Annales*:

> Neverthelesse the Statute wherein her father had excluded her, and Queene Mary, from the succession of the Crowne, was not repealed. Wherein Bacons wisedome, (upon whom as the Oracle of the Law, the Queene wholy relyed in such matters,) in some mens opinion failed him, especially considering that Northumberland had objected it against Queene Mary, and her, (and in that respect Queene Mary had repealed it as farre as concerned her self;) and some seditious persons afterward tooke occasion thereby to attempt dangerous matters against her, as being not lawfull Queene: albeit that the English Lawes have long since pronounced, That the Crowne once worne, quite taketh away all defects whatsoever.[3]

The question of whether coronation or Parliament should, or could, undo Elizabeth's mark of illegitimacy – 'taketh away all defects' – and sanction her right to rule was unresolved. As Camden describes above, Elizabeth consulted Sir Nicholas Bacon on whether or not she needed Parliament; Bacon advised that it was unnecessary and appealed instead to the ancient and legitimising act of the coronation in a way that recalls the circumstances of Henry VII's accession. As Camden reports, 'the Crowne once worne, quite taketh away all defects whatsoever'.

Elizabeth's coronation was only the second crowning of a queen regnant that England had ever seen. John Knox's *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous regiment of women* had just been published, thereby helping to discredit the Calvinists in Elizabeth's eyes. Legitimate female governance was particularly problematic for Protestants and Calvinists since what they saw as the right reading of the Scriptures forbade it. In *The First Blast* Knox equates Mary I's rule with the idolatry of

Catholicism, and idolatry with tyranny. A marginal note reads 'The empire of a woman is an idol' (fol. 28r). A female head also disfigures the body of the commonwealth: 'And no lesse monstruous is the bodie of that commonwelth, where a woman beareth empire' (fol. 27v). How could Elizabeth, for Protestants, replace a Catholic idol? How should a godly queen rule? To emphasise the ungodliness, idolatrousness and monstrosity of a woman in power, Knox invokes the objects of coronation and emblems of kingly power – the crown, the sceptre, the sword:

> What, I pray you, shulde this godlie father have saide, if he had sene all the men of a realme or nation fall downe before a woman? If he had sene the crowne, sceptre, and sworde, whiche are the ensignes of the royall dignitie, geven to her, and a woman cursed of God, and made subjecte to man, placed in the throne of justice, to sit as Goddes lieutenant? (fol. 29v)

In Knox's Calvinist discourse, female governance is counter to the 'true' religion. For promoters of the 'true' religion of the Gospel, Elizabeth would have to be recovered as Truth, and Mary's motto 'Veritas Temporis Filia' reappropriated. This motto was printed on the frontispiece of Knox's *The First Blast*, in an attempt to recover *his* meaning of Truth. For supporters of Elizabeth, her accession had to be assimilated into a providential scheme, whereby she was sent by God, for some 'secret purpose', as a shadow of the Biblical ruler and deliverer of Israel, Deborah.[4] John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* concludes with a section entitled 'The miraculous preservation of Lady Elizabeth, now Queene of England, from extreme calamitie and daunger of lyfe, in the tyme of Queene Mary her Sister', which presents Elizabeth's accession as extraordinary, and as evidence of God's mercy – language that recalls but reinvents the language of miracle that marked Mary's accession.[5] On Elizabeth's proclamation, Foxe writes that she was delivered from 'dread to dignitie, from misery to Majestie, from mournyng to rulyng: briefly, of a prisoner made a Princesse, and placed in her throne Royall, proclaimed now Queene'.[6] On Elizabeth's accession, John Hales wrote an oration that casts Mary's reign as cruel and tyrannous and presents Elizabeth as the restorer, sent by God: 'And forasmuch as besides this infinite mercy poured on your grace, it hath pleased his divine providence to constitute your hyghnesse to be our Debora, to be the governesse and head of the body of this Realme.'[7] John Aylmer's response to Knox's vitriolic text, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes, agaynst the late blowne Blaste*, published in April 1559, similarly defends Elizabeth's right to rule by appealing to God's will: 'when God

chuseth him selfe by sending to a king, whose succession is ruled by enheritaunce and lyneall discent, no heires male: It is a plain argument, that for some secret purpose he myndeth the female should reigne and governe'.[8] Aylmer also invokes Deborah, but Deborah is not a queen by divine right; she is sent by God as a deliverer of the people. Aylmer writes that God 'saved his people by the hande of a woman poore Deborah' (Biiiv). Hales, in the above, refers to Deborah, and Elizabeth, as 'the governesse'. Indeed, Elizabeth as queen by blood is secondary to her divine calling; this transcends matters of monarchical inheritance. As Hales writes, 'All men shall confesse that you are not onely for proximitie of bloud preferred, but rather of God specially sent & ordeined.'[9] Knox has to counter the precedent of Deborah and he does so by referring to her as a divine anomaly and as a godly 'mother and deliverer': 'howe unlike our mischevous Maryes be unto Debora, under whome were strangiers chased owt of Israel, God so raising her up to be a mother and deliverer . . . let such as list to defend these monstres in their tyrannie, prove first, that their sovereine maistresses be like to Debora in godlines and pitie' (fol. 41v). He continues that 'against nature he made her prudent in counsel' (fol. 42r). Deborah was not, in short, like male monarchs; she was a prophetess, a judge, a mother who spoke not as a king or prince but 'as she that had a speciall revelation frome God' (fol. 44r). Importantly here, she was 'prudent in counsel'.

Aylmer's *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes* does not offer an unequivocal defence of gynaecocracy. His powerful argument is that England is not, after all, a pure monarchy, but 'rule mixte'. Elizabeth is chosen and sanctioned by God, but her power is diffused and regulated by her Council and Parliament: it is 'not she that ruleth but the lawes' (Hiiiv). Aylmer writes:

> The regiment of Englande is not a mere Monarchie, as some for lacke of consideracion thinke, nor a meere Oligarchie, nor Democratie, but a rule mixte of all these, wherein ech one of these have or shoulde have like authoritie. Thimage whereof, and not the image, but the thinge in dede, is to be sene in the parliament hous, wherin you shal find these 3 estats. (Hiiv–Hiiir)

In a near echo of Knox, Aylmer replaces the idolatrous image of the coronation of a queen with the reality – 'not the image, but the thinge in dede' – of a queen in Parliament. Aylmer goes on to write: 'therfore they have theyr counsel at their elbow . . . she maketh no statutes or lawes, but the honerable court of Parliament: she breaketh none, but it must be she

and they together or els not' (Hiiiv). Aylmer's deft mediation of divine ordination with the legitimacy of Council and Parliament reworks the symbolic form and language of the coronation ceremony which, as the supremacy enforced, grants the monarch not 'like authoritie' but a higher authority than the three estates. But, at the same time as Elizabeth's divine status is elevated because of her exceptionality as a woman and her role as godly deliverer, this exaggeration of sacred monarchy needs to be contained. In addition, as Elizabeth was not crowned Supreme Head of the Church of England, the nature and consequences of the supremacy that Elizabeth would reinstate were both uncertain and open to definition, and subject to limitation. For Hales, the supremacy was not part of the king's prerogative but was tied into Parliament, and correct use of Parliament. He writes that the title of supremacy

> more touched the common wealth & Realme of England, then the king. For as I said before, it was ordeyned for the conservation of the libertie of the whole realme, & to exclude the usurped authoritie of the B. of Rome. And therfore no King or Queene alone could renounce such title: but it ought (if they would have it taken away) be taken away orderly & formally by act of Parlament sufficiently called & summoned. For the natural & right way to loose & undoo things, is to dissolve them by that meanes they were ordeined.[10]

Much of Hales's notion of Marian tyranny rests on what he identifies as her abuse of parliamentary procedure. This address to Elizabeth and its emphasis on the priority of the commonwealth over the monarch thus also constitutes a warning to the new queen. This is a direct extension of what we saw certain members of the Council attempt to bring about at Mary's coronation, an image of the queen's dependency on and bridling by Parliament. It also anticipates the first publication in 1583 of Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum*, and his famous remark that 'the most high and absolute power of the realme of England, is in the Parliament'.[11]

This image of the queen in Parliament, which found its way into Elizabeth's procession and *The Quenes majesties passage* as shall be shown later, was contentious. The tectonic shift in the conception of monarchical power relied on the legitimate authority of counsel and Parliament. Patrick Collinson has described Elizabethan England as 'a republic which happened also to be a monarchy: or vice versa', identifying also the tension that this caused between the Queen and her Council.[12] Similarly, John Guy writes that '"counsel" made the exercise of sovereign power legitimate' but that this was 'as much political heresy in Elizabeth's eyes as

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

temperament of England, contemporary witnesses and commentators were themselves uncertain.[20] The Venetian ambassador, Paulo Tiepolo, writes in one of his letters about the coronation, at which he was not present, that 'of the many particulars heard by me in illustration of this fact I am now able to mention one which very well illustrates the Queen's mind, viz., that at the mass which she heard on the day of her coronation she did not wish the host to be elevated, as usual'.[21] Tiepolo's 'fact' that he is seeking to prove is 'the inclination of the Queen to a religion opposed to Catholicism'.[22] The Spanish ambassador, Count de Feria, has to retract his original report to Philip II. He writes: 'By the last post I wrote your majesty that I had been told that the Queen took the holy sacrament ''sub utraque specie'' [in both kinds] on the day of the coronation, but it was all nonsense. She did not take it at all.'[23]

This urgency surrounding the mass and Elizabeth's behaviour are testament to the anxiety and ambiguity generated by Elizabeth's coronation, and the need, particularly among the foreign ambassadors, to establish facts and to interpret the ceremony correctly. Tiepolo and De Feria, for example, seek to read the ceremony as a microcosm of the reign to come. While we can never ascertain the exact details of Elizabeth's ceremony, it does seem possible to conclude that the consecrated host was not elevated according to a Catholic mass and that Elizabeth was hidden from sight from this point of the service in a curtained 'traverse' or 'closet',[24] and that this created the ambiguity concerning whether or how she communicated. The Mantuan envoy Il Schifanoya reports that 'the choristers commenced the mass, which was sung by the dean of her chapel, her chaplain, the bishops not having chosen to say mass without elevating the host or consecrating it'.[25] Il Schifanoya does not, however, mention Elizabeth withdrawing. On this, an anonymous English eyewitness account is ambiguous but suggestive: 'And then her Grace retorned into her Clossett hearing the Consecration of the Mass.'[26] A fragmentary herald's account is similarly vague but reports certain movement: 'Then the masse began by the Deane she siting still till the offering she went and kissed the patent and had a Collect said over her and went to her traverse and the masse proceeds.'[27] A memorandum drawn up prior to the ceremony records that 'her Matie in her closett may use the Masse without lyfting up above the Host according to the Ancient customs'.[28] This memorandum seems conclusive evidence, but the use of the word 'may' is non-committal and non-prescriptive. The queen may, of course, choose not to use her closet and it is not clear, either, whether it is the elevation or non-elevation of the consecrated host that is 'according to the Ancient customs' (this is

not a new religion, but an old and true religion), or if indeed the 'lyfting up above the Host' will be omitted in any eventuality, whether Elizabeth is 'in her closett' or not.

The non-elevation of the host and Elizabeth's withdrawal – this deviation from expectation and the standard 'rules' of coronation – can constitute what Paul Strohm has termed a 'rent in the symbolic fabric' of the ceremony.[29] Richard McCoy has concluded that 'something potentially scandalous' happened at Elizabeth's coronation, something which 'subverted the rite's sacrosanctity and symbolic hierarchy'.[30] But Elizabeth's likely withdrawal into the closet is more subtle, and more ambiguous than this. It conceals and hinders rather than enables interpretation. At the same time, the representational impasse created by the indeterminacy of meaning behind Elizabeth's gesture preserves, paradoxically perhaps, the very 'sacrosanctity' of the coronation rite. In addition, as this book has borne out, alteration and deviation from tradition did not necessarily entail the ceremony's subversion or, as McCoy goes on to describe, its deliberate 'subordination'.[31] It was not unusual for a monarch to hear mass and communicate in private, even at the coronation.[32] Henry VIII's coronation 'Device' records that the king and queen would take the sacrament kneeling at the altar but that 'two of the grettest estates' would hold before them a 'longe towell of Silke'.[33] The difference in 1509 is that there was no doubt that Henry and Katherine communicated in one kind behind that silk. However, in the political and religious climate of January 1559, the mystery of the mass and Elizabeth's relationship to it become one of the most contested mysteries of all. The point is not that Elizabeth did not observe mass, but that she herself could not be observed, so her attitude to the non-elevation of the host and whether she communicated or not behind the curtain have to remain a matter of her private conscience and our speculation.[34] In the pressurised context of such religious uncertainty, removing herself from sight at such a central moment was a way for Elizabeth to retain autonomy and control over her coronation and its meaning. By a familiar and accepted ceremonial gesture, but one which has now become indeterminate, Elizabeth both respects the form of the ceremony and protects her private beliefs from scrutiny. Crucially, the varied beliefs of the observing clergy, councillors, noblemen and ambassadors in the Abbey are also protected.

In April 1571, during a conversation that turned to her coronation, Elizabeth is reported to have told the French ambassador, La Mothe Fénelon, that 'elle avoit esté couronnée et sacrée selon les cérémonies de l'esglize catholique, et par évesques catholiques, sans toutefois assister à la

messe'.[35] This riddling remark, and the fact that the coronation is still being referred to in 1571, epitomise both the ambiguity and the gravity of Elizabeth's coronation.[36] While her remark implies that the mass proceeded as a Catholic mass, which contradicts the evidence above, it is not entirely clear from the French verb 'assister' whether Elizabeth was physically absent during mass (she was hidden in the closet but did communicate) or whether she did not participate in mass (she was hidden and did not communicate). The comment purposefully encapsulates the enigma of Elizabeth's coronation, and points to the inevitable contradiction that Elizabeth's legitimacy could be positioned both in correct 'Catholic' consecration and in correct 'Protestant' observance of mass. Evidence suggests that Elizabeth's coronation mass was indeed Protestant in a few crucial respects. Catholic mass was differentiated by being spoken in Latin and by the elevation of the consecrated wafer, both before and after its consecration and transformation into the body of Christ – an idolatrous and doctrinal gesture that was in conflict with Protestant interpretations of the eucharist. That Elizabeth did not agree with the gesture of elevation is implied from changes made to mass in her chapel prior to the coronation. In the Chapel Royal on Christmas Day 1558, Elizabeth ordered the Bishop of Carlisle, Owen Oglethorpe, not to elevate the host. Oglethorpe, however, replied that he could not act contrary to his training or beliefs and elevated the host as usual. Accordingly, Elizabeth rose and departed after the Gospel had been read. Il Schifanoya reports that ever since mass in the Chapel Royal 'has been so done by her chaplains', and hence without the elevation of the host.[37] It would therefore seem certain that her coronation mass would follow her edicts for the Chapel Royal. On 20 January 1559, Pedro de Ribadaneira, a companion of the Spanish ambassador, De Feria, wrote that Elizabeth 'ha ordenado que la misa se diga como en la capilla de la Reyna, en la cual no se alza hostia ni caliz, ni si alzó domingo pasado 15 deste en la misa solenna de su coronacion'.[38] Later, in a letter dated 1 February, Paulo Tiepolo reported back to the Doge and Senate that the Queen 'did not wish the host to be elevated, as usual' on the day of the coronation and that 'she had the mass celebrated in her own way'.[39] The death of Cardinal Pole, the Archbishop of Canterbury on the day of Mary's death, and the refusal of the Archbishop of York, Nicholas Heath, to crown Elizabeth meant that the office fell to his suffragen, Owen Oglethorpe. It was, however, the new Dean of her Chapel Royal – George Carew – who seems to have led the coronation mass and there was no reason for Carew not to omit the elevation of the elements.[40] Oglethorpe, a Catholic bishop, anointed and crowned Elizabeth but Carew celebrated

mass. Furthermore, as Il Schifanoya reports, the consecration prayers were read in English, and the Epistle and Gospel sung in Latin, and then said in English. The original Italian text reads: 'gli vescovi celebrare senze levare il corpo di Christo, ne consecrare l'hostia con le parole Englesi, come fece quel buon homo et fu detto l'Epistola et l'Evangelio in Englese doppo li cantati in latino'.[41] It would seem most likely, then, that Carew consecrated the host in English and that he did not raise the 'body of Christ' for adoration (Schifanoya notes the transformation from 'l'hostia' to 'il corpo di Christo').

In departing from the traditional Roman mass through use of the vernacular and the omission of the elevation of the consecrated elements, Elizabeth's coronation contravened the established practice of the time and therefore would seem a clear sign of Protestant restoration. But, as Roger Bowers has shown, the coronation also proceeded carefully given the flexibility of ecclesiastical law. The licence to read the Epistle and Gospel in English recalled injunctions that had been made in the early years of Edward but which had never been rescinded by Mary in Parliament. A royal proclamation of 27 December 1558 promoted the use of the vernacular in the celebration of high mass, but did not make it mandatory. In omitting the elevation of the elements, the mass observed in the Chapel Royal and at the coronation followed the 1548 Order of Communion which had never been legally abrogated either later in Edward's reign, or in Mary's reign.[42] It was not until June 1559 and the Settlement of Religion that the Protestant communion (the term mass being abolished) would be established, and this order of service would differ from both the 1549 and 1552 prayer books. The extent of Elizabethan Protestantism at the time of the coronation was uncertain. Neither can it be assumed that Elizabeth's personal beliefs were in harmony with those of her Council, or of the country.[43] What characterises Elizabeth's coronation is ambiguity. If, on the one hand, it can be established that the host was not elevated, on the other hand the exact implications of this omission remain elusive. Elizabeth's coronation rejected Marian ceremony, but did it forecast a return to late Henrician policy or late Edwardian policy, or something else altogether? The definition of 'Protestant' is still open and Elizabeth's coronation could not, either legally or wisely, articulate uniform and coherent 'Protestant' policy.

There is further ambiguity surrounding Elizabeth's coronation oath. William Cecil's coronation 'Articles' specify that 'A Copie of the othe that her maiestie shall take to be sene perused by her highnes' and that these relevant 'Bokes remayne with the abbott of Westminster', referring

perhaps to the *Liber Regalis* in the possession of the Abbey.[44] The English eyewitness account offers a very muddled account of Elizabeth's oath-taking which serves as further evidence of the representational confusion and interpretative scope of this coronation:

> And the Bishop gave her a Book which she had taking her oath. And after that the Bishop kneeling before the Aulter read in two Bookes; and her Grace gave a little book to a Lord to deliver unto the Bishop. The Bishop returned the book to the Lord, and red other Bookes. And immediately the Bishop took the Queenes booke and read it before the Quene hir grace.
>
> And after that hir Grace kneeled before the Aulter and the Bishop red a booke before her Grace. And immediately her Grace went to shift her apparrel.
>
> And the Bishop sang the _____ [blank in original] of the Masse in a Booke which was brought in before the Queene. And then and there was a carpet with kussynes of gold spread before the aulter. And Secretary Cycill delivered a Booke to the Bishop and there was Bishop standing at the left hand of the aulter.[45]

This reads like a description of an enigmatic but highly symbolic dumb-show, at the centre of which is the object of a book. The theatrical gestures and movement of ceremony seem thwarted. It is not at all clear what any of these books are, especially the 'little book' delivered to Oglethorpe who then seemingly rejects it, only to then 'immediately' take it and read from it. This confusion and Oglethorpe's rejection suggest some tension. The first book referred to, 'which she had taking her oath', could be the Book of Gospels which, according to the *Liber Regalis*, the monarch swore upon, as well as upon the sacrament on the altar, as Elizabeth's predecessors all did. Does this mean that Elizabeth did not swear on the sacrament, but only on the evangelists? The 'Queenes booke' could refer to either a prayer book, or perhaps to the text of the oath to be administered at this point, prior to the anointing for which Elizabeth would 'shift her apparrel'. If so, however, the book that is handed later to Oglethorpe by 'Secretary Cycill' is confusing – the above description suggests that this last book was brought in during or even after the anointing. Most recently, Dale Hoak has argued convincingly that Sir William Cecil was instrumental in Elizabeth's coronation and that he amended the text of the oath and handed it dramatically and symbolically to Oglethorpe in the middle of the service, as reported above, just prior to the anointing.[46] Hoak describes Cecil's act as a carefully choreographed piece of theatre: 'in one of the most extraordinary scenes imaginable, at the appropriate moment in the ceremony he emerged from the side of the coronation stage and "delivered" to

Oglethorpe . . . the text of the questions'.[47] This 'Booke' has never been found and neither is there any record of the wording of the oath that Elizabeth swore. Hoak, however, suggests that Cecil revised the oath along the lines of the oath amended by Cranmer for Edward VI's coronation, but that he inserted one crucial line that we know James I swore at his coronation, but which Archbishop Laud was later to claim had been inserted before James's coronation. This line was that the monarch should promise to obey the 'Laws of God, [and] the true profession of the Gospel established in this Kingdom'.[48] Cecil, comparable to John Hales's 'Oration' and John Aylmer's *An Harborowe*, envisioned a parliamentary monarchy; the amended oath possibly sworn by Elizabeth may well have defined this as inextricable from a Protestant monarchy. In this respect, Elizabeth's coronation would have been the first Protestant Tudor coronation. Confessionalism would have been written into the coronation ceremony and the monarch unequivocally bound to it in a way that had not happened before. Of course, due to the lack of conclusive evidence, whether or not Elizabeth did swear such an oath, and the nature of her own involvement with the supposed insertion, have to remain highly speculative.[49] It also raises further problems with regards to the rest of the ceremony. If Oglethorpe refused to say mass without elevating the host, would he have agreed to administer an oath that mentioned 'the true profession of the Gospel established in this Kingdom'? And, if such an oath had been uttered, why were the ceremony and especially the procedure followed for mass so problematic and confusing for certain observers? Moreover, as has been noted with reference to the mass, the laws of the 'true profession of the Gospel' in January 1559 rested on laws that Mary had not repealed and would themselves be open to later amendment and clarification. Again, what characterises Elizabeth's ceremony is its obscurity: not only is the evidence shadowy and inconclusive, but what the evidence points to is itself marked by difficulties of interpretation.

Beneath the ambiguity and controversy lie the continued importance and prominence of coronation as a legitimate, powerful and necessary ceremony. If Elizabeth's coronation contains elements that pull the ceremony towards the establishment of Protestantism, the sacredness of the ceremony – even certain sacramental properties – is not compromised. A Protestant coronation is not an empty ceremony. On the advice of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and Elizabeth's master of the horse on 14–15 January 1559, Elizabeth commissioned the astrologer and scholar John Dee to select an auspicious date for the coronation. Dee chose Sunday 15 January, with the conviction that the configuration of the heavens on this

day would presage a long and successful reign.[50] Benjamin Woolley has suggested that Dee was called upon as the fragile circumstances of Elizabeth's accession demanded as many signs of divine intervention as possible to legitimise her claim.[51] But the appeal to divine authorisation and to the prophesying power of ceremony is neither exploitative nor indicative of the 'deliberate subordination' of the coronation service.[52] The day of Elizabeth's coronation, indeed, was as important as the choice of Whitsunday was for Anne's. As Elizabeth herself is reported to have claimed, she was anointed and crowned according to custom – 'selon les cérémonies de l'esglize catholique' – and, therefore, like her sister, according to the liturgy stipulated in the *Liber Regalis*. She may even have been anointed with the special oil that Mary had ordered from Brussels. Elizabeth would also continue to touch for scrofula, the king's evil. Indeed, this traditional ceremony was apparently practised with increasing frequency during Elizabeth's reign.[53]

When Elizabeth appeared in Westminster Hall on Sunday 15 January she was dressed in the traditional crimson parliament robes, which may even have been those worn by Mary in 1553. We know that the gold and silver robe worn by Elizabeth during her procession through London had belonged to Mary, although Elizabeth had a new bodice made.[54] In Westminster Hall, before processing to the Abbey, Elizabeth was sprinkled with holy water by Bishop Oglethorpe, as Mary had been by Gardiner. She was anointed according to the liturgy stipulated in the *Liber Regalis* for a male monarch and invested with the consecrated regalia. Like Anne, Edward and Mary, she was crowned three times: with St Edward's crown, the imperial state crown and a third crown. This third crown may also have been that which was 'purposelie made' for Mary for her coronation.[55] Elizabeth is also the only Tudor monarch for whom two coronation portraits are extant. The National Portrait Gallery, London, houses a painting of Elizabeth dressed in 'a royal robe of very rich cloth of gold', an ermine-lined cloak, her hair loose, crowned in an imperial crown and carrying the sceptre and orb.[56] The painting, however, has been dated to c. 1600, but whether or not this is a copy of an earlier portrait, from either a lost painting contemporaneous with the coronation or from the miniature coronation portrait by Nicholas Hilliard of c. 1570, is uncertain.[57] It remains possible that the later portrait is associated with neither the first coronation nor Hilliard but that it was commissioned from scratch at the end of the reign, as a recollection of the young Elizabeth's coronation, and perhaps even to depict her imminent second coronation in heaven.[58] But what can be

ascertained is that Elizabeth's queenship remained powerfully associated with coronation, and with its visual and sacred symbolism. At the same time, the portrait recalls Elizabeth's coronation procession, as she is represented wearing the silver and gold robe – such as those worn by queens consort, including her mother Anne Boleyn – as opposed to the crimson robes worn at coronation. Elizabeth's coronation and the procession are thus fused together. The next part of the chapter turns to consider this coronation procession and its accompanying text, *The Quenes majesties passage*, for their representations of Elizabeth and her coronation.

