

MAKING THE METROPOLIS MONARCHICAL: ELIZABETH'S INNOVATION IN THE URBAN SPHERE

Amanda Terrell

The morning of 10 July 1561 was probably like any other summer morning in London. The metropolis must have been bustling with business early; however, normal business of the day soon yielded to intents of the Crown. At noon, Elizabeth I sailed down the Thames towards the Tower of London. The queen had official business at her Mint. The specific reasons for Elizabeth's visit are unknown. What is known, however, is that she toured the Mint and distributed gold pieces to her hosts and entourage. Recipients included the Marquis of Northampton and Lord Hunsdon. Elizabeth's activities inside the Tower took the whole day. She did not emerge from the Tower until five o'clock in the evening. Instead of returning to her barge on the Thames Elizabeth left through Iron-gate and processed through London by litter. This was no ordinary commute. The Queen was "attended in great state."¹ Her progress included, all on horseback, "trumpeters, the Gentlemen Pensioners, the Heralds of Arms, the Serjeants at Arms, then Gentlemen, then Lords, and the Lord Hunsdon bearing the sword immediately before the Queen; after the Queen was the Ladies."² The procession took Elizabeth through the city. She started over Tower Hill, to Aldgate, to Houndsditch, to Spittle, to Hog Lane and ending at Charterhouse. Undoubtedly Londoners noticed their queen's presence. How could a person miss the long train of nobles

Amanda Terrell of Danville, Illinois is a graduate student in history and a member of Phi Alpha Theta. She wrote this paper, while an undergraduate at Eastern Illinois University, as her departmental honors thesis, under the direction of Dr. Newton Key, in the Spring of 2006.

¹John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth: Among Which Are Interspersed Other Solemnities, Public Expenditures, And Remarkable Events, During The Reign of That Illustrious Princess, Collected From Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, Illustrated With Historical Notes* (London: John Nichols and Son, 1823), 1: 91.

²Ibid.

escorted with the sound of trumpets? The question that must be raised is this, was this public behavior typical of Elizabeth? Moreover, was this behavior common among other monarchs? Did Elizabeth, or other monarchs, use the metropolis? In other words was the city manipulated in order to achieve royal goals? And if so, what were those goals? This work will seek to uncover Elizabeth's relationship with London and its citizens, both elites and commoners. Was Elizabeth innovative in this public sphere? Were public actions consistent throughout her forty-four year reign? Did she vary her interactions between elite and commoners? Finally, how was Elizabeth's interaction with London similar or different from that of her predecessor, Mary I, or of successor, James VI and I? For the comparative question one must ascertain Mary's and James's relationship with the metropolis as well, although, at present, information on these topics is sparse. Despite the abundant research on Elizabeth and London individually there has been little research on the two as a whole, though many historians touch on Elizabeth's interaction with London in other writings.

Biographies are the richest form of writings on Elizabeth; despite the focus on the personal, some offer pertinent information on Elizabeth's broader relationship with London. Carolly Erickson, in *The First Elizabeth*, provides a lot of information on Elizabeth and London. Erickson records, in detail, Elizabeth's formal entrance into the city as well as her coronation procession. In addition to Elizabeth's feelings about London and its citizens, Erickson relays the reaction of the people to Elizabeth's presence in the city.³ Another older, but still classic, biography of Elizabeth is *Queen Elizabeth* by J.E. Neale. In this book, Neale goes into great detail describing Elizabeth's coronation procession, a crucial interaction between a sovereign and subjects.⁴ Jasper Ridley, author of *Elizabeth I: The Shrewdness of Virtue*, describes the crowd's reception of Elizabeth

³Carolly Erickson, *The First Elizabeth* (New York: Summit, 1983), 122, 168, 177-78.

⁴J.E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1934), 58-62.

and, also, where Elizabeth resided when she was in or around London.⁵

More specialized articles or monographs highlight Elizabeth's interaction with London more directly. Richard C. McCoy, in "'The Wonderful Spectacle: The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation,'" portrays Elizabeth's coronation procession as a "performance" and, furthermore, discusses her motives for her public behavior. McCoy also expounds on Elizabeth's involvement with her procession. This proves important because it shows Elizabeth's desire to personally construct her public image.⁶ Sandra Logan's article, "Making History: The Rhetorical and Historical Occasion of Elizabeth Tudor's Coronation Entry," analyzes the primary sources that detail Elizabeth's coronation procession, a ceremony vital for any monarch to establish a rapport with the people and city.⁷ Maintaining good relations with her people was important to Elizabeth. Tarnya Cooper, in her article, "Queen Elizabeth's Public Face," relays other ways Elizabeth remained visible to her subjects and, thus, retained her people's favor. Cooper specifically discusses Elizabeth's regulation of her portraiture. This pertains to London because urban dwellers were much more likely to own a portrait of Elizabeth than their rural counterparts.⁸

Mary Hill-Cole, in a book explicitly devoted to the rural progresses of Elizabeth, entitled, *The Portable Queen*, does pay attention as well to Elizabeth's experiences in the metropolis—London—in order to compare these with Elizabeth's rural

⁵Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I: The Shrewdness of Virtue* (New York: Viking, 1988), 76.

⁶Richard C. McCoy, "'The Wonderful Spectacle: The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I and the Troublesome Coronation,'" in *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, ed. Janos M. Bak (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 217-227, 218.

⁷Sandra Logan, "Making History: The Rhetorical and Historical Occasion of Elizabeth Tudor's Coronation Entry," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31, no. 2 (2001): 251-282.

⁸Tarnya Cooper, "Queen Elizabeth's Public Face," *History Today* 53, no. 5 (2003): 41.

travels.⁹ Ian Dunlap wrote *Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I*, in which he describes in detail Elizabeth's palaces. This proves relevant to a study on Elizabeth and London because Elizabeth had many palaces in and around London. These include: Greenwich, just east of London on the Thames; Whitehall, on the Thames, technically in Westminster; Richmond, southwest of London on the Thames; and Hampton Court, further south than Richmond and also situated on the Thames.¹⁰ In understanding where Elizabeth resided, why and when she occupied the palaces, and what kind of activity the palaces could accommodate, one can learn a lot about Elizabeth's relationship with London.

Other historians write about Elizabeth's interaction with London and her people while covering a totally different topic. This occurs because of the breadth of Elizabeth's reign. For example, books on the Spanish Armada allude to Elizabeth's public persona. Books on the Armada that mention Elizabeth's interaction with London include: *The Armada*, by Garrett Mattingly; *The Spanish Armada*, by Colin Martin and Geoffrey Parker; and *The Confident Hope of a Miracle: The True History of the Spanish Armada*, by Neil Hanson. Each of these books discusses the procession in which Elizabeth participated to celebrate England's victory over Spain. The procession took Elizabeth through London to St. Paul's where there was a victory service.¹¹

⁹Mary Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 8, 18-32.

¹⁰Ian Dunlop, *Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I* (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1962), map on inside cover. Dunlop does not give the exact distance of each palace from London. Also, Dunlop excludes Somerset House and St. James Palace both within the London and Westminster city limits. However, all the palaces he references are in the Thames River Valley, therefore, one can conclude that each palace was within one day's journey to and from London.

¹¹Garrett Mattingly, *The Armada* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959), 396; Colin Martin and Geoffrey Parker, *The Spanish Armada*, rev. ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 236-237; Neil Hanson, *The Confident Hope of a Miracle: The True History of the Spanish Armada* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 383-386.

Although these various works mention Elizabeth's relations with London, no work has devoted itself entirely to this relationship; furthermore, none assesses Elizabeth's possible innovations in this sphere. Before one can develop such a study, however, one must fully understand the models available to Elizabeth for royal interaction with the metropolis. Likewise, one must understand the impact Elizabeth had on future monarchs and their relations with London. Therefore, one should look at Elizabeth's predecessor, Mary I, and successor, James VI and I, and their respective interaction with London and its citizens. Like previous work done on Elizabeth, information pertaining to Mary and James in London tends to be buried in various sources.

The majority of writings on Mary I take the form of biographies or more generic writings on the Tudor dynasty. Extensive biographies on Mary I include: *Mary: The First Queen of England*, by J.M. Stone; and *Mary Tudor*, by H.F.M. Prescott. Both of these books describe the life of Mary I in abundant detail; therefore, they reference when Mary was in London and her relationship with the city. For instance, both devote a significant amount of attention to Wyatt's Rebellion during which Mary entrenched in London and rallied the people with a speech.¹² Penry Williams wrote *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* about the reigns of Mary I and her half siblings, Edward VI and Elizabeth I, including much information about her interaction with London. For example, Williams describes how London played a significant role in Lady Jane Grey's attempt to steal Mary's throne. In addition, Williams tells how Mary eventually entered the city triumphantly.¹³ Dale Hoak authored a brief article entitled "The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, and the Transformation of the Tudor Monarchy." In this work Hoak portrays the changes that

¹²For a thorough discussion on Wyatt's Rebellion, see H.F.M Prescott, *Mary Tudor* (New York: MacMillan, 1953), 239-254, and J.M. Stone, *Mary: The First Queen of England* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1901), 275-292.

¹³For more detail, see Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 82-87.

occurred in each of the coronation ceremonies and procession, as well as the people's reaction to the events.¹⁴ During the coronation procession the monarch rode through London to Westminster; thus, it was important to both the city and citizens. Mary's interaction with London appears to be crucial and complicated; nonetheless as with Elizabeth, in order to determine Mary's relationship with London, one must sift through a variety of sources.

Many historians have attempted to answer the question of why James VI and I detested the public pomp and pageantry that accompanied monarchy. James's attitude towards his public duties most likely affected his relationship with London. In order to understand the relationship one has to look at the many sources dedicated to James's life and reign. There are many biographies on James, some include: *James I*, by Christopher Durston; *King James*, by Pauline Croft; *The Cradle King: The Life of James VI and I, The First Monarch of a United Great Britain*, by Alan Stewart; and *King James VI and I*, by D. Harris Wilson. All of these books discuss James's dislike for the public side of his office and the people's reaction to his aloofness.¹⁵ Moreover, Stewart provides detail of James' formal entrance into the city in addition to his coronation procession.¹⁶ James's interaction with London was peculiar and different from Elizabeth's. Judith M. Richards, in "The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender, and the Personal Monarchy of England," compares and contrasts James's and Elizabeth's public appearances. Furthermore, Richards discusses how the public perceived both Elizabeth and James and how

¹⁴Dale Hoak, "The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, and the Transformation of the Tudor Monarchy," in *Westminster Abbey Reformed: 1540-1640*. ed by C.S. Knighton and Richard Mortimer (Burlington: Ashgate, 2003), 114-151.

