

Elizabeth I, Visual Icon: A Title Unintended
by
Emily Ballance Stewart
July, 2014

Director of Thesis: Dr. Jonathan Reid
Major Department: History

This thesis explores Elizabeth I's relationship with her official state portraiture to show that she placed little value in its meaning and authority for political and diplomatic uses. Understanding her personal relationship with the state portrait is significant because there are many surviving contemporary portraits of Elizabeth and most scholars believe that she tried to control the production and dissemination of these portraits for various reasons. This thesis argues that Elizabeth did not value this type of portrait enough to be a consistent well-paying patron or to exert censorship over its creation and distribution. By comparing Elizabeth to her Tudor predecessors and Western European royal peers it is clear that she did not commission and use the state portrait to the extent that other early modern kings and queens had. When comparing Elizabeth's use of censorship in other areas of communication such as the printing press, the theatre, and the church, state portraiture received little to no censorship or royal concern. An analysis of Elizabeth's words, written, spoken, or recorded by others, also reveals Elizabeth was antithetical to the state portrait for domestic or foreign diplomatic use.

Elizabeth did not value the state portrait, therefore, she was not an active agent in its production and she did not attempt to control its creation and distribution. These findings contradict Sir Roy Strong's assertion, which has been widely accepted, that Elizabeth did try to control these images based on his analysis of a draft proclamation of 1563 and a Privy Council Order of 1596. This revised assessment of Elizabeth's relationship to state portraiture is essential

to righting our understanding of who commissioned and censored her portraits, their meaning, and the ends for which they were created.

Elizabeth I, Visual Icon: A Title Unintended

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Department of History

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master's Degree in History

by

Emily Ballance Stewart

July, 2014

Elizabeth I Visual Icon: A Title Unintended

by

Emily Ballance Stewart

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF
DISSERTATION/THESIS:

Jonathan A. Reid, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Timothy Jenks, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Frank Romer, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Thomas Herron, PhD

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF HISTORY:

Gerald J. Prokopowicz, PhD

DEAN OF THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL:

Paul J. Gemperline, PhD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: HISTORIOGRAPHY	18
CHAPTER 2: ROLE OF ART IN TUDOR HISTORY	30
Italy	31
Low Countries.....	33
Spain	37
France	37
England	41
Henry VII.....	42
Henry VIII.....	43
Edward VI.....	47
Mary I	48
Elizabeth I.....	50
CHAPTER 3: TUDOR CENSORSHIP.....	54
Henry VII & Henry VIII.....	55
Edward VI	57
Mary I	58
Elizabeth I	59
CHAPTER 4: ELIZABETH AND THE PORTRAIT	76
CONCLUSION	99
REFERENCES	103

Introduction

Queen Elizabeth I has been a source of tremendous interest for over 450 years. She achieved legendary status during her lifetime, and has drawn historians, philosophers, literary critics, and artists to explore the distinctive and illuminating life she left behind. An interdisciplinary approach to the life of Elizabeth is essential to understanding the world in which she lived and the culture of the Elizabethan period. Literary culture and innovation flourished especially during the Elizabethan period, and because of that rank upon rank of scholars have explored that wealth of material. The visual arts, the subject area of this thesis, have left a trove of important monuments as well, which have attracted much attention, though they are notoriously difficult sources to interpret. British paintings are different from their continental counterparts in aesthetic, composition, and symbolism. In particular, poor documentation and record keeping often make it difficult to establish even the most basic information about the artists, subjects, and patrons of British portraits, which suggests that they may have different symbolic functions in Britain than in other countries.

Both Elizabeth's life and image have been thoroughly studied from various angles including political, religious, gendered, and artistic approaches. This study focuses on the portraits of Elizabeth herself, but not from the perspective of an art historian, or from an analysis of the portraits themselves. Rather, this investigation seeks to elucidate Elizabeth's relationship with her painted portrait, the extent of the control, or lack thereof, she exerted over this popular form of image-making, and why her relationship and interaction with portraiture was different from her contemporaries. This study attempts to show that modern scholars have concluded incorrectly that Elizabeth desired direct control over her state portraiture through a seemingly willful misreading of a narrow body of primary source material.

Against this widely accepted belief, this study will argue that Elizabeth herself did not actively try to control her visual image whether, as alleged, to rid the market of unflattering images, or to perpetuate a mythical image of an ideal ruler. I have found that Elizabeth placed little value in the large painted portrait for public and political use, and chose to represent her authority and legacy in words, both written and spoken, rather than public displays of royal art. That is not to say that other people in her court, government, and realm, as well as in foreign ones did not place profound significance in these images. These people are the reason these images were commissioned, fought over, collected, and, hence, exist and survive today.

Sir Roy Strong, the great student and cataloguer of portraits of Elizabeth, has done the most to perpetuate and popularize the incorrect notion that Elizabeth herself sought to control her public visual image. He deduced this plausible conclusion from a series of draft and published policies issued during her reign, which did indeed seek to regulate visual representations of the queen, but he never clearly established her as the author of those edicts. Moreover he overlooked one fundamental question during his analysis of Elizabeth's role in the creation and regulation of her painted portrait: "why." The only questions Strong was concerned to address were why portraits of the queen were needed in the first place and why the problem of hack artists producing debased images of the queen was never resolved during her reign.¹ His answer to the latter was simply that "she was never to have a court painter well paid by the crown and hence be able to sustain government control over her own image."²

This paper will address the questions that need to be asked for a better understanding of Elizabeth's motivations and involvement with royal portraiture: Why did she never appoint a well-paid court painter? Why did she wait twenty-three years before appointing a court painter

¹ Roy Strong, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1987, 10, 18.

² Strong, *Gloriana*, 12.

(Serjeant Painter) that specialized in portraiture? Why did she wait two more years after his death to appoint another Serjeant Painter when he had been in the midst of conducting the famous “portrait holocaust” of 1596? Why were the government edicts pertaining to censorship of portraits of Elizabeth sometimes not issued and the ones that were rarely enforced? Why was Elizabeth reluctant to sit for her portrait? Why does there seem to be a policy of rejuvenation (“mask of youth”) in artists renderings of Elizabeth toward the end of her reign? By expanding the primary source base from Strong’s presentation of her government’s official acts to include a close analysis of Elizabeth’s writings as well as accounts of her spoken words on the subjects of portraits, images, and, crucially, self-representation, this study will show that Elizabeth had no real intention of controlling her official painted image for any purpose, because she placed little to no value on portraits or their meanings.

There is an entire field dedicated to the analysis and interpretation of the patrons, symbolism, meaning, intents, and uses of pictorial images of Elizabeth, but that is not what this study will analyze. It will look at her personal relationship with the state portrait and why she had little use for it. This study will not address all forms of Elizabeth’s portraiture, just the individual portrait. Although they may be briefly mentioned this study will not analyze her relationship with woodcuts, engravings, sculpture, miniatures, and coins. Those forms of representation should be studied individually for their different meanings, purposes, and audiences. This examination will focus exclusively on painted portraits of the queen. This study is not only an analysis and evaluation of Elizabeth’s relationship to portraiture, but also an exercise in the critical analysis of primary and secondary source material and a demonstration of how their proper handling is essential in rendering accurate historical assessments.

In this regard, it is essential to understand the three distinct ways Elizabethan government issued laws and orders relating to the control and censorship of images. The Crown, under the Privy Seal, issued patents to people or companies granting them a royal privilege, or license to provide a service, or produce a good, such as a portrait. Patents transferred the property interests of the Crown to the recipient and gave them exclusive property rights over the service or product. Patents were recorded in the patent rolls and guaranteed the license holder protection in the royal courts.³ Royal proclamations were royal legislative orders issued by the order of the monarch and legally confirmed by Parliament. They were inferior to statute and common law because they could not serve as the basis for imposing penalties upon property rights or impose corporal punishment. Their real power was as psychological propaganda inducing obedience based on the threat of fines or imprisonment.⁴ The monarch's Privy Council was also empowered to issue orders and legislation relating to censorship. The Privy Council's purpose was to act on the monarch's behalf, but it possessed distinctive agency.⁵ It was through the examination and misinterpretation of three instances of these forms of legislation that the misconception of Elizabeth's desire to control her state portrait was born.

The cornerstone of my research is a royal proclamation written in 1563 regarding "Prohibiting Portraits of the Queen." This proclamation was drafted, but never passed into law, and was corrected by the secretary of state William Cecil, not Elizabeth. This draft proclamation is important to the study of Elizabeth's visual imagery for many reasons, but it does nothing to substantiate that she had any personal desire to control it. The original proclamation reads in its entirety (whose import Strong, as we will see, distorted by quoting it selectively)

³ Cyndia Clegg ed., *Censorship and the Press, 1580-1720*. Vol. 1. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009, xxxix.

⁴ Clegg, *Censorship and the Press, 1580-1720*, xl.

⁵ Clegg, *Censorship and the Press, 1580-1720*, xliii.

Forasmuch as through the natural desires that all sorts of subjects and people, both noble and mean, hope to procure the portrait and picture of the Queen's majesty's most noble and loving person and royal majesty, all manner of painters have already and do daily attempt to make in short manner portraiture of her majesty in painting, graving, and printing, wherein is evidently seen that hitherto none hath sufficiently expressed the natural representation of her majesty's person, favor, or grace, but that most have so far erred therein as thereof daily are heard complaints amongst her loving subjects; insomuch that for redress thereof her majesty hath lately been so instantly and importunately sued unto by the body of her council and others of her nobility not only to be content that some special commission painter might be permitted, by access to her majesty, to take the natural representation of her majesty, whereof she hath been always of her own disposition very unwilling, but also to prohibit all manner of other persons to draw, paint, grave, or portray her majesty's personage or visage for a time until by some perfect patron and example, the same may be by others followed:

Therefore her majesty, being herein as it were overcome at the continual requests of so many of her nobility and subjects whom she cannot well deny, is pleased that for their contentation some cunning person meet therefor shall shortly make a portrait of her person or visage to be participated to others for satisfaction of her loving subjects; and furthermore commandeth all manner of persons in the meantime to forbear from painting, graving, printing, or making of any portrait of her majesty until some special person, that shall be by her allowed, shall have first finished a portraiture thereof; after which finished, her majesty will be content that all other painters or gravers that shall be known men of understanding and so thereto hired by the head officers of the places where they shall dwell (as reason it is that every person should not, without, attempt the same) shall and may at their pleasures follow the said patron of first portrayer. And for that her majesty perceiveth that a great number of her loving subjects are much grieved and take great offense with the errors and deformities already committed by sundry persons in the behalf, she straightly chargeth all her officers and ministers to see the due observation hereof, and as soon as may be to reform the same errors already committed, and in the meantime to forbid and prohibit the showing or publication of such as are apparently deformed until they may be reformed which are reformable.⁶

A second key document is the Privy Council order of 1596 on "Unauthorized Portraits of the Queen." This order placed Elizabeth's Serjeant Painter, George Gower, in charge of the seizure and regulation of "unseemly" portraits of the queen. The order stated:

A warrant for her Majesty's Serjeant Painter and to all publicke officers to yelde him their assistance touching the abuse committed by divers unskillfull artizans in unseemly

⁶ "Prohibiting Portraits of the Queen [draft]," In Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. Vol. 2. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969, p. 240-241.

and improperly paintinge, gravinge and printing of her Majesty's person and vysage, to her Majesty's great offence and disgrace of that beutyfull and magnanimious Majesty wherwith God hath blessed her, requiring them to cause all suche to be defaced and none to be allowed but suche as her Majesty's Serjant Paynter shall first have sight of.⁷

These policies are significant both because of their existence, and also for the way in which they have been previously interpreted and presented in the authoritative works of Sir Roy Strong. Strong was the leading authority on the image and portraits of Elizabeth for nearly half a century. It is important to note that Strong's purpose when he first analyzed these attempts at censorship was to provide context for the heart of one of his early books on Elizabeth's portraits, a catalog of the extant contemporary portraits and images of Elizabeth, not to analyze Elizabeth's attitudes towards them. He never, however, really inquired about her direct involvement in these acts. It is necessary, however, to consider her involvement in this process because she ultimately shaped the way portraiture was created and accepted in Elizabethan England, even if the extent of her involvement was to neglect it.