FROM CEREMONY TO TEXT: *THE QUENES MAJESTIES PASSAGE*

It is into the representational and interpretative space opened up by the coronation ceremony that *The Quenes majesties passage* fits. It was compiled by the city and parliament man, Richard Mulcaster, and is the only full and published account of the pre-coronation procession. A copy of the book was also presented to Elizabeth herself, a gesture that is crucial to a reading of the text.[59] The Corporation of London commissioned Mulcaster to put together *The Quenes majesties passage* and it was printed by Richard Tottel on 23 January 1559, just nine days after the procession. Tottel paid a licence fee of two shillings and four pence.[60] Mulcaster was paid 40 shillings for his work:

> Itm yt was orderyd and agreyd by the Court here this day that the Chamberlyn shall geve unto Rychard Mulcaster for his reward for makyng of the boke conteynynge and declaryng the historyes set furth in and by the Cyties pageantes at the tyme of the Quenes highnes commyng thorough the Cytye to her coronacon xl^{s} which boke was gevyen unto the Quenes grace.[61]

While the publication of an entry text was not unusual – we recall Wynkyn de Worde's *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of Queen Anne* from 1533 – Mulcaster's little book seems to have been unusually successful. A second edition appeared soon after the first: it is also dated 23 January but with the more elaborate title, *The Passage of our most drad Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to westminster the day before her coronacion.*[62] In 1604 two more editions appeared, in all probability the result of a canny commercial decision taken to coincide with the coronation entry of James I on 15 March.[63] Unlike the lord mayor entry texts produced later in Elizabeth's reign for distribution among the

mayor's company members, *The Quenes majesties passage* was published to be sold, in the first instance from Richard Tottel's shop, 'The Hand and Star', situated on Fleet Street within Temple Bar.[64]

The Quenes majesties passage has been frequently cited as a supreme example, indeed the first example, of Elizabethan Protestant propaganda.[65] In contrast to the ambiguous and contentious ceremony in the Abbey, Mulcaster's detailed exposition of the pageant scenes and Elizabeth's immaculate performance as queen as she moves through the crowds in *The Quenes majesties passage* are invoked as evidence of the new regime's deliberate rejection of empty religious ritual and conscious adoption of secular, political and Protestant theatrics. Richard McCoy, for example, writes of Elizabeth's 'somewhat confusing conduct during her coronation mass' compared to 'her skilled performance during the civic progress the day before' which illuminates 'the increasingly theatrical and secular nature of Tudor power and its rites'.[66] Similarly, David Bergeron describes the text as 'a marvellous piece of propaganda', scripted and authorised by the court.[67] The dynamic of power is often identified as from the top down: the text was published to persuade and reassure an instinctively Protestant public of the new regime's clear Protestant policy. David Starkey, for example, does not identify Richard Mulcaster as the author but argues that the author is a 'reporter' whom Elizabeth commissioned to be by her side and note her every word and move.[68] On the other hand, as William Leahy has shown, it seems unlikely that Mulcaster was even a witness to the procession, let alone walking alongside the queen's litter as part of the entourage. But Leahy, too, concludes that the text is 'a work of propaganda'.[69]

These readings fail to acknowledge the enormous and continued importance attached to the religious service. They are also based on the premise that Mulcaster's text is either an accurate account of the procession, or at least a version of events approved and authorised by the court. On the other hand, *The Quenes majesties passage* is also increasingly detached from the ceremony it anticipates by being discussed as a dramatic script, thus conflating the performance of the procession with the text. It is now reproduced alongside play texts, progress entertainments and lord mayor's shows in Renaissance drama anthologies.[70] But *The Quenes majesties passage* cannot be shoe-horned neatly into either the genre of official propagandist pamphlet or the genre of civic dramatic script. Instead, *The Quenes majesties passage* constitutes a new type of ceremonial text. It marks a departure in ceremonial literature by emphasising, for the first time, interpretation over description. This contrasts with Wynkyn de Worde's *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne* of 1533. It also should be

considered in close conjunction with the ceremony that the procession anticipated – the coronation service. The purpose of the religious ceremony is negotiated and legitimised by this text's interpretation of the meaning of the city's pageants, and by its discussion of what constitutes legitimate rule. At the same time, it presents the procession as a sacred and ceremonial process whereby change is enacted. The circumstances of the commissioning of *The Quenes majesties passage* mean also that Mulcaster's authorship needs to be taken into account, which unsettles readings that identify Mulcaster as a faithful reporter and his text as court-controlled propaganda. Close reading of *The Quenes majesties passage* reveals a persuasive text that is directed at the queen herself, a text which manipulates an important discourse about legitimate female governance and which also adheres to the form and language of sacred monarchy. Furthermore, while the pageantry is not as emphatic about Protestant reformation as is often argued, *The Quenes majesties passage*'s articulation of Truth and promotion of the Word similarly emerge as godly counsel aimed at Elizabeth.

Uncritical post-Foxeian histories have ensured that Elizabeth's coronation has often featured in history as a symbolic moment signifying the break with the foreign and bloody Marian past and the happy beginning of England's Protestant future. Her coronation is placed in Foxe's Protestant providential scheme, as proof of God's will and design for true religion. It has become commonplace to associate Elizabeth's accession with English Protestant triumphalism. In 1680, J. D.'s play *The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, with the Restauration of the Protestant Religion* was published. The curtain rises on the scene of Elizabeth's coronation, with two bishops holding the crown over her head. The link between coronation and the triumphant restoration of Protestantism in the play's title is made explicit through this opening visual emblem.[71] In the later seventeenth century, before James II's accession in 1685, this play emphasised the inextricability of kingship and Protestantism. As recent work has shown, histories, poems and plays contributed to this Elizabethan mythmaking.[72] Richard Mulcaster's book, *The Quenes majesties passage* is such a text. Chroniclers devote more pages to Elizabeth's coronation than to any other Tudor monarch, drawing from or even reproducing – as Holinshed does, almost verbatim – *The Quenes majesties passage*.[73] Reminiscent of Mulcaster's words, Thomas Heywood writes of the procession in his *England's Elizabeth*, that 'the throng of people was extraordinary, their acclamations loud as thunder, many were the expressions of love tendred unto her, and by her as gratefully entertained'. She was then crowned 'to

the joy of all true-hearted Christians'.[74] The end of the first part of Heywood's play, *If you know not me, You know no bodie*, re-enacts Elizabeth's coronation and procession. The sword of justice is bestowed on her and the final speech echoes Mulcaster's description of Elizabeth receiving the gift of the English Bible from the city. Elizabeth declares:

> We thanke you all: but first this booke I kisse,
> Thou art the way to honor; thou to blisse,
> An English Bible, thankes my good Lord Maior.[75]

This can be compared to Mulcaster's description, which is as follows:

> When the childe had thus ended his speache, he reached hys boke towardes the Quene's majestie, which a little before, Trueth had let downe unto him from the hill, whiche by maister Parrat was received, and delivered unto the Quene. But she as soone as she had received the booke, kyssed it, and with both her handes held up the same, and so laid it upon her brest, with great thankes to the citie therfore. (Ciiiiv)

It is Mulcaster, followed by Heywood, who notes that the 'booke' is the 'Byble in Englishe' (Ciiv). In the actual pageant scene, that it is English is not made explicit: Truth holds a book on 'which was written, Verbum veritatis' (Ciiiiv). The representation in *The Quenes majesties passage* of Elizabeth as the humble, attentive, merciful and noble-hearted princess, the veritable Queen of Hearts, who first appears in the text 'holding up her handes', and who was 'received merveylous entierly, as appeared by thassemblie, prayers, wisshes, welcomminges, cryes, tender woordes, and all other signes' (Aiir) of the Londoners has become the predominant 'history' of the event. Foxe also echoes this language of Mulcaster's, mentioning the coronation 'of this our moste noble and Christian Princesse' in passing. He will 'let passe'

> the tryumphant passage and honourable enterteinement of the sayd our most dread Sovereigne, through the city of London, with such celebrity, prayers, wishes, welcomminges, cryes, tender wordes, Pageantes, Enterludes, declamations and verses set up, as the like hath not commonly beene seene, arguing and declaring a wonderfull earnest affection of lovinge hartes towarde theyr Soveraigne.[76]

Elizabeth's coronation is thus tied into the representation of her as a divine and Protestant saviour. But its place in Foxe's work, with Hales's

'Oration' printed immediately afterwards, should warn us against taking the account at face-value. Retrospectively, Elizabeth's coronation and procession are recalled to remind her of her godly duty, and of the expectations aroused by the 'earnest affection' she was granted. This is ceremony being interpreted as counsel. Its veracity is also cast in doubt by other types of history. John Hayward, for example, offers a much more sober, and Tacitean, account of Elizabeth's first arrival in London:

> The people of all sorts (even such whose fortunes were unlike either to bee amended or impaired by change) went many miles out of the City to see her, some uppon particular affection to her person, others upon opinion of good to the State, some upon an ordinary levity and delight in change, and not a few, because they would doe as others did.[77]

While Hayward's account of the coronation procession on 14 January also contains echoes of Mulcaster's text, it is prefaced by a rather striking interpretation. Hayward writes that 'she passed from the Tower through the City of London to Westminster most royally furnished, both for her person and for her traine, knowing right well, that in pompous Ceremonies a secret of government doth much consist, for that the people are naturally both taken and held with exteriour shewes'.[78] Commissioned by the city authorities to prepare the text, Richard Mulcaster was probably also responsible for the Latin and English verses that accompanied the pageants and that he transcribes in *The Quenes majesties passage*. He would certainly have worked closely with the four members of the Corporation commissioned by the Court of Aldermen to design the pageant scenes: Richard Hilles, a member of Parliament and a merchant taylor; Lionel Ducket, mercer (and Lord Mayor of London in 1572); Francis Robinson, grocer; and Richard Grafton the printer and chronicler. Grafton had been the mastermind behind Mary and Philip's marriage entry in 1554. Mulcaster himself was also connected to those who had designed Edward VI's coronation pageants in 1547 and he may well have learnt his craft from Nicholas Udall.[79] This pattern of continuity argues for a tightly knit sphere of influence over state pageantry that cuts across changes in monarchy and regime, suggesting that the court's hold over the pageantry for an occasion such as the procession through London was not as absolute as is often believed. As the records show, it was the Corporation that commissioned the designers and writers. The memorandum that documents Mulcaster's authorship and payment shows that his commission was from

the City, not the Court, and it was the Court of Aldermen that agreed on and ordered the appropriate payment.[80] We can never know the exact configuration of power that determined state pageantry – as with the later progresses – but evidence suggests that while the court may well have been informed about certain details, as would the Corporation of London, the pageantry was largely the product of a group of city individuals, and the text the work of one author.[81] Richard Tottel, the printer of *The Quenes majesties passage*, was not the queen's printer. This office was held jointly by John Cawood (formerly queen's printer in Mary's reign) and Richard Jugge.[82]

In 1558 Mulcaster and his colleagues were politically engaged, reformist and humanist. Mulcaster was a member of Parliament for Carlisle and was later to become the first headmaster of the Merchant Taylors' School – London's largest grammar school established in 1561 by fellow pageant-designer, Richard Hilles, senior warden of the Merchant Taylors' company. He was a keen advocate of educational reform, supporting in particular female education. He was also, like Nicholas Udall, whom he would have come across as his headmaster at Eton, an avid promoter of the English language and the accessibility of Latin texts. In *The Elementarie*, he wrote 'I love Rome, but London better, I favour Italie, but England more, I honor the Latin, but I worship the English.'[83] This commitment to learning and the English language is a discernible and important feature of *The Quenes majesties passage*. Unlike Wynkyn de Worde's celebratory pamphlet for Anne Boleyn, *The Quenes majesties passage* is not straightforward reportage or panegyric description. Mulcaster purposefully shapes his material to offer a startlingly original treatment of the pre-coronation entry. His text has a preamble and an epilogue. He mentions neither the order of the procession nor details of dress. Instead, the pageants are described in visual detail and their meaning is extrapolated and reiterated throughout the text. The narrative occasionally pauses to take stock of the meaning of the previous pageants to demonstrate how they tie in together. The text is the first of its kind to *interpret* the procession's symbolism and, in doing so, reveals a contingent and interpretable concept of monarchical power. The pageants tell a tale of good queenship and correct government, and *The Quenes majesties passage* makes much of this tale. It is impossible to ever know exactly how Elizabeth did behave during her procession, and I do not wish to suggest that Mulcaster completely fictionalised Elizabeth or invented the speeches that she is recorded as having delivered. But what does matter is that Mulcaster chooses to represent, and repeatedly, Elizabeth's engagement with the pageants. Her 'staying' her chariot so that

she can properly see, hear and understand the meaning of the pageant displayed before her constitutes the central iconic moments in the book, and the representation of Elizabeth's interrogation of the meaning of each pageant and receiving instruction becomes a powerful symbol of her queenship.[84] The text presents an idealised version of the queen, the procession and what it communicated. Indeed, through effective literary tropes, the text seems to draw attention to its own fiction and theatricality. The famous metaphor of the stage that appears at the beginning of *The Quenes majesties passage* turns the procession into a spectacle and projects a particular role on to Elizabeth: 'So that if a man should say well, he could not better tearme the citie of London that time, than a stage wherin was shewed the wonderfull spectacle, of a noble hearted princesse toward her most loving people' (Aiiv). Not only is she on her stage, but London itself comprises a series of mini stages upon which Elizabeth's stage is mirrored and represented. The next section describes briefly the route of the procession and the theme of each of the five key pageants that Mulcaster and his colleagues created for Elizabeth, drawing on *The Quenes majesties passage* and the Mantuan envoy Il Schifanoya's letter of 23 January.[85]

At two o'clock in the afternoon of Saturday 14 January, Elizabeth emerged from the Tower of London. She was dressed in a cloth-of-gold robe, her hair was down according to custom, and she wore a circlet of gold on her head. She sat on cloth of gold cushions in a rich, satin-lined litter. The litter was open at the sides with a canopy over the top supported by the four barons of the Cinque Ports. From the Tower, the procession turned north and entered the city of London via Fenchurch Street. The first pageant was a welcoming oration spoken by a child, in English, standing on a 'richely furnished' stage in 'costly apparel' (Aiiir). Next Elizabeth moved to Gracechurch Street where 'at the upper ende, before the sygne of the Egle' was the first pageant proper, 'The uniting of the two houses of Lancastre and Yorke' (Aiiiir, Bir). A stage stretched from one side of the street to the other, with three openings in the structure. Over the middle opening rose three tiers: on the lowest, were two actors playing King Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. Henry was enclosed in the red rose of the House of Lancaster and Elizabeth in the white rose of the House of York. The two roses entwined in a single branch which sprouted up to Henry VIII, seated next to Anne Boleyn on the middle level. Another branch connected them to the third level where Elizabeth sat crowned in an imperial crown. The second pageant entitled 'The seate of worthie governance' was stationed at Cornhill (Biiiv). A child playing the queen

sat in a throne, supported on one side by characters representing virtues – Pure Religion, Love of Subjects, Wisdom and Justice – who seemed to be treading upon characters representing vices – Superstition, Ignorance, Rebellion, Insolence, Folly, Vain Glory, Adulation and Bribery. On top of the whole pageant structure sat another representation of the queen, crowned in the imperial crown. Elizabeth is here presented with two images of herself.

From Cornhill, Elizabeth and her procession moved past the Great Conduit in Cheapside and across the market square of West Cheaping to the end of Soper Lane for the third pageant: 'The eight beatitudes' (Cir). Over the middle gate were three levels: on the top stood one child, on the middle three and on the lowest four. The eight children represented the eight blessings from God as expressed in the fifth chapter of St Matthew's Gospel. The procession then carried on moving down Cheapside, past the Standard and the Cross, past St Peter's Church and towards the Little Conduit just short of which Elizabeth received 1,000 marks from Ranulph Cholmley, the recorder of the City, the exchange between the city and the monarch that was first introduced in Anne Boleyn's procession in 1533. The members and representatives of the city's companies who had hitherto lined the streets were not present beyond this station.

Beyond the aldermen, the fourth pageant was erected at the Little Conduit. This pageant depicted two hills, a barren hill on the north side of the pageant – 'Ruinosa Respublica' – and a fertile hill on the south – 'Respublica bene instituta' (Ciiiv, Ciiiir). From a cave in between the two hills a character representing Time came forth, leading his daughter Truth who presented Elizabeth with a Bible, on which was inscribed 'Verbum veritatis' (Ciiiiv). The procession then moved south through St Paul's Churchyard. By St Paul's school, a child declaimed an oration before Elizabeth, before she left the city by Ludgate. The procession crossed Fleet Bridge and continued along Fleet Street towards the conduit where the fifth and final pageant was – and the only one outside the city walls. Between the conduit and the north side of Fleet Street was a four-towered structure, on top of which sat a crowned queen in a throne, dressed in Elizabethan parliament robes and representing Deborah, Judge of Israel. Around Deborah, and on the lower levels, were characters representing the nobility, the clergy and the commonalty. From here, the procession passed through the Duchy of Lancaster, the area between Westminster and city of London, and entered Westminster at Temple Bar. Temple Bar was decorated with two images from British legend: Corineus and Gogmagog the giant. After a farewell oration, the queen and the entourage moved on to

Westminster Hall, where the procession ended. The entire procession was accompanied by music, trumpet fanfares and children singing. At each pageant verses or a speech were declaimed to the queen and the texts of Latin and English verses and sentences were pinned up all over the pageant structures. The entire procession was a proliferation of words. There was, as the above bears out, notably little divine imagery.

Mulcaster's text presents the procession as a continuous *process* which brings about change and whereby the queen's authority is shown to be dependent on that which has come before. At the first oration, Mulcaster notes 'a mervelous change in looke, as the childes wordes touched either her person or the peoples tonges and hertes' (Aiiiv). After the Time and Truth pageant, Mulcaster rounds up the meanings of each pageant: 'The mater of this pageant dependeth of them that went before' (Div). The procession is described as a formal, ceremonial movement: at each pageant station, the queen stops, draws near, enquires, listens, understands, and retreats.

> Now the Queenes majestye drewe nere unto the sayde pageant, and forsomuch as the noyse was great by reason of the prease of people, so that she could skace heare the childe which did interprete the saide pageant, and her chariot was passed so farre forward that she could not well view the personages representing the kinges and Queenes abouenamed: she required to have the matter opened unto her, which so was, and every personage appointed, and what they signified, with the ende of unitie & ground of her name, according as is before expressed. (Bir–v)

Only when she has 'understood the meaning therof', or 'the meaning of the pageant at large', is Elizabeth able to proceed to the next station (Biv, Biiir).

Via this sense of process and dependent, accumulative meaning, what constitutes Elizabeth's legitimacy and right to rule, according to this text, emerges. It becomes increasingly contingent, and increasingly dependent on Elizabeth as a governor, as opposed to a sacred monarch. The genealogical tree pageant appeals to Elizabeth's blood and lineage: it is this that places Elizabeth on the throne, despite the irony implicit in the representation of Anne and the anxieties underlying Elizabeth's legitimacy. But there is no angel positioned at the top, or who appears from the pageant heavens to crown Elizabeth – as had taken place in her mother's coronation procession, for example. The next pageant depicts a throne that is not a heavenly throne but 'the seate of worthie governance' which is supported by virtues, but no angels or virgins. Mulcaster explicitly draws attention to

the fragility of the throne, repeating how it is literally supported: 'which seate was made in such artificiall maner, as to the apperance of the lookers on, the foreparte semed to have no staie, and therfore of force was stayed by lively personages, which personages were in numbre foure, standing and staieng the forefront of the same seate royal' (Biiiv). These four 'lively personages' are Pure Religion, Love of Subjects, Wisdom and Justice. Elizabeth's position on her throne is precarious, and conditional. Only if Elizabeth embraces Pure Religion that stamps on Superstition and suppresses rebellion, adulation and bribery will her throne be 'stayed'. The poetry that decorates this pageant expresses this conditionality: each verse begins with 'While that', meaning 'So long as. . .'. Mulcaster then glosses this poetry. His double logic is both flattering and admonitory: Elizabeth is on the throne because she possesses these virtues, but she will only 'syt fast in thesame' as long as she cleaves to them: 'The grounde of this pageant, was that like as by vertues (which doe aboundantly appere in her grace) the Queenes maiestie was established in the seate of governement: so she should syt fast in thesame so long as she embraced vertue and helde vice under foote' (Biiiiv). Similarly, the third pageant draws on the God-granted blessings, thereby seemingly raising Elizabeth to the divine, only to immediately qualify and moderate this: 'so if her grace did continue in her goodnes as she had entred, she shoulde hope for the fruit of these promises due unto them' (Civ). It is crucial to note, as Mulcaster's double logic displays, that Elizabeth's divine authority is not absent. Rather, the idiom of divine right is subtly redefined to become negotiable: it legitimises her claim to the throne, but it does not guarantee her staying on that throne.

By the final pageant, Elizabeth is presented as the queen in Parliament, dressed in the crimson Tudor parliament robes, wearing an open crown and holding the sceptre. Her authority derives from Biblical precedent: she is Deborah – judge and restorer of Israel, wife and mother. She is not a sovereign on a celestial throne wearing the imperial crown, an image which both her mother and her brother's processions had invoked. Never before had an entry procession represented the monarch in Parliament and Mulcaster presents this fifth and final pageant as the climax. It is often the fourth pageant, that which enacts 'Veritas temporis filia', that is cited as the most important pageant in the procession because of Elizabeth's acceptance of the gift of the English Bible. It therefore serves as 'proof' of the procession's and the text's Protestant agenda, and hence, it is claimed, Elizabeth's.[86] But Mulcaster presents the final pageant as dependent on this previous pageant for its meaning, and shows how the queen is a

legitimate queen in Parliament, not only through the legitimacy of the Word of Truth, but through the legitimacy of counsel. The image of a woman in Tudor parliament robes recalls the image conjured up in horror by Knox, discussed earlier in this chapter: 'a woman sitting in judgement, or riding frome parliament in the middest of men, having the royall crowne upon her head, the sworde and sceptre borne before her, in signe that the administration of justice was in her power: I am assuredlie persuaded, I say, that suche a sight shulde so astonishe'.[87] This image in the pageant is countered by the scene's title: ' Debora with her estates, consulting for the good government of Israel' (Diiiv). As Elizabeth draws her chariot close, Mulcaster unlocks the meaning, and this message of 'good government'. It is, according to Mulcaster's text, good counsel that will restore the desolate commonwealth pictured in the previous pageant:

> The ground of this last pageant was, that forsomuch as the next pageant before had set before her graces eyes the florishing & desolate states of a commonweale, she might by this be put in remembrance to consult for the worthie government of her people, considering god oftimes sent women nobly to rule among men, as Debora which governed Israell in peace the space of xl yeres: & that it behoveth both men & women so ruling to use advise of good counsell. (Diiiir)

The Time and Truth pageant 'set before her graces eyes' is recalled as a warning, and determines the way in which to apprehend the Deborah pageant. The words 'by this be put in remembrance' recall Cranmer's coronation sermon to Edward VI, where the rites of coronation 'be good admonitions to put kings in mind of their duty to God'. The tone of Mulcaster's interpretation is admonishing: 'be put in remembrance to consult', 'it behoveth both men & women . . . to use advise of good counsell'. At the same time, the text acknowledges that, like Deborah, Elizabeth is sent by God and this legitimises her status as a female ruler. But the syntax interlaces divine authority and Elizabeth's gender with the responsibility to seek good counsel. Elizabeth's power will ultimately derive from 'advise of good counsell'. It is, therefore, as a parliamentary queen that, according to this pageant, Elizabeth will be anointed and crowned.

The representation of the two republics – one barren ('Ruinosa Respublica') and one flourishing ('Respublica bene instituta') – and the appearance of Time and Truth recall Nicholas Udall's *Respublica* from the previous chapter. The play stages a barren commonwealth in the body of the widow, Respublica; Truth appears as the female and heaven-sent

virtue, Veritas, and Mary too is cast as the daughter of Time, as in the Prologue's line 'yet tyme trieth all and tyme bringeth truth to lyght' (l. 27). The play's dramatisation of the concept of good counsel as the restorer and maintainer of a flourishing commonwealth recur here in Mulcaster's interpretation of the pageant, linking it to the next pageant scene which represents Deborah in her parliament robes. The play, performed to coincide with Mary's recent coronation, appears here in pageant-form, and as part of Elizabeth's coronation. The sacred monarch, sent by God, but not represented on a heavenly throne, is imaged in Parliament, surrounded and supported by male councillors and the commonwealth, Respublica, is prioritised. Mary's motto – 'Veritas temporis filia' – is reappropriated by Elizabeth through this pageant and a flourishing commonwealth is represented as inextricable from a godly queen in parliament, who presses Truth to her breast in the form of the English Bible. It is important to note, however, that it is Mulcaster's text that places emphasis on the English Bible. Prior to the Respublica pageant, just after Elizabeth has passed the Cross in Cheapside, she 'espyed the pageant erected at the litle conduit in cheape, and incontinent required to know what it might signifye'. She is told that it represented 'Tyme' and that Truth would appear to deliver the 'Byble in Englishe' to her (Ciir). This is referred to again at the end of the *The Quenes majestyes passage*, in its epilogue, as the second of 'two principall sygnes' of Elizabeth's recognition of and gratitude to God for the 'mercie shewed unto her' (Eiiiir). Mulcaster remembers the giving of the English Bible and writes 'how reverently did she with both her handes take it, kisse it, & lay it on her brest to the great comfort of the lookers on' (Eiiiiv). The actual pageant is rather quieter than this. The figures of Time and Truth are labelled in Latin and in English, as is the 'boke of truth'. In addition, the 'sentences written in latin and englishe upon both the trees, declaring the causes' of a 'ruinous common weale' and a 'florishing common weale' do not mention truth or religion. Instead, obedience and 'Lovers of the common weale' are emphasised (Dir–v). When we consider the pressure and ambiguity implicit in the actual coronation ceremony, it seems impossible to read Mulcaster's text as triumphant Elizabethan propaganda. Instead it seems to place additional pressure on the new queen.

The lesson of 'good counsell' is manifest in Mulcaster's prose-style, which delights in words and correct interpretation. He presents the pageants as initially obscure to allow him to reveal the correct meaning and to ensure that the representation of the queen gleaning this correct sense becomes an inextricable symbol of her legitimacy as queen. Mulcaster's

prose is tirelessly repetitious, circling around and reiterating and reinforcing the meaning of each pageant. He interprets the pageants whose verses that he transcribes already offer their own interpretation – mirrored in both Latin and English – and whose 'voide places' in the structure are crammed with 'pretie sentences concerning the same matter' (Diiiir). *The Quenes majesties passage* not only describes an event that is excessively verbal – each pageant and character is correctly labelled and identified, like emblems – but it is itself excessive in its translating and glossing. Mulcaster's text relishes the revelation of language and meaning. His text enacts a process of mystery and revelation, whereby the queen, at each pageant, hushes the crowd, moves her chariot closer, listens intently until 'the hole matter was opened to her grace' (Ciiv). Text is therefore privileged over image; indeed it displaces image, as Mulcaster's conflation of particular verbs and nouns suggests: words are seen, 'that she might perceyve the chyldes woordes' (Civ), and verses are 'painted' (Ciir). Text also emerges as a necessary medium through which to negotiate and interpret Elizabeth's legitimate rule.

Through its displacement of legitimacy into the interpretation of good counsel and its emphasis on the importance of text, *The Quenes majesties passage* adopts for itself a crucial legitimising role in Elizabeth's coronation. Next to the unreadable and obscure ceremony, this text's insistence on signification, meaning and interpretation are pertinent. At the same time as the text appears to freeze and close down meaning, however, it appears all too aware of the possibility that meaning is not immanent, that it may mutate, that there may be several potential meanings. The *Quenes majesties passage* works within a system that attributes verbal meaning to visible signs. The prose is flooded with words such as 'represent', 'signifie', 'signe', 'token' that both pin down singularity of meaning and, paradoxically, acknowledge plurality. Indeed, because the text privileges interpretation as a legitimising force for Elizabeth's queenship, it necessarily opens up its own interpretability. Mulcaster even draws attention to this in a curiously ludic episode at the end. In the epilogue, he describes how a knight belonging to the queen's entourage spots an old man weeping in the crowd. Mulcaster quotes the knight's words: 'How may it be interpreted that he so doth, for sorowe, or for gladnes?' 'I warrant you it is for gladnes' the queen replies. But, as Mulcaster himself writes, this is a 'gracious interpretation' and the possibility that the man may have been weeping for 'sorowe' is left uncomfortably hanging (Eiiir). In addition, as if testament to Mulcaster's own fear of plurality, Richard Grafton interprets the pageant depicting Deborah rather differently from

Mulcaster. Grafton emphasises Deborah as a woman, as opposed to a ruler consulting in parliament. He writes that 'This was made to encourage the Quene not to feare though she were a woman: For women by the spirite and power of Almyghtye God, haue ruled both honorably and pollitiquely, and that a great tyme, as did Debora, whiche was there sett foorth in Pageant.'[88]

By 1559, the coronation had become inextricable from counsel, critique and performance. An inscrutable ceremony was accompanied by a descriptive text that uses dramatic tropes as a way of representing and commenting on ceremony and governance. At the same time, the text draws attention to both its own, and ceremony's, plurality and interpretability. In the new political and religious context of 1603, the *Liber Regalis* was translated into English, reinterpreted explicitly for James I's coronation.[89] In addition, the pageants for his delayed procession (performed in 1604 due to the plague) were written by two successful playwrights: Thomas Dekker and Ben Jonson. Alongside two reissues of Mulcaster's *The Quenes majesties passage*, Dekker and Jonson published their own versions of the procession they created for James, each offering different perspectives and interpretations of what had now become a unique, and necessary, dramatic performance.[90]

Epilogue
'Presume not that I am the thing I was'

There is, in the end, no grand, conclusive answer to this book's initial question: 'What art thou, thou idol ceremony?' It remains a question that was still being asked at the end of the sixteenth century, both by ceremonies themselves and, increasingly, by their dramatic counterparts. Coronation retained its political and cultural legitimacy at the same time as becoming increasingly troubling and divisive and at the mercy of its specific historical moments. We cannot ever know what Elizabeth I or contemporary witnesses really understood about her coronation, but it is clear that it cannot be dismissed as an empty form, as just 'idle' ceremony, or indeed as simply the abominable 'idol' of Catholic ceremony. The legitimising power of the ceremony persists, as does the idea of the sacred body of the monarch, despite interpretative confusion and confessional wrangles. Similarly, it is inadequate to label Elizabeth I's procession as a secular show of state, as the regime's calculated exploitation of (Catholic) ceremonial theatrics in order to promote coherent Protestant policy and majesty. Mulcaster's text, for example, is coercive and persuasive, and is directed as much at the queen as at the buying public.