¹⁵Christopher Durston, *James I* (London: Routledge, 1953); Pauline Croft, *King James* (New York: Palgrave, 2003); Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: The Life of James VI and I, The First Monarch of a United Great Britain* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003); D. Harris Wilson, *King James VI and I* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1956).

¹⁶Stewart, *The Cradle King*, 167, 169, 172.

that affected the latter.¹⁷ This proves pertinent to London because much of a monarch's public duties occurred in the city; moreover, a large chunk of the population was centered in and around London. Clearly James was at a disadvantage when it came to interacting with London and the people. He hated public performance and he followed Elizabeth who seemed to hold the people in the palm of her hand. Nevertheless, one can find insinuations of James's relationship with London in several different sources.

Since Elizabeth made use of the public sphere and much of her activities can be classified as ritual works dedicated to these topics in the pre-modern world prove especially useful. Among these is Edward Muir's *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice*. In this book Muir argues that a calendar filled with civic rituals shaped the attitudes of Venetians. Ultimately Venetians lived with a "the myth of Venice."¹⁸ The results of civic ritual in Venice are not inconsequential to a study on a monarch's use of public space and rituals to ingratiate him or herself to the people. One can juxtapose how Venetians lived with "the myth of Venice" to England's "Elizabethan Age." Both were glorified ideas that were perpetuated by public actions of leaders. Another valuable source is *Politics, And the City in Fatimid Cairo*, by Paula Sanders. This is a study of how a monarchy, the Fatimids, manipulated urban space in order to establish and stabilize their dynasty.¹⁹ Finally, James Saslow's *The Medici Wedding of 1589: Florentine Festival as Theatrum Mundi* describes the work put into one elaborate ritual. Saslow accounts the months of work, hundreds of people, as well as money and supplies that go into putting on a public spectacle.²⁰ All of these works give pertinent

¹⁷Judith M. Richards, "The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender, and the Personal Monarchy of England," *English Historical Review* 472 (June 2002): 513-535.

¹⁸Edward Muir, *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

¹⁹Paula Sanders, *Ritual Politics, and the City in Fatimid Cairo* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994).

²⁰ James Saslow, *The Medici Wedding of 1589: Florentine Festival as Theatrum*

background information to how royalty manipulated urban space, the costs of manipulation and the results of that manipulation.

In order to establish Elizabeth's work in the metropolis, London, one must determine what London was at the time of Elizabeth's reign. John Stow (1525-1605) wrote a survey of London in 1598. Of course, this was near the end of Elizabeth's reign; nevertheless, Stow's descriptions still prove useful. Just in the eighty year span of Stow's life London underwent monumental change. By the time of Elizabeth's death in 1603 London was thriving and had outgrown its medieval walls. With the growth of London also came the growth of its suburbs. In fact, during this time London seemed to swallow up its surrounding areas.²¹ With the burgeoning of London, also came the formation of neighborhoods or boroughs. Londoners tended to settle in one suburb or neighborhood. However, there was still movement within the metropolis. People formed their own small communities, but still moved freely within the London metropolitan area.²²

Moreover people from all over the globe flocked to London. In the words of Clark Hulse, "London connected England to the world."²³ With a population over 200,000 by the year 1600, London ranked as one of the dominant European capitals.²⁴ Liza Picard argues that at the time of Elizabeth's death London "had become a world power." Indeed, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign Paris's population was twice the size of London's.

Mundi (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

²¹Peter Ackroyd, *London: The Biography* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 95-96 and J.F. Merritt, *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayal of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 4.

²²Merritt, *Imagining Early Modern London*, 12-14.

²³Clark Hulse, *Elizabeth I: Ruler & Legend* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 31.

²⁴Current scholarship estimates that more than six thousand people immigrated annually to London in the years between 1500 and 1600. Arthur F. Kinney and David W. Swain eds., *Tudor England: An Encyclopedia* (New York: Garland Publishers, 2001), 441.

However, by time of Elizabeth's death the gap had diminished and London's population nearly equaled that of Paris.²⁵

Stow described the metropolis as a "city of tradesmen" because it was "the principal storehouse and staple of all commodities within this realm."²⁶ Nevertheless, London was more than just a depot. London was also viewed as the "center of civilization" in England.²⁷ After the Renaissance, cities were viewed as good because they offered cultural and social opportunities that were previously unavailable.²⁸ Thus London attracted all kinds of people. The gentry and courtiers found the latest fashions in London. And the lower classes usually found more economic and social opportunity.²⁹

Opportunity was manifest in that, during Elizabeth's reign, nearly all males in London were considered citizens. A man could become a citizen by either joining a Livery Company or being labeled a freeman. Citizens enjoyed the benefits of the vote as well as the opportunity to establish a business.³⁰ The opportunities of London did not extend to government, however. During this time London was ruled by an impenetrable oligarchy. Each of the twenty-six wards in London elected one alderman who served for life. From the alderman one mayor was chosen. The mayor was usually the alderman with seniority. These men ran London and consequently were powerful, wealthy, influential elites. There was also a Court of Common Council that handled the day to day business of the city. However, to be a member of this council one had to be among the top ten percent of the income bracket.³¹ In

²⁵Jan De Vries, *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis, 1600-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 156.

²⁶John Stow, *A Survey of London: Written in the Year 1598*, with an introduction by Antonia Fraser. Edited by Henry Morley (Guernsey: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1994), 43.

²⁷Merritt, *Imagining Early Modern London*, 14.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ackroyd, *London: The Biography*, 96.

³⁰Kinney and Swain, eds., *Tudor England*, 442.

³¹Ibid.

Elizabethan London there was a clear demarcation between the classes. There were the city elites and everyone else.³²

How does a modern historian decide what constituted Elizabethan London geographically? Today, London is defined as London Corporation and its surrounding thirty-two boroughs. Currently this serves as the Greater London area. Unfortunately there is no such consensus for London in the sixteenth century. Certainly London officially was the "mile square," old corporation founded by its walls. Even by Elizabeth's time, however, the city included parishes "without" (outside) the walls. Nevertheless the quandary continues. If a historian does happen to define London in his or her work, rarely are two definitions the same. Liza Picard in *Elizabeth's London: Everyday Life in Elizabethan London* concluded that London encompassed London proper, Westminster, and Southwark.³³ David J. Johnson took Picard's definition further in his book *Southwark and the City* by stating that "the history of the capital is the history of its suburbs."³⁴ According to Johnson, London extends much further than the city limits. However, this confusion is not new. The line that separated London from its suburbs has been blurred since at least the twelfth century. William Fitzstephen wrote that it was the Thames that made London inseparable from its suburbs. Because the river "joined" the two and they became one.³⁵ Hence the fact that most historians do not define London in their work is not surprising. It is hard to define the ambiguous.

³²For more detail on London's development during this time period see Ian Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

³³Liza Picard, *Elizabeth's London: Everyday Life in Elizabethan London* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003), xxiv.

³⁴David J. Johnson, *Southwark and the City* (London: The Corporation of London, 1969), v.

³⁵William Fitzstephen died in 1190 and in his lifetime was a clerk to Thomas Becket. After Becket's death, Fitzstephen wrote a biography of Becket. Fitzstephen included a description of London in the book, which is where he discussed both London and Westminster. Stow, 23.

This work will provide a definition of London. It is important for this study that the reader be aware of Elizabeth's exact location. London means London, not the suburbs. The reader will be made aware if Elizabeth ventures into Westminster or another suburb. It was not unlikely, due to close proximity, for Elizabeth to progress through London to a suburb and back to London. Therefore, on a given day Elizabeth could be in either place several times. However, for this work London and Westminster are not interchangeable. Due to Elizabeth's residence at Whitehall and duties at Parliament Elizabeth was frequently in Westminster without any public relations agenda. Since this study will focus on Elizabeth's use of London for public relations and her relationship with the city and citizens, the times when she is within the city limits are paramount.

When most historians write about Elizabeth's public activities; her interactions with her people, her public relations agenda, or her use of public space they point to her summer progresses as her most important tool. During most summers Elizabeth would progress to the English countryside. These progresses were never very far. Throughout Elizabeth's forty-four year reign she went on twenty-three progresses. Of the twenty-three only five were to destinations more than ninety miles from London. Elizabeth's average country progress was forty miles from London. Moreover, out of England's fifty-three counties Elizabeth visited only twenty-five.³⁶ Still, Elizabeth's excursions to the country were more frequent and grander than those of any other European monarch. There was genuine excitement when the queen went to a town and, Elizabeth regularly received a warm welcome and impressive entertainment.

Townsppeople anxiously awaited Elizabeth's arrival. Thus when Elizabeth neared a city the people rejoiced. Thomas Churchyard recorded the reaction of the people when Elizabeth visited Woodstock. He wrote that at seeing the "most redoubted

³⁶Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 23-24. It must be noted that despite Elizabeth's limited travel she still traveled more than any of her predecessors.

Queene a multitude of people" began "runing" ahead of him to see Elizabeth.³⁷ However, the people did not just want to see Elizabeth, they had "rare inuentions" and "deepe deuices" with which to honor Elizabeth.³⁸ Once Elizabeth reached her destination, usually the home of a noble, she was presented with various entertainments. Ordinarily nobles hired actors to put on plays, give Latin speeches, or stage athletic competitions. Also, nobles would arrange for singers to serenade Elizabeth. There is one instance of Elizabeth being serenaded early in the morning from the garden below her bedroom as she prepared for the day.³⁹ Furthermore there are countless examples of Elizabeth hearing poems and watching performances during her progresses.⁴⁰ Elizabeth's country progresses served as part of her public relations agenda.

Consequently, historians use these progresses as evidence of Elizabeth's political and public relations savvy. For example, when discussing Elizabeth's popularity, J.E. Neale wrote that the country progresses "offered supreme opportunities to her genius in winning the hearts of the people."⁴¹ Anne Somerset commented that "progresses served as an invaluable means of interaction between subject and sovereign."⁴² Furthermore,

³⁷Thomas Churchyard, *A Handefol of Gladsome Verses, giuen to the Queenes Maiesty at Woodstocke this Prograce* (Oxford: Ioseph Barnes, 1592), A2.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹*The Honorable Entertainment given to the Queenes Maiestie in Progress, at Eluetham in Hampshire, by the right Honorable the Earle of Hertford* (London: John Wolfe, 1591), E.