Strong attempted, rather, to tease information from them and other material relating to the production of Elizabeth's portraits that would give insight into how and why this art was produced and accepted. Indirectly, however, Strong can be seen, as I will demonstrate below, to have manipulated the source to present a distorted vision of Elizabeth's personal relationship with her self-portraiture. Rather than acknowledging that Elizabeth's avoidance of sitting for her portrait created the need for the draft proclamation of 1563, Strong suggested that this proclamation was the first attempt in a succession of efforts "to control royal portraiture."⁸ Strong later theorized that there was a cult of Elizabeth, the cult of Gloriana. His truncated presentation of these instruments of control served as a foundation for his argument in his 1977

⁷ "Unauthorized Portraits of the Queen," In John Dasent ed., *Acts of the Privy Council of England*. Vol. 26. London: Mackie & Co LD, 1902, 69.

⁸ Strong, *Gloriana*, 14.

study that Elizabeth and her government implemented a royal propaganda campaign based on the visual image. He presented this theory in 1977 in his book, *The Cult of Elizabeth* whose focus was on Elizabethan portraiture and pageantry. Strong saw these mediums as a form of public image-making used by Elizabeth's regime to increase royal power and further the Reformation.⁹ In a telling passage he stated, "as in the control for the painted image, the ceremonial one was deliberately and carefully composed."¹⁰ Tracking the root of these misconceptions and disabusing scholarship of them, this thesis contends, is a key to a more fruitful understanding of Elizabeth, the many dimensions of the image-making that focused on her, and fields of study that intersect with them.

The account that serves as the point of departure and rebuttal of this thesis is Roy Strong's interpretation, in a succession of his works of the 1563 draft proclamation and the 1596 Privy Council Order cited above. The principal problems can be traced back to Strong's presentation of these attempted governmental controls in his book of 1963, *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* and were reprised in 1987 in the revised, reworded, and renamed version of the same book, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. These two works, in turn, depend on another work. The order, sources, and format of Strong's presentation can then be traced back to an article written by Sir F. Madden in 1852 in the academic correspondence magazine, *Notes and Queries*. Strong follows Madden closely: from the quote he chose to begin his presentation of the problems Elizabeth faced regarding the production of her portrait, to the precise sources he discusses, even to the exact order he presents them in. Madden's article is the core source of the information Strong used in his own presentation. Madden was much less ambiguous and much

⁹ Susan Doran, introduction to *The Myth of Elizabeth*. Ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, 4.

¹⁰ Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1977, 115.

more presumptive than Strong attempted to be when presenting those royal edicts as proof of Elizabeth's "official" position on self-portraiture, but the tone and implications are clear in both presentations: Elizabeth sought control.

Both authors chose to begin with a quote from Horace Walpole's 1786, *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, "There is no evidence that Elizabeth had much taste for painting; but she loved pictures of herself."¹¹ From the outset of both studies, this quote sets the agenda obscuring, as we will see, Elizabeth's complex attitude towards "pictures of herself." Madden stated that Elizabeth had an "extreme sensitiveness in regard to the manner in which her portrait was drawn" and this "is curiously illustrated by the proclamation written by Cecil in 1563."¹² Madden did not note that this proclamation exists only in a draft form and was never enacted. Madden then framed the proclamation, which is transcribed verbatim above and closely scrutinized below, in such a way that it appeared that Elizabeth took full interest and control over the problems with her portraiture. Begging the question by referring to her as "the portrait-loving queen," Madden proceeded to present a newly discovered draft patent by George Gower [1584] in which he sought a monopoly over the production of the Queen's portraits. This patent also remained in draft form and was never enacted. Although Madden was able to identify and amend a dating error regarding the Italian artist Zuccaro's visit to England in Walpole's work, he missed the mark when he connected the 1563 draft proclamation with Sir Walter Raleigh's passing reference to Elizabeth's involvement in the destruction of unseemly portraits in the introduction to his work *History of the World*. Since Raleigh would have only been eleven years old at the time of the 1563 proclamation, it is not a chronological fit. As will be shown below, Strong does rectify Madden's chronologically improbable connection, and decided to use the

¹¹ Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England*. London: Alexander Murray, 1871, 84.

¹² F. Madden, "Portrait Painters of Queen Elizabeth." *Notes and Queries* 6 (September 11, 1852): 237.

same example from Raleigh, but attach it to the 1596 Privy Council order. This alteration was more appropriate than Madden's use of Raleigh's quote, but not necessarily fitting evidence. Thus, Madden explicitly states what Strong implies: Elizabeth had a strong desire to control her visible image.

Strong first echoed Madden's thesis in his analysis of the 1563 draft proclamation in his book *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth* (1963). Although he claimed he was presenting the draft proclamation as a way to show the mechanics of Tudor state portraiture, the omission of key elements in the draft has led to the widely accepted assumption that Elizabeth and/or her government was concerned with and tried to control her visual iconography rigidly.

Strong's initial condensed version of the 1563 draft proclamation was presented as follows:

The proclamation was designed to counter the production of debased images of the Queen until 'some special person that shall be by hir allowed shall have first fynished a potraicture therof, after which fynished, hir Majesty will be content that all other payntors, or grauors ... shall and maye at ther plesures follow the sayd patron or first portraictur.¹³

Strong's intent was to reveal the ways in which the royal likeness was to be produced and disseminated. He was sure to state that this proclamation remained in draft form and that there was no evidence that it was ever enacted. His key omissions were to fail to note that this proclamation was reviewed and corrected by William Cecil, not Elizabeth, and that up until the time this proclamation was drafted Elizabeth had been unwilling to sit for an artist to create a pattern for other artists to copy. The full draft stated that Elizabeth,

hath lately been so instantly and importunately sued unto by the body of her council and others of her nobility not only to be content that some special commission painter might be permitted, by access to her majesty, to take the natural representation of her majesty, *whereof she hath been always of her own*

¹³ Roy Strong, *The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963, 5.

disposition very unwilling ... Therefore her majesty, being herein as it were overcome at the continual requests of so many of her nobility and subjects whom she cannot well deny.¹⁴

In the first version of Strong's book (1963) he did not completely omit Elizabeth's unwillingness to sit for an artist. Two pages from the initial mention of the proclamation he noted that, "the draft proclamation of 1563 reveals an extraordinary reluctance on the part of the Queen to sit for her portrait."¹⁵ The brief mention of Elizabeth's reluctance to sit for an artist was presented out of context from the initial report of the proclamation. The most revealing aspect of his willful intent to present her as a principal participant in this effort of control was that her unwillingness to sit for an artist was completely removed from the updated and revised version of this book, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth* published in 1987. Rather than including her "extraordinary reluctance" to sit for an artist he changed the wording to say "the 1563 proclamation reveals that the Queen urgently needed to sit for her portrait."¹⁶ This change in wording erases any mention of the Queen's actual involvement in creating or resolving the problem of her unofficial portraiture. These omissions are essential to the understanding of Elizabeth's relationship with her painted image. She would not simply be content to sit for an approved artist for an acceptable face pattern to be created; she had to be prevailed upon "at the continual requests" of her court and council to overcome her unwillingness to sit for a portrait. The question that Strong and other scholars did not ask was "why?" Why was Elizabeth "very unwilling" to sit for an artist? This question will be addressed throughout this thesis because it has yet to be answered satisfactorily, and its implications change the historiography of Elizabeth's perceived attempts of control over her visual iconography.

¹⁴ "Prohibiting Portraits of the Queen [draft]," In Hughes, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 240-241; [emphasis added].

¹⁵ Strong, *The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*, 7.

¹⁶ Strong, *Gloriana*, 15.

Strong also invented and promoted the notion Elizabeth was involved in creating and propagating the “mask of youth” pattern evident in the portraits from the 1590s. Strong claimed that this artificial representation of youth and beauty was a governmentally sanctioned form of propaganda to ease tensions over Elizabeth’s visible mortality and aversion to naming an heir.¹⁷ Strong briefly mentioned this “policy of rejuvenation” in 1963,¹⁸ however, he fleshed out his theory in detail in 1977, 1983, and 1987.¹⁹ Although Elizabeth most likely never sat for a portrait artist in the latter half of her reign, Strong has dared to assert that this “mask of youth” was created at the governmental level and that Nicholas Hilliard was “called upon to evolve a formalized mask of the Queen that totally ignored reality and instead gave the visual expression to the final cadences of her cult”²⁰ He presented no evidence of governmental action taken regarding this “official policy of rejuvenation” other than a vague and brief quotation regarding ‘curious painting’ with no context or citation.²¹ In *The English Renaissance Miniature* Strong assumed the mask’s official existence could be proven by the survival of sixteen miniatures that represent this “mask”. Chapter four will argue that since there is no official evidence of this type of commission from the government it is more likely the work of a struggling artist creating images of a queen who would not sit for her portrait and would not pay to keep the artist as her official image maker. Hilliard worked on commission for courtiers who, it would seem, wanted to show loyalty to the queen and flatter her.

An in-depth analysis of the “mask of youth” concept is important to the study of Elizabeth’s image because it has been accepted and used by other scholars as an important

¹⁷ Strong, *Gloriana*, 20.

¹⁸ Strong, *The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*, 17-18, 94.

¹⁹ Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, 47-54., Roy Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1983, 118-122, and Strong, *Gloriana*, 147-148.

²⁰ Strong, *Gloriana*, 147.

²¹ Strong, *Gloriana*, 147.

instance of the queen's vanity, propagandistic intent, and the dynamics of crisis at the end of her reign. Although the details of Strong's idea of the cult of Elizabeth have been refuted and modified, the "mask of youth" has generally been accepted as an extension of Elizabeth's preference.²² While it is reasonable to assume that any person would rather be portrayed in a flattering light, it is not reasonable to assume that Elizabeth and her government commissioned this aesthetic and used it as propaganda without substantial proof.

Another example of Strong's misleading and underdeveloped primary source evaluation is his presentation of a Privy Council order in 1596 regarding the censorship of portraits. Strong presented the 1596 Privy Council order, regarding the destruction of unauthorized portraits of the queen, with important omissions and with a scandalous introduction. Strong began with the anecdotal report of Sir Walter Raleigh, written eleven years after Elizabeth's death and during his imprisonment under James I.

Directly after the edited 1563 draft proclamation was presented to the reader Strong offered the extreme and anecdotal evidence of Sir Walter Raleigh's comments in the introduction of his prison-time opus, *History of the World*, to introduce the 1596 governmental order regarding the control of unseemly portraits of the Queen (presented in its entirety above).

Strong's passage began with Raleigh's comment that "at one period in her reign Elizabeth caused all portraits of her made by unskilful 'common Painters' to be cast into the fire."²³

The inclusion of Raleigh's comments and the extremely abbreviated presentation of the 1596 Privy Council order lead me to believe that Strong's intentions were to portray Elizabeth as

²² See Louis Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006, 222. Susan Doran, "Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I." In *The Myth of Elizabeth*. ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 192. Anna Riehl, *The Face of Queenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, 149-150.

²³ Sir Walter Raleigh's introduction paraphrased from, *The History of the World*, in Strong, *The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth*, 5.

a direct agent in the attempted control over her image. It is important to note that Raleigh proffered his “observation” as an anecdote to make a rhetorical point, not as a historical fact. True or untrue the comment was part of an elaborate rhetorical statement intended to flatter James I in a self-effacing critique of his own work. Raleigh extolled,

I could say much more of the King’s majesty, without flattery: did I not fear the imputation of presumption, and withal suspect, that it might befall these papers of mine (though the loss were little) as it did the pictures of Queen Elizabeth, made by unskilful and common painters, which by her own commandment were knocked in pieces and cast into the fire. *For ill artists, in setting out the beauty of the external; and weak writers, in describing the virtues of the internal; do often leave to posterity, of well formed faces a deformed memory; and of the most perfect and princely minds, a most defective representation.*²⁴

In this context this statement is seen less of an historical truth and more of a rhetorical flourish.

This inflated introduction was followed by Strong’s brief paraphrasing of the 1596 Privy Council order in which Strong stated:

Raleigh is, no doubt, alluding to the action of the Privy Council in July 1596, ordering all public officers to aid the Queen’s Serjeant Painter in seeking out all unseemly portraits of her which were to her ‘great offence’ and therefore to be defaced and no more produced but such as the Serjeant Painter should first have sight of.²⁵

Presented in this way it appears that after her “great offence” Elizabeth commanded all public officers to aid her Serjeant Painter, who was George Gower at this time, to track down and deface all unsuitable portraits of her and report them to Gower. It is more likely, however, that Gower and her Privy Council had more to do with this order than Elizabeth. As discussed above, the Privy Council acted upon its own agency and did not need direct command from the Queen to issue decrees.²⁶ Until this point there is no evidence that Elizabeth was concerned with or attempted to control any aspect of her portraiture other than being unwilling to sit for an artist to

²⁴ Sir Walter Raleigh, *History of the World*, 25. In Eliot, Charles W., ed. *Prefaces and Prologues: To Famous Books*. Vol. 39. New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1909-14. <http://www.bartleby.com/39/15.html>. [emphasis added].