As a composite form that was not restricted to the consecration in the Abbey but included proclamations, processions, pageantry and plays, the coronation ceremony fell subject to many, often competing, pressures and interests and it reflected, absorbed and resisted change across the political, religious and symbolical spheres. Thus, reading the ceremonies through the lens of religious reformation only risks eclipsing other significant issues that a coronation engages with. Anne Boleyn's coronation is significant for its part in the legitimisation of imperial English monarchy rather than announcing a new religion, and Cranmer's coronation address before Edward VI articulates not only a non-sacramental interpretation of the rite of anointing, but also an important reinterpretation of monarchical authority and of the symbolic purpose of ceremonial representation. Mary I's coronation was not a straightforward restored Catholic coronation but

was fraught with the issues surrounding the legitimacy of female rule and parliamentary ownership of ceremony. This book has argued against over-confessionalised readings of all five coronations, not least because not one coronation in this study can be said to be officially 'Protestant', but also because the ceremonies themselves, and the various texts that surround them, construct emergent and divergent notions of what 'Protestantism' is, and what 'Protestant' ceremonies are. Only James VI's coronation in 1603 can be properly described as Protestant, and analysis of this crowning of a new male monarch and dynasty would need to be placed in the context of past Tudor coronations and the future union of Scotland and England. In addition, it was only in 1603 that the *Liber Regalis* was translated and thus James's coronation the first to be conducted wholly in English rather than Latin.

The five Tudor coronations in this study are characterised by the tension between the desire that this ceremony should be reformed to match changing notions of political and religious truth and authority, and the acknowledgement that ceremony is beyond change and outside of history; that its authority and legitimacy derive from precedent, the divine and from recalling the ghosts of kings and queens past. Sally Moore and Barbara Myerhoff write in *Secular Ritual* that, in altering ceremony we risk

> the possibility that we will encounter ourselves making up our conception of the world, society, our very selves. We may slip in that fatal perspective of recognizing culture as our construct, arbitrary, conventional, made by mortals. Ceremonies are paradoxical in this way. Being the most obviously contrived forms of social contract, they epitomize the made-up quality of culture . . . Yet their very form and purpose is to discourage untrammeled inquiry into such questions.[1]

While the above formulation assumes a secular position when it describes ceremonies as 'the most obviously contrived forms of social contract', void of religious belief and divine authority, it articulates a dilemma that is confronted in the sixteenth century, and which underlies each of the coronations in this book. This is the persistent sense that the coronation is more than the sum of its parts, not an arbitrary 'made-up' political construct and not a straightforward sacramental form, but something undefinable but necessary, and altogether more troubling. The coronations of Anne Boleyn, Edward VI, Mary I and Elizabeth I engage with the struggle to match ceremony to truth, to strive for ceremonial accuracy and fidelity. The consequence of such an endeavour does not have to be the delegitimisation of ceremony, but it necessarily reveals the ineffability of

ceremony. In Shakespeare's 2 *Henry IV*, Henry V, on his return from his coronation sees Falstaff and tells him to 'Presume not that I am the thing I was'. 'Thing' here is a flippant way of referring to Henry's youth and former self, but it also suggests transformation and prophetic mystery. What 'thing' is Henry now, or what thing has the ceremony prophesied he may become?[2] Such in-betweeness is present too in the mock-crowning of Una in Book I of *The Faerie Queene*. In the below, the word 'earnest' trembles with portent:

Then on her head they sett a girlond greene
And crowned her twixt earnest and twixt game[3]

What *is* ceremony when it hovers undefined in this way between seriousness and play, between doing something – and doing nothing?

The Tudor coronation ceremonies increasingly became opportunities for counsel, when the monarch could be presented with a version of him or herself. From Anne Boleyn's coronation to Elizabeth's, the church ceremony, pageantry poetry and attendant texts and plays are marked by a conditionality and reciprocity that strain readings that seek to understand the ceremonies as vehicles for official court propaganda. Via Cranmer's sermon, Edward VI's coronation was transformed into a space where Edward was presented with a version of himself as a young Josiah, and as a boy-king whose supreme authority lay in the hands of his Council. Mary's Council similarly wished to reclaim authority over her crowning. Satellite texts, such as Richard Taverner's *Oration* to Mary, negotiate the new queen's divine right with right religion and Nicholas Udall's *Respublica* depicts Mary as a vulnerable widow who is dependent on, even bridled by, her male governors. The image of the parliamentary queen recurs in 1559 when Elizabeth, on her way to Westminster, is presented with an image of herself as Deborah, dressed in parliament robes. Close examination of texts written around the specific coronations opens up the multiple ways in which the ceremonies were perceived and represented. De Worde's *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon* emphasises precedent and tradition as a response to the threat to legitimacy while Nicholas Udall's and John Leland's verses stress the imperial theme and prophesy the imminent birth of a baby boy. Indeed, the ceremonies seem to become associated increasingly with scenes of prophecy. Anne Boleyn's coronation is recalled (wrongly) in the preface to William Camden's *Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth* to frame Elizabeth's reign with prophetic truth and John Hales's *Oration* to Elizabeth on her

accession is reprinted in a later edition of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* with the seeming double purpose of praising the queen while reminding her of what was predicted and promised at her coronation. The recollection of past ceremonies, then, can have a pointed but legitimate political function. Thomas Heywood's play *If you know not me, You know no bodie: or, The troubles of Queene Elizabeth* dramatises Elizabeth's procession, drawing on Richard Mulcaster's *The Quenes majesties passage*, but it was performed in James's reign. Does this play dramatise Elizabeth's coronation in order to memorialise Elizabeth, or to address James, or both? The publication of two editions of *The Quenes majesties passage* in 1604, for James I's coronation procession, perhaps also had a political as well as a commercial impetus, whereby James was invited to learn from the earlier text's prophetic vision of an ideal Protestant monarch.

With all these attributes in mind, the representation of coronation ceremonies and their attendant rites in plays – and particularly those of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods – demands reassessment. In particular, the twin notions that the Reformation successfully demystified ceremonies and that dramatic representation, or 'displacement', completed their implosion no longer stand up.[4] The exchange between ceremony and drama has a longer, more interesting, and more positive legacy. John Bale's *King Johan* represents ceremony and majesty to redefine the legitimacy of ceremony. At the same time as the rituals of the Roman Church are satirised in this play, ceremony is reinvested with the authority of imperial majesty. Nicholas Udall's play *Respublica* both celebrates and renegotiates the implications of sacred ceremony for a female monarch. It uses and mimics ceremony to critique authority legitimately.[5] Richard Mulcaster's text dramatises Elizabeth's procession in a way that presents Elizabeth, as a spectator, with an image of herself as a certain type of protagonist. Ceremony performs increasingly as a representation, interpretation and negotiator of legitimate power, and not as the official expression or endorsement of power. As ceremonies become, like drama, an arena for dialogue and debate, this has significant implications for their representation in plays. What happens when playwrights select to represent and intervene with these ambiguous and anxious ceremonies, when a historial coronation procession moves across the stage or a mock crowning takes place in front of a monarch?[6] Where are we now on the scale 'twixt earnest and twixt game'? What Udall's Poet says of his play is also the point of ceremony: 'ytt maie be wronge interpreted from the auctors sence' (ll. 9–12).

Ceremony in Shakespeare and Fletcher's *King Henry VIII (All is True)* is an effective, dramatic way of telling history that at the same time draws

attention to the distorted nature of that history, wherein all, indeed, seems true. From 'the ceremony / Of bringing back the prisoner' (II. ll. 4–5) to Anne Boleyn's coronation and Princess Elizabeth's christening, ceremony's status as a reliable form of representation and its relationship with time and history are questioned. Anne's coronation is subject to the interpretation and report of the third gentleman, who describes how Anne 'Came to the altar, where she kneeled and, saint-like, / Cast her fair eyes to heaven' (IV. ll. 83–4). Yet, at the end of the play, Elizabeth's christening provides the occasion for Archbishop Cranmer's prophesying sermon. The christening ceremony is used to tell history, to make history and to intervene in history. This final scene memorialises and eulogises Elizabeth I, as does the gentleman's report of Anne's coronation, but it also misrepresents a past ceremony in order to address its present monarch and present ceremonial context – this being the recent funeral of England's young Protestant hope, Prince Henry, and the forthcoming marriage of his sister Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine. The representation of real historical ceremonies before James I takes on a prophetic and critical capacity, both flattering and deeply uncomfortable. For if Anne's coronation and model saintly behaviour were 'well worth the seeing', it cannot be forgotten that, in the very next scene of the play, Katherine of Aragon 'holdeth up her hands to heaven' (IV. 2. SD 82.15) and her vision of her rightful ceremony is enacted: a heavenly coronation in which she is crowned, following the actual English coronation ceremony, three times. Ceremony, like drama, can be interpreted in multiple ways. It can, to recall Nicholas Udall's Poet in *Respublica* be 'wronge interpreted from the auctors sence' (l. 12), but herein, perhaps, lies its continued power and constant reinvention.

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1. *King Henry V*, ed. T. W. Craik, Arden Shakespeare (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), IV. 1. 237.
2. The only comprehensive survey of English coronations remains Percy Ernst Schramm's *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937). To date, only Dale Hoak has looked in detail at the Tudor coronations, but in article form only: 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, and the Transformation of the Tudor Monarchy', in *Westminster Abbey Reformed 1540–1640*, ed. C. S. Knighton and Richard Mortimer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 114–51. England (compared to France, for example) is unusual for the paucity of visual evidence relating to coronations. The only official extant coronation portrait is of Elizabeth I, which was commissioned and painted at the end of her reign. See Janet Arnold, 'The "Coronation" Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I', *Burlington Magazine*, 120 (1978), 727–41.
3. Edward Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 186. Muir is referring to the classic theory put forward by Max Weber on the Protestant disenchantment of the world, and the corollary between the decline of ritual and the rise of modernity: Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 2001; first published 1930), who writes of 'That great historic process in the development of religions, the elimination of magic from the world' (p. 61). For an analysis of beliefs in the efficacy versus the symbolism of ceremony in the medieval Church, see Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971).
4. Thomas M. Greene, 'Ceremonial Play and Parody in the Renaissance', in *Urban Life in the Renaissance*, ed. Susan Zimmerman and Ronald F. E. Weissman (Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1989), pp. 281–93 (pp. 285, 288).
5. Stephen Greenblatt, 'Shakespeare and the Exorcists', in Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), pp. 94–128 (pp. 113, 127).

See also his 'Resonance and Wonder', in Stephen Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 161–83.

6. The appropriateness and usefulness of ascribing confessional identities to a period that was itself developing confessionalisation have been usefully questioned in recent work. See Tom Betteridge's *Literature and Politics in the English Reformation* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004) and the important work of Patrick Collinson, especially *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Macmillan, 1988; repr. 1991). Christopher Haigh and Eamon Duffy both argue usefully for the continuity and survival of religious rituals, but still argue for Protestantism, as a coherent act of state, versus a residual Catholicism: see Haigh's *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) and Duffy's *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992). Peter Lake with Michael Questier challenge Haigh's thesis and emphasise the instability and contingency of the terms 'Protestant' and 'Catholic' and the idea of a monolithic 'Protestant' state in their *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002).
7. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', (p. 147). 'Degraded into . . . tokens' is from Schramm, p. 10.
8. Richard McCoy, '"The Wonderful Spectacle": The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation', in *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, ed. János M. Bák (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press, 1990), pp. 217–27 (p. 218). See also Richard McCoy, '"Thou Idol Ceremony": Elizabeth I, *The Henriad*, and the Rites of the English Monarchy', in *Urban Life in the Renaissance*, ed. Zimmerman and Weissman, pp. 240–66.
9. Albert Rolls, *The Theory of the King's Two Bodies in the Age of Shakespeare*, Studies in Renaissance Literature, 19 (Lewiston, Queenston and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000), pp. 100, 101.
10. Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 167. And see McCoy, '"The Wonderful Spectacle"'.
11. David Starkey, 'Representation through Intimacy: A Study in the Symbolism of Monarchy and Court Office in Early-Modern England', in *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross-cultural Studies in Symbolism*, ed. Ioan Lewis (London, New York and San Francisco: Academic Press, 1977), pp. 187–224 (p. 221).
12. For an important discussion of the concept of duty and obedience across the Reformation, see Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), II: 'The Age of Reformation', pp. 189–238.

13. Paul Kléber Monod, *The Power of Kings: Monarchy and Religion in Europe 1589–1715* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 47.
14. Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: Macmillan, 1995), p. 37.
15. Schramm, pp. 96, 98–9. *History of the English Coronation* remains the only study of its kind. Other studies are comparative and tend to place the English coronation in its wider European context. See Kléber Monod, *The Power of Kings*; *Coronations*, ed. Bák, and *European Monarchy: Its Evolution and Practice from Roman Antiquity to Modern Times*, ed. Heinz Duchhardt, Richard A. Jackson and David Sturdy (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992).
16. John Adamson, 'The Tudor and Stuart Courts 1509–1714', in *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under the* Ancien Régime *1500–1750*, ed. John Adamson (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999), pp. 95–117 (p. 101).
17. Adamson, 'The Tudor and Stuart Courts', p. 102.
18. Adamson, 'The Tudor and Stuart Courts', p. 102.
19. Fiona Kisby, 'The Royal Household Chapel in Early-Tudor London, 1485–1547' (doctoral thesis, University of London, 1996) and Fiona Kisby, '"When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485–1547', *Journal of British Studies*, 40 (2001), 44–75.
20. David J. Sturdy, '"Continuity" versus "Change": Historians and English Coronations of the Medieval and Early Modern Periods', in *Coronations*, ed. Bák, pp. 228–45.
21. These early histories include Arthur Taylor, *The Glory of Regality: An Historical Treatise of the Anointing and Crowning of the Kings and Queens of England* (London: Payne and Foss, 1820); T. C. Banks, *An Historical Account of the Ancient and Modern Forms, Pageantry and Ceremony of the Coronations of the Kings of England* (London, 1820); and Wickham Legg's, *ECR*. A counter-argument to these 'continuity' works is Herbert Thurston's *The Coronation Ceremonial: Its True History and Meaning* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1902). On the continuity versus discontinuity debate in histories of the English Church, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, 30 (1991), 1–19.
22. *ECR*, p. xv.
23. Schramm, pp. 228, 99.
24. Schramm, p. 97.
25. Alan C. Don, Dean of Westminster, 'Introduction' to Lawrence E. Tanner, *The Historic Story of the Coronation Ceremony and Ritual* (London: Pitkins, 1952), p. 1. For an account of coronations since the nineteenth century see David Cannadine, 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820–1977', in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 101–64.

26. The fourteenth-century *Liber Regalis*, which is still held at Westminster Abbey, contains the order of ceremony for the English coronation service and was used until the end of the seventeenth century. Chapter 1 discusses the *Liber Regalis* in detail. The 'Ryalle Book' is reprinted in *The Antiquarian Repertory* (see list of *Abbreviations*) and discussed in Chapter 1.
27. Paul Strohm, 'Coronation as Legible Practice', in Paul Strohm, *Theory and the Premodern Text* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), pp. 33–48 (p. 48).
28. Ralph E. Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1960); Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957; repr. with new preface by William Chester Jordan, 1997).
29. Sydney Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992), pp. 101–2.
30. There is, however, a subtle shift in the way chronicles report the transition from one monarch to another during the sixteenth century. See Chapter 3.
31. Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997; first published 1969), p. 2.
32. Roy Strong, *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450–1650* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1984); Roy Strong, *Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973). In the latter he writes that 'whether Tudor, Habsburg or Valois, all transmuted the traditional forms of secular entertainment into a vehicle for dynastic apotheosis', pp. 22–3.
33. Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), p. 114. See also Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).
34. McCoy, '"Thou Idol Ceremony"', p. 244. Other important work on the performance of power, particularly with reference to later Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, includes Stephen Orgel, 'Making Greatness Familiar', in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. David M. Bergeron (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1985), pp. 19–25; Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1975); Leonard Tennenhouse, *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres* (New York and London: Methuen, 1986); and Louis Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
35. Clifford Geertz, 'Politics Past, Politics Present', in Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, 2nd edn (New York: Basic Books, 2000; first published 1973), pp. 327–41 (p. 335).
36. Geertz, 'Politics Past, Politics Present', p. 335.
37. Clifford Geertz, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', in *Culture and its Creators: Essays in Honor of Edward Shils*, ed. J. Ben-David and T. N. Clark (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1977), pp. 150–71. There have been many studies born

of this anthropological enquiry that began to decode symbolic forms. See *Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics since the Middle Ages*, ed. Sean Wilentz (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); *Symbols and Sentiments*, ed. Lewis; and *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, ed. David Cannadine and Simon Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). The latter is a collection of essays whose range extends from the Madagascan royal bath to the Byzantine Book of Ceremonies.

38. Geertz, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma', p. 156.
39. Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship*, p. 130. For a refutation of the approaches of scholars such as Geertz and Anglo, see R. Malcolm Smuts' celebrated article 'Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: The English Royal Entry in London, 1485–1642', in *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone*, eds A. L. Bier, David Cannadine and James M. Rosenheim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 65–93.
40. For works that study English royal rituals alongside European counterparts, see Monod, *The Power of Kings*; *Coronations*, ed. Bák; *European Monarchy*, ed. Duchhardt, Jackson and Sturdy; *The Princely Courts of Europe*, ed. Adamson; and Glenn Richardson, *Renaissance Monarchy: The Reigns of Henry VIII, Francis I and Charles V* (London: Arnold, 2002). Also see specific work on French royal rituals including Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*; Richard A. Jackson, *Vive le Roi! A History of the French Coronation from Charles V to Charles X* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); and Lawrence M. Bryant, *The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony: Politics, Ritual and Art in the Renaissance* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1986).
41. See, for example, the work of Diarmaid MacCulloch, especially *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996), and also Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*.
42. The records of the Corporation of London, for example, reveal the collaborative nature of the relationship between court and city, and the role of the civic authorities. See Anne Lancashire, *London Civic Theatre: Civic Drama and Pageantry from Roman Times to 1558* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002; Gordon Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); and Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
43. On the idea of ceremonies as social, communal events, see Kipling, *Enter the King*, and Mervyn James, 'Ritual, Drama and Social Body in the Late Medieval English Town', *Past and Present*, 98 (1983), 3–29. Also see the collection of essays in *Ceremony and Text in the Renaissance*, ed. Douglas F. Rutledge (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1996), which is largely informed by Victor Turner's theories of ritual.
44. Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*, p. i.

45. Schramm's *History of the English Coronation*, for example, does not consider the coronation processions. On the other hand, Gordon Kipling's excellent study of the royal entry, *Enter the King*, does not include analysis of the coronation ceremonies. An exception is Anglo's *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy* which does consider, albeit briefly, the actual coronation ceremonies. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', also considers the crowning ceremonies and the processions, but reads both as the double expression of a particular political agenda, rather than as two events in dialogue with each other.
46. On counsel see Patrick Collinson, 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', in Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays* (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994), pp. 31–57; John Guy, 'The Rhetoric of Counsel in Early Modern England', in *Tudor Political Culture*, ed. Dale Hoak (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 292–310. Greg Walker's work has also emphasised the importance of counsel as a political trope. See his *Persuasive Fictions: Faction, Faith and Political Culture in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996) and his work on the household drama as a medium of this political counsel in *Plays of Persuasion: Drama and Politics at the Court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) and *The Politics of Performance in Early Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
47. John Guy, 'Elizabeth I: The Queen and Politics', in *The Shakespearean International Yearbook 2: Where Are We Now in Shakespearean Studies?*, ed. W. R. Elton and John M. Mucciolo (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 183–202 (p. 185).
48. This argument is developed in Chapters 3 and 4.
49. Traditional accounts of the transition from pageantry to drama include David M. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry 1558–1642* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971), and *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. Bergeron. More recent accounts are included in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).
50. John Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Philip Edward Barnes, 2 vols. (London, 1853), I, pp. 205–7 (p. 206).
51. *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999), pp. 21–34.

CHAPTER 1. WHY CROWN A KING? HENRY VIII AND THE MEDIEVAL CORONATION

1. Quoted in Sturdy, '"Continuity" versus "Change"', pp. 243–4.
2. *CSP: Venetian*, II (1509–19), p. 2.
3. Monod, *The Power of Kings*, p. 42. Only French and English monarchs, for example, exploited their sacredness to cure scrofula, known as the king's

evil: David J. Sturdy, 'The Royal Touch in England', in *European Monarchy*, ed. Duchhardt, Jackson and Sherdy, pp. 171–84 (p. 171). The classic work on the subject is Marc Bloch, *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France*, trans. J. E. Anderson (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973).

4. Schramm, pp. 96, 98.
5. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship with a Study of the Music of the Laudes and Musical Transcriptions by Manfred F. Bukofzer* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1946; repr. 1958), p. 78.
6. On the anointing of David by Samuel, see I Samuel 16. 13: 'Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the spirit of the Lord came upon David.' On the anointing of Solomon by Zadok the priest, see I Kings 1. 39–40. These and all further references are to the Authorised (King James) version of the Bible.
7. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae*, p. 78.
8. Janet L. Nelson, 'The Lord's Anointed and the People's Choice: Carolingian Royal Ritual', in *Rituals of Royalty* ed. Cannadine and Price, pp. 137–80 (p. 142). See also Walter Ullmann, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship* (London: Methuen, 1969) on the legacy and significant constitutional implications of the Carolingian idea of sacred kingship.
9. Schramm, p. 19. *ECR* includes a transcript and translation of a version of this first English coronation order: 'An English Coronation Order taken from a Ninth Century Pontifical', pp. 3–13.
10. Nelson, 'The Lord's Anointed and the People's Choice', p. 144.
11. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, p. 329. Kantorowicz's book remains the most comprehensive work on the problem of dynastic continuity for medieval theories of kingship.
12. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, p. 319.
13. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, p. 329.
14. The anointing of kings with chrism was instituted in England in the fourteenth century, thus increasing the parallels with the ordination of bishops, Legg, 'Introduction' to *ECR*, pp. xv–lxxxi (p. xvii). Chrism is a mixture of balsam and olive oil, whereas the oil of catechumens or 'simple' oil is olive oil only.
15. Quoted in Pamela Tudor-Craig, 'Henry VIII and King David', in *Early Tudor England: Proceedings of the Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Daniel Williams (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), pp. 183–205 (p. 186).
16. Schramm, p. 122.
17. Schramm, p. 126.
18. Sturdy, 'The Royal Touch', p. 174.
19. 'Letter of Robert Grosseteste to Henry III on the Gifts Conferred by Unction', *ECR*, pp. 66–8 (pp. 67–8). Legg transcribes and translates the letter from a manuscript in the Bodleian (Bodleian MS 312, fol. 171), which is a copy of the original letter.

20. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, p. 206.
21. Sturdy, '"Continuity" versus "Change"', p. 239.
22. See 'Description by Thomas Becket of the Delivery of the Holy Oil to him by St Mary', *ECR*, pp. 169–71 and 'Letter of John XXII to Edward II about the Oil of Coronation', *ECR*, pp. 69–76.
23. Strohm, *Theory and the Premodern Text*, pp. 42–4.
24. Richard Grafton, *A Chronicle at large and meere History of the affayres of Englande and Kinges of the same* (1569), p. 852.
25. Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 10.
26. Hall, p. 423.
27. See, for example, J. J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, 2nd edn (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997; first published 1968), who devotes one paragraph to describing the procession, coronation and banquet. Of the actual ceremony he simply writes 'There, before the great of the realm, he was anointed and crowned by the archbishop of Canterbury', p. 18.
28. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, I, p. 6.
29. Hall, p. 509; *CSP: Venetian*, II (1509–19), p. 2.
30. Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 123.
31. Jennifer Loach, 'The Function of Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII', *Past and Present*, 142 (1994), 43–68. As Loach points out, the silence of many histories may, in part, be due to the scarcity of evidence (p. 46).
32. Holinshed, III, p. 481.
33. The *Liber Regalis* is still held at Westminster Abbey Library: Westminster Abbey Library and Monument Room MS 38. An edition was prepared by the Earl of Beauchamp for the Roxburghe Club in 1870: *Liber Regalis* (London: J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1870). Legg, *ECR*, also transcribes the *Liber Regalis* and provides a translation of the rubrics, but not of all of the prayers: *ECR*, pp. 81–130. The order of service was reconfigured again at the coronation of William and Mary in 1689, to become the sixth and final recension. See 'Coronation Order of King William III and Queen Mary II', *ECR*, pp. 317–42.
34. 'An English Coronation Order', *ECR*, pp. 3–13.
35. See Andrew Hughes, 'The Origin and Descent of the Fourth Recension of the English Coronation', in *Coronations*, ed. Bàk, pp. 197–216. Also see Legg's 'Introduction' to *ECR*, pp. xv–lxxxi, especially the very useful table showing variations between recensions up to and beyond the *Liber Regalis* to Queen Victoria's coronation (pp. x–xi). Also see transcriptions and translations of the second and third recensions in *ECR*: 'A Coronation Order Written before the Conquest', pp. 14–29, and 'An English Coronation Order of the Twelfth Century', pp. 30–42. For a detailed history of these earlier recensions see Schramm, pp. 19–24.
36. Paul Binski, 'The *Liber Regalis*: Its Date and European Context', in *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*, ed. Dillian Gordon, Lisa Monnas and Caroline Elam (London: Harvey Miller, 1997), pp. 233–46. Legg presumes that the *Liber Regalis* pre-dates the Litlyngton ordo, *ECR*, p. 81.

Beauchamp, in the edition prepared for the Roxburghe Club, dates the *Liber Regalis* to 'between 1350 and 1380': 'Introduction', pp. iii–xvi (p. xv).

37. Binski, 'The *Liber Regalis*', p. 233. Binski's article reproduces the illustrations, which have not been identified with any particular king or queen.
38. *The Coronation Order of King James I*, ed. John Wickham Legg (London, 1902). See also 'A Breefe of the Rites of the Coronation Called Liber Regalis for the Coronation of the King and Queene togither', BL Sloane MS 1494, fol. 89.
39. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 112. Quotations of the rubrics from the *Liber Regalis* are taken from Legg's translation in *ECR*, pp. 112–30.
40. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 113. Kipling, *Enter the King*, notes that the first manuscript evidence for a monarch's procession dates from Richard II's coronation in 1377 (p. 6).
41. Binski, 'The *Liber Regalis*', pp. 238–9.
42. 'Preface' to *Liber Regalis* (Roxburghe), pp. i–ii (p. ii).
43. The name derives from the first line of the Devices, usually a variation of the following: 'Here followeth under correction a litle devise of the coronacion of the most high and mightie christian Prince Henrie the viith', 'Little Device for the Coronation of Henry VII', *ECR*, pp. 219–39 (p. 220).
44. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 124. Midsummer's Day, 24 June, is the Feast of Nativity of John the Baptist, presaging Christ and descent of the Holy Spirit. This saint's day was a very holy day and its liturgy had echoes of Christmas, thus the coming of Christ was liturgically linked to Henry's coronation.
45. BL Additional MS 18669, fol. 1R. See Legg's notes on these manuscripts in *ECR*, pp. 219–20. Legg cites four extant versions of a Device for Henry VII and transcribes one in *ECR*: 'Little Device for the Coronation of Henry VII', *ECR*, pp. 220–39. The manuscript he transcribes is BL Egerton MS 985 fol. 1. This manuscript, Legg claims, dates from early in the reign of Henry VIII, so it is either a copy of the original or an earlier version (p. 220). The three other versions of the Device are BL Add. MS 18669, BL Harleian MS 5111, fol. 77, and William Jerdan's transcription of a manuscript found in the papers of the Duke of Rutland: *The Rutland Papers: Original Documents Illustrative of the Courts and Times of Henry VII and Henry VIII*, ed. William Jerdan, Camden Society, 21 (London, 1842–3), pp. 1–24. There are subtle variations between all the manuscripts.
46. 'The coronacion of kyng henry the viiith', BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, fol. 90, known as a 'Little Device'. Further references to this manuscript will be in the main text, indicated by folio number. For subtle variations on this Device for Henry VIII's coronation see College of Arms MS Vincent 25, fol. 144, and College of Arms MS I.7, fol. 21.
47. The most complete accounts are in Holinshed, III, pp. 547–52; Hall, pp. 506–13; *The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (London: Corporation of London, 1938), pp. 339–41.
48. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR,* p. 114, 113.
49. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 128.