⁴⁰For more descriptions of Elizabeth's country progresses see:*The Ioyfull Receyuing of the Queenes most excellent Maiestie into hir Highnesse Citie of Norwiche: The things done in the time of hir abode there: and the dolor of the Citie at hir departure* (London: Henrie Bynneman, 1578); Robert Laneham, *A letter whearin part of the entertainment vntoo the Queenz Maiesty at Killingwoorth Castl in Warwik sheer in this soomerz progress 1575 is signified / from a freend officer attendant in couort vntoo hiz freend a citizen and merchaunt of London* (London: 1575); *Speeches Delivered To Her Maiestie This Last Progresse, At The Right Honorable the Lady Rvssels, at Bissam, the Right Honorable the Lorde Chandos at Sudley, at the Right Honorable the Lord Norris, at Ricorte* (Oxford, Ioseph Barnes, 1592).

⁴¹Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 203.

⁴² Anne Somerset, *Elizabeth I* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 372.

Carolly Erickson wrote that “nothing did more to spread and enrich the cult of the queen than her summer progresses.”⁴³ And lastly, Mary Hill Cole stated that the progresses “gave the queen a public stage on which to present herself as the people’s sovereign.”⁴⁴ However, by focusing on Elizabeth’s country progresses one only gets a glimpse of her public relations genius. Elizabeth usually visited nobles when on progress, hence the people, entertainment, food, gifts, presented to her mostly reflected the upper classes’ way of life. Indeed, when on progress, Elizabeth was only exposed to small cross-sections of people. A common person’s ability to see and interact with Elizabeth was slim and usually at her host’s discretion. Perhaps Elizabeth allowed for such limited exposure because the nobles proved to be a vital asset to Elizabeth in keeping her throne. Contemporary records of Elizabeth’s country progresses remain and describe what seem like vacations rather than public relations efforts.

Evidence of the host noble’s control over Elizabeth’s progresses can be seen in the queen’s visit to Elventham. Before Elizabeth arrived her host, the Earle of Hertford, set about remodeling his house. He added extra rooms for “the Nobles” and a “large Hall, for entertainment of Knights, Ladies, and Gentlemen.”⁴⁵ During her stay Elizabeth “dined, with her Nobles” and after dinner watched water games under a canopy which Hertford “caused...to bee set [sic].” Hertford’s other contributions included having poems read in Latin for Elizabeth, a display of fireworks, music played under her window, and having his servants serve the queen in “plentifull abundance.”⁴⁶ Hertford controlled what Elizabeth saw and experienced at Elventham. In the record of Elizabeth’s visit there is no mention of her interacting, one on one, with anybody. The closest she came was to request to see a “spectacle” twice, and the source

⁴³ Erickson, *The First Elizabeth*, 274.

⁴⁴ Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 1.

⁴⁵ *The Honorable Entertainment given to the Queenes Maiestie in Progress, at Eluetham in Hampshire, by the right Honorable the Earle of Hertford*, A2.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, B.

only states that it “so delighted her Maiesty, that shee desired to see and hear it twice ouer.”⁴⁷ Elizabeth was the guest of Lord Montacute while on progress to Cowdrey in Sussex. The record of this visit reads much like that of her visit to Elventham. Elizabeth enjoyed lavish meals, entertainments, and hunting on Montacute’s estate.⁴⁸ Of course, Elizabeth did all of this in the company of nobles.

Most records of Elizabeth’s country progress will report much of the same as the previous two sources.⁴⁹ But these accounts of Elizabeth’s interaction with her people prove futile because they do not reveal the full scope of Elizabeth’s objectives regarding public relations. Furthermore, these sources do not portray Elizabeth as active and intentional with her subjects since she was always the guest. In order to ascertain Elizabeth’s mindset towards public relations and gauge her ability and goals in that realm, one must also study Elizabeth’s public interactions with in the urban sphere as well as the rural. The latter has been documented. This work, an in-depth study of Elizabeth’s actions in London, will seek to show that Elizabeth radically changed the way monarchs’ utilized the metropolis. In addition we shall find that Elizabeth’s public image was always in the forefront of her mind and, consequently, she groomed that image through excursions in London. And that Elizabeth continually interacted with her people, both elites and commoners, from the first days and months of her reign to the last years. Ultimately, Elizabeth’s relationship with London proved unique and transforming.

Elizabeth I’s Performances in London during Her Formal Entry into the Metropolis and Coronation

Elizabeth I ascended to the English throne on 17 November 1558; however, she delayed her entrance into London, and

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, E.

⁴⁸ *The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment giuen to the Queenes Maiestie in Progresse, at Cowdrey in Sussex, by the right Honorable the Lord Montacute* (London: Thomas Scarlet, 1591), A4.

⁴⁹ See note 36.

taking formal possession of the Tower, by over a week.⁵⁰ Elizabeth had opted instead to remain at her home, Hatfield, to update herself with the matters of state and establish a privy counsel. Nonetheless there was no lack of celebration when she did enter London on 28 November 1558. When news reached London that Elizabeth began her journey toward the city, people flocked to the countryside and roads in order to catch a glimpse of their queen. When Elizabeth finally reached the city, she was greeted with cannon fire, and the sound of trumpets blaring. In addition, Londoners did not hesitate to show their adulation for their queen; the streets of London were lined with people. There was not an empty spot along the procession route. The enormous crowd shouted support to Elizabeth. The people were so happy that they could not help but convey it. Londoners “declared their inward rejoicings [sic] by gestures, words and countenance....”⁵¹ Elizabeth was actually surprised by the amount of praise lavished on her during her entrance.⁵² Clearly this was a successful first interaction between Elizabeth and London. It proved the beginning of a substantial bond between the ruler and the ruled that would only grow.

Elizabeth’s entrance into London was not the first time the city embraced her. Indeed, Elizabeth had a relationship with London long before she assumed the throne. Elizabeth’s half-sister Mary I, Queen of England from 1553 to 1558, often called her sister to London and required her to stay in the city. For instance Mary imprisoned Elizabeth in the Tower for a period of many months on the suspicion of the latter’s compliance in

⁵⁰The formal entrance into London and subsequent acquisition of the Tower was a critical action by a new monarch. Both served to legitimize the sovereign’s hold on power and allowed the public to see and cheer its new leader. Thus London proved crucial in the early days of monarch’s reign.

⁵¹John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth: Among Which Are Interspersed Other Solemnities, Public Expenditures, And Remarkable Events, During The Reign of That Illustrious Princess, Collected From Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, Illustrated With Historical Notes* vol. 1 (London: John Nichols and Son, 1823), 32.

⁵²Erickson, *The First Elizabeth*, 167-68.

Wyatt’s Rebellion.⁵³ Consequently, Elizabeth’s early experiences in London were not as happy as those during her reign. Thomas Heywood detailed Elizabeth’s imprisonment and stated that she was taken abruptly to London, while her household was reduced to only a few people. Furthermore Heywood acknowledged that “the very name of Tower struck a deep horror into her, insomuch that the cheerful blood forsaking her fresh cheeks, left nothing but ashy paleness in her visage.”⁵⁴ Elizabeth’s first trips to the Tower did not evoke the pleasure that would come. The fear Mary aroused was not partial to her ordinary subjects; indeed, it resonated with her own sister. When Elizabeth left London after her imprisonment she did so amidst an atmosphere of jubilation. In addition to the sound of ringing church bells and cannon fire, Londoners thronged to see Elizabeth off. Clearly the city supported and held Elizabeth in high regard, even when she was not queen, much to the chagrin of her sister.⁵⁵

Elizabeth also visited London for formal occasions during her sister’s reign. Francis Bacon records, in *The history of the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary*, Elizabeth processed through London on 30 July 1553 on her way to meet Mary in Wansted and congratulate her on her accession.⁵⁶ Furthermore, Bacon notes Elizabeth’s presence and prominent position in Mary’s formal entry into London. Mary entered the city on 3 August 1553 and Bacon described it as

⁵³For a more thorough discussion, see Jane Dunn, *Elizabeth and Mary: Cousins, Rivals, Queens* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004), 116-125; Thomas Heywood, *England’s Elisabeth: Her Life And Troubles, During her minoritie, from the cradle to the Crown, Historically laid open and interwoven with such eminent passages of State, as happened under the reign of Henry the eight, Edward the sixt, Q. Mary, all of them aptly introducing to the present relation* (Cambridge: Ph. Waterhouse, 1632), 90-91.

⁵⁴Heywood, *England’s Elisabeth*, 91.

⁵⁵Dunn, 121.

⁵⁶Francis Bacon, *The history of the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, 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* (London: W.G., 1676), 162.

“triumphant.”⁵⁷ Another contemporary author described Mary’s entrance by stating, “she came to *London*, through which she passed to the *Tower* with all imaginable Grandure....”⁵⁸ Despite the description of the elegance in which Mary entered and processed through London, neither author discussed the reaction of either Mary or her people during this crucial ritual. This omission is pronounced. The country had just endured a passionate struggle for the throne between Mary and Jane Grey.⁵⁹ Yet the excitement of the time was missing from Mary’s entrance and procession through London. The cheers and excitement present in Elizabeth’s entry were either markedly absent or unrecorded in Mary’s. If the people did hold Mary in high esteem, it was not conveyed or at least not as much as it was towards Elizabeth. Was the people’s behavior in Mary’s or Elizabeth’s entry extraordinary? In other words, was the city’s reaction to Elizabeth’s presence a new phenomenon? Or did Londoners usually lack enthusiasm when a monarch entered the city limits? One way to settle the question is to examine James VI and I’s, Elizabeth’s successor, entrance into the metropolis after his accession.

James entered London on 7 May 1603 after a prolonged journey from Scotland, through the English countryside, and finally to London. Thomas Millington chronicled James’s trip to London and also noted the reaction of the people along the way. The reaction and reception of Londoners will prove crucial for this study. Millington documented that as James neared the city:

The multitudes of people in high wayes, fieldes, medowes, close and on trees were such, that they covered the beautie of the fieldes, and so greedy were they to behold the countenance of the King, that with much unrulinesse they iniured and hurt one another, some even hazarded to the daunger of death: but as

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Anon, *The History of the life, bloody reign, and death of Queen Mary, eldest daughter to H.8* (London: Black Swan, 1682), 32. Author’s italics.