²⁵ Roy Strong, *The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963, 5.

²⁶ Clegg, *Censorship and the Press, 1580-1720*, xliii.

paint her. Since it was the duty of the Privy Council to maintain public order it is likely they were concerned with the censorship of portraits of the queen, but this order does not necessarily mean that Elizabeth did. Gower, moreover, had previously attempted, unsuccessfully, to gain a patent monopoly on Elizabeth's painted portrait, which plainly indicates he was hitherto keenly interested in regulating the market of her images and implies that he, not Elizabeth, was the one plumping for the Privy Council decree. Unfortunately for Gower, he died the same year this Privy Council order was issued; therefore, the extent to which it was acted upon is not known.

Had Elizabeth been greatly concerned with these "unseemly" portraits she would have, most likely, immediately appointed another Serjeant Painter and had her government enforce the order. Elizabeth, however, did not appoint another Serjeant Painter for two years and never enforced the order. Moreover, if Elizabeth had been concerned with the production of her portraiture from the beginning of her reign, as alleged based on the 1563 draft edict, it stands to reason that she would have appointed a qualified official portrait painter (as had her predecessors) immediately after her accession to the throne to take control over her visual iconography and not, subsequently, allow hack artists to fill the vacuum she left for lack of appointing one. Instead, she only appointed a first Serjeant Painter trained in the art of portraiture in 1581, and this self-same George Gower, was initially put to work painting interiors and on other decorative projects and more so [rather] than the queen's portrait.²⁷ This is probably the reason why he attempted to gain a monopoly over the production of her portrait three years after he was appointed.

It could be argued, as Strong did, that Elizabeth wanted control over her image because, in her anxiety over aging and appearance, she did not want unflattering images circulated

²⁷ Tarnya Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*. London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2014, 175.

throughout her realm. In both versions of his book on her portraits Strong commented on Elizabeth's "extreme sensitivity over her personal appearance and her awareness and fear of its decay."²⁸ Not only does this comment echo Madden's antiquated article, but also it is only backed up by anecdotal evidence of a recorded encounter with the French ambassador, De Maise.²⁹ If, however, Elizabeth had truly wanted control over this facet of her iconography she could have and would have taken measures to censor its production and dissemination like she did with printed material, religious prophesying, and theatre productions. She also made it clear, as we will see below, from the time she was a young girl that she placed far more value in the mind and in the words of a person than in an artist's rendering of their corporal features.

Chapter one will outline the scholarly fallout from Strong's presentation of Elizabeth's official relationship with self-portraiture. This chapter will show how the omissions listed above changed the way in which scholars have since presented and interpreted Elizabeth's interaction with her visible image. There is a shift detected in the absolute acceptance of Strong as an authority on Elizabeth's iconography with the rise of the new historicists. The new historicists began to question Strong's findings from a bottom up perspective and revealed the involvement of Elizabeth's subjects in the development of her visual iconography.

Chapter two discusses the role of portraiture in Tudor England. The civic portrait was a practice revived from classical antiquity. Its widespread use began in Italy and spread to other Western European countries through cultural diffusion of the Renaissance and religious changes of the Reformation. The civic portrait was adopted and developed in each country, or region, differently in response to local political and religious dynamics. This study will compare and

²⁸ Strong, *The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*, 19; and Strong, *Gloriana*, 20.

²⁹ Strong, *Gloriana*, 20. Full account can be found in Maise. *De Maise: A Journal of All That Was Accomplished by Monsieur De Maise Ambassador in England from King Henri IV to Queen Elizabeth Anno Domini 1597*. Translated by G. B. Harrison. Bloomsbury, England: The Nonesuch Press, 1931, 38.

contrast how Spain, France, and the Low Countries utilized civic portraiture and how their interactions with England influenced how it assimilated into English culture. This will provide a historical and artistic context of the role of portraiture in Elizabethan England. This chapter will also analyze how each Tudor monarch adopted and used civic portraiture during their respective reigns. Although the comparison begins with Henry VII this examination will show how earlier monarchs and artists influenced Tudor usage of the portrait. The ultimate goal of this chapter is to introduce the role of the portrait in Western Europe and how Elizabeth's usage of it was unlike any other monarch of her time.

Chapter three discusses the role of censorship during Elizabeth's reign. It will examine the evolution of censorship under the Tudor dynasty to show the similarities and differences between each Tudor monarch and how the Reformation informed Elizabeth's use of censorship. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the profound ways in which the Reformation influenced the role of censorship in England. It will provide a comparative context in which to examine the types of control and censorship that were important to Elizabeth and her government. Religious divisions within the Tudor dynasty and within England created an immediate need for censorship of the press. The written word was powerful and could be spread relatively quickly and easily throughout England and beyond with the utilization of the printing press. The performed words of prophesying preachers and theatrical companies also reached a large and diverse audience. All of these kinds of communication necessitated censorship of the government in order to maintain public order and to prevent rebellion. During this volatile time of Catholic dissent and religious uprisings, Elizabeth's portraiture did not hold a priority over the power of the word.

Chapter four will analyze primary sources from Elizabeth and those close to her regarding portraiture and self-expression. From this evidence it is clear that Elizabeth formed her opinion on portraiture at a young age. After witnessing the negative aspects of marriage negotiation portraiture through her father and sister, Elizabeth refused to allow that form of medium to hold any authority in her diplomatic dealings. This chapter holds the key to many of the unanswered questions we listed above. Chapter four also investigates Elizabeth's relationship to limning, or the miniature portrait. Elizabeth favored this small and private portrait, but this relationship was casual and was not significant enough to garner her miniaturist an official position on Elizabeth's payroll. This chapter will also examine Strong's concept of the "mask of youth" because he believed her limner, Nicholas Hilliard, created it. Strong has offered an explanation that fit his overarching theme of the cult of Elizabeth, but this study will offer a simpler explanation of this "phenomenon."

Elizabeth was an intelligent and calculated speaker and writer. We may never know if her words truly reveal her personal feelings, but we do know how she wished to be perceived and remembered from them. Ignoring documents written by her hand or based on her word of mouth does not present the full picture of her official position and should therefore be analyzed to the closest extent possible. I hope to emend the consensus that Elizabeth attempted to manipulate and control her visible image and prove that she was more concerned with controlling the word than the portrait.

Chapter 1: Historiography

In addition to studying the primary sources relating to Elizabeth's personal relationship to her portraiture, it is important to understand how previous scholars have evaluated this relationship. This step is necessary because it clarifies the evolution of thought that has filtered to the present. When researching the secondary sources for information relating to this thesis topic, a conflicting interpretation between Elizabeth's own words and that of scholars specializing in her visible image was found. These scholars argued that Elizabeth attempted to impose governmental control over her portraiture in a way that does not square with her writings or reports of her opinions on the subject. The critical analysis of secondary sources has revealed a common thread that has sewn a disparate collection of scholars together from a variety of different disciplines. This thread consists of the intertwined works of the cultural historians, Dame Frances Yates and her student Sir Roy Strong, from the Warburg Institute of London.

This chapter begins with the two most influential works regarding the historiography of Elizabeth's relationship to her visual image: Yates' "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea" and Strong's *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. The intention of this thesis is to prove that Elizabeth placed little to no value in the public form of self-portraiture, so this chapter will examine how the presentation of a set of attempted governmental policies on the regulation of the production and dissemination of portraits of Elizabeth shaped the subsequent historiography of Elizabeth's visual iconography. This chapter will show the discrepancies in how this proclamation was described before and after Strong's abbreviated presentation of it and the subsequent evolution from there in which every work studied here credits, cites, refutes, or debates Strong's contribution. Strong's claims were the authority on Elizabeth's visual image for roughly 20

years and have affected all subsequent research until the present day, including this one. In order to understand Strong one must examine his mentor.

Yates and Strong have left an indelible impression on the study of Elizabeth's iconography, particularly regarding the visual aspects of her portraiture. Before Yate's seminal study in 1947, "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea," the authoritative works concerning Elizabeth were the hagiographical biographies written by William Camden (1625) and J.E. Neale (1934), neither of which focused solely on her image. In 1786, Freeman M. O'Donoghue provided a rudimentary catalog of the portraits of Queen Elizabeth I, which would be the focus of Strong's updated study in 1963. With the emergence of Yates' provocative, contemplative, and paradigm-shifting work the field of Elizabeth's image would become a goldmine for scholarly inquiry up until the present day.

Frances Yates was an English cultural historian from the Warburg institute who specialized in Renaissance history. Strong recognized her as the first person to seriously analyze the imagery of Elizabeth's portraits.³⁰ She wrote the paradigm-shifting article, "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea" in 1947 shortly after the end of World War II in which propaganda was an essential element. This experience is significant because it is difficult, if not impossible, for historians to write about their historical subject without their present circumstances permeating their analytical thought process. It was after this unprecedented war that she promoted the idea that Elizabeth and her image-makers developed a propaganda campaign centralized around her

³⁰ Strong, *Gloriana*, 7.

supposed virginity.³¹ Yates claimed, “the virginity of the queen was used as a powerful political weapon all through her reign.”³²

Yates did not just focus on the visual presentation of Elizabeth’s imagery as Astraea-Virgo; she showed evidence through historic Roman literary precedence, and evidence in contemporary English Renaissance literature as well. Through a close examination of popular poetry, verse, and song Yates expanded on Wilson Knight’s suggestion that the cult of the Virgin Queen was perhaps, “half-unconsciously, intended to take the place of the cult of the Virgin.”³³ The cult of the virgin queen, or the cult of Elizabeth, would be the topic that would inspire Strong to submit a more thoroughly developed thesis on this topic in 1977.

In this most acclaimed and debated essay Yates laid the groundwork for an entire sub-topic of study of Elizabeth’s reign which would inspire scholars of various disciplines to examine and reexamine this intriguing queen’s dynamic iconography. Although Yates did not mention the draft proclamation of 1563, which binds the rest of this historiography together, she inspired the scholar who would use it in such a way to further his own theories. Yates did, however, offer multiple ideas and suggestions for the future study of Elizabeth’s intricate symbolism and iconography. In the beginning and end of her work, Yates recommended that a fuller study of the mythical names associated with Elizabeth would remedy the complex problems of Elizabethan symbolism.³⁴ Thereafter, that recommendation has been taken up and continues to animate in a subfield devoted solely to the study of Elizabeth’s iconography.

The most significant proponent of Yates’ legacy was her student, Roy Strong who completed his doctoral dissertation under her direction in the 1950s. His work cataloging the

³¹ Doran, *The Myth of Elizabeth*, 3.

³² Frances A. Yates, “Queen Elizabeth as Astraea.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 10 (1947): 27-82; 82.

³³ Yates, “Queen Elizabeth as Astraea,” 74.

³⁴ Yates, “Queen Elizabeth as Astraea,” 27 & 72.

portraits of Elizabeth, however, began earlier while he attended the University of London. Most current scholars take issue with Strong's work *The Cult of Elizabeth* for its interpretation of Elizabeth's image as a calculated tool to further the Reformation, which was, furthermore, insulated from the art and culture of the rest of continental Europe. Strong asserted, "the cult of Gloriana" was skillfully created to buttress public order and, even more, deliberately to replace the pre-Reformation externals of religion, the cult of the Virgin and saints with their attendant images, processions, ceremonies and secular rejoicing."³⁵ The cult of Elizabeth was centered on the use of her unmarried and virginal status as Yates claimed, to wield political and religious power. Although scholars have refuted this view, and his catalog of Elizabeth's portraits is now out of date because of the technological advancements in image dating, he is still heavily cited in almost every significant work regarding Elizabeth's portraiture and visible image. His substantial presence in the work of current scholars denotes his lasting authority and should, therefore, be scrutinized for accuracy.