50. Katherine of Aragon's crown could be the queen's state crown as identified by A. Jefferies Collins from the Westminster Abbey inventory of 1605: *Jewels and Plate of Queen Elizabeth I: The Inventory of 1574*, ed. A. Jefferies Collins (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1955), p. 267. However, there is a second crown in the Westminster regalia at this time known as Queen Edith's crown – the crown of the wife of St Edward. The provenance of the so-called 'Queen Edith's crown' is suspect, but it could be that Katherine was crowned with this and wore the queen's state crown for the recession. On this and the history of the regalia, especially its tenuous links with St Edward himself, see Ronald Lightbrown, ' The English Coronation Regalia before the Commonwealth', in *The Crown Jewels: The History of the Coronation Regalia in the Jewel House of the Tower of London*, ed. Claude Blair, 2 vols. (London: Stationery Office, 1998), I, pp. 257–353.
51. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 114.
52. Holinshed, III, p. 548.
53. Strohm, *Theory and the Premodern Text*, p. 39.
54. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 116.
55. *Liber Regalis* (Roxburghe), p. 6: 'pretende super hunc famulum tuum N. gratiam tuam', where 'N' stands for the name of the relevant king. Further citations from the prayers will be to this edition, noted from now on as *Liber Regalis*, with reference also to J. Legg's transcription of the English translation of the *Liber Regalis* from 1603, *The Coronation Order of King James I.* Bearing in mind the difficulties with ascribing a 1603 translation to 1509, the former has only been followed as a guide and key Latin words from the *Liber Regalis* are discussed separately. The order J. Legg transcribes is from Lambeth Palace Library MS 1075b and constitutes the earliest and 'strangely exact' translation of the *Liber Regalis*: Legg, 'Introduction', pp. xvii–cii (p. xxi). Legg's translation of the *Liber Regalis* in *ECR* does not include the prayers; for these he refers the reader to 'The Coronation Order of King Charles I', pp. 245–71. But this contains some crucial differences that Legg chooses to overlook.
56. Schramm, p. 180.
57. Schramm, pp. 203–4. For a transcription of Edward II's oath see *English Historical Documents*, III (1189–1327), ed. Harry Rothwell (London and New York: Routledge, 1996; first published 1975), p. 525.
58. Schramm, pp. 213, 219. On the development of the English coronation oath, also see H. G. Richardson, 'The English Coronation Oath', *Speculum*, 23 (1949), 44–75.
59. *The Penguin Book of Hymns*, ed. Ian Bradley (London: Viking, 1989), p. 90. The translation printed is John Cosin's (1594–1672). It was one of the anthems retained and translated in *The Book of Common Prayer* of 1549 for the ordination of priests and bishops. It begins 'Come holy ghost eternall god / procedyng from above' and refers to 'unccion spirituall': 'The Orderyng of Priestes', in *The forme and maner of makyng and consecratyng of Archebishoppes, Bishoppes, Priestes and Deacons* (1549), Fiiiv.

60. *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, ed. William Maskell, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882), III, p. 255.
61. *Liber Regalis*, p. 8, and *The Coronation Order of James I*, ed. Legg, p. 17.
62. *Liber Regalis*, p. 11.
63. *The Coronation Order of James I*, ed. Legg, p. 22.
64. *Liber Regalis*, p. 12.
65. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 119.
66. *The Coronation Order of James I*, ed. Legg, p. 25.
67. Thomas Elyot, *The Dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knyght* (1538). The 'bowells of thy harte', however, is a poetic exaggeration that was struck out and replaced by 'inwarde partes', *The Coronation Order of James I*, ed. Legg, p. 25. This is closer to the Latin 'ad interiora cordis', *Liber Regalis*, p. 13.
68. *Liber Regalis*, pp. 15, 16.
69. *Liber Regalis*, p. 16.
70. *The Coronation Order of James I*, ed. Legg, p. 30.
71. *Liber Regalis*, p. 17.
72. *Liber Regalis*, p. 37. The paragraph entitled 'De exequiis regalibus' directs that the king shall be buried clothed in the 'tunica', the tunic, and the 'pallio', the mantle, with a crown on his head and rod and sceptre in his hands. Legg notes that 'when Edward I's tomb was opened, he was found buried in coronation robes', *ECR*, p. xliii.
73. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 116.
74. *OED*: 'ceremony' (1a) and 'solemnity'. 'Solemnity' denoting 'gravity' is not in use until the eighteenth century.
75. Elyot, *The Dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot* (1538).
76. Hall, p. 509; *CSP: Venetian*, II (1509–19), p. 2.
77. 'Ryalle Booke', *AR*.
78. David Starkey, 'Henry VI's Old Blue Gown: The English Court under the Lancastrians and Yorkists', *Court Historian*, 4 (1999), 1–28, and Kisby, '"When the King Goeth a Procession"'.
79. *The Coronation Order of James I*, ed. Legg, p. 38.
80. *Liber Regalis*, p. 20; *The Coronation Order of James I*, ed. Legg, p. 38.
81. *Liber Regalis*, p. 23.
82. M. R. Holmes, 'The Crowns of England', *Archaeologia*, 86 (1936), 73–90 (82).
83. Hall, p. 510.
84. Hall, pp. 510–11.
85. Kipling, *Enter the King*, p. 17.
86. Hall, p. 506.
87. Holinshed, III, p. 548.
88. On Katherine's entry, see Anglo, *Spectacle*, pp. 56–97, who describes this procession as 'a masterpiece of ingenuity' (p. 97).
89. Hall, p. 509.
90. Stephen Hawes, *A Joyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall soverayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght* (1509), printed in

Stephen Hawes: The Minor Poems, ed. Florence W. Gluck and Alice B. Morgan, EETS (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 85–91.
91. *Liber Regalis*, p. 10.

CHAPTER 2. 'COME MY LOVE THOU SHALBE CROWNED': THE DRAMA OF ANNE BOLEYN'S CORONATION

1. *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne, wyfe unto the moost noble kynge Henry the viii* (1533). The pageant verses are recorded in BL Royal MS 18, A LXIV, fol. 1, possibly a manuscript that was presented to Anne Boleyn by the poets. See *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, comp. Peter Beal and others, 5 vols. (London: Mansell Publishing, 1980), I (1450–1625), Part 2, p. 302. The verses are reprinted in full, with abstracts of the Latin verses, in *Ballads from Manuscripts*, ed. F. J. Furnivall and W. R. Morfill, 2 vols. (London: Ballad Society, 1868–73), I, pp. 373–401. The English verses only are reprinted as 'English Verses and Ditties at the Coronation Procession of Queen Anne Boleyn', in *An English Garner: Ingatherings from our History and Literature*, ed. Edward Arber, 8 vols. (London, 1877–96), II, pp. 52–60.
2. It is not mentioned at all, for example, in Schramm's *A History of the English Coronation* and Sydney Anglo describes it as a 'dull, trite, and lamentably repetitious pageant series' due to its lack of political coherence, 'superficial' humanism and 'indigestible mass of eulogistic Latin verse'. According to him, it marks 'both a beginning and an end in the history of the Early Tudor public spectacle and court festivals': Anglo, *Spectacle*, pp. 248, 261. John King does not consider the pageantry noteworthy or novel: it makes no reference to the supremacy, he claims, and is simply 'in the late medieval mode of praising queens': John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 196. On the other hand, Gordon Kipling has considered the symbolic heritage of Anne's entry and its departure from this heritage more generously. He considers it the first procession to fuse traditional medieval pageants with classical pageants but attributes this fusion to the clash between the Protestant-leaning court and the traditional Catholic city. Gordon Kipling, '"He that Saw It would not Believe It": Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry into London', in *Civic Ritual and Drama*, ed. Alexandra F. Johnston and Wim Hüsken (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997), pp. 39–79.
3. Retha M. Warnicke, *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn: Family Politics at the Court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 127.
4. E. W. Ives, *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), p. 282. See also Ives's new, and slightly revised, edition of this biography: *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: The Most Happy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).
5. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I' and Dale Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', in *Tudor Political Culture*,

ed. Hoak, pp. 54–103. Yates, *Astraea*, traces the imperial theme in Elizabeth's reign. Both Yates and Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', consider the Protestantisation of the imperial theme.

6. John Guy identifies the 'catalysts' as 'the fragmentation of humanism, the advent of the Reformation, a crescendo of anticlericalism at the inns of court, Anne Boleyn's support for reform, and the formation of Court factions': John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 116. G. R. Elton, in *Reform and Reformation: England 1509–1558* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), focuses on the activities and influence of Cromwell. For a particularly nuanced account, see MacCulloch, *Cranmer*.
7. Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, *Episcopi De Vera Obedientia: Oratio* (1535).
8. Hall, p. 803.
9. For advocates of Anne Boleyn as a zealous evangelist and her contribution to Reformation through her selected patronage of reformists see Ives, *Anne Boleyn*; Guy, *Tudor England*; Maria Dowling, 'Anne Boleyn and Reform', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35 (1984), 30–46; and David Starkey, *The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics* (London: George Philip, 1985). For a different view, see G. W. Bernard, 'Anne Boleyn's Religion', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), 1–20, who questions the extent of Anne's commitment to evangelical beliefs and her influence.
10. Bernard, 'Anne Boleyn's Religion', p. 5.
11. Nicholas Sanders, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, ed. and trans. D. Lewis (London, 1877). On sixteenth-century histories of Anne, see Tom Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530–83* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), esp. Chapter 3.
12. 'William Latymer's Chronickille of Anne Bulleyne', ed. Maria Dowling, Camden Miscellany, 30 (London, 1990), pp. 45–65; John Foxe, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiastical History, contayning the Actes & Monumentes of thinges passed in every kinges time, in this Realme, especially in the Churche of England* (1576): 'what a zelous defender shee was of Christes Gospell, all the worlde doth know', p. 1055.
13. John Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes, agaynst the late blowne Blaste, concerninge the Government of Wemen wherin be confuted all such reasons as a straunger of late made in that behalfe, with a brief exhortation to Obedience* (Strasbourg [London], 1559), B2v.
14. 'William Latymer's Chronickille', ed. Dowling, p. 47.
15. Thomas Heywood, *England's Elizabeth: Her Life and Troubles, During her Minoritie, from the Cradle to the Crowne* (1631), p. 13.
16. William Camden, *The Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth, Late Queene of England* (1630): 'Before her Birth (as some say,) even while shee was in Her Mothers Wombe, were those Golden dayes which wee so many yeares enjoyed under her Gracious Governement foretold . . . when that most Vertuous Queene Anne passed to her Coronation', A2r. The preface was written by Camden's translator, Robert Norton.

17. William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, *King Henry VIII (All is True)*, ed. Gordon McMullan (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2000).
18. *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. J. G. Nichols, 3 vols. (London, 1788–1805), I, pp. i–xx (verses), 1–17 (narrative account). Interestingly, neither of these items were included in Nichols's revised 1823 edition of the *Progresses*.
19. 'The Noble Triumphant Coronation of Queen Anne', in *An English Garner*, ed. Arber, II, pp. 41–51 (p. 43).
20. Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, p. 33; Kipling, '"He that Saw It would not Believe It"', p. 63.
21. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. 196–7; Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, p. 29.
22. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*.
23. John Guy, 'Thomas Cromwell and the Intellectual Origins of the Henrician Revolution', in Alistair Fox and John Guy, *Reassessing the Henrician Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500–1550* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), pp. 151–78 (p. 164).
24. Betteridge, *Tudor Histories*: 'Instead of asking, "how does this text's Protestantism affect or determine its meaning?" ... one should ask, "what is Protestantism in this text?"' (p. 17). Betteridge notes the instability of the term 'Protestantism' and of its usefulness as a meaningful term of identification.
25. *The Statutes of the Realm*, 12 vols. (London: Record Commission, 1810–28), III: 24 Henry VIII, c. 12 (p. 427). Also reprinted in *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary*, ed. G. R. Elton, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982; first published 1960), pp. 353–8.
26. Francis Bacon, *The History of the Reigns of Henry the Seventh, Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, and Queen Mary, The First Written by the Right Honourable, Francis Lord Verulam, Viscount St Alban. The other Three by the Right Honourable and Right Reverend Father in God, Francis Godwyn, Lord Bishop of Hereford* (1676), p. 78.
27. In a letter to Cromwell, dated 27 September 1536, Ralph Sadler mentions 'whether it were best to put off the time of the Coronation, for a season', due to plague: *English Historical Documents*, ed. C. H. Williams, V (1485–1558) (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1967), p. 519. Kipling mentions an extant list of arrangements for Jane Seymour's aborted coronation: '"He that Saw It would not Believe It"' (p. 49). The manuscript reference is BL Additional MS 9835, fol. 22.
28. *A glasse of the truthe* (1531). For Henry's authorship, see Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 176.
29. Guy, 'Thomas Cromwell and the Intellectual Origins of the Henrician Revolution', pp. 151–78.
30. *The Tudor Constitution*, ed. Elton, pp. 354–5.
31. *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, ed. Henry Ellis, 4 vols., 3rd series (London: Richard Bentley, 1846), II, p. 276.

32. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, I, p. 17.
33. See Guy, *Tudor England*, on the debate in court over the king's supremacy in relation to Parliament. Guy shows that while Henry asserted his spiritual supremacy independently from Parliament, Cromwell wanted this to be subject to the King-in-Parliament. Guy writes that 'This ambiguity permeated the theory of the supremacy for the remainder of the Tudor period', p. 133.
34. Hall, p. 798.
35. *The Tudor Constitution*, ed. Elton, p. 364.
36. On 9 July, the pope provisionally excommunicated Henry until the marriage with Anne was revoked. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 97.
37. *The Tudor Constitution*, ed. Elton, p. 353.
38. Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 134.
39. *The Works of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. J. E. Cox, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844–6), II, p. 213.
40. This is cited in Richard Koebner, '"The Imperial Crown of this Realm": Henry VIII, Constantine the Great, and Polydore Vergil', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 26 (1953), 29–52 (p. 31).
41. A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 2nd edn (London: BT Batsford, 1989; first published 1964), p. 138.
42. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 88.
43. *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Cox, II, p. 460.
44. BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, fol. 95r.
45. The manuscript reference is BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, fol. 89. Legg transcribes the manuscript in *ECR*, pp. 240–1. Further quotations, however, will be directly from the manuscript. The cataloguing proximity of the revised oath to Henry VIII's coronation Device does not, however, prove that the revised oath was sworn in 1509.
46. Walter Ullmann, 'This Realm of England is an Empire', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 30 (1979), 175–203 (183).
47. Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Henry VIII and the Reform of the Church', in *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch (London: Macmillan, 1995), pp. 159–80 (p. 163).
48. Tudor-Craig, 'Henry VIII and King David', p. 187; Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', p. 55 n. 3. For the text of Edward VI's coronation oath see *APC*, II, p. 31, and the next chapter of this book.
49. Schramm, pp. 204–7, 215.
50. BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, fol. 89r–v.
51. Ullmann, 'This Realm of England is an Empire'.
52. *The Tudor Constitution*, ed. Elton, p. 353.
53. Ullmann, 'This Realm of England is an Empire'; Koebner, '"The Imperial Crown of this Realm"'; Guy, 'Thomas Cromwell and the Intellectual Origins of the Henrician Revolution'.
54. Ullmann, 'This Realm of England is an Empire', p. 200.
55. Schramm, p. 180.

56. *A glasse of the truthe*, F2v; A2r.
57. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 113.
58. *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Cox, II, pp. 245–6. Ives notes that Henry was 'compelled by ancient tradition' to observe the coronation festivities in secret: Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, p. 218, but neither the *Liber Regalis* nor the 'Ryalle Booke' stipulate this custom.
59. BL Harleian MS 41, fol. 12r.
60. BL Harleian MS 41, fol. 13v, itemises a 'Stage to be made lacesed and covered with riche clothes where the kynges highnes and suche other as shall please hym ~ may stande to see the solempnyte'.
61. For the order of service for a queen consort's coronation without the king, see 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, pp. 128–30, and the 'Ryalle Booke', *AR*, pp. 302–4.
62. *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Cox, II, pp. 245–6.
63. *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon*, Biir. Further references to de Worde's 1533 edition will be in the main text.
64. Hall, p. 803. The 'Ryalle Booke' states 'the bischope to sett the crown on hir hed', which indicates that she would be crowned with one crown only, *AR*, p. 303.
65. *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Cox, II, p. 246.
66. *CSP: Milan*, I, pp. 557–8.
67. *CSP: Spanish*, IV, Part 2 (1531–3), p. 700.
68. *L&P*, V, p. 446.
69. *L&P*, V, p. 448.
70. Roy Strong, *Holbein and Henry VIII* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), p. 25. Later, in Elizabeth's reign, these frescoes were referred to as 'the discourse of King Henries Coronacion and his going to Bulleyne', the 'going to Bulleyne' undoubtedly being the occasion of Henry VIII's and Francis I's meeting in 1532. Anne Boleyn accompanied Henry on this trip. Also see Erna Auerbach, *Tudor Artists: A Study of Painters in the Royal Service and of Portraiture on Illuminated Documents from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Elizabeth I* (London: Athlone Press, 1954).
71. Tudor-Craig, 'Henry VIII and King David', p. 189.
72. Simon Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240–1698* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999).
73. *A Critical Edition of Sir Thomas Elyot's 'The Boke Named the Governour'*, ed. Donald W. Rude (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1992), p. 180.
74. Desiderius Erasmus, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, trans. Neil M. Cheshire and Michael J. Heath and ed. Lisa Jardine (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 49–50.
75. Erasmus, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, p. 69.
76. There is no extant 'Device' for Anne's coronation. In addition to *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon*, other narrative accounts are: Hall, pp. 798–805; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, I, pp. 17–22; John Stow, *The Annales of England, faithfully collected out of the most autenticall Authors, Records, and other*

Monuments of Antiquitie (1600), pp. 947–57; Holinshed, III, pp. 778–86. The most valuable manuscript account is BL Harleian MS 41, fol. 2: 'The Recyvyng conveyng and Coronacion of the qwene.' This includes a narrative account plus lists of items and regalia needed for the 'Qwenes Coronacion' (fols. 13r–14v) and a sketch showing the seating plan in Westminster Hall for the coronation banquet (fol. 12r). Also see *L&P*, VI, pp. 246–9: 'The appointment what number of officers and servitors that shall attend upon the Queen's grace, the Bishop and the ladies sitting at the Queen's board in the Great Hall at Westminster, the day of the coronation'; p. 263: 'The manner of attendance of the judges at the coronation of queen Anne, at Whitsuntide'; p. 264: 'For the Quenys litter' and 'Apparel'.

77. *CSP: Venetian*, IV (1527–33), p. 418.
78. *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Cox, II, pp. 244–7.
79. 'Ryalle Booke', *AR*, p. 303.
80. Hall, p. 798.
81. For a detailed analysis of Katherine's 1501 entry see Anglo, *Spectacle*, pp. 56–97 and Kipling, *Enter the King*, pp. 209–21.
82. 'Ryalle Booke', *AR*, p. 302.
83. Hall, p. 801.
84. 'Ryalle Booke', *AR*, p. 302.
85. 'Ryalle Booke', *AR*, pp. 302, 303.
86. Kipling, '"He that Saw It would not Believe It"', p. 45.
87. *L&P*, VI, p. 265.
88. *CSP: Venetian*, IV (1527–33), pp. 418–19.
89. *CSP: Venetian*, IV (1527–33), pp. 398–9.
90. *CSP: Spanish*, IV, Part 2 (1531–3), p. 675.
91. *CSP: Venetian*, IV (1527–33), p. 404.
92. *CSP: Spanish*, IV, Part 2 (1531–3), p. 704.
93. *L&P*, VI, p. 266.
94. Lord Herbert of Cherbury, *The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth* (1649), p. 358.
95. *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Cox, II, p. 245.
96. *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. Cox, II, pp. 245–6.
97. Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, p. 274.
98. Hawes, *A Joyfull medytacyon to all Englonde* (1509); *The maner of the tryumphe at Caleys and Bulleyn* (1532).
99. *The traduction & mariage of the princesse* (1500); *Of the tryumphe, and the verses that Charles themperour & the most myghty redouted kyng of England, Henry the viii were saluted with passyng through London* (1522).
100. *Pierre Gringore's Pageants for the Entry of Mary Tudor into Paris: An Unpublished Manuscript*, ed. Charles Read Baskervill (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. ii.
101. Hall, p. 802.
102. Hall, p. 799.
103. Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, p. 274; Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 248.

104. *L&P*, VI, p. 226.
105. Manley, *Literature and Culture*, p. 251.
106. Hall, p. 798.
107. Kipling, '"He that Saw It would not Believe It"', p. 45.
108. Kipling, '"He that Saw It would not Believe It"', p. 49. The three 'medieval' pageants are the pageant of St Anne and her progeny at Leadenhall, the three holy virgins at Paul's Gate and the 200 children in St Paul's Churchyard. The 'classical' pageants are: Apollo and the Nine Muses on Gracechurch Street, the Three Graces on Cornhill and the Judgement of Paris at the Lesser Conduit in Cheapside.
109. BL Egerton MS 2623, fol. 5r.
110. Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 187.
111. Dowling, 'Anne Boleyn and Reform', p. 37, and Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, p. 274.
112. William L. Edgerton, *Nicholas Udall* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1965), p. 31.
113. *ODNB*.
114. Udall's interesting migration across the reigns of Anne, Edward and Mary, and the significance of the play *Respublica*, will be discussed in Chapter 4.
115. Anglo, *Spectacle*, writes that, although this was 'the first time England witnessed a pageant series which seemed truly classical', the humanism was 'superficial – a self-conscious Latinity and a thin veneer of commonplace literary allusions' (p. 248). On the pageants' humanism, also see Ives, *Anne Boleyn*.
116. Kipling, *Enter the King*, p. 293.
117. Anglo, *Spectacle*, pp. 68–71. For continental entries see Strong, *Art and Power*.
118. Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, p. 15.
119. Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, pp. 7–8 and Plate 27.
120. *Ballads*, ed. Furnivall, I, pp. 388–9. Further references will be in the main text, as Furnivall followed by page number.
121. *The Tudor Constitution*, ed. Elton, p. 353.
122. Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', p. 66.
123. Holmes, 'The Crowns of England', p. 73.
124. Hall, p. 510.
125. Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', p. 54.
126. Strong, *Holbein and Henry VIII*, p. 12. The original sketch is in the Staatliche Museen, Berlin. As Strong notes, Holbein was not yet under royal patronage but was still connected to the More family in 1533 (p. 13).
127. Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', p. 71.
128. This is an English abstract from Furnivall's *Ballads* of the Latin verse, which reads: 'Aeterni iam veris honor, iam secla redibunt / Qualia Saturni regna tenentis erant' (p. 388).
129. Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–IV,* ed. Jeffrey Henderson, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough and rev. by G. P. Goold (Cambridge, Mass., and

London: Harvard University Press, 1999), *Eclogue* IV. l.6, pp. 48, 49. And see Yates, *Astraea*, p. 33.

130. Kipling, '"He that saw It would not believe it"', p. 65.
131. Manley, *Literature and Culture*, p. 247. He describes Anne's procession, but only in passing, as 'perhaps the most discursively explicit up to that time'.
132. *Pierre Gringore's Pageants for the Entry of Mary Tudor*, ed. Baskervill, p. ii.
133. Camden, *The Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth*, A2r.

CHAPTER 3. 'BUT A CEREMONY': EDWARD VI'S REFORMED CORONATION AND JOHN BALE'S *KING JOHAN*

1. *Documents relating to the Revels at Court in the Time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary (The Loseley Manuscripts)*, ed. Albert Feuillerat (Louvain, 1914), p. 3, p. xii.
2. *Documents relating to the Revels at Court* , ed. Feuillerat, pp. 5, 6.
3. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, p. 206.
4. On the controversy over the dating and signing of Henry's will, and whether it reflects Henry's wishes for a protectorate or the interests of power-seekers and religious radicals, see Starkey, *The Reign of Henry VIII*. For the argument that the will was not tampered with, see E. W. Ives, 'Henry VIII's Will: A Forensic Conundrum', *Historical Journal*, 35 (1992), 779–804, and Jennifer Loach, *Edward VI*, ed. George Bernard and Penry Williams (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 21–2.
5. *APC*, II, pp. 3–4.
6. *APC*, II, p. 5.
7. Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 332.
8. On 1 March, Lord Wriothesley was struck off the Council as a consequence of his opposition to Hertford's (now Duke of Somerset) protectorate: Loach, *Edward VI*, p. 25. On the composition of Edward's Council and Somerset's personal appropriation of king-like powers, see Dale Hoak, *The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
9. *APC*, II, pp. 29–30.
10. For the revised order of the ceremony see *APC*, II, pp. 29–33.
11. Dale Hoak notes that, 'No historian of Edward's reign or Reformation has discussed the significance of Cranmer's revisions of the young king's coronation' in 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', p. 146. But Hoak's excellent article, with which this chapter engages, is mostly concerned with looking at the revisions as necessary for the 'unprecedented advent of a *protestant* supremacy' (p. 146, my italics).
12. Loach, *Edward VI*, p. 24; Hoak, *The King's Council*, pp. 84, 260.

13. Strype transcribes a manuscript account of Henry VIII's funeral ceremonies in his *Ecclesiastical Memorials, Relating Chiefly to Religion*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1822), II, Part 2, pp. 289–311. Also see Loach, 'The Function of Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII', pp. 56–66.
14. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2001), p. 2.
15. *CSP: Spanish*, IX (1547–9), p. 50.
16. *CSP: Spanish*, IX (1547–9), p. 47.
17. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, and Haigh, *English Reformations*, argue for popular resistance and a residual Catholicism. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, argues, of Edward VI's government, that 'this evangelical establishment grouping knew from the start in 1547 exactly what Reformation it wanted' and that it was a 'religious revolution of ruthless thoroughness' (pp. 365, 366). On Henry's inconsistency see Guy, *Tudor England*.
18. Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 274.
19. *Documents of the English Reformation*, ed. Gerald Bray (Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 1994), pp. 163, 164. For the Act of the Six Articles, see pp. 222–32.
20. *The Institution of a Christen Man, Conteynynge the Exposytion or Interpretation of the commune Crede, of the seven Sacramentes, of the x commandementes, and of the Pater noster, and the Ave Maria, Justyfication & Purgatory* (1537), fol. 39r. As this is more commonly known as 'The Bishops' Book', further references will be to this edition but will be abbreviated to 'The Bishops' Book'.
21. 'The Bishops' Book', fols. 44v–45r.
22. *Documents of the English Reformation*, ed. Bray, pp. 172–3.
23. *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen man, sette furthe by the kynges majestie of Englande* (1543) became known as 'The King's Book'.
24. 'The Bishops' Book', fol. 42r.
25. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 364.
26. Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 295. Schramm's words (my italics) are quoted from his *A History of the English Coronation*, p. 97.
27. Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 294.
28. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', p. 147.
29. 'Liber Regalis', *ECR*, p. 117.
30. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, pp. 205–7. On the authenticity of the text, see MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 364.
31. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, p. 205.
32. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, p. 206.
33. *OED*: 'enoil'. The spelling here – 'inoiled' – is the only instance cited in the *OED*.
34. Schramm, p. 139.
35. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, p. 206.
36. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, p. 206.