⁵⁹For more detail see Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 83-85.

uncivill as there were among themselves, all the ways his Maiestie past with shoutes and cryes, and casting up of hattes [sic]....⁶⁰

Clearly, James was well received. However Elizabeth’s entrance still stands as unique because of the revolutionary strides she made in public relations throughout her reign. By the time of James’s accession flocking to the monarch and shouting praise was the norm, thanks to Elizabeth.

After Elizabeth’s formal entrance into the city she further consolidated her power in London through her coronation procession six weeks later. Much has been made about Elizabeth’s procession through London the day before her coronation. A recapitulation of the days events are in nearly every biography of Elizabeth.⁶¹ Why is this? Elizabeth made a rare connection with her subjects that day.

Elizabeth processed through London on Saturday, 14 January 1559. All of London turned out to see their queen. Nevertheless, this was no ordinary parade or procession. This event was a demonstration of the shared love between Elizabeth and her people awkwardly veiled in regal pomp and pageantry. Despite the tradition and solemnity of the occasion, the people’s affection for Elizabeth could not be restrained. When Elizabeth made her way out of the Tower and began the procession she was saluted with “prayers, wishes, welcomminges, cryes, tender wordes, and all other signes, which argue a wonderfull earnest love of most obedient subjects towarde theyr soveraigne....”⁶² The people’s love did not go unnoticed. Elizabeth responded by “holding up her handes, and merie countenance to such as

⁶⁰Thomas Millington, *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Maiestie, from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; til his receiving at London: with all or most speciall Occurrences* (London: Thomas Creede, 1603), 42.

⁶¹See Erickson, *The First Elizabeth 177-179*; Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 24-26; Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I*, 80-81; Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 60-62; Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I* (London: Longman, 1988), 7.

⁶²Anon, *The Passage of our most drad Soueraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion* (London: Richard Cottill, 1559), A ii.

stode farre of, and most tender and gentle language to those that stode nigh to her grace...."⁶³ From the outset, the procession was a dynamic interaction between Elizabeth and London. Neither Elizabeth, nor her London people, was content to spend the day in passive recognition of one another. The monarchs' relationship with London was maturing.

At Fenchurch Elizabeth was formally welcomed into the city. A child welcomed her with an oration that described the primary gifts the city would give her. The first gift was "blessing tonges that would praise her "to the sky."⁶⁴ The second gift was "true heartes that love thee fro their root."⁶⁵ This affection was not just spewed as lines from a script, for after the child was finished the whole crowd erupted in praise for their queen.⁶⁶ After Elizabeth's initial greeting she made her way through the sprawling metropolis. The city had prepared five pageants for Elizabeth to view while on her journey. Elizabeth stopped at each of these pageants to absorb the warmth of the people and to reflect her own good feelings.⁶⁷

The crowds and noise in the metropolis that day was overwhelming. At the first pageant at Gracious Street, Elizabeth could not see or understand the pageant, so she had to stop her chariot and go back in order that she could see and hear the pageant again. The pageant portrayed Elizabeth's family: her grandparents, Henry VII and Queen Elizabeth; her parents, Henry VIII and Queen Anne; and lastly, herself. This portrayal

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Ibid., A iii.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶*The Royall Passage of her Maiesty form the Tower of London to her Palace of White-hall, with all the Speeches and Devices, both of the Pageants and otherwise, together with her Maiesties severall answers, and most pleasing Speeches to them all* (London: S.S., 1559).

⁶⁷The substance of the pageants will only be examined when it is critical to understand the interactions between Elizabeth and the people. For reference, the pageants emphasized: unity, virtue trumping vice, Elizabeth having all the attributes discussed in the Beatitudes, truth in the form of Protestantism, attributes of both a rising and declining society, and Deborah from the Bible as a model woman leader for Elizabeth to emulate.

of the Elizabeth's lineage was to represent the uniting of the Houses of Lancaster and York and the subsequent end of the Wars of the Roses. Furthermore, the pageant conveyed the anticipated unity Elizabeth would bring to the country since she sprouted from the portrayed family tree. Also, this pageant rehabilitated the image of Elizabeth's mother who was executed by her father. In a way the pageant rewrote the past to omit the violence and treachery to portray a version of Elizabeth's past as perfect and peaceful. At the pageant's conclusion, Elizabeth promised to uphold the spirit of the pageant and see that England remained unified.⁶⁸ Due to the confusion of the first pageant, because of the noise and crowding, Elizabeth sent messengers ahead of her to each pageant to ask the people to restrain themselves during the orations so she could hear and understand. Also, she had the messengers find out what each pageant was going to be about so she could prepare herself.⁶⁹ This shows Elizabeth's desire to really understand what was being imparted to her that day. Similarly, it demonstrates Elizabeth's awareness of the atmosphere and her wish to work around it, even stoke it, but not squelch it. Indeed, at every pageant Elizabeth made some kind of interaction with the people. She had resolved to be an active participant in the day's events. Sometimes she even led the people in their praise. For instance it is noted that at several times in the procession Elizabeth "held up her handes to heavenwarde and willed the people to say, Amen [sic]."⁷⁰ Similarly, Elizabeth realized the importance of this day for her subjects. For ordinary townsfolk seeing a monarch could quite possibly be the highlight of their lives. Elizabeth never hesitated in allowing the people to simply look at her. Heywood wrote that "she would many times cause her chariot to stand, that the people might have their full sight of her."⁷¹ Whether it was a smiling face, words of thanks, loving

⁶⁸*The Passage of our most drad Sovereigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion*, Bii.

⁶⁹Ibid.

⁷⁰Ibid., Eii.

⁷¹Heywood, *England's Elisabeth*, 181.

gestures, or simply being, Elizabeth willingly and intentionally interacted with the people.

Besides simply interacting with the people, Elizabeth made gestures and speeches that would endear her to the population. For example, she received an English translation of the Bible with dramatic emotion. When handed the book, Elizabeth took it with two hands, kissed it, held it to her chest, and thanked the city profusely for such a gift.⁷² This act had to have gone over well with the audience. London was predominantly a Protestant town; even more, they were weary of Catholicism. After Mary's tumultuous reign, in which she persecuted Protestants, the city was ready for a change and, moreover, stability.⁷³ The fact that Elizabeth embraced the gift and showed such emotion had to have been reassuring and put Elizabeth's in the people's highest esteem.

Elizabeth further ingratiated herself with Londoners with several speeches she made. One in particular she gave after receiving one thousand gold pieces from the Lord Mayor and the city. She said:

I thanke my lord maior, his brethren and you all. And Whereas your request is that I should continue your good ladie and quene, be ye ensured, that I will be as good unto you as ever quene was to her people...I will not spare, if nede be to spend my blood, God thanke you all.⁷⁴

⁷²*The Passage of our most drad Sovereigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion, Cv.*

⁷³Evidence of London's religious climate is found in many sources. John Stow in his classic *Survey of London* chronicled the religious leaders of London and how some under Mary were imprisoned and burned at the stake. John Stow, *A Survey of London: Written in the Year 1598*, with an introduction by Antonia Fraser; Henry Morley, ed. (Guernsey: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1994), 433. For a thorough discussion on London's religious climate see Liza Picard, *Elizabeth's London: Everyday Life in Elizabethan London* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003), 270-279; Alison Weir, *The Life of Elizabeth I* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1998), 54-69; Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I: The Shrewdness of Virtue* (New York: Viking, 1988), 82-88.

⁷⁴*Ibid.*, civ.

Elizabeth made promises in this statement that have often been quoted. It is significant that she made these assurances when and where she did. Elizabeth's reign began on shaking footing. However, she gained some stability in assuring her support in London. Further, she assured her support in London with statements recognizing her people and reiterating her dedication.

Elizabeth further fueled the people's love through more discrete interactions with citizens during the procession. On several occasions, poor women approached Elizabeth's chariot wanting to speak with her or impart a gift. Elizabeth did not turn these women away. Instead she welcomed their gifts and kind words. Also she made impromptu stops to interact more with citizens. Once she ordered her chariot be stopped so she could hear children, patients in a hospital, recite verses to her.⁷⁵

Elizabeth revolutionized monarch-subject relations in the course of one day. Many more loving interactions occurred than were mentioned in this chapter. Besides the pageants and shouts of praise rendered to Elizabeth, people wept at the sight of their queen.⁷⁶ Pageants and praise were not unique to Elizabeth or even London; however, the love showed towards her was. Neither Mary I, Elizabeth's predecessor, or James VI and I, Elizabeth's successor, received or courted the adulation that was lavished upon Elizabeth.

Mary's coronation procession took place on the 30 September 1553. She processed through the city in all stateliness. Documents describe her chariot, dress, crown, and the scores of nobles and diplomats who participated in the event.⁷⁷ However, lacking is the mention of the people's reaction to Mary's presence. In one document there is a vague mention referencing

⁷⁵*The Royall Passage of her Maiesty from the Tower of London to her Palace Whitehall, with all Speeches and Devices, both of the Pageants and otherwise, together with her Maiesties severall Answers and most pleasing Speeches to them all, D3-D4.*

⁷⁶*Ibid.*

⁷⁷Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 6 vols. (London: 1808), IV, 6-7 in Richard Tittler, *The Reign of Mary I*, 2nd ed (Harlow: Longman, 1991), 84-85.

the feelings of the people. It states “that the joy seemed great; Nor was any cost spared by the Citizens and Merchants Strangers, to make the Triumph compleat [sic].”⁷⁸ The welcome given to Elizabeth was not “seemingly” great or affectionate. One can clearly understand the emotions of Londoners that day. The same cannot be said about Mary’s coronation procession. If great emotion was showed towards Mary it is omitted from documents describing her coronation procession.

Something else emphasized in depictions of Mary’s procession is the involvement and prominence of foreigners. The Genoese produced a pageant at Fenchurch, the Florentines at Grace Street, and a Dutchman provided entertainment at St. Paul’s.⁷⁹ One may glean from this information that Mary’s coronation procession was an international affair. One cannot do the same for Elizabeth’s. In fact, both documents describing Elizabeth’s coronation procession make a point to mention that the city received the queen without any foreigners present.⁸⁰ Elizabeth’s procession seemed to be a thoroughly English affair, while Mary’s was not. This might be another reason why Elizabeth was beloved. Elizabeth’s procession and pageants embraced and emphasized England and the English, and what they had to offer.