Most works on British art and portraiture before Strong did not focus narrowly on Elizabeth alone. These works were typically large-scale surveys covering hundreds of years and various topics. The Elizabethan era was typically summed up in a short section or chapter. Elizabeth has always been a popular subject, but not the art of her age. Frances Yates and Roy Strong deserve credit for popularizing this subject. In the 1960s and 70s, there was also a shift in historical interest directed toward subcultures of societies and a research trend of analyzing primary material from the bottom up rather than top down. Strong can also be credited with changing the perception of Elizabeth's involvement with her public visible image.

³⁵ Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, 16.

Ellis Waterhouse is one example of pre-Strong scholarship.³⁶ His work, *Painting in Britain 1530-1790* was written in 1953 and covered over two hundred years of British art. Waterhouse did address the draft proclamation of 1563 in his brief treatment of Elizabethan art. Attempting to identify official portraits of Elizabeth, he used the proclamation to show evidence of the difficulty of doing so. Instead of editing the proclamation to make it show what he wanted people to think was happening beneath the surface, he used it to point out the most peculiar and telling aspect of Elizabeth's relationship with portraiture; how unwilling she was to sit for an artist for an undetermined amount of years after her accession. Waterhouse noted that the proclamation was written in Cecil's hand, and its existence implied that there was an unmet demand for her portrait. Strong noticeably omitted those significant aspects from his presentation in order to promote his theory of the cult of Elizabeth.³⁷

Richard Ormond and Elizabeth Pomeroy provide the best examples of how Strong's skewed analysis of attempted governmental censorship of her image, as well as his de-contextualization presentation of Elizabeth's "extreme sensitiveness" toward her appearance has led subsequent scholars to a distorted understanding of Elizabeth's attempted control over her portraiture. Ormond's book *The Face of Monarchy*, published in 1977, is structured like previous works on the royal image presenting the subject as a whole rather breaking it down by era or topically. Therefore, Elizabeth became a subtopic of the Tudor subtopic. Ormond's short section on Elizabeth's involvement with the production of her portraiture is essentially a summarized presentation of Strong's findings. The danger in reducing an already condensed account is that it can concentrate significance and meaning in underdeveloped ideas giving them

³⁶ Other examples include James Lees-Milne, *Tudor Renaissance*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1951. and David Piper, *The English Face*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1957.

³⁷ Ellis Waterhouse, *Painting in Britain 1530 to 1790*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1953, 21.

more power than they deserve. Conversely, it can overlook significant aspects that the previous author explored. Ormond guided the reader toward the abbreviated list of attempted governmental policies with the prefatory statement of Elizabeth's hypersensitivity about her appearance, which led to her reactionary actions. The draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 are not presented in any context to their purpose or execution, leading the reader to believe the vain queen had to impose governmental policy upon her subjects to control her image, which is inaccurate and misleading. Ormond simply related that,

a draft proclamation of 1563 forbids the production of images of the queen, until such time as an official portrait has been approved as a pattern for artists to follow. Later in the reign, the Privy Council was seeking to suppress unauthorized portraits of Elizabeth, and to give the sergeant painter a censorship role.³⁸

These two sentences paraphrase Strong's summary leaving out essential details about why they were created and by whose order. Since Strong is the authority on the subject, Ormond also neglects to ask why these edicts were needed in the first place.

Pomeroy's *Reading the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*, published in 1989, exhibits the most careless profusion of assumption based on Strong's interpretation. In the introduction Pomeroy declares that she was "building upon the extensive work of Roy Strong and Frances Yates,"³⁹ which is something, unfortunately, she did too literally. Pomeroy did not provide any analysis or critical interpretation of the draft proclamation of 1563 or Privy Council order of 1596 from the original source. In her presentation of the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596, she cited their contents directly from Strong's 1963 version and took the liberty of asserting that these actions were executed by the direct command of the Queen. Throughout the entire book Pomeroy asserted that Elizabeth, upon her own agency, tried

³⁸ Richard Ormond, *The Face of Monarchy*. Oxford: Phaidon Press Limited, 1977, 20.

³⁹ Elizabeth W. Pomeroy, *Reading the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. Hamden, CT: Archon, 1989, xiv.

to control and regulate her image directly. This misinterpretation led Pomeroy to make claims that “her [Elizabeth’s] later attempts to control quality in her portraits testify to her efforts at visual self-fashioning.”⁴⁰ This interpretation, not surprisingly, promotes Strong’s “cult of Elizabeth” theory. Because of Strong’s omissions in the draft proclamation of 1563 Pomeroy assumes, “Elizabeth felt it necessary to regulate the production of her portraits” and “because the Queen attempted, however fitfully and unsuccessfully, to regulate the production of her portraits, we must count her as one shaper of these images.”⁴¹ Without reading the original draft proclamation of 1563, these assumptions are entirely understandable, however flawed they are, because of Strong’s omissions. This book exemplifies why identifying and rectifying misconceptions in scholarship is essential to the field moving forward.

Even when authors do not cite Strong in the presentation of their analysis of the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 their references can be traced back to him. In 1996, David Howarth included the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 in his examination of Elizabeth’s relationship with her portraits in *Images of Rule*. Howarth asserted that Elizabeth desired direct personal control over her portraiture. He stated, “the key to understanding the attitude of Elizabeth to her own image is to appreciate that she wanted to control it.”⁴² He then presented the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 as proof of his claim. The draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 were not cited from their original sources, and they were not cited from Strong. Instead, they were cited from Paul Johnson’s *Elizabeth I: A Study in Power and Intellect* written in 1974. In Johnson’s presentation, the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596

⁴⁰ Pomeroy, *Reading the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*, 12.

⁴¹ Pomeroy, *Reading the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*, 17, 62.

⁴² David Howarth, *Images of Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997, 102.

were cited from their original sources and from Strong.⁴³ Howarth's understanding of the role of the draft proclamation and Privy Council order were, therefore, twice filtered and skewed because of his failure to find the original source. Howarth was not trying to glean the mechanics of Tudor portraiture out of their wording; rather he was making a claim on Elizabeth's desire for control. Howarth's presentation and analysis were misinformed because he was not able to see that these decrees were not written from Elizabeth's own command or from a desire for control, although that was how he presented them. This truncated presentation and understanding leads the reader to believe Elizabeth desired direct control, but a reading of the original source suggests otherwise. If Howarth had returned to the original sources, he would have understood the motivating forces behind the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 were Elizabeth's subjects, councilors, and official court painter, not Elizabeth. His analysis of Elizabeth's relationship to her official image is, therefore, misleading and does not back up his claim that these documents prove that Elizabeth was not antithetical to portraiture, and their existence proves her "awareness of the potency of portraits."⁴⁴ This case represents the danger in relying on secondary sources for primary source interpretation.

Pomeroy is only one of many authors who come from a background in literary criticism who specialize in the image of Elizabeth I. Efforts in the 1980s and 1990s by the new historicists shifted the angle of Strong's theory of a strict top-down model of the promotion of Elizabeth's cult image to recognizing the other social and cultural forces behind the promotion of this cult. Many new historicists identified themselves as promoting the opposite paradigm of Yates and Strong.⁴⁵ Stephen Greenblatt was the first to promote the idea that the social forces of

⁴³ Paul Johnson, *Elizabeth I: A Study in Power and Intellect*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974, 12.

⁴⁴ Howarth, *Images of Rule*, 102.

⁴⁵ Julia M. Walker, ed. *Dissing Elizabeth*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998, 3.

art and literature created by her subjects, while influenced by a supreme authority, were also influential to the promotion of the “cult.”⁴⁶ John N. King agreed and asserted, “that while royal action may produce an environment suitable for the creation of particular art forms, it need not control or commission works generated outside the court.”⁴⁷ King’s research centered on the impact of the Protestant Reformation and previous English religious ideologies that influenced the way Elizabeth’s image was circulated throughout England. American literary theorist Louis Montrose agreed with Greenblatt’s thesis in acknowledging the authority of royal image making, but added that Elizabethan subjects asserted their own control through subversive images causing the government to become reactive.

While the main focus of these authors was contemporary Elizabethan literature, they also ventured to study Elizabethan art and the role it played in this reciprocal cultural interaction between subjects and royal authority. John N. King made no mention of the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596, but Montrose did use them in his analysis, not for what they say about Elizabeth’s desire or effort for control, but simply to imply that Elizabeth’s portraits made for public consumption must have been relatively crude and ephemeral.⁴⁸ Montrose did not make the leap to assume they were used for her direct control like Pomeroy did. Montrose stated, “Elizabeth was a privileged agent in the production of the royal image, but she was not its master.”⁴⁹ Although Montrose is not an art historian, his expertise in analyzing cultural interactions and meanings makes his contribution to the study of Elizabeth’s portraits valuable.

⁴⁶ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980, 166-168.

⁴⁷ John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989, 18.

⁴⁸ Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth*, 4.

⁴⁹ Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth*, 2.

In 2004, art historian Shearer West included a section on portraits of rulers in her contribution to the Oxford History of Art series called *Portraiture*. In it she explained how Elizabeth was exceedingly aware of her royal image and that she, directly, tried to control her image based on Strong's presentation of the draft proclamation of 1563 in *Gloriana*. West asserted that Elizabeth, "attempted to control her image by issuing a proclamation in 1563 that allowed only an approved representation, justifying this by suggesting that the 'errors and deformities' of some of her portraits 'grieved' her subjects."⁵⁰ Because of Strong's key omissions in his presentation, the omissions in West's report create an incorrect assessment of Elizabeth's involvement and the actual intention of the draft proclamation of 1563. This interpretation is an error that must be addressed to prevent this type of flawed information from being included in respectable and authoritative studies for the scholar or the general reader.

In 2010, Anna Riehl treated the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 to a more substantive analysis. She did not see Elizabeth as the principal architect in their implementation. In her book *The Face of Queenship: Early Modern Representations of Elizabeth I*. Riehl cited the policies from Strong's *Gloriana* and from their original sources and was, therefore, able to identify the Privy Council and Elizabeth's subjects as the actual proponents for their creation. Her study was aimed at identifying what the "unseemly" and "deformed" images were projecting in relation to blemishes on her skin rather than Elizabeth's relationship to the policies and her portraiture.⁵¹

Riehl did, however, accept the idea of the "mask of youth" based on Strong's suggestion that Elizabeth and her government solicited its creation from Nicholas Hilliard for political and

⁵⁰ Shearer West, *Portraiture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, 73.

⁵¹ Riehl, *The Face of Queenship*, 204-205.

propaganda purposes. Louis Montrose also accepted and promoted Strong's concept of the "mask of youth." Montrose also overestimated the amount of royal patronage to Hilliard's studio for these idealized images. Although the new historicists have provided evidence that altered Strong's theory of the cult of Elizabeth, their research shows that there are still facets of Strong's work left to examine. In addition to Strong's presentation of the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596, it is also essential to examine Strong's concept of the "mask of youth."

British historian, Susan Doran treated the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 in her essay "Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I." In the essay, she dismantled the mystique surrounding the cult of Elizabeth. Doran pointed out that other than the accepted face pattern and the Privy Council order of 1596 there were no other attempts at government control. She did comment on the draft proclamation of 1563 in an endnote, but since it was never enacted, she did not include it in her argument. She also concluded the accessibility of ordinary people to these cult images would be minor if at all. In the final blow she recalled King's claim that Elizabeth's iconography was not unique to her reign. Not only did the symbolism used to represent Elizabeth exist in previous Tudor iconography, but also elsewhere on the continent.⁵²

Strong's influence is apparent in all works on Elizabeth's visual iconography. Although more recent scholars have taken on Strong's cult of Elizabeth theory, no one has asked "why." If people are still concerned with understanding what the intricate symbolism of these portraits might mean or who were the people responsible for creating images of Elizabeth, the first question that should be asked is "why." Why was Elizabeth not involved directly? Why did her

⁵² Doran, "Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I," 192-199.

policies look different than her predecessors' and that of the rest of royal Europe? When all of these "whys" are answered, scholars will have a firmer foundation in understanding the proponents and the message of these portraits. This study attempts to answer these questions.

Chapter 2: Role of Portraiture in Tudor History

To be able to understand Elizabeth's relationship with portraiture one has to examine it in cultural, religious, and political contexts. This chapter will discuss the role of portraiture in Tudor history as it evolved in distinctive ways from broader Western European trends. In particular, it will examine the influence of the Renaissance and the Reformation in order to understand how the two influenced how English portraiture was created, accepted, and displayed. This chapter will also explore how the Tudors integrated portraiture into their regimes and how it evolved through each Tudor monarchy. This chapter will show that Elizabeth was unlike her family and royal peers in the acceptance and display of the royal state portrait. This chapter will first explore Renaissance art in Italy, the Low Countries, Spain, France, and England. The examination will then focus narrowly on the Tudor monarchs of England and how each one used portraiture during their reign.