37. II Kings 23. 24: 'the images and the idols, and all the abominations that were spied in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away, that he might perform the words of the law which were written in the book'.
38. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, p. 207.
39. Cited in Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', p. 89.
40. Schramm, p. 217, and Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', who writes of the oath that 'the gates were opened wide to royal Reformation . . . it was the people, not the king, who were to consent to new laws', p. 148.
41. *APC*, II, p. 31.
42. BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, fol. 89r.
43. In 1553, as the next chapter shows, the Council attempted to persuade Mary to swear a revised coronation oath which she feared would tie her to uphold the new religion. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', persuasively suggests that, in 1559 at Elizabeth I's coronation, Sir William Cecil did succeed in inscribing the new religion into the oath. This will be discussed further in Chapter 5.
44. Schramm, p. 97.
45. *TRP*, I, p. 381.
46. *TRP*, I, p. 382.
47. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, I, p. 178.
48. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, I, p. 178.
49. *APC*, II, p. 7.
50. This herald's account is transcribed in *Literary Remains of King Edward the Sixth*, ed. J. G. Nichols, 2 vols. (London, 1857), I, pp. ccxcii–ccxcvii (p. ccxcvi). Nichols collates two very similar College of Arms manuscript accounts, College of Arms MS I.7, fol. 28, and I.18, fol. 68. For another narrative account of Edward's coronation see Society of Antiquaries MS 123. College of Arms MS I.7 is agreed to be contemporary with Edward's coronation: see Sydney Anglo, 'The Coronation of Edward VI and Society of Antiquaries Manuscript 123', *Antiquaries Journal*, 78 (1998), 452–57 (455 n. 2).
51. BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, fol. 94r.
52. BL Cotton MS Tiberius E VIII, fol. 94r.
53. *APC*, II, p. 30.
54. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', p. 146.
55. Schramm, p. 97.
56. On the development of a parliamentary supremacy in Edward's reign see Hoak, *The King's Council*, and his 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I'.
57. *Literary Remains*, ed. Nichols, I, p. ccxcv. The third, personal crown is referred to as 'his crowne imperiall on his hede', p. ccxcvi. It was made by Everart Everdyes and consisted of an arched circlet set with diamonds, emeralds, pearls and rubies, and perhaps the Black Prince's ruby set on the cross on top of the crown: Arnold, 'The "Coronation" Portrait of Queen

Elizabeth I', 732. The 'imperyall crowne of his realme of Englande' would have been that documented in Henry VIII's reign, but with the images of Christ replaced by figures of kings but with the central image of the Virgin Mary retained. See Holmes, 'The Crowns of England', 82.

58. Sedition in John Bale's *King Johan* declares how he is 'sumtyme a pope, and than am I lord over all, / Bothe in hevyn and erthe and also in purgatory, And do weare iii crownes whan I am in my glorye', *John Bale's King Johan*, ed. Barry B. Adams (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1969), ll. 208–10.
59. Society of Antiquaries MS 123, fol. 29v.
60. Quoted in Loach, *Edward VI*, p. 33.
61. Grafton, *A Chronicle at large*, p. 1283; Holinshed, III, p. 866.
62. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, I, pp. 182–3.
63. Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 294. The College of Arms MSS I.7 and I.18 describe the pageants and transcribe the verses. They are collated in *Literary Remains*, ed. Nichols, I, pp. cclxxviii–ccxcii. As Anglo has noted more recently, however, the account in *Literary Remains* omits one of the verses spoken at the pageant at Cornhill. This is noted in Society of Antiquaries MS 123 and transcribed by Anglo in 'The Coronation of Edward VI', p. 454.
64. This was a painting commissioned by Sir Anthony Browne (Edward's Master of the Horse) and hung in Cowdray House, Suffolk, until it was destroyed by fire in 1793. An engraving and a watercolour of the original are held by the Society of Antiquaries. On the original painting see Joseph Ayloffe, 'An Account of Some Ancient English Historical Paintings at Cowdry, in Sussex', *Archaeologia*, 3 (1786), 239–72 (268), and John Topham, 'An Historical and Descriptive Account of the Ancient Painting Preserved at Cowdray in Sussex . . . Representing the Procession of King Edward VI from the Tower of London to Westminster', *Archaeologia*, 8 (1787), 406–22. A reduced version of the engraving is reproduced in *ECR*, between pp. 280–1.
65. Stow, *Annales*, p. 1000.
66. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, I, p. 182.
67. *CSP: Spanish*, IX (1547–9), p. 47. Van der Delft, although he rode next to Cranmer, was not formally invited to the coronation service in the Abbey, an oversight that he resented and responded to by refusing to attend: *CSP: Spanish*, IX (1547–9), p. 48.
68. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, I, p. 182. See Corporation of London Records Office, Repertory XI, fols. 309v–310r, for the names of Londoners allocated to each pageant. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', p. 135, claims that Richard Grafton and Richard Mulcaster were involved in Edward's pageantry. This claim, however, is not referenced.
69. Anglo, *Spectacle*, p. 285, shows how the pageants and verses were adapted from Lydgate's verse description of the 1432 entry as documented in the 1542 edition of Fabyan's *Chronicle*: *The Chronicle of Fabyan, whiche he hym selfe nameth the concordaunce of historyes, nowe newely printed, & in many places corrected, as to the dylygent reader it may apere* (1542).

70. The description of the pageants and procession is taken from the herald's account transcribed in *Literary Remains*, ed. Nichols, I, pp. cclxxviii–ccxci. Further references to this account will be in the main text indicated by page number only.
71. On Bale's patronage by Cromwell see Paul Whitfield White, *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage and Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). For a detailed bibliography of John Bale's plays and prose works see W. T. Davis, 'A Bibliography of John Bale', in *Oxford Bibliographical Society: Proceedings and Papers*, V (1936–9), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940), pp. 201–79.
72. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 227.
73. *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, ed. Peter Happé, 2 vols. (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1985–6), II.
74. John Bale, *The Vocacyon of Johan Bale to the bishoprick of Ossorie in Irelande his persecucions in the same, & finall delyveraunce* (Rome, [London] 1553), fol. 24r–v.
75. White, *Theatre and Reformation*, p. 17.
76. The manuscript of *King Johan* is preserved in the Huntington Library, California. For the difficulties involved with dating the A- and B-texts and the different hands see J. H. Pafford, 'Introduction' to *King Johan by John Bale*, ed. J. H. Pafford (Oxford: Malone Society Reprints, 1931), pp. v–xxxiv. Pafford suggests that the play was first revised 'in the reign of Edward VI', following Henry's death and, in light of a later reference to John Leland who had died in 1552, before 1552, pp. xv–xvi. The suggestion made by J. P. Collier in his edition, *Kynge Johan: A Play in Two Parts* (London, 1838), that the play was revised for performance before Elizabeth during a progress to Ipswich in August 1561 because the manuscript was found among papers that may have belonged to the Corporation of Ipswich must remain conjecture (*King Johan*, ed. Pafford, p. xix). Pafford's edition reproduces the A-text followed by the B-text with notes showing additions and corrections to the A-text. Adams's edition follows the later B-text. As my discussion does not tie the play to a particular date or political moment, further references to the play will be to Adams's edition, by line number(s) in the main text.
77. Nobility declares that 'Englande hath a quene – Thankes to the lorde above' (l. 2671) and Clergy says 'And now of late dayes the secte of Anabaptistes / She seketh to suppresse for their pesiferouse facyon' (ll. 2680–1).
78. *King Johan*, ed. Pafford, p. xv. Greg Walker, however, argues that the role of Imperial Majesty was already developed for the performance of *King Johan* in 1538–9 to refer to Henry VIII and that 'little of substance' was added to later revisions: *Plays of Persuasion*, p. 177.
79. *King Johan*, ed. Pafford, pp. xviii–xix; *Documents relating to the Revels at Court*, ed. Feuillerat, p. 3.
80. John Bale, *Illustrium Majoris Britanniae Scriptorum, Hoc Est, Angliae, Cambriae, ac Scotiae Summarium* (Wesel, 1548). The frontispiece engraving depicts John Bale on his knees presenting his book to Edward VI.

81. Strype, *Cranmer*, I, p. 207.
82. Walker, *Plays of Persuasion*. Walker argues that the play, composed and performed in a climate of hesitant reform, presents Henry VIII as Imperial Majesty and 'the ardent reformer' in order to persuade Henry to 'adopt the role in reality', p. 210.
83. Edwin Shepard Miller, 'The Roman Rite in Bale's *King John*', *PMLA*, 64 (1949), 802–22 (817–18).
84. Kurt Tetzeli Von Rosador, 'The Sacralizing Sign: Religion and Magic in Bale, Greene and the Early Shakespeare', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 23 (1993), 30–45 (37).
85. David Scott Kastan, '"Holy Wurdes" and "Slypper Wit": John Bale's *King Johan* and the Poetics of Propaganda', in *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts*, ed. Peter C. Herman (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994), pp. 267–82 (p. 272).
86. White, *Theatre and Reformation*, pp. 14, 37.
87. Scott Kastan comments further that 'For Bale, of course, the distinction between his plays and the impersonations of his villains is clear and absolute. Bale's play-making is legitimate because its representations conform to the truth': '"Holy Wurdes" and "Slypper Wit"', p. 272.
88. *The Play of the Sacrament*, in *Medieval Drama: An Anthology*, ed. Greg Walker (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), ll. 754– 7.
89. On the church as a playing-space for both liturgical and vernacular plays see John M. Wasson, 'The English Church as Theatrical Space', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. Cox and Kastan, pp. 25–37. On the performance of an unidentified play by Bale in September 1538 'before Thomas Cromwell at St Stephen's', see Ian Lancashire, *Dramatic Texts and Records of Britain: A Chronological Topography to 1558* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 104. White suggests that this play was *God's Promises*: *Theatre and Reformation*, p. 152.
90. See David Bevington, *Medieval Drama* (Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1975), on what he calls 'liturgically mimetic ceremonials', scenes and processions that acted out the liturgy in the context of a religious service, p. 6.
91. Bale, *Vocacyon*, fol. 30v.
92. John Bale, *A mysterye of inyquyte contayned within the heretycall Genealogye of Ponce Pantolabus is here both dysclosed & confuted* (Geneva, 1545), fol. 44v.
93. John Bale [pseud. Henry Stalbrydge], *The Epistel Exhortatorye of an Inglyshe Chrystian unto his derely beloved countrey of Ingland* (Basel?, 1544?), fol. 18r.
94. *Johan Baptystes Preachynge* in *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, II, ed. Happé, pp. 35–50 (ll. 29–30). Further references will be to this edition and noted in the main text.
95. *The Towneley Plays*, ed. Martin Stevens and A. C. Cawley, 2 vols. EETS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), I, pp. 218–26 (ll. 187, 194).
96. *Two Latin Comedies by John Foxe the Martyrologist: Titus et Gesippus, Christus Triumphans*, ed. and trans. John Hazel Smith (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1973), p. 229.

CHAPTER 4. 'HE HATH SENT MARYE OUR SOVERAIGNE AND QUENE': ENGLAND'S FIRST QUEEN AND *RESPUBLICA*

1. For this now rather dated, but surprisingly tenacious, view of Mary's reign see, for example, Dickens, who understands the Marian Reaction as 'the supreme crisis of the English Reformation' (*The English Reformation*, p. 10).
2. Neither Schramm in his *History* nor Anglo in *Spectacle* mentions this inflammatory proposal of the Council's. Neither is it mentioned in Hoak's 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I'.
3. I borrow this phrase 'monarchical republic' from Patrick Collinson's 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', in Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays*, pp. 31–57.
4. 'Events of the Kingdom of England beginning with King Edward VI until the wedding of the most serene Prince Philip of Spain and the most serene Queen Mary as related by Monsignor G. F. Commendone: an Italian Manuscript in the Library of the Monasterio de San Lorenzo El Real Del Escorial', in *The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor as Related in Four Manuscripts of the Escorial*, ed. and trans. C. V. Malfatti (Barcelona: C. V. Malfatti, 1956), pp. 3–65 (p. 8). Further references will be to Malfatti, followed by page number.
5. On the Acts of Succession, see *The Tudor Constitution*, ed. Elton, pp. 2–3, and *Statutes of the Realm*, III: 1534 Act of Succession, 25 Henry VIII, c. 22 (p. 471), 1536 Act of Succession, 28 Henry VIII, c. 7 (p. 655), and 1544 Act of Succession, 35 Henry VIII, c. 1 (p. 955).
6. Elton, for example, argues that Northumberland was not entirely to blame and that the 'likeliest answer must allow for cooperation between King and duke: neither forced the other': *Reform and Reformation*, p. 374. See also Dale Hoak, who offers a favourable account of Northumberland and his achievements in Edward's reign and reads the deviation from succession as his great misjudgement: 'Two Revolutions in Tudor Government: The Formation and Organization of Mary I's Privy Council', in *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration*, ed. Christopher Coleman and David Starkey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 87–115.
7. J. A. Froude, *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth*, 12 vols. (London, 1856–70), VI, p. 15.
8. 'My devise for the succession' is printed in *Literary Remains of Edward VI*, ed. Nichols, II, pp. 571–3.
9. For a transcription of the letters patent see *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Two Years of Queen Mary, and Especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyat Written by a Resident in the Tower of London*, ed. J. G. Nichols (London, 1850), pp. 91–100.
10. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, ed. Nichols, p. 98.

11. Hoak, 'Two Revolutions', p. 91.
12. For a vivid contemporary account of the coup and Northumberland's fall see 'The *Vita Mariae Angliae Reginae* of Robert Wingfield of Brantham', ed. and trans. Diarmaid MacCulloch, Camden Miscellany, 28 (London, 1984), pp. 196–301. For a detailed analysis of the formation and composition of Mary's Council, especially the switching of allegiances of key members of Henry VIII's and Edward VI's Councils, see Hoak, 'Two Revolutions' and Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 229–30.
13. *Machyn's Diary*, p. 37.
14. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), pp. 150–1. Simon Renard, Monsieur de Courrières and Monsieur de Thoulouse replaced Jehan Scheyfve as the imperial ambassadors on the day Edward VI died. They were sent primarily to negotiate the marriage pact. Renard stayed on as resident ambassador in England once the mission was completed.
15. For this view see Haigh, *English Reformations*, and Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*. For a counter-thesis see Andrew Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), who argues for a 'residual Protestantism' (p. 3) as opposed to Duffy and Haigh's tenacious Catholicism.
16. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), p. 209.
17. Elton, *Reform and Reformation*, p. 375.
18. Haigh, *English Reformations*, pp. 205, 204. Diarmaid MacCulloch similarly describes the 'groundswell of popular support which carried Mary to victory' in his 'Introduction' to 'The *Vita Mariae Angliae Reginae*', pp. 182–95 (p. 188).
19. Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 7, 9.
20. David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England, 1553–58*, 2nd edn (London and New York: Longman, 1991; first published 1979), p. 400.
21. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 540.
22. Loades, *Reign of Mary Tudor*, pp. 19–20.
23. Quoted in *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, ed. Nichols, pp. 1–2 (note (b)).
24. Hoak, 'Two Revolutions', p. 107.
25. Guy describes Arundel as a 'traditionalist': *Tudor England*, p. 230.
26. Malfatti, p. 16.
27. Malfatti, pp. 16–17.
28. Malfatti, p. 9.
29. Malfatti, p. 9.
30. *TRP*, II, p. 3. Richard Grafton printed Mary's proclamation.
31. *CSP: Venetian*, V (1534–54), p. 430.
32. T. W., *A Ninvectyve agaynst Treason* (1553).
33. Robert Fabyan, *The Chronicle of Fabian, whiche he nameth the concordaunce of histories, newly perused* (1559), p. 709.
34. Malfatti, p. 8.
35. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), p. 151.

36. Richard Taverner, *An Oration gratulatory made upon the joyfull proclayming of the moste noble Princes Quene Mary Quene of Englande* (1553). Further references will be in the main text.
37. The first of Mary's continental coronation texts was *Coronatione de la serenissima Reina Maria d'Inghilterra fatta il di primo d'ottobre MDLIII* (Rome, 1553). A slightly altered Spanish translation was published in March 1554 as *La Coronacion de la Inclita, y Serenissima reyna Maria de Inglaterra* (Medina del Campo, 1554). The identity of the authors is not known, nor the source from which the details were drawn, although the similarities to Commendone's description in Malfatti (pp. 30–6) would suggest him as a likely source. Malfatti reproduces the Spanish account as an appendix to *The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor*, pp. 150–5. It is also included in *Relacion muy verdadera de Antonio de Guaras: criado de la Serenissima y Catholica reyna de Inglaterra* (Medina del Campo?, 1554?), although de Guaras is not the author. An English translation is available in Antonio de Guaras, *The Accession of Queen Mary*, ed. and trans. Richard Garnett (London, 1892), pp. 117–23.
38. *ODNB*. He is described as 'Cromwell's principal propagandist for religious reform'. The entry does not, however, mention *An Oration gratulatory*.
39. E. Gordon Duff, *A Century of the English Book Trade* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1905), pp. 38–9.
40. David Cressy, 'The Protestant Calendar and the Vocabulary of Celebration in Early Modern England' in Cressy, *Society and Culture in Early Modern England*, (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2003) pp. 32–52.
41. *CSP: Venetian*, V (1534–54), p. 424.
42. *CSP: Venetian*, V (1534–54), p. 383.
43. G[eorge] M[arshall], *A compendious treatise in metre declaring the firste originall of Sacrifice, and of the buylding of Aultares and Churches . . . in Englande* (1554); reprinted in *Fugitive Tracts Written in Verse*, ed. Henry Huth, Series 1 (London, 1875), no. 14, Cir–v (pagination follows original as no separate pagination).
44. John Christopherson, *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion* (1554), Iviiiv.
45. Leonard Stopes, *An Ave Maria in commendation of our Most vertuous Queene* (1553).
46. John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous regiment of women* (Geneva, 1558).
47. Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 233.
48. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), p. 238.
49. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, II, p. 103.
50. Hoak, 'Two Revolutions'. He writes that Mary's Council at the beginning of her reign comprised 'Edwardian "professionals" whose experience was too valuable for the queen to reject or ignore; they knew how government really worked at Westminster, and were prepared to render loyal service to the legitimate sovereign', p. 89.

51. Guy, *Tudor England*. He writes of Mary's Council at this time that 'traditionalists . . . were bedded down with *politiques*', p. 230.
52. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), p. 241.
53. CSP Spanish, XI (1553), p. 239.
54. Henry's will had also decreed that, should Mary or Elizabeth marry without the Council's consent, their rights to the throne would be forfeited. See Loades, *Reign of Mary Tudor*, p. 11.
55. J. R. Planché, *Regal Records: Or, A Chronicle of the Coronations of the Queens Regnant of England* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1838), p. 2 (note b).
56. Constance Jordan, 'Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-century British Political Thought', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40 (1987), 421–51; Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990), esp. 'Women's Rule: The Tudor Queens', pp. 116–33.
57. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, ed. Nichols, p. 86.
58. Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet*, fols. 41v, 19v.
59. Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes*, Biiir. On the rhetoric of miracle associated with female rulers, in relation to Elizabeth I, see Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, p. 41.
60. Judith. M. Richards, 'Mary Tudor as "Sole Quene"? Gendering Tudor Monarchy', *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), 895–924 (903).
61. David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), p. 1.
62. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), pp. 239–40.
63. *CSP: Venetian*, V (1534–54), p. 431.
64. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), p. 220.
65. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), p. 231.
66. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), p. 262. It would not be until December 1553 that the mass and plate would be restored to the churches: 'Note, the xvth of December, 1553, the proclamacion for the stablyshing again of the masse was proclaymed', *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, ed. Nichols, p. 33.
67. *CSP: Venetian*, V (1534–54), p. 430. Mary stopped using the title 'Supreme Head' at the end of 1553, but the break with Rome was not officially reversed and England absolved until the third Parliament in November 1554: Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 234–5.
68. See *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), pp. 209–10.
69. *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, ed. J. G. Nichols (London, 1852), p. 85. Nichols includes a footnote which refers the reader to Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* to explain why the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr John Taylor) was derobed at the opening of Parliament: 'hys parlament robe was tane from hym and he was comytted to the tower'.
70. CSP Spanish, XI (1553), p. 240.
71. Planché, in *Regal Records*, draws on a few contemporary accounts of Mary's coronation, mainly Society of Antiquaries MS 123, College of Arms MSS I.7 and W. Y., and the description offered by Strype in *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III, Part 1, pp. 52–7.

72. Of the chronicle accounts of Mary's procession and coronation ceremony, the most detailed are *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, ed. Nichols, pp. 27–32; *Chronicle of the Grey Friars*, ed. Nichols, pp. 84–5; Holinshed, IV, pp. 6–7. For ambassadorial reports see Commendone's account in Malfatti, pp. 30–6; Renard's letter to Prince Philip dated 3 October 1553 in *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), pp. 261–4; the French ambassador François Noailles's account in *Ambassades de Messieurs de Noailles en Angleterre*, ed. M. l'Abbé de Vertot, 5 vols (Paris, 1763), II, pp. 196–201.
73. Holinshed, IV, p. 7.
74. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, ed. Nichols, p. 31.
75. 'Order of proceeding from the Tower to Westminster Palace and from Westminster Hall to the church for the Coronation of Queen Mary', Society of Antiquaries MS 123, fol. 1r.
76. Planché, *Regal Records*, p. 6.
77. Anne Boleyn wore a 'circot of white cloth': Hall, p. 801. Commendone's account describes that Mary – like Anne – was 'dressed with a silver robe and a head-dress of precious stones', Malfatti, p. 31.
78. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, ed. Nichols, p. 28; Holinshed, IV, p. 6. In the latter, the 'blew' has translated to 'purple' which would indicate that Mary wore purple, imperial robes.
79. Society of Antiquaries MS 123, fol. 4v; Malfatti, p. 32.
80. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, ed. Nichols, p. 31.
81. *CSP: Spanish*, XI (1553), p. 262: 'and she was twice anointed'.
82. Malfatti, p. 33.
83. Society of Antiquaries MS 123, fol. 8r.
84. Society of Antiquaries MS 123, fol. 8v.
85. Malfatti, p. 34.
86. Malfatti, p. 33.
87. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Philip and Mary* (London, 1937), I, p. 339: 'An nother letter to the Bisshopp of Chichester, doing hym to understande that the Quenes Heighnes hath specially appointed hym to make sermon on the Coronation Daye at Westminster.' On Day's recovery of this office, see Loades, *Reign of Mary Tudor*, p. 47.
88. Juan Paez de Castro, 'A Diary of Events Regarding the Happenings in Connection with the Rebellion of Thomas Wyatt and others following the arrival of the Imperial Ambassadors', in Malfatti, pp. 63–75 (p. 67).
89. Grafton, *A Chronicle at large*, p. 1332.
90. On the scandal see Edgerton, *Nicholas Udall*, pp. 37–40, and, for a different reading, Elizabeth Pittenger, '"To Serve the Queere": Nicholas Udall, Master of Revels', in *Queering the Renaissance*, ed. Jonathan Goldberg (Durham, N.C., and London: Duke University Press, 1994), pp. 162–89.
91. *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testamente with a dedicatory preface to Queen Catherine dowager of Henry VIII* (1548); *A discourse or traictise of Petur Martyr Vermilla Florentine, the publyque reader of divinitee in the Universitee of Oxford wherin he openly declared his whole and*

determinate judgemente concerynynge the Sacrament of the Lordes Supper in the sayde Universitee (1550?). It is not certain, however, whether Udall translated as well as printed *A discourse*: *ODNB*.

92. Walker, *The Politics of Performance*, p. 165. And see *ODNB*.
93. *Documents relating to the Revels at Court*, ed. Feuillerat, p. 291.
94. Although we cannot be absolutely certain about Udall's authorship, it has been persuasively attributed to him (and largely accepted in modern scholarship) by, among others, W. W. Greg. See 'Introduction' to *Respublica: An Interlude for Christmas 1553 Attributed to Nicholas Udall* ed. W. W. Greg, EETS (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1952), pp. vii–xxi. See also L. Bradner, 'A Test for Udall's Authorship', *Modern Language Notes*, 42 (1927), 378–80; Walker, *The Politics of Performance*; and 'Nicholas Udall', *ODNB*. We also cannot be entirely certain about a specific performance time or date, and rely on internal evidence from the play text itself which suggests that, at some point, the play was performed, or at least intended for performance, at Mary's court in 1553. If it was a Christmas performance, then it is likely that this took place at Richmond where Mary spent her first Christmas as queen.
95. Walker, *The Politics of Performance*, p. 166.
96. *Respublica*, ed. Greg, ll. 5–6, 39. Further references will be to this edition, indicated in the main text by line number.
97. *Documents relating to the Revels at Court*, ed. Feuillerat, p. 149.
98. *Documents relating to the Revels at Court*, ed. Feuillerat, p. 149.
99. *Documents relating to the Revels at Court*, ed. Feuillerat, p. 289.
100. *Documents relating to the Revels at Court*, ed. Feuillerat, p. 290.
101. Greg, 'Introduction', p. x.
102. Walker, *Politics of Performance*, pp. 169–70.
103. The first Parliament ran from 5 October to 6 December 1553. As well as declaring Henry's marriage to Katherine of Aragon legitimate, it repealed Edwardian laws of treason and the Acts of Uniformity, ruled against clerical marriage and reinstated images, communion in both kinds and the form of consecration, bringing religion back into line with the law of 1547. Elizabeth was once again ruled illegitimate. See Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 233–4.
104. Loades, *Mary Tudor*, p. 210.
105. Holinshed, IV, p. 6; Malfatti, p. 32.
106. Elyot's Dictionary of 1552 translates 'Res publica' as 'common weale': *Bibliotheca Eliotae: Eliotes Dictionarie the second tyme enriched, and more perfectly corrected, by Thomas Cooper* (1552).
107. Collinson, 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', p. 36.
108. Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 352.
109. *Sir Thomas Elyot's 'The Boke Named the Governour'*, ed. Rude, pp. 15–16: 'hit semeth that men have ben longe absued in calling *Rempublicam* a comune weale . . . And consequently there may appere lyke diversitie to

be in englisshe, betwene a publike weale and commune weale, as shuld be in latine, betwene *Res publica* and *Res plebeia*.'

110. Betteridge, *Tudor Histories*, p. 138.
111. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. 191–2.
112. T. W., *A Ninvectyve agaynst Treason.*
113. Bevington, 'Drama and Polemics', 113.
114. Douglas F. Rutledge, '*Respublica*: Rituals of Status Elevation and the Political Mythology of Mary Tudor', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 5 (1991), 55–68 (55).
115. Rutledge, '*Respublica*', p. 57.
116. For a detailed analysis of the play as a response to disastrous Edwardian economic and social policies, see Walker, *The Politics of Performance*, pp. 172– 92.
117. Bevington, 'Drama and Polemics', 107.
118. For further discussion about the extent to which *Respublica* engages with theological and doctrinal debates see Jean-Paul Debax, '*Respublica*: pièce catholique?', *Caliban*, 24 (1987), 27–47, and Michael A. Winkelman, '*Respublica*: England's Trouble about Mary', *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 33 (2002), 77–98. Winkelman refers to the play's 'intentionally obscure theology', 89, but argues that the play endorses a Catholic story of retribution through a woman named Mary. Walker, *The Politics of Performance*, argues for the inextricability of material and spiritual concerns, which makes the play's criticism of the ransacking of church wealth and property equivalent to spiritual poverty (p. 185).
119. See Chapter 5.
120. Betteridge discusses 'the conflicting nature of the play's two models of history' (*Tudor Histories*, p. 138).