James’s coronation procession took place on the 15 March 1604, nearly a year after his accession.⁸¹ Gilbert Dugdale recorded James’s procession in *The Time Triumphant*. Dugdale stated that the people’s “heartes were wilde fire, and burned

⁷⁸Anon, *The History of the life, bloody reign, and death of Queen Mary, eldest daughter to H.8*, 47.

⁷⁹Titler, *The Reign of Mary I*, 84-85.

⁸⁰See, *The Passage of our most drad Sovereigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her coronacion*, Eii, and *The Royall Passage of her Maiesty from the Tower of London to her Palace White-hall, with all Speeches and Devices, both of the Pageants and otherwise, together with her Maiesties severall Answers and most pleasing Speeches to them all*, D2.

⁸¹James acceded on 24 March 1603. There are several reasons for the delay. First, James had to travel from Scotland to London. Second, an outbreak of plague caused the initial date for the coronation procession. For more detail see, Stewart, *The Cradle King*, 172.

unquenched in love....”⁸² Londoners were excited to see their new monarch. However, all was not equal to Elizabeth’s procession. Elizabeth offered kind words and gestures to her people, James did not.⁸³ At one point, frustrated with the noise and commotion, James exhorted the people to “doe as they doe in Scotland stand still and use silence, so shall you cherish his visitation and see him....”⁸⁴ James did not relish the atmosphere like Elizabeth, nor did he encourage the crowd in their praise. For James he was the main event, for Elizabeth, it was her subjects. Similarly, James did not reciprocate his subjects’ affections; although his family did. His wife, Queen Ann, and son, Henry, Prince of Wales, smiled and waved to the crowd. Thus the crowd’s affections were as much for James’s family as for him.⁸⁵

Dugdale also noted a foreign presence at James’s procession. Several times he mentions foreigners and their stake in the procession. He states that the Italians, Dutch, and French all “spared for no cost, to gratifie [sic] our King....”⁸⁶ This fact points to James’s acceptance of foreign presence and harkens back to Elizabeth’s repudiation of the same.

In neither Mary’s nor James’s coronation procession did the public display the emotion they did at Elizabeth’s. In addition, neither Mary nor James showed the type of emotion towards the people that Elizabeth did. Elizabeth’s coronation procession

⁸²Gilbert Dugdale, *The Time Triumphant* (London: R.B., 1604), B1.

⁸³James did finally offer kind words for his people; however it was in the privacy of Parliament. In a speech to both the House of Commons and House of Lords, James acknowledged and thanked the people for their hearty welcome. However, given the context of the speech one begs to question whether James was only thanking the MPs or did he actually recognize the love and affection of the people? Unlike Elizabeth, James did not reciprocate, much less acknowledge his subjects’ affection in their presence. *The Speech of King James the I. To Both Houses of Parliament Upon his Accession to, and the Happy Union of Both the Crowns of England and Scotland, Regally Pronounced, and Expressed by him to them, Die Jovis 22th Martii 1603* (London: Old-Baily, 1689), 1.

⁸⁴Dugdale, *The Time Triumphant*, B2.

⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶Ibid., B3.

stands out as one of a kind, different from her predecessor and unmatched by her successor. Elizabeth transformed monarch-subject relations in a single day. Whether it was through mass interaction, or interaction on a smaller scale, or gestures and speeches, Elizabeth altered the relations, or expected relations, between sovereign and subjects.

Neither the volumes that have been written by historians on Elizabeth, her life, reign, and the Elizabethan Age, nor those devoted to London; aptly describe the affect Elizabeth had on Londoners and monarchical public relations in the city. If one examines the contemporary sources documenting the formal entrances into London and the coronation processions of Mary, Elizabeth, and James, closely, however, one sees clear differences, and must acknowledge Elizabeth's initial brilliance in the sphere of public relations.

Elizabeth I and Her Londoners: Public Performances under Mary, Elizabeth and James Compared

Chapter one has shown that Elizabeth quickly established a rapport with her London people. Her formal entry into the metropolis and her subsequent coronation procession sought to procure a hold on her subjects' hearts. However, the peoples' affection can be fickle. People may turn against monarchs or any authority if they lack food, money, or security. Thus, Elizabeth needed to work to make an indelible mark on London. This chapter examines how Elizabeth strategically developed her public activities and worked to strengthen her image in London during her long reign amongst both the London elites and commoners. Similarly, this chapter will analyze the similarities and differences in Elizabeth's public actions throughout her rule. One will see that Elizabeth's work would never be completed. Until the last years of her reign, Elizabeth's public image was in the forefront of her thoughts. Elizabeth's main objective: remain visible. Over the years the reasons for public outings varied, but Elizabeth's public performance remained constant.

Take for example her St. George's Day outings or Accession Day celebrations. These celebrations were events marked on the

royal calendar and thus both Londoners and Elizabeth could expect a public show. Also, there were other unexpected times when sovereign and subjects were given an excuse to unite in celebration. For instance, the thanksgiving celebration in London following England's defeat of the Spanish Armada proved to be a valuable time for Elizabeth to publicly reiterate her dedication to her people and the people to recognize Elizabeth as a ruler capable of leading their country through the perils of war. In other words, the event was both celebratory in nature and a functional tool in order to sharpen Elizabeth's public image. Whether early or late in Elizabeth's reign, crisis or celebration, she was often ready for public performance and used it to her advantage. She did, however, fluctuate in her use of public ceremony or spectacle. Perhaps the cost or the openness of public days was not to her liking. But she did apply her public performances selectively to further her relations with the metropolitan dwellers in times of emergency. Furthermore, both her predecessor and successor lacked this skill.

In the months following her coronation, Londoners showered Elizabeth with praise. This affection, however, was encouraged. In the first year of Elizabeth's reign she took advantage of anytime she could publicly move in and about London.⁸⁷ Early as well as late in her reign going from her residence to Parliament, or any of Elizabeth's movements around London, proved to be a spectacle and is recorded in the annals of her reign.⁸⁸ However Elizabeth made particular use of St. George's Day, a quasi English holiday dedicated to the country's patron saint, to bond with her people.⁸⁹ England annually recognizes St. George's Day on 23 April with a feast. On this date in 1559 Elizabeth went beyond the customary

⁸⁷Remember, she made a spectacle of going to her Mint in July 1559.

⁸⁸For specific examples please see G. B. Harrison, *The Elizabethan Journals: Being A Record Of Those Things Most Talked Of During The Years 1591 – 1603* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1955), 1:98, 3:50, 3:125, 3:205.

⁸⁹For more detail regarding St. George's Day and the myth of St. George see www.woodlands-junior.kent.sch.uk/customs/stgeorge.html, and www.stgeorgesday.com.

observances and celebrated St. George's Day in a new way. Elizabeth kept the tradition of a feast, but also made the event reflect her own personality and public goals. After Elizabeth dined with clergy and nobility in Westminster (as was the custom) she boarded a barge and sailed up and down the River Thames. Elizabeth did not intend for this to be a quiet or private affair. She ordered trumpets, drums, flutes, and artillery to sound accompanying her progress. Also, Elizabeth's barge was surrounded by hundreds of other vessels. Of course, Elizabeth's excursion did not go unnoticed. John Nichols recorded that thousands of Londoners went to see her, "thronging at the waterside...rejoicing to see her."⁹⁰ Besides the music, there were games and fireworks. The festivities lasted late into the evening, until Elizabeth retired to Somerset House. Clearly, Elizabeth's intent for this evening was an opportunity for her and her subjects to bond via fun activities and not a formal occasion. Even though the city warmly had welcomed Elizabeth in both November and January, she evidently ordered this special display a few months later in April. Her plan appears to have worked. This event proved crucial to Elizabeth's nurturing her relationship with London and its citizens. Nichols also recognized this fact because he wrote that "by these means...she made herself dear and acceptable to them [Londoners]."⁹¹

This particular St. George's day celebration proves special for another reason; there is no other record of Elizabeth celebrating St. George's Day in this manner during the rest of her reign. Nichols documents the St. George's Day festivities for 1560 as well, and in it he does not mention Elizabeth sailing on the Thames or her interacting with any commoners for that matter. Furthermore, Nichols does not mention St. George's Day

⁹⁰John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth: Among Which Are Interspersed Other Solemnities, Public Expenditures, And Remarkable Events, During The Reign of That Illustrious Princess, Collected From Original Manuscripts, Scarce Pamphlets, Corporation Records, Parochial Registers, Illustrated With Historical Notes*, 3 vols. (London: John Nichols and Son, 1823), 1: 67.

⁹¹Ibid.

after 1560 in his voluminous work that chronicles Elizabeth's progresses and processions.⁹² Why was St. George's Day 1559 special? This celebration was part of Elizabeth's plan to ingratiate herself with Londoners early in her reign. According to her more-or-less official contemporary historian, Elizabeth's major goals at her accession were: the safety of England, the safety of her subjects, and: "that she might purchase herself Love amongst her Subjects, amongst her Enemies Fear, and Glory amongst all Men."⁹³ From the beginning Elizabeth coveted the love and admiration of her subjects. At points this desire seemed to dictate all she did, as one seventeenth-century author wrote, everything Elizabeth "did or said was by her designed to draw upon herself the Good Wills of her Subjects."⁹⁴ Five months after her accession, Elizabeth transformed a holiday steeped in England's past to meet her political needs. Similarly, once the celebration accomplished Elizabeth's ends she let it revert back to tradition.

Later, the nationwide celebration after England's defeat of the Spanish Armada showed that Elizabeth continued to manipulate events, days, and people to achieve her public relations goal. Throughout Elizabeth's reign England shared a tense relationship with Spain, a reflection of Elizabeth's personal relationship with the king of Spain, Philip II, her former brother-in-law. Elizabeth and Philip were former allies turned enemies. Philip had intervened to spare Elizabeth's life during her sister Mary's reign and subsequently expected Elizabeth's gratitude.⁹⁵

⁹²Ibid., 89.

⁹³William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England; Containing All the most Important and Remarkable Passages of STATE, both at Home and Abroad (so far as they were linked with English Affairs) during her Long and Prosperous REIGN* (London: Post Office in Convent-Garden, 1688), 32.