In the sixteenth century, Western Europe was changing in complex and contradictory ways. The Renaissance reshaped almost every facet of European culture from education to religion to art. The Reformation was generated from the discerning and critical minds trained by humanist teachings, thus creating a complex environment of turmoil and confusion. The Renaissance represented a revival of classical literature, philosophy, and art. With this renewed interest in ancient culture came the secularization of literature, philosophy, and art. Approximately a century after the cultural shift of the Renaissance began in Italy, the Reformation took hold of Western Europe, challenging the traditional institution of the Catholic Church. The sixteenth century was a time when the traditional Christian norms were clashing with new beliefs, while secular Greco-Roman culture was infusing the royal courts and noble houses of Western Europe. The ideological shifts of the Renaissance and the Reformation by

turns both complemented and contradicted each other, and each country responded to and absorbed the two movements with significant differences.

The Renaissance originated in Italy in the late fourteenth century, a little over a century before the Reformation took place. Just as the Renaissance moved north, the Reformation sent shock waves across the West. Spain and Italy would remain staunchly Catholic while France would be divided religiously. Large portions of Germany and the Low Countries would accept the reformed religion, but their affiliations with the Catholic Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, would complicate their ability to worship and live freely. The northern part of the Low Countries, consisting of what is now the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg embraced reformed beliefs. The southern half, consisting of Flanders and Artois remained Catholic. These religious divides would also influence how portraiture evolved in each region and which continental regions would be most influential to England.

Italy

The Italian Renaissance altered the conceptual landscape of Western Europe. The renewed interest in ancient philosophies and aesthetics established the influential school of humanism and inspired native artists to experiment with and revive in the ancient artistic aesthetic techniques of naturalism.⁵³ Humanism was a reaction against the medieval educational program of scholasticism. Instead of seeing the liberal arts as essentially preparatory education leading to the higher studies of, medicine, law, or theology, humanism offered a fully rounded civic education through the *studia humanitatis*, which were an end in themselves.⁵⁴ The curriculum re-centered the focus of liberal arts education on the disciplines of grammar, rhetoric,

⁵³ Charles G. Nauert, *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, 88.

⁵⁴ Nauert, *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*, 14.

history, poetry, and moral philosophy. These “humanities” were supposed to train students in mind and spirit, inculcating in them skills and virtues that would enable them to pursue careers in civic life affecting and engaging their communities.⁵⁵ Humanism inspired the revival of many ancient practices in art, literature, rhetoric, and philosophy; the central focus of this study, the civic portrait, was one of the most striking and highly regarded of these revived cultural forms.

The civic portrait, or state portrait, was a principal feature in ancient Roman society because man, as an individual, was celebrated for his capabilities and accomplishments. The ultimate goal of an aristocratic ancient citizen was to have a successful career and life in the public sphere of government affairs. The accomplishments of a man and his individual glories were commemorated in the ancient world through the commission of works, both literary and artistic, immortalizing his deeds; this sentiment, as well as this aesthetic, was reanimated during the Renaissance.⁵⁶ While renaissance humanists revived dormant ancient culture and practices, the competitive rulers of the financial and artistic centers of Italy exploited the art aesthetic of classical culture.⁵⁷ The wealthy rulers used the civic portrait to increase the visibility of their personal fame and glory and the reputation of their households. This kind of competition was fostered in Italy because its constituent individual nation-states and duchies were locked in perpetual competition with each other for dominance and legitimacy. Along with the wherewithal afforded by its prosperous merchant economy, this competition in Italy allowed the arts to flourish. Florence was the heart of Italy’s financial and artistic cultural center in the fifteenth century, with the Medici family as primary patrons. After the Medici were expelled from Florence in 1494, the artistic center of Italy moved to Rome and was supported by the

⁵⁵ Nauert, *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*, 15.

⁵⁶ Lauro Martines, *Power and Imagination: City-States in Renaissance Italy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988, 229-230.

⁵⁷ Martines, *Power and Imagination*, 251-253.

Renaissance popes Julius II (1503-1513) and Leo X (1513-1521). During the High Renaissance (1494-1527) master artists, throughout Italy, became celebrities in their own right such as, Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), Michelangelo (1475-1564), Raphael (1483-1520), and Titian (1488-1576).

The Low Countries

Several factors led to the dispersion of Italian Renaissance culture and art to the North. The first were the similarities and contact between Italy and the Low Countries. Like Italy, the Low Countries were comprised of semi-autonomous territories supported by a merchant economy. Italy and the Low Countries had thriving trade relations, leading each culture to come in direct contact with the other. Artists from the Low Countries spent time in Italy and artists from Italy spent time in the Low Countries. Thus, these interactions created reciprocal connections and exchanges of ideas and techniques between artists and patrons of the two regions. As humanism gained international appeal, scholars and artists began visiting schools and workshops in Italy from England, France, and Spain, consequently bringing back Italian renaissance concepts and aesthetics, as well as artists back to their home countries. The other significant cultural interactions between Italy and northern European countries were the continuous military campaigns of France and Spain in Italy. While the nobles from outside Italy descended there to wage these wars, though it was not their primary purpose, they nevertheless absorbed and developed a taste for much of the new Italian culture, providing the demand and patronage necessary for its rapid development outside of Italy. The Italian Renaissance declined after Charles V's army sacked Rome in 1527 and much of the peninsula lost its independence. The legacy of the Renaissance would continue in the North, but it manifested itself in each country quite differently.

Although Italian renaissance artists influenced artists in the Low Countries, northern artists developed a distinctive aesthetic different than the Italian masters. [The northern artists almost exclusively painted with oil on wood panels, as opposed to the preferred tempera and frescoes of the Italians.] Northern artists were less affected by the classical revival because their national heritage was not rooted in the concept; therefore, they had more freedom to experiment. They combined medieval, gothic, and renaissance style to develop their distinctively northern aesthetic. These northern artists were more concerned with precise detail than idealizing the human form like the Italians. In the fifteenth century great Flemish masters like Robert Campin, Jan van Eyck, and Rogier van der Weyden painted for the dukes of Burgundy and wealthy merchants.

The portrait was also a popular request from patrons in the North. The Double Portrait of Giovanni Arnolfini and his Wife, painted by Jan van Eyck in 1434, and the companion portraits of Battista Sforza and Federico da Montefeltro, painted by Piero della Francesca in 1474, represent the stylistic contrast between Northern and Italian artists and also their connections. The companion portraits painted by Piero in Italy display the popular Northern aesthetic of the landscape in the background. Piero also used the Northern techniques of showing depth within landscape by making the most distant landscape features paler than the landscape in the foreground and by making the body of water appear narrower as it flows further from the viewer.⁵⁸ The Arnolfini portrait is painted in oil on wood panel and presents the subjects and their environment in meticulous realistic detail. Arnolfini and his wife are painted in full length and Arnolfini is directly facing the audience, his wife is positioned at a three-quarter angle and does not make eye contact with the viewer. The face of the man does not seem to be idealized in

⁵⁸ Marilyn Stokstad and Michael W. Cothren, *Art a Brief History*. 5th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2012, 320.

any way, showing the distinctive features of his eyes, nose, and chin.⁵⁹ The companion portraits painted by Piero are painted in oil on wood panel and are both painted in profile, disengaging the subjects from the viewer. The subjects are imposed upon a landscape background. The profile image is a classical technique adapted from the ancient Roman coin and cameo. Although a Northern artist painted Arnolfini in Flanders, the subject was an Italian cloth merchant, which shows the close connections between the two regions and their cultural exchange. Almost one hundred years later German artist, Albrecht Dürer, expressed his assessment of the influence of the artistic Italian Renaissance on art in Europe. He stated,

In what honour and respect these arts were held by the Greeks and Romans the old books sufficiently prove. And, although in the course of time the arts were lost, and remained lost for more than a thousand years, they were once more brought to light by the Italians, two centuries ago. For arts very quickly disappear, but only with difficulty and after a long time can they be re-discovered.⁶⁰

There was a high demand for art in the Low Countries and flourishing workshops were producing capable and talented artists. Because of this artistic atmosphere there was also fierce competition for patronage. Northern artists found their way to England and other European cities for financial survival. In the latter half of the sixteenth century, they would also immigrate for religious reasons.⁶¹ Although many artists from the Flemish school would create portrait masterpieces, they were also known for their religious work until the Reformation.

The Reformation influenced artists in the Low Countries in profound ways. As reformed ideas gained momentum in the 1520s, the popularity of religious imagery decreased dramatically because of the reformers' reaction against the worship of religious images and their pronounced

⁵⁹ Stokstad, *Art a Brief History*, 293.

⁶⁰ Albrecht Dürer, 'Dedication to Herr Wilibald Pirckheimer,' from *The Teaching of Measurement With Rule and Compass, In Lines and Solids, Put Together And Brought to Print With Accompanying Figures By Albrecht Dürer*. In Steve Edwards, ed. *Art and Its Histories: A Reader*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999, 113.

⁶¹ Christopher Brown, "British Painting and the Low Countries 1530-1630." In Karen Hearn, ed. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630*. New York: Rizzoli, 1996, 30.

emphasis on the Word. The reaction against religious imagery was strongest in Holland and England. This development led to a concentration on other artistic genres such as the portrait, but it also destroyed an entire market of production in religious images. Although Martin Luther, the father of reformed beliefs, did not encourage the destruction of religious art, the affects were observed in Germany.⁶² Albrecht Dürer remarked in the dedication of his treatise on painting,

And they will not be misled by those now amongst us who, in our own day, revile the Art of Painting and say that it is servant to Idolatry. For a Christian would no more be led to superstition by a picture or effigy than an honest man to commit murder because he carries a weapon by his side. He must indeed be an unthinking man who would worship picture, wood, or stone. A picture therefore brings more good than harm, when it is honorably, artistically, and well made.⁶³

Dürer's defense of religious artistic expression would not be adopted by the northern Low Countries or England under Henry VIII. This could have been because Henry VIII placed a high value in the power and meaning of the painted image. Traditional religious imagery was associated with Catholicism, thus asserting the authority of the Pope. Henry VIII eliminated imagery associated with the Pope and replaced it with images of his own personal power and of the Tudor dynasty.

The evolution of renaissance art in the Low Countries was impeded and redirected by the religious upheaval of the Reformation and Counter Reformation, led by Charles V.

In addition to the changing artist-patron dynamic in the Low Countries, Charles V, and later his son Philip II, took active stands to stamp out reformed communities in these regions in the Low Countries. Religious persecution led to the migration of artists and tradesmen out of the Low

⁶² Stokstad, *Art a Brief History*, 359.

⁶³ Albrecht Dürer, 'Dedication to Herr Wilibald Pirckheimer,' In Edwards, *Art and Its Histories: A Reader*, 112-113.

Countries to seek work elsewhere, including England, where they would find very different artistic communities depending on which Tudor monarch was in power.

Spain

Charles V inherited three principal dynastic territories between 1506 and 1519. In 1506, he became Archduke of the Burgundian Netherlands after the death of his father Philip I. In 1516, he was crowned the first king of the newly united Spain. In 1519, he was also elected the Holy Roman Emperor, Catholic king of Germany and Italy. Although Charles was a native of Ghent, his artistic patronage went to the Italian artist Titian. In 1533, Charles V showed his favor and appreciation to Titian by admitting him as a Knight of the Golden Spur and elevating him to the rank of Count Palatine.⁶⁴ Philip II would also be a patron to Titian. This type of royal patronage for a court artist was in stark contrast to Tudor royal patronage. Spanish renaissance art included both religious art and civic portraiture.