CHAPTER 5. 'A STAGE WHERIN WAS SHEWED THE WONDERFULL SPECTACLE': REPRESENTING: ELIZABETH I'S CORONATION

1. *TRP*, II, p. 99.
2. Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 244. In 1553, Wriothesley records that 'the Queene rode from the Tower of London throughe the Cittie to her coronation in a riche chariott of clothe of golde. The Ladie Elizabeth and the Ladye Anne of Cleve ridinge after her in another riche chariott covered with cloth of sylver': *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, II, p. 103.
3. Camden, *The Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth*, p. 18.
4. Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes*, Biiir.
5. John Foxe, *The Second Volume of the Ecclesiastical history, conteynyng the Actes and Monumentes of Martyrs* (1570), pp. 2288–96. On the representation of Elizabeth in Foxe, especially the additions made to the second (1570) edition, see Thomas S. Freeman, 'Providence and Prescription: The

Account of Elizabeth in Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 27–55.

6. Foxe, *Actes and Monumentes* (1570), p. 2296.
7. John Hales, 'Oration' on Elizabeth's coronation, BL Harleian MS 419, fol. 143. It is printed as 'An Oration of J. H. to the Queenes majestie, and delivered to her majestie by a certayne Noble man, at her first entrance to her raigne', in the third edition of John Foxe, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiastical History, contayning the Actes & Monumentes of thinges passed in every kinges time, in this Realme, especially in the Churche of England* (1576), pp. 2005–7 (p. 2007). It is significant that Hales's 'Oration' is not printed until the 1576 edition of *Actes and Monumentes*. Further references will be to this printed edition.
8. Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes*, Biiir.
9. Hales, 'Oration', p. 2007.
10. Hales, 'Oration', p. 2006.
11. Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum*, ed. Mary Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 78. *De Republica Anglorum* was probably composed 1562–5 and it has been argued that the genesis of Smith's remarks can be found in the early years of Edward VI's reign and Smith's involvement with the Scottish cause. See Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', pp. 143–4.
12. Collinson, 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', p. 43.
13. Guy, 'Elizabeth I: The Queen and Politics', pp. 189, 193.
14. Guy, 'Elizabeth I: The Queen and Politics', p. 191.
15. Anne McLaren, *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: Queen and Commonwealth 1558–1585* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 3. See also Mary T. Crane, '"Video et Taceo": Elizabeth I and the Rhetoric of Counsel', *Studies in English Literature*, 28 (1988), 1–15.
16. See Freeman, 'Providence and Prescription'. Hoak, in 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', links the discourse of parliamentary rule with Protestantism and understands Elizabeth's coronation and her procession as united in their expression of a coherent Protestant policy. This present discussion argues for a rather less unified and more confessionally ambiguous reading of both events.
17. The debate begins in *English Historical Review* with C. G. Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, *English Historical Review*, 22 (1907), 650–73 who argues that the host was elevated and that Elizabeth walked away. For a refutation of this see H. A. Wilson, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 23 (1908), 87–91. Wilson argues that the host must have been elevated if only because coronation 'valait bien une élévation' (90). The debate continued in *English Historical Review* as new evidence was uncovered or old evidence reinterpreted. See G. Lockhart Ross, 'Il Schifanoya's Account of the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 23 (1908), 533–4; C. G. Bayne, 'The Coronation of

Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 24 (1909), 322–3; A. F. Pollard, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), 125–6; C. G. Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), 550–53; A. L. Rowse, *An Elizabethan Garland* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1953), pp. 11–28. For an overview of the entire debate, see William Haugaard, 'The Coronation of Elizabeth I', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 19 (1968), 161–70.

18. Official documents are: (i) BL Harleian MS 6064, fol. 4: Cecil's 'Articles Concerninge the Quenes Maties Coronacion'; (ii) a folio volume among the Lord Chamberlain's records at the National Archives concerning the accounts: 'The presidente of the coronacõn of our Soverayne lady Quene Elysabethe Solemnyzed at Westminster the XVth Day of January in the ffirst yer of Hir most prosperous Reyne', Lord Chamberlain's List 1887, vol. 3; (iii) another folio volume in Lord Chamberlain's List 1887, vol. 792, itemising props and wardrobe; (iv) book of drawings relating to the service which is thought to be an incomplete draft of a Book of Ceremonies prepared for Elizabeth's coronation: BL Egerton MS 3320; (v) a memorandum entitled 'Notes respecting the form of public prayer to be established' in *CSP: Domestic* (1547–80), p. 119; (vi) Wardrobe Book January 1559: NA, E 101/429/3, fol. 4; (vii) Richard Sackville's account book: NA, LC 2/4(3). Contemporary accounts are: (i) a fragmentary herald's account in College of Arms volume W. Y. fol. 198. This is reprinted in Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 671; (ii) an English eyewitness report known as 'The Ceremonies of the Coronac'on of the moost excellent Queen Elysabeth'. A copy of this narrative, by Mr Anthony Anthony, is in Ashmole's Collections in the Bodleian (MS Ashmole 863), and reproduced in *The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. Nichols (1823), I, pp. 60–5, and in Bayne 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 666–71; (iii) the Mantuan envoy Il Schifanoya's letter to the Castellan of Mantua, dated 23 January 1559, *CSP: Venetian*, VII (1558–80), pp. 11–19.
19. George Carew, formerly Elizabeth's chaplain, replaced the papist Thomas Thirlby within a week of Elizabeth's accession. See Roger Bowers, 'The Chapel Royal, The First Edwardian Prayer Book, and Elizabeth's Settlement of Religion, 1559', *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), 317–44 (322).
20. Readings of the ceremony are also marked by the desire to make the coronation consistent with a particular view of Elizabeth herself. David Starkey, for example, argues that Owen Oglethorpe insisted on elevating the host and that Elizabeth walked out in a defiant gesture of repugnance: *Elizabeth: Apprenticeship* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2000), p. 274.
21. *CSP: Venetian*, VII (1558–80), pp. 24–5. It is remarkable that neither Tiepolo nor De Feria, unlike Il Schifanoya, attended the coronation in the Abbey. Ambassadors were certainly invited: the drawings in BL Egerton MS 3320 show a 'standinge for all Embassatores' to the right of the high altar, fol. 21r.
22. *CSP: Venetian*, VII (1558–80), p. 24.

23. *CSP: Spanish*, I (Elizabeth 1558–67), p. 25.
24. A curtained pew, positioned near the high altar. As William Haugaard points out, closet and traverse could denote, in the sixteenth century, 'any kind of area within a church equipped with a faldstool or cushions and cross-wise curtains to provide privacy for some eminent person at prayer': Haugaard, 'The Coronation of Elizabeth I', 168. Nevertheless, the signification and whereabouts of this 'clossett' or 'traverse' have caused some heated debate, leading A. L. Rowse, for example, to claim that it must be situated in St Edward's Chapel, which is itself also referred to as a 'traverse', behind the sanctuary and accessed via a door to the left or right of the high altar. Elizabeth's withdrawal from mass, therefore, would have been a bold, defiant and unprecedented gesture: Rowse, *An Elizabethan Garland*, p. 27. Bayne also locates the closet or traverse 'with certainty' in St Edward's Chapel: Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 661.
25. *CSP: Venetian*, VII (1558–80), p. 17.
26. Quoted in Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 670.
27. Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 671.
28. Quoted in McCoy, '"Thou Idol Ceremony"', p. 241.
29. Strohm, *Theory and the Premodern Text*, p. 41.
30. McCoy, '"Thou Idol Ceremony"', p. 240.
31. McCoy, '"Thou Idol Ceremony"', p. 243.
32. On the use of private closets by the Tudor monarchs, see Adamson, 'The Tudor and Stuart Courts 1509–1714', p. 104.
33. BL Cotton MS Tiberuis E VIII, fol. 99r.
34. Roger Bowers argues that she did communicate, and in both kinds, but that this had to take place in secret because it contravened the law of the time: Bowers, 'The Chapel Royal', 327.
35. Quoted in Pollard, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', 125. Elizabeth's words can be translated as: 'she had been crowned and anointed according to the rites of the Catholic Church and by Catholic bishops without, however, participating in mass'.
36. Interestingly, it was in c. 1571 that Nicholas Hilliard painted the miniature 'Coronation' painting of Elizabeth I: Arnold, 'The "Coronation" Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I', 727.
37. *CSP: Venetian*, VII (1558–80), p. 2.
38. Quoted in Bayne,'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 322. Translation: 'Elizabeth commanded that the mass should be said as in the Queen's chapel, without elevating either the host or the chalice; neither was elevated last Sunday the 15th during the solemn mass of her coronation.'
39. *CSP: Venetian*, VIII, pp. 24–5.
40. The herald writes: 'Then the masse began by the Deane', Bayne,'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 671. Il Schifanoya reports that the mass 'was sung by the dean of her chapel, her chaplain, the bishops not having chosen to say mass without elevating the host': *CSP: Venetian*, VII

(1558–80), p. 16. The English report, however, does not differentiate between the dean and the bishop: 'the Bishop began the Masse', Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 670.

41. Transcribed in Ross, 'Il Schifanoya's Account of the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', 533. *CSP: Venetian*, VII (1558–80), p. 17, translates the Italian as follows: 'the bishops not having chosen to say Mass without elevating the Host or consecrating it, as that worthy individual did; the Epistle and Gospel being recited in English'. However, this translation omits the fact that the Epistle and Gospel were also sung in Latin, before they were said in English.
42. Bowers, 'The Chapel Royal', 327.
43. Bowers, 'The Chapel Royal', argues for Elizabeth's conservatism relative to her Council's radicalism. On the inconsistency and unfathomability of Elizabeth's private beliefs, particularly her relationship with ceremony, see Patrick Collinson, 'Windows in a Woman's Soul: Question about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I', in Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays*, pp. 87–118.
44. BL Harleian MS 6064, fol. 4v.
45. Quoted in Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 667.
46. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', p. 150. On the confusion of the oath-taking, see also Bayne, 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth' (1907), 667–8. Sir William Cecil had become a member of Elizabeth's Privy Council on her accession and took the office of secretary. Marian councillors who retained office were the Earls of Arundel, Pembroke, Shrewsbury and Derby, and Lord Treasurer Winchester. Sir William Paget, considered too close to Philip II, was ousted from office. See Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 253.
47. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', p. 150.
48. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', p. 150. As background to Cecil's political motivation, Hoak discusses his involvement in the parliaments of Edward VI's reign and his plan 'for a conciliar/parliamentary interregnum' in the 1560s, pp. 150–1. On James I's oath, also see Schramm, pp. 218–19.
49. Starkey, for example, argues that the 'Booke' handed to Oglethorpe by Cecil refers to the coronation pardon: *Elizabeth*, pp. 272–3.
50. Robert Dudley, son of the late Duke of Northumberland was made master of the horse – a privileged office at the coronation. The choice of Dudley was on one level an odd one: he was imprisoned by Mary for his involvement with his father's plot to install Jane on the throne of England. If Northumberland had succeeded, the English crown would be with the Dudley family and Elizabeth's coronation would never have happened.
51. Benjamin Woolley, *The Queen's Conjuror: The Science and Magic of Dr Dee* (London: HarperCollins, 2001), p. 59.
52. Adrian Rolls, for example, describes Elizabeth's 'ritual improprieties' and writes that 'the English, at least those with Protestant leanings, had accepted the delegitimization of the coronation enacted as Elizabeth assumed the throne': *The Theory of the King's Two Bodies*, pp. 100, 101.

53. The 'king's evil' was another name for scrofula which, it was claimed, could be cured if touched by the monarch. Touching for the 'king's evil', therefore, was evidence of the monarch's sacred nature. See Sturdy, 'The Royal Touch', esp. p. 174, and the seminal work by Bloch, *The Royal Touch*.
54. See Arnold, 'The "Coronation" Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I', 735–41. Arnold transcribes the manuscripts that document the lists of clothing itemised for Elizabeth's coronation.
55. Society of Antiquaries MS 123, fol. 8r. BL Harleian MS 6064 records for Elizabeth's coronation that 'the Crowne the Circlett and rynge to be broughte that her highnes maye assaie the same', fol. 4v.
56. Il Schifanoya records that Elizabeth wore this for the procession through London and again ('wearing the ample royal robe of cloth of gold') when she recessed from the Abbey after the coronation service: *CSP: Venetian*, VII (1558–80), pp. 12, 17. This, however, would be counter to tradition: monarchs (including Mary) wore the purple imperial robes for the recession.
57. Arnold, 'The "Coronation" Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I', argues that the painting is a copy of a lost 1559 portrait but that it is distinct from the Hilliard miniature.
58. This is the argument put forward by John Fletcher in his 'The Date of the Portrait of Elizabeth I in her Coronation Robes', *Burlington Magazine*, 120 (1978), 753.
59. *The Quenes majesties passage through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion* (1558). The date 1558 refers to the old dating system, when the year changed in March, not January. There is only one extant copy of this first edition and this is held by the Elizabethan Club at Yale University. A facsimile exists as *The Quenes majesties passage through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion*, ed. James M. Osborn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960). Since it is most likely that it was the first edition of the text that would have been presented to the queen, all further references will be to this facsimile edition, with page references following the original signatures.
60. 'Rycharde tottle ys lycensed to prynte the passage of the quenes majesties Throwoute the Cytie of London / The frute of foes and a treates of Seneca': *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, ed. Edward Arber, 4 vols. (London, 1875–7), I, p. 32b.
61. This memorandum is dated 4 March 1559 and quoted in Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*, p. 13.
62. Richard Mulcaster, *The Passage of our most drad Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to westminster the day before her coronacion* (1558). Extant copies are in the British Library, Westminster Abbey, University of London Library, Guildhall, Lambeth Palace, Bodleian, Folger and Huntington libraries. The two British Library editions, however, differ slightly from the Westminster Abbey edition. Some corrections found in the Westminster Abbey edition are taken in, but not all. This suggests that the British Library editions were among the first in the print-run of the second

edition and that some 'stop-press' corrections were taken in during the printing process. Alternatively, a third, but unrecorded, reprint could have taken place after the second. There have been a few modern editions of the text. The most recent are *The Queen's Majesty's Passage*, ed. Germaine Warkentin (Toronto: The Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2004), and 'The Quenes majesties passage', in *Renaissance Drama*, ed. Kinney, pp. 21–34. Both Warkentin's and Kinney's editions are modernised-spelling editions. Warkentin follows the first edition – *The Quenes majesties passage* – and Kinney collates the first and second editions. Neither Warkentin nor Kinney notes that there are spelling differences between the various copies of the second edition.

63. Both 1604 editions were printed by Simon Stafford; one for John Busby as *The royall passage of her Majesty from the Tower of London, to her palace of White-hall, with all the speaches and devices, both of the pageants and otherwise, together with her Majesties severall answers, and most pleasing speaches to them all* (STC 7593), and another, with the same title, for Jone Millington (STC 7592). Neither edition, however, is listed in the Stationers' Register. Thomas Dekker's *The Magnificent Entertainment: given to King James, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, upon the day of his Majesties Tryumphant Passage (from the Tower) through his Honourable Citie (and Chamber) of London, being the 15 of March 1603* (1604) is entered in the Stationers' Register on 2 April 1604.

64. The exact price of the book is unknown, but standard retail prices of the time were one halfpenny per sheet for texts printed in pica or larger type and two-thirds of a penny for books printed in long primer or smaller type. See H. S. Bennett, *English Books & Readers 1558–1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 300. Nine days printing time would also have been adequate. Bennett suggests 'that one sheet per day per machine was the normal rate of production, that is eight quarto or sixteen octavo pages of type' (p. 290). On *The Quenes majesties passage*, he goes on to write: 'if we allow for the preparation of the copy and for the Sunday intervening it looks as if about five or six days would be available for the actual printing. At a sheet a day this would comfortably fill up the time, since the pamphlet ran to five quarto sheets.' Kinney suggests that 1,500 copies of the book were printed with each print-run: 'Introduction' to *Renaissance Drama*, pp. 19–21 (p. 21).

65. Roy Strong first argued for the propagandist intentions of the procession pageants and *The Quenes majesties passage* in a chapter of his 1962 doctoral thesis, 'Elizabethan Pageantry as Propaganda' (doctoral thesis, University of London, 1962), subsequently published as 'The 1559 Entry Pageants of Elizabeth I', in Roy Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography*, II: Elizabethan (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995), pp. 33–54. Also see Anglo, *Spectacle*, who refers to *The Quenes majesties passage* as 'the official description' (p. 353) and writes too that

'it is clear . . . that court and country were at one in rejoicing at the prosepct of a Protestant revival' (p. 345).

66. McCoy, '"The Wonderful Spectacle"', p. 218.
67. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*, p. 13.
68. Starkey, *Elizabeth*, p. 270: 'Throughout, the reporter was close by the Queen, observing, listening and scribbling in his notebook . . . The author of the pamphlet fully recognized the novelty of what he had witnessed.'
69. William Leahy, 'Propaganda or a Record of Events? Richard Mulcaster's *The Passage Of Our Most Drad Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth Through The Citie Of London Westminster The Daye Before Her Coronacion*', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 9.1 (2003) <www.purl.oclc.org/emls/09-1/leahmulc.html> (p. 13).
70. Most recently in *Renaissance Drama*, ed. Kinney, where Mulcaster's entry text is the first script of the anthology, pp. 21–34.
71. J. D., *The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, with the Restauration of the Protestant Religion. Or, The Downfal of the Pope* (1680).
72. For example see the work in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. Doran and Freeman.
73. Holinshed, IV, pp. 159–76. Fabyan, *The Chronicle of Fabian* (1559), pp. 567–70; Richard Grafton, *Graftons Abridgement of the Chronicles of Englande, newely corrected and augmented, to thys present yere of our Lord* (1572), pp. 194–6. Grafton's 1572 edition substantially embellishes the account of the procession and coronation as first described in his 1563 edition: *An abridgement of the Chronicles of England, gathered by Richard Grafton, citizen of London* (1563).
74. Heywood, *England's Elizabeth*, pp. 227, 234.
75. Thomas Heywood, *If you know not me, You know no bodie: or, The troubles of Queene Elizabeth* (1606), F3v.
76. John Foxe, *The seconde Volume of the Ecclesiasticall Historie, conteining the Acts and Monuments of Martyrs* (1583), p. 2116. This was printed in the 1563 edition, but omitted in the 1570 and 1576 editions. In 1583 it is reinstated, positioned before Hales's 'Oration'.
77. John Hayward, *The Beginning of the Reigne of Queene Elizabeth* (1636), pp. 447–8.
78. Hayward, *The Beginning of the Reigne of Queene Elizabeth*, p. 470.
79. Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I', pp. 135, 142. Mulcaster was also a pupil at Eton for a few years while Udall was headmaster there. See Richard DeMolen, *Richard Mulcaster (c. 1531–1611) and Educational Reform in the Renaissance* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf Publishers, 1991).
80. See Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). Frye argues that the procession, and Mulcaster's text, were the expression of the London elites's power and sovereignty and their desire to emphasise their economic independence from the crown, p. 52.

81. David Bergeron in 'Elizabeth's Coronation Entry (1559): New Manuscript Evidence', *English Literary Renaissance*, 8 (1978), 3–8 cites a document that records the loaning of costumes from the Revels Office for the pageant actors to wear. He argues that this is proof of Elizabeth's interest in the event and approval of the spectacle. While it indeed suggests that the court were informed about certain pageant details, this evidence is not conclusive about the extent or nature of court control. For this view also see Guy, 'Elizabeth I: The Queen and Politics', p. 192 n. 74.
82. Tottel was certainly a prominent and successful London printer: he had held an almost exclusive patent to print law books since Edward VI's reign, a patent that was extended for life by Elizabeth on 12 January 1559, just two days before the coronation entry.
83. Richard Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie which entreateth chefelie of the right writing of our English tung* (1582), p. 254.
84. John Hayward notes how short-sighted Elizabeth was: *The Beginning of the Reigne of Queene Elizabeth*, p. 450. Could Mulcaster have turned a handicap into a virtue?
85. *CSP: Venetian*, VII (1558–80), pp. 11–19. There is the possibility that Il Schifanoya wrote this letter with Mulcaster's text by his side. Its date, 23 January, is the same as the publication date and he transcribes the Latin verses. This casts doubts on whether he was even a witness to the procession, although the pageants remained up for a few days after the event. There are a few notable discrepancies between his letter and Mulcaster's text. On these see Sandra Logan, 'Making History: The Rhetorical and Historical Occasion of Elizabeth Tudor's Coronation Entry', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31 (2001), 251–82.
86. Helen Hackett, for example, writes that this pageant 'generated the most excitement' and that it made 'dramatically clear her commitment to Protestantism': *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, p. 43.
87. Knox, *The First Blast*, fols. 10v–11r.
88. Grafton, *Graftons Abridgement of the Chronicles of Englande*, p. 196.
89. *The Coronation Order of King James I*, ed. Legg.
90. Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment;* Ben Jonson, *His Part of King James his Royall and Magnificent Enterteinement through his Honorable Cittie of London* (1604). A later edition of Dekker's *The Magnificent Entertainment, entitled, The Whole Magnificent Enterteinement* (1604), included some of Jonson's material but also differs considerably from the first edition. On this, see Fredson Bower's discussion in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953–61), II, pp. 231–52. Jonson composed the pageant dramas for the first arch at Fenchurch and the last at Temple Bar, and a speech delivered in the Strand. Dekker devised all the other pageants. For the first time, too, a book was published that provided a full set of drawings of all the arches and pageants: Stephen Harrison, *The Archs of Triumph Erected in honor of the High and mighty prince James the first* (1604). On the

discrepancies between the drawings and the texts, see Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*, pp. 71–88, and his 'Harrison, Jonson, and Dekker: The Magnificent Entertainment for King James (1604)', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 31 (1968), 445–8. Also see Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), who puts forward the standard propaganda argument – that James determined the representation of his power in this entertainment, and offered 'the power of himself as image' (p. 33).

EPILOGUE: 'PRESUME NOT THAT I AM THE THING I WAS'

1. Sally F. Moore and Barbara G. Myerhoff, *Secular Ritual* (Assen: Gorcum, 1977), p. 2. Jürgen Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis*, trans. Thomas McCarthy (London: Heinemann, 1976), also discusses the vulnerability and legitimacy of cultural forms.
2. William Shakespeare, *The Second Part of King Henry IV*, ed. A. R. Humphreys, Arden Shakespeare (London and New York: Routledge, 1966; repr. 1996), V. v. 56.
3. Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene, Disposed into twelve books* (1590), I. 12. 8.
4. McCoy in '"Thou Idol Ceremony"', talks about the 'displacement of royal ceremony on to the public stage', p. 254, and its unsettling effects.
5. Suzanne Westfall has considered the emulation of ceremonial structure in early Tudor household plays, but she argues that they reinforce the hierarchy of power: *Patrons and Performance: Early Tudor Household Revels* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 177.
6. Stephen Orgel notes the overlap between ceremony and drama in Jacobean masques: 'The Poetics of Spectacle', *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation*, 2 (1971), 367–89. Orgel's point, however, is that it is the royal family's image of themselves, rather than an image held up by others. See also his *The Illusion of Power* in which he writes that Jacobean court dramas were 'the expression of the monarch's will, the mirrors of his mind', p. 45. Other work on the performance of ceremonies before monarchs, particularly in relation to Shakespeare's drama, includes Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing*; Tennenhouse, *Power on Display*; and Leah S. Marcus, *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and its Discontents* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1988), on the Henry VI plays in particular. Alvin Kernan notes a movement from 'ceremony and ritual to history' in the *Henriad*, a historical process that moved from an ordered ceremonial world to a contingent, chaotic one: Alvin Kernan, 'From Ritual to History: The English History Play', in J. Leeds Barroll, Alexander Leggatt, Richard Hosley and Alvin Kernan, *The Revels History of Drama in English*, III (1576–1613) (London and New York: Routledge, 1975; repr. 1996), pp. 262–99 (p. 270).

Bibliography

MANUSCRIPTS

BRITISH LIBRARY

Additional 9835
Additional 18669
Cotton Tiberius E VIII
Egerton 985
Egerton 2623
Egerton 3320
Harleian 41
Harleian 419
Harleian 5111
Harleian 6064
Royal 18 A LXIV
Sloane 1494

CORPORATION OF LONDON RECORDS OFFICE

Repertory XI
Lambeth Palace Library
MS 1075b

SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES

MS 123

COLLEGE OF ARMS

I.7
I.18
Vincent 25
W. Y.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY LIBRARY AND MUNIMENT ROOM

MS 38

PRIMARY PRINTED MATERIAL

This includes primary material printed before 1800.

Anon., *La Coronacion de la Inclita, y Serenissima reyna Maria de Inglaterra* (Medina del Campo, 1554).

Coronatione de la serenissima Reina Maria d'Inghilterra fatta il di primo d'ottobre MDLIII (Rome, 1553).

The forme and maner of makyng and consecratyng of Archebishoppes, Bishoppes, Priestes and Deacons (1549).

A glasse of the truthe (1531).

The Institution of a Christen Man, Conteynynge the Exposytion or Interpretation of the commune Crede, of the seven Sacramentes, of the x commandementes, and of the Pater noster, and the Ave Maria, Justyfication & Purgatory (1537).

The maner of the tryumphe at Caleys and Bulleyn (1532).

A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen man, sette furthe by the kynges majestie of Englande (1543).

The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne, wyfe unto the moost noble kynge Henry the viii (1533).

The traduction & mariage of the princesse (1500).

Of the tryumphe, and the verses that Charles themperour & the most myghty redouted kyng of England, Henry the viii were saluted with passyng through London (1522).

Aylmer, John, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes, agaynst the late blowne Blaste, concerninge the Government of Wemen wherin be confuted all such reasons as a straunger of late made in that behalfe, with a brief exhortation to Obedience* (Strasbourg [London], 1559).

Bacon, Francis, *The History of the Reigns of Henry the Seventh, Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, and Queen Mary, The First Written by the Right Honourable, Francis Lord Verulam, Viscount St Alban. The other Three by the Right Honourable and Right Reverend Father in God, Francis Godwyn, Lord Bishop of Hereford* (1676).

Bale, John [pseud. Henry Stalbrydge], *The Epistel Exhortatorye of an Inglyshe Chrystian unto his derely beloved countrey of Ingland* (Basel?, 1544?).

Bale, John, *Illustrium Majoris Britanniae Scriptorum, Hoc Est, Angliae, Cambriae, ac Scotiae Summarium* (Wesel, 1548).

A mysterye of inyquyte contayned within the heretycall Genealogye of Ponce Pantolabus is here both dysclosed & confuted (Geneva, 1545).

The Vocacyon of Johan Bale to the bishoprick of Ossorie in Irelande his persecucions in the same, & finall delyveraunce (Rome [London], 1553).

Camden, William, *The Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth, Late Queene of England* (1630).

Christopherson, John, *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion* (1554).

D., J., *The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, with the Restauration of the Protestant Religion. Or, The Downfal of the Pope* (1680).

Dekker, Thomas, *The Magnificent Entertainment: given to King James, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, upon the day of his Majesties Tryumphant Passage (from the Tower) through his Honourable Citie (and Chamber) of London, being the 15 of March 1603* (1604).

Dekker, Thomas and John Webster, *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyat with the Coronation of Queen Mary, and the coming in of King Philip* (1607).

Elyot, Thomas, *Bibliotheca Eliotae: Eliotes Dictionarie the second tyme enriched, and more perfectly corrected, by Thomas Cooper* (1552).

Bibliotheca Eliotae: Eliotes Dictionarie, by Thomas Cooper the third tyme corrected (1559).

The Dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knyght (1538).

Fabyan, Robert, *The Chronicle of Fabian, whiche he nameth the concordaunce of histories, newly perused. And continued from the beginnyng of Kyng Henry the seventh, to thende of Queene Mary* (1559).

The Chronicle of Fabyan, whiche he hym selfe nameth the concordaunce of historyes, nowe newely printed, & in many places corrected, as to the dylygent reader it may apere (1542).