⁹⁴Edmund Bohun, Esq., *The Character of Queen Elizabeth. Or, A Full and Clear Account of Her Policies, and the Methods of Her Government both in Church and State. Her Virtues and Defects. Together with The Characters of Her Principal Ministers of State. And the greatest part of the Affairs and Events that Happened in Her Times* (London: Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1693), 305.

⁹⁵The nature of Philip and Elizabeth's personal relationship is ambiguous.

After Elizabeth's accession Philip was suggested as a suitor. However, Elizabeth rebuffed Philip's proposals and the relationship soured, mainly for political and religious reasons. In addition to Philip's personal intentions towards Elizabeth were other motives. After Elizabeth acceded she steered England back towards Protestantism, thus angering the Vatican and other Catholic nations. Thus Philip, a Catholic and one of the most powerful men in Europe, saw it as his duty to bring England back into the Catholic fold.⁹⁶ Philip's mighty Armada in 1588 was what he intended to use to force England, and Elizabeth, into Catholic submission. However, Philip's plans did not succeed. England's navy, under the command of Admiral Lord Howard, forced the Armada off its course during the summer of 1588 and the butchered Armada returned on the perilous route around the rough northern seas around Scotland and Ireland to Spain without ever landing troops on English soil as planned.⁹⁷

Elizabeth's behavior during and after the Spanish Armada suggests she was always conscious of her public perception. Elizabeth entrenched near London to wait out the fighting. In early July she stayed at Richmond, a royal palace on the Thames near London. However as the situation intensified Elizabeth moved to St. James's Palace in Westminster. Elizabeth stayed in Westminster for the duration, only leaving to visit English troops at Tilbury on 8 August.⁹⁸ At a time when Elizabeth

We do know he did help her when he was married to Mary and she was grateful. Rumors of romantic feelings between the two cannot be verified. For more detail see Jasper Ridley, *Elizabeth I*, 63, 66-67.

⁹⁶Pope Pius V issued the papal bull that excommunicated Elizabeth on 25 February 1570. The Pope also called for Elizabeth to be deposed and gave his support for those who would try to do so. Now Catholics all across Europe devised assassination plots and plans to overthrow Elizabeth. Philip proved no different. For a thorough discussion see Ridley, *Elizabeth I*, 171.

⁹⁷For a more detailed account of the Spanish Armada see Garrett Mattingly, *The Armada* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959); Colin Martin and Geoffrey Parker, *The Spanish Armada*, Rev. Ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); Neil Hanson, *The Confident Hope of a Miracle: The True History of the Spanish Armada* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005).

⁹⁸Ridley, *Elizabeth I*, 284-285.

normally went on progresses to the countryside, she remained near London because of the crisis that England faced. Elizabeth needed to remain close to her capital city during the tense period in order to stay connected to her centers of power and support.

After the victory, Elizabeth celebrated both privately and publicly. Privately, Elizabeth celebrated with her court which was situated around London most likely at Richmond. Different courtiers staged different celebrations for the queen. The Earl of Essex presented mock battles and jousts while others prepared feasts.⁹⁹ Lord Howard of Effingham went to see Elizabeth at court to report on the status of the navy and found it in an atmosphere of revelry.¹⁰⁰ Clearly Elizabeth was enjoying her victory over her old nemesis; although, the celebrations were not exclusive to the royal household.

The entire nation celebrated England's victory. Church leaders called for services of celebration and thanksgiving all over England. From August through December it was not uncommon to partake in several celebratory church services. Clergy preached sermons reiterating God's grace and favor towards England. Also, Spanish booty captured during the battle littered London as visible proof of the spoils of war.¹⁰¹ Despite the apparent atmosphere of jubilation, Elizabeth acted to unite the country in observance of English victory and provide a public stage on which she could be praised. William Camden states that Elizabeth "commanded publick Prayers and Thanksgiving to be used throughout all the Churches of England."¹⁰² A central celebration would be held in London, in which Elizabeth would be the star.

The metropolis prepared for the festivities and the presence of the queen. In a letter to the Livery Companies in London the

⁹⁹Hanson, *The Confident Hope of a Miracle*, 383.

¹⁰⁰Martin and Parker, *The Spanish Armada*, 236.

¹⁰¹Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:537.

¹⁰²Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth*, 418.

Lord Mayor, Sir Martin Calthorpe, stressed the city be prepared for Elizabeth's visit. He wrote:

Where the Queene's moste excellent [Majesty] entendeth to come in her [Majesty's] moste royal [person], on the eighteenth day of the present moneth, from [Somerset] House to Pawles to heare a sermon: Theise therefore shal be to require and charge you, in her [Majesty's] name, that you take especiall care that all persones of the Livery of your saide Companye may be in readynesse againste the said tyme, with their liverye hoodes, attyred in their best apparel, to wayte and attend her [Majesty's] cominge; and that you and the Livery of youre said Companye receave direction from Mr. Martin, Mr. Allott, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Radcliff, Alderman, and others of the worshipful [Commoners] of this Citie, appointed by me and my brethren the Aldermen, for orderinge and disposinge of all things needful for that service; requiringe you not faile hereof, as you will answer the contrarye at [your peril] [sic].¹⁰³

Clearly, the city, especially the city's leadership, took great pains to accommodate Elizabeth and see that the day went smoothly. In this letter the Lord Mayor's respect for the queen is apparent from the orders he gives the Livery Companies. The Mayor directs the companies to be dressed in their best and accompany the queen; moreover, he warns them that if they shrink from

¹⁰³Ibid., 537-538. Elizabeth was staying at Somerset House which is located on the Strand and is technically in Westminster. However, since she was set to progress through London to St. Paul's this information is pertinent. Somerset House was built between 1547 and 1550 for Lord Protector Somerset. Elizabeth received the residence in 1552 in exchange for Durham House. Elizabeth rarely stayed at Somerset. Nevertheless it was from Somerset that Elizabeth departed to meet her sister Mary on 3 August 1555 to accompany Mary into London. In 1558 Elizabeth returned part of the residence to Edward Seymour (the Protector's nephew) and other parts of the home served as meeting places for her council. After 1558 Elizabeth only stayed at Somerset for a few days at a time, usually before she left for a summer progress. Ben Weinreb and Christopher Hibbert, eds., *The London Encyclopedia* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 795-796.

their duties it would be at their "peril."¹⁰⁴ A visit by Elizabeth was so important the Lord Mayor wanted to leave nothing to chance and reminded the companies not to disappoint him or the city. From the Mayor's letter it is clear that along with the great amount of affection the city leaders held for Elizabeth there was an equal measure of respect. Similarly, it is clear that the Mayor, and city, took this event seriously; hence the stern warning given to the Livery Companies of the consequences if they should have failed at their tasks. Besides stressing the preparedness of the Livery Companies the Lord Mayor alluded to the atmosphere and affection that could be expected that day. He mentions that the several of the people in charge of the festivities were "worshipfull [Commoners] of this Citie."¹⁰⁵ The feelings of at least some of the people were evident to the Lord Mayor. Were these few leaders representative of the greater populace? Taking into account Elizabeth's earlier interactions with London and the current mood of the nation, it seems likely the majority of London would be "worshipful" towards Elizabeth.

The day of thanksgiving and celebration was initially scheduled for mid-November.¹⁰⁶ This was so the city could celebrate both the anniversary of Elizabeth's accession and the victory over the Armada. However, for reasons unknown, Elizabeth did not go to London that day. Instead the celebration was rescheduled for Sunday 24 November.¹⁰⁷ One can assume Elizabeth did not want a double celebration. If she celebrated both her accession and victory on the same day another opportunity for public festivities about her accession day would

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

¹⁰⁶The date for the initial date for the procession and service is disputed. Some sources claim the date to be the 17th others the 18th.

¹⁰⁷This date is also disputed. Some sources say the procession and service were held on 4 December, some claim the 29 November. However the 24 November is the date most often claimed as the day the celebration took place.

be lost. By pushing the thanksgiving celebration back one week Elizabeth allowed Londoners to double their celebrations.¹⁰⁸

Elizabeth's procession to St. Paul's on 24 November was no ordinary procession; Elizabeth used it to demonstrate her power and majesty. There are many similarities between this procession and Elizabeth's coronation procession. Perhaps Elizabeth was trying to recapture the magic of her first days on the throne. Records state Elizabeth processed "in Triumph" and "went with a very gallant Train of Noblemen through the Streets of London, which were all hung with blew Cloath."¹⁰⁹ Like her coronation procession, Elizabeth was taken through the city in a horse-drawn chariot. There were also other parallels to the coronation procession. For example, Elizabeth received several gifts while riding through London. The city leadership gave her a fine jewel set in gold, as well as a book entitled *The Light of Britaine*, and a scepter.¹¹⁰ Each of these gifts can show how Londoners felt about their queen or, better yet, how Elizabeth wanted them to feel. The Crown was undoubtedly involved the preparations for this celebration, as it was for all others. The jewel is a gift fit for royalty; it shows Elizabeth was worth all that London could bestow on her. There was undoubtedly symbolism in giving Elizabeth a book entitled *The Light Of Britayne* written by Henry Lyte. The book chronicles the origins of Britain combining both reality and mythology. Lyte praises the mythic founders of Britain and likens Elizabeth to her mythic forbearers. In the opening Lyte describes Elizabeth as "the Phenix of the worlde:

¹⁰⁸Even though Elizabeth was absent from London on 17 November does not mean celebrations ceased. Indeed, by this time in Elizabeth's reign her Accession Day or the Queen's Day had been transformed into a national holiday. All over England, and in London particularly, people lit bonfires, rang bells, and celebrated late into the night. John A. Wagner, *Historical Dictionary of the Elizabethan World: Britain, Ireland, Europe, and America* (Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1999), 3.

¹⁰⁹Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth*, 418. Author's italics and capitalization.