France

Italian renaissance art concepts came to France because of their geographical proximity and because of France's continuous involvement in the Italian Wars from 1492-1559, spanning the reigns of four French monarchs. Francis I, the third of these warring French monarchs, (1515-1547) contributed to the spread of Italian renaissance aesthetics in France. Francis collected Italian art and invited Italian artists like Leonardo da Vinci to his court. Francis was an image-conscious ruler who was aggressive and competed with Charles V and Henry VIII on all fronts, including waging war and image-making. Francis's true nemesis was Charles V, not only because he had lost the election for Holy Roman Emperor to Charles V in 1519, but also because

⁶⁴ Dana Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England: a comparative study*. Paris: Honore Champion Editeur, 2004, 213.

of their constant military confrontations in Italy and France. In 1525, during the Four Years' War in Italy, Spanish forces captured Francis at the Battle of Pavia. Francis was held prisoner in Madrid for a year and was released in 1526 with the signing of the Treaty of Madrid. The treaty forced Francis to make many territorial concessions, including giving up claims to Milan, Naples, Flanders, Artois, and the duchy of Burgundy. The most significant concession for the sake of this study, as will be shown below, was the hostage exchange of Francis' two sons, the eight-year old Dauphin Francis and the seven-year old Henri, for Francis I's freedom. The princes were sent to the prison in Madrid and Francis I was returned home.

In 1526, Francis' sister Marguerite of Alençon sent a set of miniature portraits of Francis and the Princes to England to persuade Henry VIII to lend diplomatic help for the release of the young hostages. Henry was unable to expedite the negotiations, but this diplomatic interaction introduced England to the diplomatic usage of the miniature portrait from a French perspective.⁶⁵ England was already familiar with the miniature portrait because of their interactions with Flemish artists who also specialized in manuscript illumination. Henry already had a miniature portrait artist on his payroll in 1525,⁶⁶ but it is reasonable to claim that this incident influenced the style and usage of the miniature in the English court, as Francis and Henry were competitive with each other in all aspects of rule and image. The most fitting example being the extravagance put forth by both monarchs at the meeting of the Field of the Cloth of Gold, near Calais, to strengthen the Anglo-French alliance of the Treaty of London (1518). The field was transformed into a makeshift palace of indulgence and competition between the two young monarchs. For as much effort as was put into flaunting excessive amounts of material

⁶⁵ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 145.

⁶⁶ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 146.

possessions, the treaty was a failure. The miniature portrait, however, would evolve from their interactions into an important form of portraiture in England.

When Francis died in 1547, his second son, Henri, assumed the throne in 1536. Henri II's wife, Catherine de' Medici, expanded the role of portraiture in the French court during his reign and after his death in 1559, while she served as regent to her three successive sons. Catherine collected and commissioned portraits of her family and other royal households on a magnificent level. Catherine was, after all, a Medici whose family was one of the most influential patrons of Italian Renaissance art and portraiture. An inventory taken after her death at her home in Paris revealed she had 341 portraits in her possession.⁶⁷ Catherine insisted on lifelike realism and even used portraiture to inspect the health of her children when they no longer lived with her.⁶⁸ Catherine was on the opposite end of the spectrum from Elizabeth I concerning the role of portraiture, and even criticized Elizabeth for lack of concern over her portraiture. In 1563, Elizabeth's ambassador to France wrote to her describing a conversation he had with Catherine and Charles IX regarding a possible marriage between the two sovereigns. Ambassador Smith related that when he was speaking of Queen Elizabeth's beauty, Catherine retorted, "after what everyone tells me of her beauty, and after the paintings of her that I have seen, I must declare that she did not have good painters; I will send her one myself."⁶⁹ By 1582, during the second set of marriage negotiations with Catherine's youngest son, Francis duke of Anjou, she had done just that. In a letter from Henry Cobham to Sir Francis Walsingham, Cobham noted:

The Quene moother this other daie shoed in Courte her Ma^{ts} picture made in full length and p[ro]portion by her owne frenche painter w^{ch} was lately in England, of

⁶⁷ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 134.

⁶⁸ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 134.

⁶⁹ Ambassador Smith to Queen Elizabeth, Paris, 1 April 1563 in Gustave Lebel, "British-French Artistic Relations in the XVI Century." *Gazette des Beaux Arts* 32: 1948, 278.

the w^{ch} picture this Quene semeth to make great est'macione . . . The great princesses did note, and weare very much satisfied to see her ma^{tie} appareled and attyred all over alla françoise.⁷⁰

Elizabeth's apparent reluctance to sit for or exchange diplomatic portraits had not changed since the draft proclamation of 1563 and Catherine took charge of the matter by sending her own artist to paint Elizabeth.

Thus, the civic renaissance portrait was adopted in France in a different manner than it had been used in Italy. Instead of being used as a display of power and competitive propaganda against other ruling houses, like Italian civic portraiture, the civic portrait had become more of an object for collecting, displaying, and trading with other ruling dynastic leaders. The French use of the miniature portrait between royal houses also inspired a new trend in personal and diplomatic relationships between countries. It should be noted that the miniature portrait existed long before 1526. Lorne Campbell traced the miniature portrait back to 1405 in the death inventory of Margaret of Flanders, Duchess of Burgundy.⁷¹ Marguerite of Alençon's gift of miniatures to Henry VIII, however, influenced England's interest and production of this type of portraiture.

The Wars of Religion hindered in France the development of the portrait as well as other cultural innovations. These religious wars, pitting the French Catholic ruling classes against their Huguenot subjects broke out in 1562 and lasted until 1598. At least one court artist, Corneille de Lyon, was an admitted Protestant and was forced to renounce his faith to keep his post.⁷² Territory disputes ended the advancement of renaissance culture in Italy, and religious clashes impeded its growth in France.

⁷⁰ Henry Cobham to Walsingham, Paris, 22 January 1581-2 (Public Record Office, London, sp 78/7/12. In Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990, 205.

⁷¹ Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, 62-64.

⁷² Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 137.

England

Although Henry VII and Henry VIII did patronize some Italian artists, such as sculptors or decorative painters, England did not have as much direct contact with the painted portrait of High Renaissance art as the other Western European countries. Renaissance culture and art did find its way to England, filtered through interactions with France, Germany, and the Low Countries. It is important to note that the portrait existed in England well before renaissance art crossed the English Channel. Two portraits dating from the late 1390s of Richard II survived the iconoclasm of the Reformation, and the Puritan iconoclasm of the Civil War in the 1640s, leaving modern researchers examples of pre-renaissance English portraiture.

The first portrait is called the Wilton Diptych and it portrays Richard II being presented by three saints to the Virgin and Child surrounded by eleven angels. The diptych style format allowed the portrait to be portable and private because the two panels are hinged together allowing it to open and close like a book. The subject matter is unambiguously religious, yet the presence of Richard II within this religious context asserts the divine authority of his kingship. The second is a full-length, life-sized portrait called the Westminster Portrait. It depicts an older Richard II, with a forked beard, sitting on the throne with the orb and scepter. Richard is positioned in full-face view, gazing directly at the viewer, similar to images of Christ. Richard's positioning makes another connection to his divine right as king of England, and creates a precedent in English art concerning the display of the royal image. The royal portrait, therefore, existed in England before the Renaissance, but the Renaissance and the Reformation would popularize the civic portrait to non-royal consumers in England. It is important to note that the Wilton Diptych depicts Richard as a boy of ten, the age of his coronation, yet it was created in the 1390s when he was around thirty years old. This portrait shows a precedent in English art of

depicting the ruler anachronistically, often as a youth, making the “mask of youth” concept less exclusive to Elizabeth.

Henry VII

The Tudor tradition of civic portraiture truly began with Henry VII, who took the English throne by force from Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485. Henry VII established the Tudor dynasty and combined the warring houses of Lancaster and York by marrying Edward IV’s daughter and Richard III’s niece, Elizabeth of York. In all aspects of his reign, Henry VII was concerned with firmly establishing his dynasty politically and therefore visually. Henry VII inherited an artistic tradition begun by his father-in-law, Edward IV. In 1468, Edward IV married his sister, Margaret, to Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy. This marriage alliance and Edward IV’s brief exile in the Netherlands, in 1470, introduced him to the art and aesthetics of the Low Countries. Edward IV was particularly drawn to the illuminated manuscripts of Flanders.⁷³

Henry VII was also a patron of the literary arts, but his interests extended to other cultural forms. He showed his stylistic preference when he rebuilt and converted the royal palace at Sheen into Richmond Palace in the Burgundian model of his father-in-law.⁷⁴ The visual arts Henry VII most delighted in were stained glass, tapestries, court entertainments, and festivals. Henry VII did, however, appoint Maynard Wewych as King’s Painter. Wewych was from the Low Countries and specialized in portraiture. His work was used for diplomatic purposes and he appeared in the payroll of Henry VII and James IV of Scotland during the marriage negotiations between Henry VII’s daughter, Margaret, and the Scottish king. Wewych would also appear in the payroll of Henry VII’s son and successor Henry VIII.

⁷³ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 79.

⁷⁴ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 79.

In 1503, Elizabeth of York died leaving Henry VII a widower. In 1505, Henry VII began marriage negotiations with Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian I, to wed his daughter, Margaret of Austria, duchess of Savoy. Although nothing came from the marriage negotiations, a portrait of Henry VII was commissioned for the occasion. The portrait is painted in the Flemish style in which the sitter is posed with their hands resting on a ledge at the bottom of the portrait that sometimes gives the illusion of the hands resting on the frame of the picture. Henry VII is also depicted accurately, in that his age is obvious. He is not depicted as a young and virile man in the midst of his prime, but rather an older man with a serious countenance. This negotiation portrait is one of the first examples of civic portraiture in England. It is important to note that a Flemish artist painted this portrait and not an Italian artist. Humanism had arrived in England during the reign of Henry VII, but Italian Renaissance painting had yet to become popular. Humanism was brought directly from Italy from English scholars such as William Grocyn, Thomas Linacre, and John Colet, otherwise known as the Oxford Reformers. Renaissance art aesthetics, however, did not have such a direct route. This lag in the reception of Renaissance style suggests that native English artists did not have the money or opportunity to study abroad or that the portrait artist did not yet hold a significant role in the court of English monarchs (and, additionally, that there was no necessary reason that it was by no means necessary that any of the Italian forms would or should be adopted). The role of portrait art and artist would, however, all change under the rule of Henry VIII.

Henry VIII

When Henry VII died in 1509 Henry VIII became King of England and married Catherine of Aragon shortly thereafter. Henry VIII was eighteen years old when he became king and was soon joined by two other young monarchs of major European dynasties. Francis I

became king of France in 1515 and Charles V, Catherine's nephew became king of Spain in 1516 and Holy Roman Emperor in 1519. The political and religious dynamic between these three rulers would breed cultural innovation and transference, as well as debilitating adversity and war. While the relationship between Henry VIII and Francis I fluctuated between friendship and enmity (depending on each ruler's current political agenda), Francis I and Charles V became archenemies because of the continual wars in Italy. The constant warfare in Italy resulted in Francis I's capture by Charles V and the subsequent exchange of his sons for his freedom. It is possible Marguerite of Alençon's gift of the portrait miniatures to Henry VIII inspired his enthusiasm for them. There are eight extant miniature portraits of Henry VIII, Queen Catherine, and Princess Mary dating to 1526-1527, which were created in the same circular format as the miniatures of the Dauphin and his brother.⁷⁵

Although Henry VIII had several portrait artists on his payroll such as Maynard Wewych, Lucas Hornebolte, and William Scrots, the most significant artist to contribute to the cultivation of the portrait in England was Hans Holbein the Younger. Although Holbein created some of the most iconic portraits of Henry VIII's reign, his contribution to English portraiture was brief and not consistently compensated by the crown until 1537. Holbein was born in Augsburg, but resided in Basel when he was commissioned by Erasmus to paint his portrait in 1523. The effects of the Reformation were already being felt in this region in the 1520s and the most damaging to Holbein's career were the attacks on religious images. Holbein needed work to support his family, and Erasmus recommended he go to England and visit his friend Sir Thomas More. After painting More's family and doing a few other non-royal portraits, Holbein returned

⁷⁵ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 147.

to Basel. He came back to England in 1532 to find a changed country with a new religion and different patrons.

In 1532 Henry VIII was in the last stages of seeking an annulment from Catherine of Aragon so he could marry Anne Boleyn, against the authority of the pope. Henry, thereby, ushered in the Reformation to England because of political expediency rather than religious piety or even desire. In 1534, Henry enacted the Act of Supremacy, declaring himself head of the Church of England and the only legal sovereign in Britain. This act and Sir Thomas More's refusal to comply put Holbein's first English patron on the executioner's block. These events and the following succession of Henry's wives did not greatly affect Holbein's position. Holbein created several portraits of Henry; a draft drawing of Anne Boleyn, and possibly a painting that did not survive from this drawing; the decorative heraldry for Anne's coronation; a portrait of Henry's next wife, Jane Seymour; a dynastic mural depicting Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, Henry VIII, and Jane Seymour; a portrait of Henry and Jane's son Edward; full length and miniature negotiation portraits of Amelia and Anne of Cleves and Christina of Denmark during Henry's search for a fourth wife; and many other portraits and commissions for courtiers, merchants, and ambassadors in England. Holbein died in 1546 leaving his iconic image of Henry, which would be copied for centuries, on the wall of Whitehall Palace. Although Holbein left no workshop or school of his techniques, he did leave behind a book of eighty of his drawings called *A booke of paternes for phisioneames* that revealed his artistic process and the high demand for his work, therefore, showing the increased popularity and demand for portraits in England under the rule of Henry VIII.⁷⁶

⁷⁶ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 170.