Foxe, John, *The First Volume of the Ecclesiastical History, contayning the Actes & Monumentes of thinges passed in every kinges time, in this Realme, especially in the Churche of England* (1576).

The Second Volume of the Ecclesiastical history, conteynyng the Actes and Monumentes of Martyrs (1570).

The seconde Volume of the Ecclesiasticall Historie, conteining the Acts and Monuments of Martyrs (1583).

Gardiner, Stephen, *Episcopi De Vera Obedientia: Oratio* (1535).

Grafton, Richard, *An abridgement of the Chronicles of England, gathered by Richard Grafton, citizen of London* (1563).

A Chronicle at large and meere History of the affayres of Englande and Kinges of the same (1569).

Graftons Abridgement of the Chronicles of Englande, newely corrected and augmented, to thys present yere of our Lord (1572).

Guaras, Antonio de, *Relacion muy verdadera de Antonio de Guaras: criado de la Serenissima y Catholica reyna de Inglaterra* (Medina del Campo?, 1554?).

Hales, John, 'An Oration of J. H. to the Queenes maiestie, and delivered to her majestie by a certayne Noble man, at her first entrance to her raigne', in Foxe, *Actes & Monumentes* (1576), pp. 2005–7.

Harrison, Stephen, *The Archs of Triumph Erected in honor of the High and mighty prince James the first* (1604).

Hawes, Stephen, *A Joyfull medytacyon to all Englonde of the coronacyon of our moost naturall soverayne lorde kynge Henry the eyght* (1509).

Hayward, John, *The Beginning of the Reigne of Queene Elizabeth* (1636).

Herbert of Cherbury, Lord, The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth (1649).

Heywood, Thomas, *England's Elizabeth: Her Life and Troubles, During her Minoritie, from the Cradle to the Crowne* (1631).
If you know not me, You know no bodie: or, The troubles of Queene Elizabeth (1606).
Jonson, Ben, *His Part of King James his Royall and Magnificent Enterteinement through his Honorable Cittie of London* (1604).
Knox, John, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous regiment of women* (Geneva, 1558).
Marshall, George, *A compendious treatise in metre declaring the firste originall of Sacrifice, and of the buylding of Aultares and Churches . . . in Englande* (1554).
Mulcaster, Richard, *The First Part of the Elementarie which entreateth chefelie of the right writing of our English tung* (1582).
The Passage of our most drad Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to westminster the day before her coronacion (1558).
The royall passage of her Majesty from the Tower of London, to her palace of White-hall, with all the speaches and devices, both of the pageants and otherwise, together with her Majesties severall answers, and most pleasing speaches to them all (1604).
Spenser, Edmund, *The Faerie Queene, Disposed into twelve books* (1590).
Stopes, Leonard, *An Ave Maria in commendation of our Most vertuous Queene* (1553).
Stow, John, *The Annales of England, faithfully collected out of the most autenticall Authors, Records, and other Monuments of Antiquitie* (1600).
Taverner, Richard, *An Oration gratulatory made upon the joyfull proclayming of the moste noble Princes Quene Mary Quene of Englande* (1553).
Udall, Nicholas, *A discourse or traictise of Petur Martyr Vermilla Florentine, the publyque reader of divinitee in the Universitee of Oxford wherin he openly declared his whole and determinate judgemente concerynynge the Sacrament of the Lordes Supper in the sayde Universitee* (1550?).
The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testamente with a dedicatory preface to Queen Catherine dowager of Henry VIII (1548).
Vertot M. l'Abbé de, ed., *Ambassades de Messieurs de Noailles en Angleterre, 5* vols. (Paris, 1763).
W., T., *A Ninvectyve agaynst Treason* (1553).

SECONDARY PRINTED MATERIAL

This includes editions of early works printed after 1800.

Acts of the Privy Council of England, New Series, II (1547–50) (London, 1890).
Adams, Barry, B., ed., *John Bale's King Johan* (San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1969).

Adamson, John, 'The Tudor and Stuart Courts 1509–1714', in *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under the* Ancien Régime *1500–1750*, ed. Adamson, pp. 95–117.

ed., *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under the* Ancien Régime *1500–1750* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999).

Anglo, Sydney, 'The Coronation of Edward VI and Society of Antiquaries Manuscript 123', *Antiquaries Journal*, 78 (1998), 452–7.

Images of Tudor Kingship (London: Seaby, 1992).

Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997; first published 1969).

Arber, Edward, ed., *An English Garner: Ingatherings from our History and Literature*, 8 vols. (London, 1877–96).

A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 4 vols. (London, 1875–7).

Arnold, Janet, 'The "Coronation" Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I', *Burlington Magazine*, 120 (1978), 727–41.

Auerbach, Erna, *Tudor Artists: A Study of Painters in the Royal Service and of Portraiture on Illuminated Documents from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Elizabeth I* (London: Athlone Press, 1954).

Ayloffe, Joseph, 'An Account of Some Ancient English Historical Paintings at Cowdry, in Sussex', *Archaeologia*, 3 (1786), 239–72.

Bák, János, M., ed., *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press, 1990).

Banks, T. C., *An Historical Account of the Ancient and Modern Forms, Pageantry and Ceremony of the Coronations of the Kings of England* (London, 1820).

Barroll, J. Leeds, Alexander Leggatt, Richard Hosley and Alvin Kernan, *The Revels History of Drama in English,* III (1576–1613) (London and New York: Routledge, 1975; repr. 1996).

Baskervill, Charles Read, ed., *Pierre Gringore's Pageants for the Entry of Mary Tudor into Paris: An Unpublished Manuscript* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).

Bayne, C. G., 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 22 (1907), 650–73.

'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 24 (1909), 322–3.

'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), 550–3.

Beal, Peter and others, comp., *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 5 vols. (London: Mansell Publishing, 1980).

Beauchamp, Earl of, ed., *Liber Regalis* (London: J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1870).

Ben-David, J. and T. N. Clark, eds., *Culture and its Creators: Essays in Honour of Edward Shils* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

Bennett, H. S., *English Books & Readers 1558–1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

Bergeron, David, M., 'Elizabeth's Coronation Entry (1559): New Manuscript Evidence', *English Literary Renaissance*, 8 (1978), 3–8.

English Civic Pageantry 1558–1642 (London: Edward Arnold, 1971).

'Harrison, Jonson, and Dekker: The Magnificent Entertainment for King James (1604)', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 31 (1968), 445–8.

ed., *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1985).

Bernard, G. W., 'Anne Boleyn's Religion', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), 1–20.

Betteridge, Tom, *Literature and Politics in the English Reformation* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004).

Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530–83 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

Bevington, David, 'Drama and Polemics under Queen Mary', *Renaissance Drama*, 9 (1966), 105–24.

Medieval Drama (Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1975).

Bier, A. L., David Cannadine and James M. Rosenheim, eds., *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Binski, Paul, 'The *Liber Regalis*: Its Date and European Context', in *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*, ed. Gordon, Monnas and Elam, pp. 233–46.

Blair, Claude, ed., *The Crown Jewels: The History of the Coronation Regalia in the Jewel House of the Tower of London*, 2 vols. (London: Stationery Office, 1998).

Bloch, Marc, *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France*, trans. J. E. Anderson (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973).

Bowers, Fredson, ed., *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953–61).

Bowers, Roger, 'The Chapel Royal, The First Edwardian Prayer Book, and Elizabeth's Settlement of Religion, 1559', *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), 317–44.

Bradley, Ian, ed., *The Penguin Book of Hymns* (London: Viking, 1989).

Bradner, L., 'A Test for Udall's Authorship', *Modern Language Notes*, 42 (1927), 378–80.

Bray, Gerald, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation* (Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 1994).

Bryant, Lawrence M., *The King and the City in the Parisian Royal Entry Ceremony: Politics, Ritual and Art in the Renaissance* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1986).

Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere (London, 1862–).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Philip and Mary (London, 1937).

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth (1547–80) (London, 1856).

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Milan, 1 (1385–1618) (London, 1912).

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy (London, 1864–).

Cannadine, David, 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820–1977', in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Hobsbawm and Ranger, pp. 101–64.

Cannadine, David and Simon Price, eds., *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Cole, Mary Hill, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999).

Coleman, Christopher and David Starkey eds., *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

Collier, J. P., ed., *Kynge Johan: A Play in Two Parts* (London, 1838).

Collins, A. Jefferies, ed., *Jewels and Plate of Queen Elizabeth I: The Inventory of 1574* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1955).

Collinson, Patrick, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Macmillan, 1988; repr. 1991).

Elizabethan Essays (London and Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1994).

'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', in Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays*, pp. 31–57.

'Windows in a Woman's Soul: Questions about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I', in Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays*, pp. 87–118.

Cotgrave, Randle, *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues, Compiled by Randle Cotgrave, Reproduced From the first Edition, London, 1611* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968).

Cox, John D and David Scott Kastan, eds., *A New History of Early English Drama* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

Cox, J. E., ed., *The Works of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844–6).

Crane, Mary T., '"Video et Taceo": Elizabeth I and the Rhetoric of Counsel', Studies in English Literature, 28 (1988), 1–15.

Cressy, David, 'The Protestant Calendar and the Vocabulary of Celebration in Early Modern England', in Cressy, *Society and Culture in Early Modern England*, pp. 32–52.

'Purification, Thanksgiving and the Churching of Women in Post-Reformation England', in Cressy, *Society and Culture in Early Modern England*, pp. 106–46.

Society and Culture in Early Modern England (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2003).

Davies, W. T., 'A Bibliography of John Bale', in *Oxford Bibliographical Society: Proceedings & Papers,* v (1936–9) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940), pp. 201–79.

Debax, Jean-Paul, '*Respublica*: pièce catholique?', *Caliban*, 24 (1987), 27–47.

DeMolen, Richard, *Richard Mulcaster (c. 1531–1611) and Educational Reform in the Renaissance* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1991).

Dickens A. G., *The English Reformation*, 2nd edn (London: BT Batsford, 1989; first published 1964).

Doran, Susan and Thomas S. Freeman, eds., *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Dowling, Maria, 'Anne Boleyn and Reform', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35 (1984), 30–46.

ed., 'William Latymer's Chronickille of Anne Bulleyne', Camden Miscellany, 30 (London, 1990), 45–65.

Duchhardt, Heinz, Richard A. Jackson and David Sturdy, eds., *European Monarchy: Its Evolution and Practice from Roman Antiquity to Modern Times* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992).

Duff. E. Gordon, *A Century of the English Book Trade* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1905).

Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400–1580* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992).

Edgerton, William., *Nicholas Udall* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1965).

Ellis, Henry, ed., *Hall's Chronicle Containing the History of England, during the Reign of Henry the Fourth, and the Succeeding Monarchs, to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are Particularly Described the Manners and Customs of those Periods*, 2 vols. (London, 1809).

Original Letters Illustrative of English History, 4 vols., 3rd series (London: Richard Bentley, 1846).

Elton, G. R., *Reform and Reformation: England 1509–1558* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977).

ed., *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982; first published 1960).

Elton, W. R. and John M. Mucciolo, eds., *The Shakespearean International Yearbook 2: Where Are We Now in Shakespearean Studies?* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002).

Erasmus, Desiderius, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, trans. Neil M. Cheshire and Michael J. Heath and ed. Lisa Jardine (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Feuillerat, Albert ed., *Documents relating to the Revels at Court in the Time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary* (The Loseley Manuscripts), (Louvain, 1914).

Fletcher, John, 'The Date of the Portrait of Elizabeth I in her Coronation Robes', *Burlington Magazine*, 120 (1978), 753.

Fox, Alistair and John Guy, *Reassessing the Henrician Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500–1550* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).

Freeman, Thomas S., 'Providence and Prescription: The Account of Elizabeth in Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"', in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. Doran and Freeman, pp. 27–55.

Froude, J. A., *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth*, 12 vols. (London, 1856–70).

Frye, Susan, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Furnivall, F. J. and W. R. Morfill, eds., *Ballads from Manuscripts*, 2 vols. (London: Ballad Society, 1868–73).

Geertz, Clifford, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', in *Culture and its Creators*, ed. Ben-David and Clark, pp. 150–71.

The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays, 2nd edn (New York: Basic Books, 2000; first published 1973).

'Politics Past, Politics Present', in Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, pp. 327–41.

Giesey, Ralph, E., *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1960).

Rulership in France, 15th–17th Centuries, Variorum Collected Studies Series (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

Gluck, Florence W. and Alice B. Morgan, eds., *Stephen Hawes: The Minor Poems*, EETS (London: Oxford University Press, 1974).

Goldberg, Jonathan, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983).

ed., *Queering the Renaissance* (Durham, N. C., and London: Duke University Press, 1994).

Gordon, Andrew, 'Performing London: The Map and the City in Ceremony', in *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Gordon and Klein, pp. 69–88.

Gordon, Andrew and Bernard Klein, eds., *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Gordon, Dillian, Lisa Monnas and Caroline Elam, eds., *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych* (London: Harvey Miller, 1997).

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992).

Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

'Resonance and Wonder', in Greenblatt, *Learning to Curse*, pp. 161–83.

'Shakespeare and the Exorcists', in Greenblatt, *Shakespearean Negotiations*, pp. 94–128.

Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

Greene, Thomas M., 'Ceremonial Play and Parody in the Renaissance', in *Urban Life in the Renaissance*, ed. Zimmerman and Weissman, pp. 281–93.

'Ritual and Text in the Renaissance', in *Reading the Renaissance*, ed. Hart, pp. 17–34.
Greg, W. W., ed., *Respublica: An Interlude for Christmas 1553 Attributed to Nicholas Udall, EETS* (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1952).
Grose, Francis, ed., *The Antiquarian Repertory*, 2nd edn, 4 vols. (London, 1807–9; first published 1775).
Guaras, Antonio de, *The Accession of Queen Mary*, ed. and trans. Richard Garnett (London, 1892).
Guy, John, 'Elizabeth I: The Queen and Politics', in *The Shakespearean International Yearbook 2*, ed. Elton and Mucciolo, pp. 183–202.
'The Rhetoric of Counsel in Early Modern England', in *Tudor Political Culture*, ed. Hoak, pp. 292–310.
'Thomas Cromwell and the Intellectual Origins of the Henrician Revolution', in Fox and Guy, *Reassessing the Henrician Age*, pp. 151–78.
Tudor England (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).
Habermas, Jürgen, *Legitimation Crisis*, trans. Thomas McCarthy (London: Heinemann, 1976).
Hackett, Helen, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: Macmillan, 1995).
Haigh, Christopher, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
Happé, Peter, ed., *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1985–6).
Hart, Jonathan, ed., *Reading the Renaissance: Culture, Poetics, and Drama* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1996).
Haugaard, William, 'The Coronation of Elizabeth I', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 19 (1968), 161–70.
Herman, Peter C., ed., *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994).
Highley, Christopher and John, N. King, eds., *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002).
Hoak, Dale, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, and the Transformation of the Tudor Monarchy', in *Westminster Abbey Reformed 1540–1640* ed. Knighton and Mortimer, pp. 114–51.
'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', in *Tudor Political Culture*, ed. Hoak, pp. 54–103.
The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
'A Tudor Deborah? The Coronation of Elizabeth I, Parliament and the Problem of Female Rule', in *John Foxe and his World*, ed. Highley and King, pp. 73–88.
'Two Revolutions in Tudor Government: The Formation and Organization of Mary I's Privy Council', in *Revolution Reassessed*, ed. Coleman and Starkey, pp. 87–115.
ed., *Tudor Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Holinshed, Raphael, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, ed. Abraham Fleming, 6 vols. (London, 1807–8).

Holmes, M. R., 'The Crowns of England', *Archaeologia*, 86 (1936), 73–90.

Hughes, Andrew, 'The Origin and Descent of the Fourth Recension of the English Coronation', in *Coronations*, ed. Bàk, pp. 197–216.

Hughes, Paul L., and James F. Larkin, eds., *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964–9).

Huth, Henry, ed., *Fugitive Tracts Written in Verse*, Series 1 (London, 1875).

Ives, E. W., *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).

The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: The Most Happy (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

'Henry VIII's Will: A Forensic Conundrum', *Historical Journal*, 35 (1992), 779–804.

Jackson, Richard A., *Vive le Roi! A History of the French Coronation from Charles V to Charles X* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984).

James, Mervyn, 'Ritual, Drama and Social Body in the Late Medieval English Town', *Past and Present*, 98 (1983), 3–29.

Jerdan, William, ed., *The Rutland Papers: Original Documents Illustrative of the Courts and Times of Henry VII and Henry VIII*, Camden Society, 21 (London, 1842–3).

Johnston, Alexandra F. and Wim Hüsken, eds., *Civic Ritual and Drama* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997).

Jordan, Constance, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990).

'Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-century British Political Thought', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40 (1987), 421–51.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957; repr. with new preface by William Chester Jordan, 1997).

Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship with a Study of the Music of the Laudes and Musical Transcriptions by Manfred F. Bukofzer (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1946; repr. 1958).

Kastan, David Scott, '"Holy Wurdes" and "Slypper Wit": John Bale's *King Johan* and the Poetics of Propaganda', in *Rethinking the Henrician Era*, ed. Herman, pp. 267–82.

Kernan, Alvin, 'From Ritual to History: The English History Play', in Barroll, Legatt, Hosley and Kernan, *The Revels History of Drama in English*, III, pp. 262–99.

King, John N., *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

Kinney, Arthur F., ed., *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments* (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999).

Kipling, Gordon, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

'"He that Saw It would not Believe It": Anne Boleyn's Royal Entry into London', in *Civic Ritual and Drama*, ed. Johnston and Hüsken, pp. 39–79.

Kisby, Fiona, 'Kingship and the Royal Itinerary: A Study of the Peripatetic Household of the Early Tudor Kings 1485–1547', *Court Historian*, 4 (1999), 29–39.

'"When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485–1547', *Journal of British Studies*, 40 (2001), 44–75.

Knighton, C. S. and Richard Mortimer, eds., *Westminster Abbey Reformed 1540–1640* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

Koebner, Richard, '"The Imperial Crown of this Realm": Henry VIII, Constantine the Great, and Polydore Vergil', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 26 (1953), 29–52.

Lake, Peter with Michael Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002).

Lancashire, Anne, *London Civic Theatre: City Drama and Pageantry from Roman Times to 1558* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Lancashire, Ian, *Dramatic Texts and Records of Britain: A Chronological Topography to 1558* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Leahy, William, 'Propaganda or a Record of Events? Richard Mulcaster's *The Passage Of Our Most Drad Soveraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth Through The Citie Of London Westminster The Daye Before Her Coronacion', Early Modern Literary Studies,* 9.1 (2003) <www.purl.oclc.org/emls/09-1/leahmulc.html>.

Legg, John Wickham, ed., *The Coronation Order of King James I* (London, 1902).

Legg, Leopold G. Wickham, ed., *English Coronation Records* (London: Archibald Constable & Co., 1901).

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII (London, 1862–1932).

Lewis, Ioan, ed., *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross-cultural Studies in Symbolism* (London, New York, San Francisco: Academic Press, 1977).

Lightbrown, Ronald, 'The English Coronation Regalia before the Commonwealth', in *The Crown Jewels*, ed. Blair, i, pp. 257–353.

Loach, Jennifer, *Edward VI*, ed. George Bernard and Penry Williams (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999).

'The Function of Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII', *Past and Present*, 142 (1994), 43–68.

Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

Loades, David, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).

The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England, 1553–58, 2nd edn (London and New York: Longman, 1991; first published 1979).
Logan, Sandra, 'Making History: The Rhetorical and Historical Occasion of Elizabeth Tudor's Coronation Entry', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31 (2001), 251–82.
MacCulloch, Diarmaid, 'Henry VIII and the Reform of the Church', in *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, ed. MacCulloch, pp. 159–80.
'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies*, 30 (1991), 1–19.
Thomas Cranmer: A Life (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996).
Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2001).
ed., *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety* (London: Macmillan, 1995).
ed. and trans., 'The *Vita Mariae Angliae Reginae* of Robert Wingfield of Brantham', Camden Miscellany, 28 (London, 1984), pp. 196–301.
McCoy, Richard, '"Thou Idol Ceremony": Elizabeth I, *The Henriad*, and the Rites of the English Monarchy', in *Urban Life in the Renaissance*, ed. Zimmerman and Weissman, pp. 240–66.
'"The Wonderful Spectacle": The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation', in *Coronations*, ed. Bák, pp. 217–27.
McLaren, Anne, *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: Queen and Commonwealth 1558–1585* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
Malfatti, C. V., ed. and trans., *The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor as related in Four Manuscripts of the Escorial* (Barcelona: C. V. Malfatti, 1956).
Manley, Lawrence, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
Marcus, Leah S., *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and its Discontents* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1988).
Maskell, William, ed., *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882).
Miller, Edwin Shepard, 'The Roman Rite in Bale's *King John*', PMLA, 64 (1949), 802–22.
Monod, Paul Kléber, *The Power of Kings: Monarchy and Religion in Europe 1589–1715* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999).
Montrose, Louis, *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
Moore, Sally F. and Barbara G. Myerhoff, eds., *Secular Ritual* (Assen: Gorcum, 1977).
Muir, Edward, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
Nelson, Janet L., 'The Lord's Anointed and the People's Choice: Carolingian Royal Ritual', in *Rituals of Royalty*, ed. Cannadine and Price, pp. 137–80.

Nichols, J. G., ed., *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London* (London, 1852).

The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Two Years of Queen Mary, and Especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyat Written by a Resident in the Tower of London (London, 1850).

The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London from A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563 (London, 1848).

Literary Remains of King Edward the Sixth, 2 vols. (London, 1857).

The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, 3 vols. (London, 1788–1805).

The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, 3 vols. (London, 1823).

Orgel, Stephen, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1975).

'Making Greatness Familiar', in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. Bergeron, pp. 19–25.

'The Poetics of Spectacle', *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation*, 2 (1971), 367–89.

Osborn, James M., ed., *The Quenes majesties passage through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960).

Pafford, J. H., ed., *King Johan by John Bale* (Oxford: Malone Society Reprints, 1931).

Pettegree, Andrew, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996).

Pittenger, Elizabeth, '"To Serve the Queere": Nicholas Udall, Master of Revels', in *Queering the Renaissance*, ed. Goldberg, pp. 162–89.

Planché, J. R., *Regal Records: Or, A Chronicle of the Coronations of the Queens Regnant of England* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1838).

Pollard, A. F., 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), 125–6.

Pollard, A. W. and G. R. Redgrave, eds., *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475–1640*, 3 vols., 2nd edn, revised by W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson and K. F. Pantzer (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976–91).

Richards, Judith M., 'Mary Tudor as "Sole Quene"? Gendering Tudor Monarchy', *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), 895–924.

Richardson, Glenn, *Renaissance Monarchy: The Reigns of Henry VIII, Francis I and Charles V* (London: Arnold, 2002).

Richardson, H. G., 'The English Coronation Oath', *Speculum*, 23 (1949), 44–75.

Rolls, Albert, *The Theory of the King's Two Bodies in the Age of Shakespeare*, Studies in Renaissance Literature, 19 (Lewiston, Queenston and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000).

Rosador, Kurt Tetzeli Von, 'The Sacralizing Sign: Religion and Magic in Bale, Greene and the Early Shakespeare', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 23 (1993), 30–45.

Ross, G. Lockhart, 'Il Schifanoya's Account of the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 23 (1908), 533–4.
Rothwell, Harry, ed., *English Historical Documents,* III (1189–1327) (London and New York: Routledge, 1996; first published 1975).
Rowse, A. L., *An Elizabethan Garland* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1953).
Rude, Donald W., ed., *A Critical Edition of Sir Thomas Elyot's 'The Boke Named the Governour'* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1992).
Rutledge, Douglas F., '*Respublica*: Rituals of Status Elevation and the Political Mythology of Mary Tudor', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 5 (1991), 55–68.
ed., *Ceremony and Text in the Renaissance* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1996).
Sanders, Nicholas, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, ed. and trans. D. Lewis (London, 1877).
Scarisbrick, J. J., *Henry VIII*, 2nd edn (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997; first published 1968).
Schramm, Percy Ernst, *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. Leopold G. Wickham (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937).
Shakespeare, William, *King Henry V*, ed. T. W. Craik, Arden Shakespeare (London and New York: Routledge, 1995).
Macbeth, ed. Kenneth Muir, Arden Shakespeare (London and New York: Routledge, 1951; repr. 1995).
The Second Part of King Henry IV, ed. A. R. Humphreys, Arden Shakespeare (London and New York: Routledge, 1966; repr. 1996).
Shakespeare, William and John Fletcher, *King Henry VIII (All is True)*, ed. Gordon McMullan (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2000).
Skinner, Quentin, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
Smith, John Hazel, ed. and trans., *Two Latin Comedies by John Foxe the Martyrologist: Titus et Gesippus, Christus Triumphans* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1973).
Smith, Thomas, *De Republica Anglorum*, ed. Mary Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
Smuts, R. Malcolm , 'Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: The English Royal Entry in London, 1485–1642', in *The First Modern Society*, ed. Bier, Cannadine and Rosenheim, pp. 65–93.
Starkey, David, *Elizabeth: Apprenticeship* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2000).
'Henry VI's Old Blue Gown: The English Court under the Lancastrians and Yorkists', *Court Historian*, 4 (1999), 1–28.
The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics (London: George Philip, 1985).
'Representation through Intimacy: A Study in the Symbolism of Monarchy and Court Office in Early-Modern England', in *Symbols and Sentiments*, ed. Lewis, pp. 187–224.
The Statutes of the Realm, 12 vols. (London: Record Commission, 1810–28).

Stevens, Martin and A. C. Cawley, eds., *The Towneley Plays*, 2 vols., EETS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Streitberger, W. R., *Court Revels, 1485–1559* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994).

Strohm, Paul, *Theory and the Premodern Text* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).

Strong, Roy, *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450–1650* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1984).

The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry (London: Thames & Hudson, 1977).

Holbein and Henry VIII (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966).

Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973).

The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography, II: Elizabethan (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995).

Strype, John, *Ecclesiastical Memorials, Relating Chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of it, and the Emergencies of the Church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary I*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1822).

Memorials of Thomas Cranmer, ed. Philip Edward Barnes, 2 vols. (London, 1853).

Sturdy, David J., '"Continuity" versus "Change": Historians and English Coronations of the Medieval and Early Modern Periods', in *Coronations*, ed. Bák, pp. 228–45.

'The Royal Touch in England', in *European Monarchy*, ed. Duchhardt, Jackson and Sturdy, pp. 171–84.

Tanner, Lawrence E., *The Historic Story of the Coronation Ceremony and Ritual* (London: Pitkins, 1952).

Taylor, Arthur, *The Glory of Regality: An Historical Treatise of the Anointing and Crowning of the Kings and Queens of England* (London: Payne and Foss, 1820).

Tennenhouse, Leonard, *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres* (New York and London: Methuen, 1986).

Thomas, A. H. and I. D. Thornley, eds., *The Great Chronicle of London* (London: Corporation of London, 1938).

Thomas, Keith, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971).

Thurley, Simon, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240–1698* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999).

Thurston, Herbert, *The Coronation Ceremonial: Its True History and Meaning* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1902).

Topham, John, 'An Historical and Descriptive Account of the Ancient Painting Preserved at Cowdray in Sussex ... representing the Procession of King Edward VI from the Tower of London to Westminster', *Archaeologia*, 8 (1787), 406–22.

Tudor-Craig, Pamela, 'Henry VIII and King David', in *Early Tudor England*, ed. Williams, pp. 183–205.

Turner, Victor, *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play* (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982).

The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969).

Ullmann, Walter, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship* (London: Methuen, 1969).

'This Realm of England is an Empire', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 30 (1979), 175–203.

Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–IV*, ed. Jeffrey Henderson, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough and rev. by G. P. Goold (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Walker, Greg, *Persuasive Fictions: Faction, Faith and Political Culture in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996).