¹¹⁰Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:539.

the Angell of Englande...the chast Diana of Calydonia."¹¹¹ The author and city must have believed Elizabeth to be the nations light, a high distinction. Finally, the scepter is a symbol of royal authority. The Lord Mayor was symbolically giving Elizabeth authority of the city that day. And, of course, the streets of London were lined with people. Along with the Livery Companies, dressed in their finest attire, commoners flocked to see Elizabeth and join her in the celebration.¹¹² Besides gifts the city also decorated for the occasion, like the days leading up to the festivities, the city was bedecked in Spanish booty. Camden wrote that even St. Paul's was adorned with battle paraphernalia; he documented that "banners taken from the Enemy were hung up to be seen."¹¹³

Once Elizabeth arrived at St. Paul's she was met by the Bishop of London and the clergy. The queen did not hesitate to show God, and the people, her gratitude. Elizabeth, in the plain sight of the crowd, knelt on the outside steps of St. Paul's and "made her heartie prayers unto God."¹¹⁴ Elizabeth's prayers were no doubt genuine but it is apparent from her actions she had not lost her knack for public performance. The service consisted of a time of thanksgiving, a sermon, and recognition of Admiral Lord Howard and the men who fought valiantly for England. During the service Elizabeth supposedly conferred many honors on Howard and his men.¹¹⁵ This last point has been often refuted. Some scholars argue that the sailors were not recognized or were only given token recognition. These scholars maintain that the celebration was nothing but propaganda used by Elizabeth to enhance her own public image.¹¹⁶ As we have

¹¹¹Henry Lyte, *The Light Of Britayne: A Record of the honorable Originall & Antiquitie of Britaine* (London: J. Charlewood, 1588), A3.

¹¹²Ibid.

¹¹³Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth*, 418.

¹¹⁴Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:539.

¹¹⁵Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth*, 418.

¹¹⁶See Hanson, *The Confident Hope of a Miracle*, 386.

seen public relations was always in the forefront of Elizabeth's mind so this not necessarily an erroneous claim.

After the service, Elizabeth attended a dinner at the Bishop's Palace in Lambeth.¹¹⁷ Then, after dinner, she processed back through London to Somerset House. By this time it was night, so Elizabeth's way was lined with torches.¹¹⁸ The day of thanksgiving and celebration was indeed an all day affair. Undoubtedly, this church service and procession were celebratory, but also propagandistic in nature. Elizabeth wanted to display not only England's victory, but her power and majesty. Paradoxically she also wanted Londoners to see her humbled and gracious. This accounts for her public actions on the outside steps of St. Paul's. Elizabeth wanted to be seen as the perfect prince. A perfect prince was powerful and majestic as well as humble and thankful. Even though Elizabeth had strived to establish religious uniformity in England, religious divisions still remained. By her acknowledging God's grace as she did she pushed divisions aside and presented what united England, herself and God's provision and protection. Furthermore Elizabeth was able to interact with London's elite, the city leaders and clergy, while the common populace watched with admiration. Hence, Elizabeth was able to satisfy both groups.

How did her subjects respond to her performance? The people's reaction was probably just what Elizabeth anticipated. One contemporary account stated that Elizabeth's actions were "observed by her Subjects with the highest Expressions of Joy and Gratitude towards God, and of Loyalty and Affection towards her..."¹¹⁹ London's admiration for their queen was undiminished. Actually, Elizabeth went up in the people's

¹¹⁷Lambeth is and was a borough in the Greater London area surrounded by Southwark on the East and Wandsworth on the West. Weinreb and Hibbert, 441-442.

¹¹⁸Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:539. This in fact became a tradition throughout the rest of Elizabeth's reign. Lit torches or beacons came to represent England's defeat of the Spanish Armada, and subsequently, Protestantism triumphing over Catholicism.

¹¹⁹Bohun, *The Character of Queen Elizabeth*, 277.

estimation. After steering the country through the tensions with Spain and facing the enemy head on, Elizabeth "was now in the height of all her Glory both at Home and Abroad."¹²⁰ Not surprisingly, Elizabeth used a very public situation and later a public celebration to interact with both London's elite and commoners and it was definitely to her benefit. Her popularity soared as never before.

How did Mary and James perform in times of national crisis? Did they rally Londoners to their cause? Did they use the city as a stage to perform, or publicly display their power and dedication? If they did, were their means of garnering support as effective as Elizabeth's? Both Mary and James faced moments of extreme national crisis. As we will see, however, neither Mary nor James resorted to the level of public performance or interaction as Elizabeth. Likewise, neither received the same reception from the people or even used what praise they did receive to their advantage later in their reigns.

Mary faced a situation similar to Elizabeth's early in her reign. On 16 January 1554 Mary's marriage contract was final. She was now pledged to marry Philip of Spain. However, given the religious divisions of this newly re-Catholicized country, there were many people who did not want to see the queen marry a Catholic and give birth to a Catholic heir. Therefore, already unhappy with the country's present circumstances and convinced the future had to be different, several conspirators schemed to thwart the marriage and even take Mary's throne. One of the conspirators was Sir Thomas Wyatt.¹²¹

The conspirators planned a wide-spread rebellion. They plotted an uprising in the Welsh Marches and Southern England. However, Wyatt was the only one who was able to muster men for a revolt. Wyatt, accompanied with nearly three thousand men rebelled against Mary's regime on 24 January

¹²⁰*Ibid.*, 277-278.

¹²¹ Prescott, *Mary Tudor*, 234-235. Some have accused Wyatt of also wanting to kill Mary. It seems the queen herself believed this rumor to be true; however, Wyatt denied it.

1554.¹²² Wyatt and his troops were in Kent, a county just southwest of London. Hence Mary and her capital city were under a serious threat. In fact, Kent had been a hotbed of discontent with the religious settlement and Mary's prospective marriage.¹²³ Thus the rebellion took hold and panic struck through London and the royal court. Mary remained near London throughout the crisis. She stayed at Whitehall in Westminster, near her counselors and government officials.

Mary did not stay idle. London was sympathetic towards Protestantism and the queen worried the rebels' cause would take hold in the metropolis. Yet Mary did not just feel worry for the city, she was also suspicious. One admittedly later account of the rebellion states that Mary was "mistrustful of the Londoners" because they in "no ways favoured Popery."¹²⁴ However, Mary had to act because if she lost London her throne would be in the greatest peril. Hence Mary went to London on 1 February to rally support. She did so by speaking to the city leadership and Livery Companies at Guildhall. There is no detailed account of how Mary went to London. One source states she "came attended by several of the Nobility"; nonetheless, given the time and situation, Mary most likely did not travel to London with any elements of grandeur.¹²⁵

In her speech, Mary condemned the rebels and contended that the revolt was not simply against her marriage, but that the rebels desired to see her dead. Mary then strove to defend her marriage. She appealed to the crowd by saying she had spent her whole life as a virgin and it was Parliament that wanted her to marry. Mary also stated that she would remain single if that is what her government wanted. Finally, she ended the speech by asking the people to "persist therefore in your Loyal

¹²²World History at KMLA accessed at <http://www.zum.de/hkmla/military/16cen/wyatt1554.html>. Posted on 17 November 2004, accessed on 2 March 2006.

¹²³Prescott, *Mary Tudor*, 236.

¹²⁴Anon, *The History of the life, bloody reign, and death of Queen Mary, eldest daughter to H.8* (London: Black Swan, 1682), 66.

¹²⁵Ibid.

Resolution, and assist us in Executing our Revenge upon these Traytors...."¹²⁶ Immediately following the speech Mary returned to Whitehall, there is no record of her interacting with the people beyond the speech. Moreover, the sources do not mention the presence of ordinary Londoner at the speech. Since one had to be a member of a Livery to be a citizen or freeman one can assume that there were many Londoners not present for Mary's speech. Francis Bacon did write that Mary "confirmed the minds of the Citizens."¹²⁷ Unfortunately we do not know how many citizens Mary spoke to and consequently convinced.

Likewise, the documents do not explicitly state Londoners' reaction to Mary's speech and presence in the metropolis. Again referring to Bacon, his wording that Mary "confirmed the minds of the Citizens" is the only description historians have of London's reaction to Mary.¹²⁸ Nonetheless, one must look to the outcome of the situation in order to gauge the city's response. After the speech, the city, at Mary's command, fortified London Bridge and thus refused Wyatt and his men entrance. Next Wyatt tried to march around London in order to gain entry; however, he was again turned away. Wyatt eventually surrendered on 4 February, having never been able to take London.¹²⁹ Therefore, one must conclude that Mary's actions during this crisis proved effective; she did, after all, keep her throne.

The atmosphere in London after Wyatt's rebellion is unknown. Apparently there was no victory parade, the spoils of battle were not displayed, and Mary received no gifts. Although London did not openly support Wyatt's Rebellion, there is a sense that the city did not wholeheartedly support Mary either. There was not a proliferation of literature to support Mary after

¹²⁶Ibid., 67-68.

¹²⁷ Francis Bacon, *The history of the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, 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* (London: W.G., 1676), 172.

¹²⁸Ibid.

¹²⁹Ibid., 172-173.

the crisis as there was for Elizabeth after the Armada.¹³⁰ Clearly Londoners did not and would not support the usurpation of the throne. London had supported Mary's claim to rule over that of Jane Grey's. The fact that Mary was a daughter of Henry VIII and sister of Edward VI evoked loyalty even if citizens did not agree with her religious reforms. Mary must have been aware of this because she referenced her lineage in her speech at Guildhall. She said to the people "you...unanimously admit our Government, decerning us the undoubted Successor to our Royal Father, and Royal Brother, whom you gratefully did acknowledge."¹³¹ Mary worked for the support of her people in a way that was different than Elizabeth. Elizabeth craved the spotlight and was always looking for ways to interact with the people. The few times Elizabeth's throne was in jeopardy she went to public extremes to maintain her hold on it.

Moreover, Elizabeth usually made compromises so not to upset a large contingent of people and maintain her popularity. On the other hand Mary stubbornly found herself constantly battling for the people's affection. Mary's actions on the throne, re-establishing Catholicism, met fierce opposition. Once, Londoners strung a cat from Cheapside Cross. The cat was clothed like a monk and clutched a communion wafer between its feet. This was a blatant affront to Mary's regime and her religious reforms. And Mary took it seriously. She tried to hunt the people down.¹³² Mary's tactics did not set well with the people. Both queens endured serious crises that risked their

¹³⁰Documents that came out after the Armada in defense of Elizabeth and England include: William Cecil, Baron Burghley, *The Copie Of A Letter Sent Out of England To Don Bernardin Mendoza Ambassadour in France For the King of Spaine, declaring the state of England contrary to the opinion of Don Bernardin, and of all his partisans Spaniards and others* (London: I. Vautrollier, 1588); and I.L., *A n Answer To The Untruthes, Published And Printed In Spaine, In Glorie Of Their Supposed Victorie atchieved against our English Navie, and the Right Honorable Charles Lord Howard, Lord high Admiral of England, and Sir Francis Drake, and the rest of the Nobles and Gentlemen Captaines, and Soldiers of our said Navie* (London: Iohn Iackson, 1589).