This increase in demand for portraiture was caused, in part, by the popularity of the civic portrait inspired by Renaissance customs, but also in part by the iconoclastic nature of the Reformation. Reformers vilified the Catholic practices of alleged religious idol worship, relic collecting, and saint veneration. All of these practices, they believed, diverted attention away from the real meaning of religion and the Word of God. Zealous Protestants destroyed these religious images to preserve the sanctity of God's Word, but Henry allowed this process to take place in England for less holy motives. Henry's adopted version of Protestantism had less to do with doctrine and more to do with greed. He changed little about how Christianity was practiced other than making himself the supreme authority of church instead of the pope. He did, however, use Protestant iconoclasm to his political and financial advantage. Beginning in 1536, Henry enforced the dissolution of the monasteries condoning the destruction of religious images and houses in order to confiscate the money, land, and revenues of the existing religious houses in England.

The religious image did not entirely disappear in private homes, but its decline in commissions and popularity created a demand for other types of art, and courtiers and nobles tended to follow the trend set by their monarch. There are far more surviving portraits of Henry VIII and his court than his predecessors. Maurice Howard perceptively pointed out that although portraits make up the bulk of the artwork that survived from this period in English history, portraits were not the only forms of decorative expression.⁷⁷ According to contemporary wills and inventories, there were many other types of interior decoration such as painted cloths,

⁷⁷ Maurice Howard, *The Tudor Image*. London: Tate Publishing Ltd, 1995, 8.

decorative wall hangings, plasterwork, and carvings.⁷⁸ That being noted, portraiture came to occupy a distinctive function in the upper echelons of English society in the sixteenth century.

There is a significant difference between the two monarchs when comparing Henry VII and Henry VIII's involvement with portraiture. One of the only surviving individual portraits of Henry VII was a portrait commissioned by an agent of Emperor Maximilian I, and it left England on its completion to serve the diplomatic function of a marriage negotiation. Henry VII did have a portrait artist on his payroll, but little if any of his work has survived. Henry VIII left behind a visible history, unlike his father, which can be traced from the walls of his palaces to royal courts across Europe. Henry VIII's iconic image spanned beyond his lifetime because of the talent and output of the artists he employed, namely, Holbein's full-sized image of Henry VIII in the mural at Whitehall depicting the dynastic succession. This image of Henry VIII, developed by Holbein, became the standard face pattern that would be used consistently throughout his reign.⁷⁹ This image of defiant authority was a departure from his earlier portraits or any other English ruler before him. This image and the extent to which it was copied suggest that it was used as propaganda to assert his authority as the supreme ruler over church and state and to secure the claims of the Tudor dynasty. His son Edward would be painted in the same iconic pose and countenance further proving the intent and effectiveness of this image.

Edward VI

Upon Henry's death in January 1547, Edward VI became king of England. Edward was only nine years old, and his uncle Edward Seymour, duke of Somerset, assumed power as regent. Edward VI was the first Tudor monarch who was raised in an entirely Protestant household; consequently, the destruction and avoidance of religious images was continued during his reign.

⁷⁸ Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*, 14.

⁷⁹ Tarnya Cooper, *A Guide to Tudor & Jacobean Portraits*, London: 2008, 31.

Edward died at the age of fifteen so he did not have the time or the influence to make a significant impact on the role of portraiture during his brief kingship. It is important to note, however, that even during this brief period Edward VI did have an official Serjeant Painter, William Scrots. Scrots was dismissed when Edward's Catholic sister came to power. Right before his father's death, however, Edward was depicted in a portrait in the same iconic stance and apparel as his father in the Whitehall mural portrait. It was clearly the commissioner of the portrait's intent to show Edward as the next Henry VIII and connect the two visibly and politically and to reiterate the dominance of the Tudor dynasty. There is also an instance, as will be developed more thoroughly below, in which Edward requested a portrait of Elizabeth. The purpose of the painting remains uncertain, but it does show that the portrait played a role in the relationship between royal siblings.⁸⁰ Some scholars, including Strong, have associated the surviving painting, Elizabeth I when Princess, with this letter because her age and the style of the painting match the description of a painting listed in Edward's royal collection in 1547.⁸¹

Mary I

When Edward died in 1553, his older sister Mary I assumed the throne. Mary reinstated Catholic practices along with Catholic imagery. Mary continued the tradition of employing artists from Catholic Flanders to paint the royal portrait; Hans Eworth, was her artist of choice and official Serjeant Painter. Originally from Antwerp, Eworth continued the tradition of painting portraits from patterns, and there is visual evidence of several face patterns of Mary during her reign.⁸² The practice of creating and using face patterns for monarchs and other highly visible patrons were necessary for time and convenience. Asking a high-profile subject to

⁸⁰ Princess Elizabeth to King Edward VI, with a present of her portrait, May 15 1549, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 35.

⁸¹ Karen Hearn, ed. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630*. New York: Rizzoli, 1996, 78. And Strong, *Gloriana*, 9.

⁸² Strong, *Gloriana*, 14.

sit for each portrait would have been too time-consuming for the sitter, who had other court obligations. Neither Edward nor Mary, however, used the civic portrait as a tool of power and propaganda as had their father. This is not to say that Edward would not have used civic portraiture further, but his reign was cut short by a premature death. It is also important to note that after Mary's death, her Serjeant Painter, Eworth, was dismissed and was forced to survive by painting portraits of Elizabeth's Catholic subjects in secrecy. Elizabeth would have a long reign and under her the civic portrait would develop further, but its advancement would not come from Elizabeth's command. Unlike her father, Elizabeth would not use the civic portrait for propaganda and visibility, but her courtiers, who were the chief patrons of images of Elizabeth, would cultivate an image of mythical proportions often confused with Elizabeth's attempt at propaganda.

The monarch was not the only subject or patron of the portrait during the Tudor period. During the reigns of the first three Tudor monarchs, patronage of portraits was limited primarily to the royal house, the nobility, and members of the court. Visual and documentary evidence shows that beginning in Elizabeth's reign more segments of the population chose to commission portraits of themselves, their family, and their ruler; this art form was no longer exclusive to the nobility. It became accessible because the middling sort demanded it. During Elizabeth's reign, portraits were commissioned by the gentry, bankers, merchants, goldsmiths, drapers, wholesalers, clergymen, lawyers, musicians, writers, and their wives and families.⁸³ With the rise in popularity of the individual portrait came a high demand for portraits of Elizabeth as well. This increase in portraiture was influenced by several factors.

⁸³ Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*, 11.

Elizabeth I

Elizabeth reestablished Protestantism in England after Mary's Catholic resurgence, ending the need for religious imagery and creating a void in the art market. London was becoming an international trading center and, as such, the urban population grew steadily over the course of the sixteenth century. Greater numbers of males, mainly from the elites, were receiving humanistic education creating more self-aware, cultured subjects and consumers of culture. The influence of Flemish artists only increased throughout Elizabeth's reign with the Catholic persecutions in the Netherlands and Low Countries. Citizen portraits were already popular in the Low Countries in the decades preceding their emergence in England. As artists and craftsmen immigrated to England from the Low Countries, they brought their culture with them. According to Tarnya Cooper, the citizen portrait of the Elizabethan period was a way to record a moment in time and they were also increasingly used to record family lineage.⁸⁴ Unlike during Henry VIII's reign when the monarch controlled the use of portraiture for his political agenda, the citizens were in control of portraiture and used it to further their own agendas. As Cooper has documented, it is important to note: the large-scale survival of the portrait, over other decorative elements, does not suggest that, "Elizabethan visual culture was exclusively concerned with royal propaganda, and the promotion of rank, fame and personal virtue through the medium of portraiture."⁸⁵

The portrait, however, did occupy a particular function and aesthetic for English citizens. Portraits were used to decorate the extensive interior space of the long gallery. The long gallery started appearing in English homes in the sixteenth century and reached their peak popularity

⁸⁴ For a more detailed account of portraits of Elizabeth and her citizens refer to Tarnya Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*. London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2014.

⁸⁵ Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*, 14.

during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James VI. These architectural structures were built in and added to homes, and they served several functions. Two functions of the long gallery were to connect public and private rooms within the house and to provide a place to exercise in inclement weather.⁸⁶ The space evolved into a social gathering area and, consequently, a portrait gallery. The long gallery is where the owner of the house could display portraits depicting their family lineage, portraits of kings and queens of European royalty, exotic royalty, Roman emperors, and portraits of people that touted the owner's social success. This feature in English homes was a contributing factor to the high demand of Elizabeth's portrait.

The demand for Elizabeth's portrait also explains the existence of over one hundred surviving contemporary portraits of the queen. Many of the portraits that have survived come from private collections and not from the royal collection because Elizabeth was neither a collector nor a significant patron to the arts.⁸⁷ This survival rate indicates that Elizabeth's subjects were commissioning her portrait and displaying it in their homes. The increased patronage of Elizabeth's subjects for her portrait also explains the mythical and flattering images of Elizabeth that have survived. To have a portrait of the Queen displayed in one's home was a gesture of loyalty and declaration of position within Elizabethan society. A few portraits of Elizabeth were commissioned to display to the Queen during a personal visit to the estate. The Ditchley Portrait is an example of one of these. Sir Henry Lee commissioned the Ditchley Portrait for the entertainments he held at his home for the Queen and her progress in 1592. In addition to the elaborate symbolism of Elizabeth's dress and appearance one can detect the

⁸⁶ Rosalys Coope, "The 'Long Gallery'; its Origin, Development, Use and Decoration." *Architectural History* 29 (1986): 43-84; 45, 51.

⁸⁷ Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 196; and Roy Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1983, 65.

patron's involvement in the creation of the portrait. Elizabeth is shown right on top of Oxfordshire. The county in which Sir Henry Lee lived and this portrait resided.

Elizabeth did not appoint a Serjeant Painter at the beginning of her reign. She inherited Nicholas Lyzard, who had served under her father and two siblings as a decorative painter.⁸⁸ The lack of having a portrait artist on staff was clearly part of the problem when Cecil drafted the proclamation of 1563 in an attempt to encourage the unwilling queen to sit for her portrait. It was not until 1581 that she appointed George Gower, a painter who specialized in portraiture. Even so, she had Gower attend to decorative and interior painting in addition to portraits. Currently, there are only a few large-scale civic or state portraits of Elizabeth that can be traced back to Elizabeth's royal collection or direct patronage. Interestingly, both portraits are allegorical and contain other people or mythical figures as well as Elizabeth. The painting that was exhibited in Elizabeth's royal collection during her lifetime was Elizabeth I and the Three Goddesses. The painting that was most likely commissioned by her was *The Family of Henry VIII: An Allegory of the Tudor Succession*. These portraits will be treated more thoroughly in chapter four, but they are important to note here. A subject that will also be discussed further in chapter four is the miniature portrait. Elizabeth did participate in the patronage, collection, and gifting of the portrait miniature. She did not use them overtly for diplomatic purposes like Francis I and her father, but this is a type of portraiture can be easily traced to Elizabeth, unlike the civic portrait.

The Italian Renaissance portrait and visual arts that affected all of Western Europe manifested differently in England in a different manner than the royal courts on the continent. Italian Renaissance ideals were filtered through French interactions, on a small level, and

⁸⁸ Matthews, P. G., 'Lyzard, Nicholas (d. 1571)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008.

predominantly through the cultural exchange between England and the Low Countries. In addition to the diffusion of these concepts through different cultures, the visual arts took on different functions under each Tudor Monarch. Some artists, like Scrots and Eworth, lived past their patron's death and found themselves without work under the reign of a different Tudor. Henry VIII was the first Tudor monarch to exploit portraiture and manipulate it for his political agenda. Edward and Mary did not live long enough to be associated with an official program for civic portraiture, but both did employ Serjeant Painters from the outset of their reigns. Elizabeth delayed the appointment of a Serjeant Painter for twenty-three years. One must wonder why that was, and chapter four will attempt to answer that question. Elizabeth clearly did not implement and exploit civic portraiture as any of her predecessors or contemporaries did, and the rest of this study seeks to address the reasons for her incongruous relationship with the portrait.