Plays of Persuasion: Drama and Politics at the Court of Henry VIII (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

The Politics of Performance in Early Renaissance Drama (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

ed., *Medieval Drama: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

Warkentin, Germaine, ed., *The Queen's Majesty's Passage* (Toronto: The Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2004).

Warnicke, Retha M., *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn: Family Politics at the Court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Wasson, John M., 'The English Church as Theatrical Space', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. Cox and Kastan, pp. 25–37.

Weber, Max, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 2001; first published 1930).

Westfall, Suzanne, *Patrons and Performance: Early Tudor Household Revels* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

White, Paul Whitfield *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage and Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Wickham, Glynne, *Early English Stages 1300–1660* (London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980).

Wilentz, Sean, ed., *Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual and Politics since the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985).

Williams, C. H., ed., *English Historical Documents, V (*1485–1558*)*, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1967).

Williams, Daniel, ed., *Early Tudor England: Proceedings of the Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989).

Wilson, H. A., 'The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth', *English Historical Review*, 23 (1908), 87–91.

Winkelman, Michael, A., '*Respublica*: England's Trouble about Mary', *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 33 (2002), 77–98.

Withington, Robert, *English Pageantry: An Historical Outline* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918).
Woolley, Benjamin, *The Queen's Conjuror: The Science and Magic of Dr Dee* (London: HarperCollins, 2001).
Wriothesley, Charles, *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors 1485–1559*, ed. W. D. Hamilton, 2 vols. (London, 1875–7).
Yates, Frances A., *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).
Zimmerman, Susan and Ronald F. E. Weissman, eds., *Urban Life in the Renaissance* (Newark: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1989).

UNPUBLISHED THESES

Gordon, Andrew, 'Civic and Symbolic Space in Representation and Ritual in the Renaissance' (doctoral thesis, University of London, 1999).
Kisby, Fiona, 'The Royal Household Chapel in Early-Tudor London, 1485–1547' (doctoral thesis, University of London, 1996).
Strong, Roy, 'Elizabethan Pageantry as Propaganda' (doctoral thesis, University of London, 1962).

Index

Abraham, Biblical patriarch 28
Actes and Monuments 41, 148, 176
Act in Restraint of Appeals 42, 44, 48, 68
Act of Appeals 45, 47, 49–50, 72
Act of Conditional Restraint of Annates 43–4
Act of Succession (1534) 112
Act of Succession (1536) 112, 113, 147
Act of Succession (1544) 113, 117, 147
Act of Supremacy 123
Act of the Six Articles 81
Act of Uniformity 83, 204
Act of Uniformity, Second 129, 204
Acts of Annates and Appeals 48
Acts of Succession and Supremacy 45
Acts of the Privy Council 78, 80, 91, 95
Adamson, John 4
Anabaptists 99
Anglo, Sydney 7, 8, 17, 19, 63, 84
Annales of John Stow 95
Annales of William Camden 41, 75, 175
Anne of Cleves, Queen of England, wife of Henry VIII 205
anthems, *see* coronation ceremony, anthems in
Arber, Edward 41
Arras, Bishop of 129
Arthur, legendary king 70
Arthur, Prince of Wales, son of Henry VII 18, 66
  and marriage to Katherine of Aragon 36, 57, 61
Arundel, Earl of, *see* Fitzalan, Henry, and Fitzalan, William
Augustus, Roman emperor 71
Ave Maria, An 123–4
Aylmer, John 41, 127, 148–50, 151, 157
  An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes 41, 148–9, 151, 157

Bacon, Nicholas 147
Bainbridge, Christopher, Archbishop of York 23
Bale, John 10, 11, 77–8, 98, 136, 139, 140–1, 176
  The Betrayal by Thomas Becket 98
  The Epistel Exhortatorye 107
  God's Promises 98
  Johan Baptystes Preachynge 98, 108
  King Johan 10, 11, 77–8, 98, 99–110, 112, 136, 139, 140–1, 176
  On the King's Two Marriages 98
  A mystereye of inyquyte 107
  The Temptation of our Lord 98
Bancroft, Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury 21
bath, ritual 24
Beaufort, Margaret, mother of Henry VII 70
Becket, *see* Thomas Becket
Bedford, Earl of, John Russell 114
Bergeron, David 160
Berthelet, Thomas, king's printer 60, 65
Betrayal by Thomas Becket, The 98
Betteridge, Tom 42
Bevington, David 139, 140–1
Binski, Paul 21
'Bishops' Book' 81, 82–3
Boke Named the Governour, The 54, 137
Boleyn, Anne, Queen of England, wife of Henry VIII 96, 165
  coronation of 1, 10, 19, 76, 79, 86, 93, 112, 125, 129, 113–33, 158, 159, 164, 173, 174, 175
  dramatisation of coronation of 177
  marriage of 45, 59, 98, 112, 117
  pregnancy of 10, 39, 52, 57, 59
  as second Eve 123
  as type of Virgin Mary 66–8
Book of Common Prayer 83, 129
Bosworth Field 12, 16, 17
Bowers, Roger 155
Buckingham, Duke of, *see* Edward Stafford

Calendar of the Patent Rolls 132
Calvinists 147–8
Camden, William 41, 75, 147, 175
  Annales 41, 75, 175

Capello, Carlo, Venetian ambassador 56, 58, 59
Carew, George, Dean of the Chapel Royal 151, 154–5
Cawood, John, printer 164
Cecil, William 21, 155, 156–7, 198
ceremonial texts, printed 60–3, 147–59, 160–1, 175
champion, king's 36
Chapuys, Eustace, imperial ambassador 41, 53, 58, 59, 63
Charlemagne, Frankish Emperor 13–15
Charles I, King of England 26
Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor 43, 58, 63, 65, 66, 88, 114, 130
Cherbury, Lord Herbert of 59, 61
Cholmley, Ranulph, recorder of City of London 166
Christopherson, John 123
Christus Triumphans 108–9
  see also Foxe, John
'Chronickille of Anne Bulleyne' of William Latymer 41
Chronicle at large, A 16, 17, 94
Cinque Ports, Barons of 23, 165
Collectanea 64
Collinson, Patrick 136–7, 150
Commendone, G. F., papal despatch 112–13, 119, 131, 132
Compendious treatise in metre, A 123
Constantine, Roman Emperor 50, 70, 71
Cornwallis, Thomas 114
coronation ceremony
  in ancient Rome 12
  anointing (unction) in 3, 5–7, 10, 11–14, 14–16, 18, 27–9, 30, 31, 40–64, 85, 86–7, 94, 129, 130, 132, 133, 156, 173, 183
  anthems in 6, 19, 27, 28, 32
  in Byzantium 12, 13
  celebration of mass in 26, 32–3, 129, 151
  clothing of 22, 24, 28–9, 30–1, 33, 40–64, 95, 131–2, 158–9
  continuity of 4–6
  in Denmark 4
  Devices 21–2, 22–38, 47, 53, 79, 84, 91, 131, 132, 151, 153
  fealty and homage in 20, 32, 90, 133
  in France 12, 74
  Frankish origins of 12
  medieval influence on 4, 6, 10, 12
  oath of monarch in 14, 19, 20, 26–7, 33, 39, 47–50, 77, 84, 85, 88, 93, 94, 128, 131, 146, 155–6
  order of 13
  prayers in 27, 29, 30, 31–3, 47, 88
  regalia of 5–7, 10, 16, 19, 20–1, 24–5, 29–30, 31, 51–3, 87, 93–4, 130–2,
  see also St Edward's chalice; St Edward's crown
  as sacrament 15
  as sacred rite 3, 13–19
  sermons in 84, 93
  in Scotland 4
  in Spain 4, 12, 92
  in Sweden 4, 12
  as symbolic drama 2–3, 84
  as symbol of legitimacy 16–18, 111–23, 149
Coronation of Queen Elizabeth . . . The 161
Coronation of the Virgin, The 66
Courtenay, Edward, Earl of Devon 123
Cranmer, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury 45, 51, 52, 99, 177
  authority of 51
  consecration as archbishop of 46
  coronation sermon for Edward VI of 77, 80, 84, 92, 93, 97, 98, 100, 101, 110, 118, 136, 169, 173, 175
  imprisonment of 131
  as member of Edward VI's Privy Council 78–80, 93
  and Reformation 83, 115
  role in coronation ceremonies of 10, 16, 40, 51, 56, 59, 77, 79, 81, 84, 94, 130, 157
  role in Henry VIII's divorces of 40, 43, 44
  trial of 45–7
Cressy, David 121
Cromwell, Thomas 40, 44, 64, 65, 98, 120
crown, Queen Edith's 186
crown, queen's state 185–6
crowns, imperial 33, 34, 52, 68–71, 72, 92, 93, 97, 118, 121, 130, 132, 158
Croxton Play of the Sacrament, The 106–7

David, Biblical king 28, 101, 132, 133
Day, George, Bishop of Chichester 132
Day, John, printer 120
Deborah, biblical ruler 148–9, 166, 168, 169–70, 171–2, 175
de Courrieres, Monsieur, imperial ambassador 200
Dee, John 157–8
de Feria, Count, Spanish ambassador 152, 154
Dekker, Thomas 172
De Republica Anglorum 150
de Thoulouse, Monsieur, imperial ambassador 200
De Vera Obedientia 40
Devon, Earl of, Henry Courtenay 23

de Worde, Wynkyn 10, 39, 58, 60, 61, 62, 95, 97, 159, 160, 164, 175
see also *The Noble tryupmphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne*
Dictionary of sir Thomas Eliot knyght 29, 31
Dispensations Act of 1534 41
divine right of kings 12, 13, 19, 22, 37, 50, 88, 89, 139, 150
Don, Alan C., Dean of Westminster 5
drama, Elizabethan 2
see also plays, accession; procession pageants
Ducket, Lionel, Lord Mayor of London 163
Dudley, Guildford, husband of Lady Jane Grey 113
Dudley, John, *see* Northumberland, Duke of
Dudley, Robert, Earl of Leicester 157
Dunstable Priory 44
Dunstan, St, Archbishop of Canterbury 13
Dymoke, Robert, king's champion 36

Edgar, King of England 13
Education of a Christian Prince, The 55
Edward the Confessor, St, King of England 15, 23, 24, 27, 52, 96, 97
coronation of 54
see also St Edward's chalice; St Edward's crown; St Edward's Shrine
Edward I, King of England 13, 26, 48, 187
Edward II, King of England 13, 19, 26
Edward VI, King of England 18, 65, 106, 113, 116, 129, 134–5, 143, 155
coronation oath of 48, 77, 85, 88–9, 94, 128, 157
coronation of 1, 3, 10, 16, 48, 52, 76, 77–98, 110, 111, 118, 130, 132, 135, 146, 158, 169, 173, 174, 175
death and funeral of 112, 113, 118, 130
and *King Johan* 99–101
and Lady Jane Grey 112, 113
proclamation as king of 89–90, 112, 118, 119
revisions to coronation ceremony of 77, 91–3
succession of 112
supremacy of 117, 124
as Supreme Head of the English Church 77, 78, 124, 146
will of 117, 124, 125
Edward Stafford, Duke of Buckingham 23, 24
Elizabeth I, Queen of England 9, 10, 41, 75, 99, 100, 127, 177
birth of 75
coronation mass of 151–5
coronation oath of 146, 155–6
coronation of 1–11, 52, 60, 75, 94, 111, 136, 141, 145, 146–76, 195
dramatisation of christening of 177
illegitimacy of 112–13, 204
portrait of 158–72, 178
proclamation as queen of 146–7
as queen in Parliament 149–51, 168, 169, 175
succession of 43, 117
Elizabeth II, Queen of England 5
Elizabeth, daughter of James I, wife of Frederick V, Elector Palatine 177
Elizabeth of York, Queen of England, wife of Henry VII 21, 57, 165
Elton, G. R. 115
Ely, Bishop of, James Stanley 23
Elyot, Thomas 54–5, 137
The Boke Named the Governour 54, 137
England's Elizabeth 41, 75, 161
Epistel Exhortatorye, The 107
Erasmus, Desiderius 55–6, 65, 88, 133
Essex, Earl of, Henry Bourchier 23, 30
Exeter, Bishop of, Hugh Oldham 23
Exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion, An 123

Fabyan's *Chronicle* 119
Faerie Queene, The 175
falcon, allegory of 69, 72, 73, 96
Fénelon, La Mothe, French ambassador 153
Field of Cloth of Gold, painting 19, 54
First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous regiment of women, The 127, 147–8
Fitzalan, Henry, Earl of Arundel 114–17, 126
Fitzalan, William, Earl of Arundel 23
Fitzwilliam, Earl 12
Fletcher, John 41, 176
Floures for Latine Spekynge 65
Foxe, Edward, Bishop of Hereford 43
Foxe, John 41, 108–9, 130, 148, 151, 161, 162, 176
Frances, daughter of Mary Tudor 127
Francis I, King of France 61, 66
funerals, royal 20

Gardiner, Stephen, Bishop of Winchester 40, 127, 130, 134
and divorce of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon 40
and role in coronations 40, 126, 158
Geertz, Clifford 8
gender, as problem in succession 123–4, 147–51
Giesey, Ralph 6, 9
Glasse of the truthe, A 43, 50
God's Promises 98
Godwyn, Francis, Bishop of Hereford 43
Gough, John, bookseller 61
Grafton, Richard 16, 17, 94, 163, 171–2, 197
A Chronicle at large 16, 17, 94
Greenblatt, Stephen 2

Greene, Thomas M. 2
Greg, W. W. 134–5
Grey, Lady Jane 112, 113, 115–19
Gringore, Pierre 61
Grosseteste, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln 15, 16
Guy, John 9, 42, 43, 137, 150–1

Hackett, Helen 3, 42
Hadrian I, Pope 13
Haigh, Christopher 115
Hales, John 148, 150, 151, 157, 162, 175
Hall, Edward 18, 19, 22, 31, 34, 35, 52, 62, 63, 68
Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes, An 41, 148–9, 151, 157
Hawes, Stephen 36–8, 60
Hawkins, Nicholas, Archdeacon of Ely 51, 59
Hayward, John 163
Heath, Nicholas, Archbishop of York 154
Helena, mother of Emperor Constantine 70
Henry I, King of England 127
Henry II, King of England 14, 16
Henry III, King of England 13, 15, 54
Henry IV, King of England 16, 17
2 *Henry IV* 175
Henry V, King of England 68, 70
  see also King Henry V
Henry VI, King of England 5, 96
  accession of 78
  coronation of 12
Henry VII, King of England 12, 19, 31, 53, 68, 70, 165
  accession of 22, 147
  coronation of 15, 21–2, 57
Henry VIII, King of England 10, 65, 81, 98, 99, 100, 116, 117, 165
  and acts of succession 112–13, 124, 127
  as Christ-like king 68, 71
  coronation oath of 19, 26–7, 33, 39, 47–50, 85, 88–9
  coronation of 1, 2, 10, 12, 18–33, 47, 52, 54, 57, 93, 153
  and coronation of Anne Boleyn 51, 53, 59–60
  death of 78, 89–106, 125
  Devices of 22–38, 47, 79, 84, 91, 153
  divorce of Katherine of Aragon by 40, 43–5
  funeral of 80, 83
  as head of Church of England 40, 43–7
  jurisdiction of 48–51
  marriage to Anne Boleyn 45, 69, 117
  marriage to Katherine of Aragon 117, 204
  paintings of 54
  supremacy of 4, 40, 42–51, 65, 106, 125
  will of 78, 113, 117, 130, 202
Henry, Prince of Wales, son of James I 177
Herbert, William, *see* Pembroke, Earl of
Heywood, Thomas 41, 75, 161–2, 176
  England's Elizabeth 41, 75, 161
  If you know not me, You know no bodie . . . 176
Hilles, Richard 163, 164
Hilliard, Nicholas 158
Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth, The, see Annales of William Camden
Hoak, Dale 40, 48, 68, 80, 84, 92, 116, 126, 156–7
Holbein, Hans 69, 70
Holinshed, Raphael 24, 36, 94, 130, 131, 161
Howard, Thomas, Duke of Norfolk 64
Howard, Thomas, Earl of Surrey (then 2nd Duke of Norfolk), *see* Surrey, Earl of

If you know not me, You know no bodie . . . 176
Il Schifanoya, Mantuan envoy 152, 154, 155, 165
Imperial Majesty, character in *King Johan* 99, 100–1, 106, 110, 141
Ives, Eric 40, 60, 63

James I, King of England, as James VI, King of Scotland 177
  coronation of 4, 6, 20, 157, 159, 172, 174
James II, King of England 19, 161
Johan Baptystes Preachynge 98, 108
John, King of England 100
  see also John Bale's *King Johan*
John the Baptist 108
Jonson, Ben 172
Joshua, Biblical patriarch 28
Josiah, Biblical king 87, 88, 98, 175
Joyfull medytacyon to all Englonde . . ., A 60
Judah, Biblical patriarch 15
Judith, Biblical character 127
Jugge, Richard, printer 164

Kantorowicz, Ernst 13, 14
Kastan, David Scott 89–106
Katherine of Aragon, Queen of England, wife of Henry VIII 41, 54
  as character in *King Henry VIII (All is True)* 177
  clothing of 23, 31
  coronation of 19, 32–6, 37, 52, 153
  crown of 53
  divorce of 19, 40, 44–5
  entry procession of 36, 57, 61, 65, 66
  marriage of 18, 117, 204
Kent, Earl of, Richard Grey 23, 24
King Henry V 1
King Henry VIII (All is True) 41, 176
King Johan 10, 11, 77–8, 98, 99–110, 112, 136, 139, 140–1, 176

King, John 42
King's Bench 23
'King's Book' 83
'king's two bodies', concept of 6, 173
Kipling, Gordon 35, 42, 64, 65, 71
Kisby, Fiona 4
Knights of the Bath 23, 34, 56, 59
Knox, John 124, 127, 147–9
  The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous regiment of women 127, 147–8, 169

Langton, Stephen, monk 103, 104
Latymer, William 41, 75
Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury 157
Leahy, William 160
Legg, Leopold Wickham 5
Leland, John 10, 39, 58, 63, 40–65, 73, 175
Lentree de tresexcellente Princesse dame marie dangleterre 61
Levi, Biblical priest 15
Liber Regalis 5, 6, 10, 16, 19–24, 25, 26, 28, 30–3, 35, 47, 50, 51, 85, 91, 93, 94, 127, 156, 158
  translation into English of 6, 28, 172, 174
Lily, William 64
Litlyngton, Nicholas, Abbot of Westminster 20
Litlyngton ordo 20
Loach, Jennifer 19, 80, 115
Loades, David 115
London, Corporation of 159
  records of 182
Louis XII, King of France 61
Lydgate, John 197

McCoy, Richard 2–3, 7–8, 153, 160
MacCulloch, Diarmaid 42, 48, 83–4
Machyn, Henry 114–15, 121
McLaren, Anne 151
Maner of the tryumphe at Caleys and Bulleyn, The 61
Manley, Lawrence 63, 74
Margaret, Queen of Scotland, wife of James IV 113
Marshall, George 123
Martyr, Peter 134
Mary I, Queen of England 6, 9, 65, 100, 151, 155, 157, 175
  associations with tyranny 148, 150
  coronation oath of 128, 131, 195
  coronation of 1, 3, 11, 52, 65, 94, 128–33, 146, 150, 158, 170, 173, 174, 175
  death of 146
  Device of 131, 132
  entry into Paris 61, 74
  marriage of 128, 132, 135, 163
  motto of 170
  proclamation of legitimacy of 112
  succession of 43, 98, 111, 147
  as Supreme Head of the Church of England 111, 124, 129, 146
  as symbol of Virgin Mary 123, 127
Mary Tudor, Queen of France, wife of Louis XII, and wife of Duke of Suffolk 113, 127
Matilda, Empress 127
Miller, E. S. 103
Monod, Paul Kléber 3, 12
Moore, Sally 174
More, Thomas 45, 46
Moses, Biblical patriarch 28
Mulcaster, Richard 60, 197, 146, 158–72, 173, 176
  see also The Quenes majesties passage
Myerhoff, Barbara 174
Mystereye of inyquyte, A 107

Nathan, Biblical prophet 28
Nichols, J. G. 41
Ninvectyve agaynst Treason, A 119, 139
Noble tryupmphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne . . . The 10, 39, 42, 51, 56, 58, 59–63, 71, 72, 74, 95, 97, 159, 175
Northumberland, Duke of, John Dudley 78, 112, 113, 114, 115, 119, 121

Of the tryumphe, and the verses that Charles themperour . . . 61
Oglethorpe, Owen, Bishop of Carlisle 151, 154, 156–8
Oldham, Hugh, *see* Exeter, Bishop of
On the King's Two Marriages 98
Oration gratulatory . . . An 120–3, 138, 175
Order of Communion (1548) 155
'Ordo of St Dunstan' 13, 50

Pafford, J. H. 99
Paget, William 115
  as councillor of Edward VI 78, 116
paintings, coronation 53–4, 158–72
  see also Field of Cloth and Gold, painting
Pandulphus, Cardinal 100, 103, 104, 105
papacy, Roman 40–1, 42, 64–5, 109, 125, 129, 143, 176
  authority of 43–4, 45, 48, 85–6, 100–4, 106
Paraphrases upon the New Testament 65, 88, 133
Parliament of England, jurisdiction of 17, 43–4, 45, 48, 83, 127–9, 133, 135, 143
  primacy of 27, 48, 117–18, 127
  and succession of Elizabeth I 149–51
  and succession of Mary I as queen 111, 113, 120, 122–6, 132, 133

Parr, Katherine, Queen of England, wife of Henry VIII 133
Paul III, Pope 85
Paulet, William, Marquis of Winchester 78, 114
Pecocke, Stephen, Mayor of London 57
Pembroke, Earl of, William Herbert 114, 115, 116, 126
Penning, Henry, secretary to Cardinal Pole 119, 128, 129
Pepin, Frankish King 13
Peter de Blois 15
Petre, William 126
Philip II, King of Spain 115, 152
  marriage to Mary I of 128, 135, 143, 163
plays 160, 173, 175
  accession 1, 9, 10
  Corpus Christi 106
  post-coronation 77
  Towneley cycle 108
  see also individual titles of plays
Pole, Cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury 119, 123, 127, 128, 129, 154
Privy Council,
  of Edward VI 78–80, 83, 88, 89, 90, 92–3, 97, 110, 112, 113, 115, 126, 143, 175
  of Elizabeth I 149–50, 155
  of Henry VIII 126
  of Mary I 111, 116, 119, 124–7, 128–9, 132–4, 135, 143–4, 175
procession pageants 1, 7–10, 36, 136, 173, 175
  of Anne Boleyn 39–40, 42, 62–74, 96, 146
  of Edward VI 95–8, 163
  of Elizabeth I 146, 160, 161, 162, 173
  water 56–7, 60, 63
processions 173
  of Anne Boleyn 33, 36, 39–40, 42, 62–74, 95, 96, 136, 146, 166
  of Edward VI 81, 94, 95–7
  of Elizabeth I 7, 11, 159–72, 175, 176
  of Henry VIII 21, 34–6
  of Mary I 131, 136, 158
  of queen consort 31
proclamations, of accession 89–90, 93, 146–7, 173
  of legitimacy 112
Pynson, Richard, printer 61

Quenes majesties passage, The 11, 60, 146, 150, 159–72, 176
  see also Mulcaster, Richard

Ralph Roister Doister 134
Recognition, 25–6, 36, 77, 84, 88, 91–3, 132
Reformation, English
  and accession of Anne Boleyn 40–2
  and changes to religious ceremonies 84
  and coronation ceremonies 2, 3, 5, 14, 21, 39, 40, 48, 146, 151–5, 176
Renard, Simon, imperial ambassador 115, 129, 131, 200
Respublica 10, 11, 65, 111, 133–45, 146, 169, 175, 176
Richard II, King of England 16, 26
  coronation of 25
  procession of 66
Richard III, King of England 16, 21–2, 53
Richards, Judith 127
Robinson, Francis 163
Rolls, Albert 2
Russell, John, *see* Bedford, Earl of
Rutledge, Douglas 139
Ryalle Book 5, 31, 57, 58, 66

St Edward's chalice 23, 24, 52
St Edward's crown 23, 24, 25, 29–30, 32, 52, 54, 68, 93, 132, 158
St Edward's Shrine 33
St Paul's Cathedral 17, 58, 95
  Churchyard of 60, 66, 166
  Gate of 66, 68, 70, 71, 75
Samuel, Biblical prophet 28
Sanders, Nicholas 41
Scheyfve, Jehan, imperial ambassador 200
Schramm, Percy Ernst 4, 5, 84, 86, 92
Settlement of Religion 155
Seymour, Edward, Earl of Hertford, Duke of Somerset, Lord Protector 78, 80, 91, 93, 94, 113
Seymour, Jane, Queen of England, wife of Henry VIII 96
  coronation of 43
  marriage of 112
Shakespeare, William
  2 *Henry IV* 175
  King Henry V 1, 2, 41
  King Henry VIII (All is True) 41, 176
Shrewsbury, Earl of
  Francis Talbot 114
  George Talbot 23, 24
Smith, Thomas 150
Solomon, Biblical king 28, 100, 101
Somerset, Duke of, *see* Seymour, Edward
Southwell, Richard 114
Southwood, William, goldbeater 54
Spenser, Edmund 175
Stanley, James, *see* Ely, Bishop of
Stanley, Thomas, Earl of Derby 16, 17
Starkey, David 3, 161
Stokesley, John, Bishop of London 40
Stow, John 95

Strohm, Paul 6, 16, 25, 153
Strong, Roy 7
Sturdy, David 16, 17
Supplication of the Commons against the Ordinaries 44
Surrey, Earl of, Thomas Howard 23, 24

Talbot, Francis, *see* Shrewsbury, Earl of
Talbot, George, *see* Shrewsbury, Earl of
Taverner, Richard 120, 138, 175
  An Oration gratulatory . . . 120–3, 138, 175
Temptation of our Lord, The 98
Ten Articles 81–2
Thomas Becket, St, Archbishop of Canterbury 14, 16, 98
Throckmorton, Nicholas 116
Tiepolo, Paulo, Venetian ambassador 152, 154
Tottel, Richard 159, 160, 164
Traduction & mariage of the princesse, The 61
Tregonwell, John 44
Tudor-Craig, Pamela 48

Udall, Nicholas 10, 11, 39, 40–64, 88, 111, 112–22, 133–5, 137, 146, 163, 164, 169, 175, 176
  Floures for Latine Spekynge 65
  Paraphrases upon the New Testament 65, 88, 133
  Ralph Roister Doister 134
  Respublica 10, 11, 65, 111, 133–45, 146, 169, 175, 176
Ullmann, Walter 47, 48, 50

Van der Delft, François, imperial ambassador 80–1, 95
'Veni Creator Spiritus' 27, 32, 94, 96
Victoria, Queen of England 12, 14
Virgil, Roman poet 71, 72
Virgin Mary 16, 62, 66, 68, 71, 95, 123, 124, 127, 136

Walker, Greg 100, 135
Warham, William, Archbishop of Canterbury 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 44
Warnicke, Retha 40
Westminster Abbey 155–6
  abbot of 23, 28, 31, 33, 52, 56, 61
  coronation services in 7, 18–21, 25, 39, 40–52, 54, 56, 63, 71, 77, 91, 126, 153, 160, 173
  processions to 18, 25, 40, 56, 57, 60, 79, 131, 158, 175
Westminster Hall (Palace) 24, 46, 54, 62, 69, 90, 95, 166
  coronation banquets at 34, 51, 94
  procession from 23, 52, 158
  robing at 22, 158
  see also Whitehall palace
White, Paul Whitfield 106
Whitehall palace 19, 53, 54
  see also Westminster Hall
Winchester, cathedral 127
Woolley, Benjamin 158
Wriothesley, Charles, *see Wriothesley's Chronicle*
Wriothesley's Chronicle 18, 45, 90, 94, 95, 125
Wyatt, Thomas, the younger 132

Zadok, Biblical priest 28