¹³¹Anon, 68.

¹³²Anon, 117.

thrones. Although both survived, one did so amidst a tense atmosphere while the other in an air of jubilation.

James also faced crises in his reign. The time between November 1605 and March 1606 proved especially trying. During these four months James endured a failed attempt on his life as well as rumors he was dead. However, James did not use these times to increase his public image. Although London did show some affection for him, he certainly did not encourage it.

The first crisis James faced in his reign came on 5 November 1605. Parliament was scheduled to meet and have its formal opening. Keeping with tradition, James and his family were set to attend. Part of James's formal duties was to give a speech on this occasion. However Parliament did not meet that day. A plot was discovered to blow up the Parliament building with the intent of killing all present including James and his family. Catholic dissidents who wanted religious toleration had planned the scheme.¹³³ The conspirators believed James would grant toleration and were upset when he did not. In fact James did the opposite; he put more restrictions on Catholics. Thus the Gunpowder Plot, as it came to be known, was an open attack on James, his royal authority, and his throne.

London was ecstatic to learn the plan had been thwarted. That night bonfires illumined London's night sky. Though the people did seem happy their monarch was safe, the celebration was not for James. Instead Londoners thanked God for his protection from Catholicism. A contemporary document noted that the "the people" were "praising God for His mercy, and wishing that the day may for ever be held a festival."¹³⁴ Primarily this appears to be a celebration amongst the local Londoners. There is no reference to the king or courtiers being present. James had a distaste for public appearances. Granted

¹³³For a more detailed account of the Gunpowder Plot see Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 1:577-588; G.B. Harrison, *A Jacobean Journal: Being a Record Of Those Things Most Talked Of During The Years 1603 – 1606* (London: Gordon Routledge & Sons, 1946), 240 – 243.

¹³⁴Harrison, *A Jacobean Journal*, 243.

he may have been wary of going out in public since his life had just been threatened. Nevertheless, he did not make use of the situation. He did not process through town nor in any way engage the people; hence, when the people wanted to celebrate, they honored God not their king. This is a striking difference to Elizabeth's actions. After she had survived a threat she rejoiced with her people. She made herself visible and created a reason for interaction. Consequently, Londoners expressed thanks to God and love for Elizabeth. James did none of this and Londoners simply thanked God.

James faced another crisis on 22 March 1606. While James was in the country town of Woking, approximately twenty miles west of London, a rumor spread that James had been assassinated. Quickly all of London feared their king was dead. Immediately the city went into defense mode. The gates were secured and the Lord Mayor ordered all "traind souldiers...to reapipe unto their knowne London Captaines [sic]."¹³⁵ The city anticipated trouble and was ready to defend itself. The state of panic lasted for several hours until it was confirmed by members of the Court that James was indeed alive. However, all was not settled. London was still in an uproar. To ease tensions and fears James eventually went to London to prove to the people he was in fact alive. When entering the city James was met by the Lord Mayor, city officials, members of Parliament, and "thousands of the people flocking that way."¹³⁶ Clearly the people were happy to see their king alive and well. But how would James react to the city's affection?

The next day, being Sunday, James went to church. On his way he was greeted by exuberant Londoners. They lined the king's way and rejoiced at seeing James.¹³⁷ Although the people showed great affection towards James he did not seek out more. He did nothing out of the ordinary that day, but went simply to

¹³⁵ Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2:39.

¹³⁶Harrison, *A Jacobean Journal*, 287.

¹³⁷Ibid.

church. It was the people who sought him out to celebrate his safety and wellbeing. Unlike Elizabeth James did not embrace or provoke the public's affection. For instance, in contrast to Elizabeth, James did not pray on the steps outside St. Paul's. The proof of James's dislike of and ineptitude at public appearances lie in what happened to James the next day.

James's accession to the throne on 24 March might have become a day of jubilation and celebration. This was not the case. James observed his accession day by attending the scheduled events. However, he did not once engage the people. John Nichols reported that the day "passed with ordinary solemnities."¹³⁸ Also, that James spent the day "*present but unseen*."¹³⁹ One day after the people greeted James with rejoicing, he avoided any kind of contact with them. James did nothing to further his public image, nor his relationship with London. In the following years of his reign, Nichols reported nothing concerning the common Londoners' actions that day. Perhaps there was nothing special to report. How might Elizabeth have handled the situation? Knowing her attitude and the goals of her reign, she would not have passed up an opportunity to intermix with the city. Elizabeth usually returned from her country progresses in November to spend "her Winter in London in the procuring the safety of her People."¹⁴⁰ One assumes that, since she was usually in London for her accession, she would have made the occasion as celebratory as possible and utilize the already present joy. This is the marked differenced between her and James. Elizabeth strategically utilized opportunities to interact with her people and later died as one of England's most beloved monarchs. James did not employ the same public relations methods and thus has not reached the level of Elizabeth's distinction.

¹³⁸Nichols, *The Processes, Procession, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 2: 43.

¹³⁹Ibid. Author's Italics.

¹⁴⁰Bohun, *The Character of Queen Elizabeth*, 350.

It seems public relations or establishing a rapport with subjects was an afterthought to Mary and James. One can glean from evidence that their personal agendas came first and public relations were not part of that agenda. Or, perhaps, these two did not believe it to be a monarch's role to interact with its subjects. Elizabeth could not be more different, yet still the same. Her public image and perception were always in the forefront of her mind. She made use of opportunities to increase or strengthen her popularity amongst her subjects. Though, Elizabeth did this in order to strengthen her hold on power and thus secure her personal agenda. Elizabeth realized that a monarch's greatest asset was public approval. Consequently, Elizabeth centered most of her public activity in and around London. This is where Elizabeth could access a large concentration of her people; thus, she could receive massive exposure for one single event. There were times in both Mary's and James's reigns they sought London's affection, although the times were less frequent. And, the results of Mary and James's efforts were not met with the same reaction. On the other hand, Elizabeth always seemed to be ready to embrace the people and their metropolis. Whether at annual St. George's Day festivities or at a national celebration Elizabeth played to her audience and subsequently received the people's affection and loyalty. Mary and James may have had the respect of Londoners, but Elizabeth held their hearts. This fact has assured Elizabeth a place among the most esteemed and beloved British monarchs.

Conclusion: Elizabeth's London Interactions and Her Public Relations Goals

Clearly the events on 10 July 1559 were not unusual to Elizabeth's reign. We have seen how Elizabeth I manipulated the urban sphere as well as her public relations abilities. Compared to her predecessor and successor Elizabeth used the urban sphere, London, uniquely and to her advantage. She seized opportunities to bond with the people of the metropolis. Furthermore when Elizabeth was in London she was active and intentional. She did not let her subjects do all the work. Rather

she made great efforts to encourage the crowds. Whether by means such as orchestrating the entire event, or simply raising her hands or smiling, Elizabeth made sure Londoners paid proper respect to their queen. Similarly, Elizabeth conveyed her own feelings toward the city and citizens. In doing so, she established a bond with Londoners, both elite and commoner, that endured throughout her reign and, subsequently, provided her stability in the political, diplomatic, and religious realms. These London interactions are not Elizabeth's sole public relations agenda and experiences; however, I argue that these interactions proved more important and a better tool to gauge Elizabeth's public goals and savvy. If one just looks at Elizabeth's country progresses and declares, "nothing did more to spread and enrich the cult of the queen" without considering the enormous strides Elizabeth made in the urban sphere, one grossly underestimates Elizabeth's intentions and ultimate brilliance.¹⁴¹

In establishing this argument I have used several sixteenth century pamphlets: compiled shortly after the events they covered. The value in sources like these is their detail, not their causal explanations. It is in the sources printed long after these events that controversy arises as to dates and locations. Value lost in sources such as these are objectivity and perspective. The authors were undoubtedly influenced just like everyone else by Elizabeth's theatrics in London. Nonetheless, further steps could be taken in this study if one examines who these authors were. Were they Elizabeth's pawns? Moreover, this study could be taken further if one examines the letters, diaries, and papers, of the elites of London that Elizabeth came in contact with. How did these men perceive and describe Elizabeth when she was not around. These are just a few examples how this study could be broadened.

Nevertheless, this work has sought to uncover Elizabeth's brilliance. We have learned that from the first weeks of Elizabeth's reign she set out to bewitch London. From her

¹⁴¹ Erickson, *The First Elizabeth*, 274.

formal entry into the city (28 November 1558) and subsequent coronation procession (14 January 1559) through London we see Elizabeth spared no cost to make London her city. Even more, we find Elizabeth continually courting London. Up to the last years of her reign Elizabeth saw the importance of having solid support in the metropolis. Hence, we see her using public spectacle early (St. George's Day 1559), as well as late into her reign (victory celebrations in 1588) to sure up support and further her public image. In doing this Elizabeth set herself apart as a monarch.

There are similarities between Elizabeth's rural and urban interactions. For instance the entertainments were usually similar and included pageants, speeches, and plays. Moreover, Elizabeth always arrived with great pomp and accompanied by a large train of courtiers. Lastly, whether in an urban or rural setting, Elizabeth found herself greeted by large crowds and in magnificent fashion. However, despite the parallels between the rural and urban interactions, the latter prove more indicative of Elizabeth's overall public relations goals and actions. And furthermore, show Elizabeth innovations in the urban sphere, resulting in making the metropolis monarchical.

While in London, both Elizabeth and the people actively participated in public spectacle. Nobody was relegated to the role of spectator. Even more, when in London Elizabeth intermingled with all kinds of people. Both elites and commoners had access to the queen. In addition, when Elizabeth went on progresses she was the guest of one specific noble. When Elizabeth visited London she was considered the guest of the city. Therefore, all the people could collectively claim to be the queen's host. Perhaps the best indicator of the urban sphere being more valuable in evaluating Elizabeth's public savvy was her intentions. When examined, Elizabeth's purpose becomes clear. We can plainly see she was there to accomplish the initial aim of her reign to "purchase herself Love amongst her Subjects."¹⁴² Elizabeth achieved her goal in London. Elizabeth I

made London the primary stage for royal spectacle and its people the primary players. Indeed, before her reign monarchs and London seemed mere acquaintances; however after Elizabeth's reign, the two were old friends.

¹⁴²William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess*

Elizabeth, 32.