Chapter 3: Elizabethan Censorship

This chapter will explore the role of the word, both written and spoken, to provide a comparative context in which to understand Elizabeth's emphasis on the greater power of words over pictures in projecting an image of her as a ruler and how and why she implemented censorship over books, pamphlets, theatre, and prophesying but did not do so over images. The unstable religious situation she inherited from her forbearers required Elizabeth to be especially concerned with the spoken and printed word lest they be used to foment sedition. The reformation of the church initiated by her father and reversed by her sister created a deep divide between English Catholics and Protestants leaving Elizabeth with many potential foreign and domestic problems. Simply put, the word was much higher than the image in Elizabeth's censorship priorities. As evident through royal proclamations and government initiatives, Elizabeth's regime was focused on censoring and controlling written words from the printing press and performed words from prophesying preachers and theatrical companies. All of these forms of communication reached a wider audience in one printing or one performance than a portrait hung in someone's private home could.

The Tudor dynasty coincided with the English Renaissance and the Reformation, both of which altered the course of English history. Neither of these significant social changes would have occurred on such a large-scale without the printing press. The printing press facilitated the spread of humanist teachings and classical texts, thereby transforming the education system in England. The press was also responsible for the distribution of Martin Luther's reformed ideas on religion, and it also allowed subversive ideas and beliefs that were not condoned by the crown to circulate throughout England causing dissent and sedition. Because of these dangers, Elizabeth and her government attempted to enforce rules concerning what could and could not be

printed in England. In addition to regulations on the printing press, her government censored religious prophesying and the English theatre from the beginning of her reign as can be found in the Royal Injunctions. No such censorship was actually attempted upon her portraiture at the beginning, middle, or end of her reign by her direct command.

Henry VII & Henry VIII

Both Edward IV and Henry VII were patrons of printers and Henry VII appointed the first Royal Stationer in 1503.⁸⁹ This appointment suggests that the crown understood the power the printing press could wield and a desire to have control of it. Henry VII also appointed the Master of the Revels to assist the Lord Chamberlain with staging masques and court entertainments.⁹⁰ Both of these appointments would evolve into instruments of censorship under the subsequent succession of Tudors, and provide a comparison between censorship priorities between the theatre and portraiture under Elizabeth's rule. Henry VII was the only Tudor who did not have to negotiate the complicated difficulties of religious dissent caused by the Reformation. Henry VIII witnessed the first undermining aspects of the press caused by the Reformation. In 1521, Henry VIII conducted the first public book burning in England of the works of Martin Luther.⁹¹ Two months later, Pope Leo X declared Henry "Defender of the Faith" for his religious manifesto, *Defense of the Seven Sacraments*. A decade later, Henry would drastically change his stance on religion when Pope Clement VII would not grant him an annulment from Catherine of Aragon. This drastic change in religion caused the monarch to forge a new relationship with the press. Henry went from burning Protestant books to using the press to encourage the acceptance of reformed beliefs. Henry allowed his principal secretary,

⁸⁹ D. M. Loades, "The Theory and Practice of Censorship in Sixteenth-Century England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 24 (1974), 145.

⁹⁰ Richard Dutton, *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1991, 32.

⁹¹ David Cressy, "Book Burning in Tudor and Stuart England." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 36, no. 2 (2005): 362.

Thomas Cromwell, to engage in a propaganda campaign to defend Henry's rejection of papal supremacy.

In its increased use and manipulation of the press, Henry's government set several precedents that would be used by Elizabeth's regime, such as royal licensing, patents of monopoly, regulation of international book trade, and penalties for failure to adhere to these new rules. Before Cromwell's program of damage control began, book licensing and patents of monopoly had been left to university chancellors and appointed bishops. In 1538, after a tumultuous five years involving England's official break with Rome, Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn, the birth of Elizabeth, the execution of Anne Boleyn, Henry's marriage to Jane Seymour, the birth of Edward, and the death of Jane Seymour, the crown assumed control of the licensing of printed material in England. By consolidating these functions under royal prerogative the government, theoretically, had control over what could be printed and imported, and ultimately, seen by the public. Henry VIII also made the Master of the Revels a full time position under the Lord Chamberlain's office, whose brief included jesting, masques, and theatre. The Master of the Revels, during this period, reviewed and approved anything that would be performed in front of the king; this duty would expand to public performances under Elizabeth's rule. Along with the appointment of the Kings Painter (Serjeant Painter), as mentioned in the previous chapter, Henry VIII had assembled a public relations team that covered all aspects of public communication and visibility, his government took every measure imaginable, in that age, to ensure the success of its propaganda.

Edward VI

Attempts to control the press would continue under Edward VI. Edward and his regent Lord Somerset, however, went further than Henry VIII's superficial Protestantism to align the Church of England with conventional Protestant ideals. Edward did this by removing the Catholic devotional holdovers of his father. In their stead he established a vernacular liturgy, clerical marriage, and a new prayer book explaining the concepts of evangelical beliefs.⁹² Edward's government continued the program of destroying religious images in the churches, which his father's had begun, but its primary focus was on proper conversion rather than the confiscation of wealth. In addition to continuing Henry's press censorship and furthering reform, Edward's regime found that it had to extend censorship to the playhouses and players to counteract the oral expressions of discontent with the young king's acceptance of reformed religion. In 1548, Edward's first Act of Uniformity forbade "interludes, plays, songs, rhymes, or by other open words, declared or speak anything in the derogation, depraving, or despising of the same book [*Common Prayer Book*]." ⁹³ In 1549, a royal proclamation banned all plays, public and private, within England for three months.⁹⁴ In 1551, he issued another royal proclamation that required interludes and plays to be licensed by his direct permission or by his Privy Council.⁹⁵ Richard Dutton identified this as the first formal attempt to censor performed material.⁹⁶ Mary and Elizabeth would continue this form of censorship. Censorship was a necessary measure for all of Henry's children to try and curb the religious dissent that was rampant during each of their reigns.

⁹² Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. New York: Palgrave, 2001, 12.

⁹³ "The First Act of Uniformity 1548." In David C. Douglas, Ian W. Archer, and F D. Price, eds. In *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V(A). New York: Routledge, 2011.

⁹⁴ Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, 17.

⁹⁵ Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, 19.

⁹⁶ Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, 19.

Mary I

Unlike Cromwell's proactive approach to harnessing the press in Henry's favor, Mary I's rule and reinstatement of Catholicism created a new set of challenges. Under Mary, the regime was forced to be more reactive than proactive because she inherited a firmly reformed press structure. She had to rid the market of existing Protestant literature, prevent more from being circulated, and handle printed attacks on her religion and rule. Reactive measures tend to be more severe because of their distressed nature. Elizabeth would also need to adopt these devices of reaction, set in place by her sister, to regain order and adherence to Protestantism. In 1555, slander against the queen and king became a felony, with a penalty of the loss of the offender's right hand.⁹⁷ In the same year, Parliament clarified the definition of treason recognizing religious differences as the primary sources of treasonous outbursts. This type of subversion against the royal government occurred primarily on the pulpit, on the stage, and in the press. In an attempt to rectify this lack of control of the press, Mary granted a charter to the Company of Stationers in 1557. This charter allowed the printing company a monopoly and power to regulate other printing businesses in England. They were permitted to search out and destroy books and publications that did not adhere to their guidelines, effectively making the Company of Stationers an extension of the crown's machinery of censorship. Books, pamphlets, articles, plays, ballads, and sermons that did not conform to royal guidelines were sought out and destroyed. The people who produced them were imprisoned, fined, and sometimes maimed. Incidents of this nature would intensify under Elizabeth because religious discontent was widespread. Because of Europe's religious upheavals and England's revolving religious

⁹⁷ Loades, "The Theory and Practice of Censorship in Sixteenth-Century England," 152.

policies, English citizens could go to sleep loyal to the crown and wake up a heretic, based on the present ruler's religious preference.

Elizabeth I

When Elizabeth became queen, she chose to adopt a religious settlement that combined elements of her father's invention and her brother's legacy in an attempt to be moderate, but this attempt inflamed both Catholic and Protestant idealists. Henry VIII's Protestantism had not been moderated for the sake of his subjects. He simply needed to remove the pope's authority so he could divorce an unwanted wife. The liturgy and ceremony changed little, the only decisive alteration he made was in the power structure of the church. In the first Act of Supremacy, Henry named himself and his successors as the "supreme head" of the Church of England with

full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempt's, and enormities, whatsoever they be . . .⁹⁸

It is important to note that although the different Tudor regimes adopted and adapted different versions of Christianity, the three major shifts in religious orientation of the Tudor monarchs only had a polarizing effect on Protestants and Catholics galvanizing the opposition of each confession's extremist wings against the monarchy, whatever its religious orientation. The majority of the population was willing to submit to whatever religion was demanded of them without a struggle.⁹⁹ Both zealous Protestants and Catholics would cause trouble for Elizabeth in the press, on the pulpit, and on the stage.

Shortly after her accession Elizabeth, her Principal Secretary William Cecil, and her council created the Act of Supremacy (1559) and the Act of Uniformity (1559) in an attempt to

⁹⁸ "An act for the king's highness to be supreme head of the Church of England and to have authority to reform and redress all errors, heresies and abuses in the same (1534)."

⁹⁹ Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002, 243.

counteract these religious obstacles. Elizabeth followed these acts with the Royal Injunctions of 1559. Although her settlement was clearly Protestant she conceded some points to Catholic belief. The injunctions reiterated her authority over any foreign and domestic power religious or secular. They required English people to abandon religious superstitions associated with images, relics, and miracles and also encouraged them to cleanse church and the home of ‘idols.’

Elizabeth, however, would not, despite pressure from the thorough-going Reformed, get rid of the silver crucifix that hung in her private chapel, which is a direct reflection of Elizabeth’s moderated Protestantism. The injunctions directed educated and licensed preachers to teach the people the Creed and the Ten Commandments in English so that the laity could in turn teach the basics of faith in their homes. The preachers were also to sing or say the litany of the sacrament of communion in English, “to the intent the people may hear and answer: and none other procession or litany to be had or used but the said litany in English, adding nothing thereto but as it is now appointed.”¹⁰⁰ Control and censorship over the preacher and his sermon were essential to reaffirming the Protestant religion and invalidating the authority of the pope.

The purpose of these injunctions was to lay the groundwork for Elizabeth’s policies as a ruler and as governor of the state religion. The injunctions also contained regulations on England’s media. They state:

Because there is a great abuse in the printers of books, which for covetousness chiefly regard not what they print so they may have gain, whereby ariseth great disorder by publication of unfruitful, vain and infamous books and papers, the Queen’s Majesty straightly charges and commands that no manner of person shall print any manner of book or paper of what sort, nature or in what language soever it be, except the same be first licensed by her Majesty by express words in writing or by six of her Privy Council, or be perused and licensed by the archbishops of

¹⁰⁰ “Royal Injunctions, 1559.” In David C. Douglas, Ian W. Archer, and F D. Price, eds. *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V(A). New York: Routledge, 2011.

Canterbury and York, the bishop of London, the chancellors of both universities .
¹⁰¹
. .

This injunction casts publishers and printers as unsavory, self-seeking individuals who needed to be regulated because of their inability to censor the material they agreed to circulate. This section of the Injunctions laid out the framework for licensing and the people who were authorized to approve texts on Elizabeth's behalf. It was also Elizabeth's attempt at government-justified censorship of the press from the outset of her reign. The Injunction goes on to state:

And because many pamphlets, plays and ballads be oftentimes printed, wherein regard would be had that nothing therein should be either heretical, seditious or unseemly for Christian ears, her Majesty likewise commands that no manner of person shall enterprise to print and such, except the same be to him licensed by such her Majesty's commissioners . . . And if any shall sell or utter any manner of books or papers, being not licensed as is abovesaid, that the same party shall be punished by order of the said commissioners, as to the quality of the fault shall be thought meet. . .¹⁰²

This section addressed forms of communication that were not always written, but were often circulated. Plays and ballads are interesting inclusions in these Injunctions, because they are not always printed, but when they were their message could reach an even broader audience than the one for which they were performed. Elizabeth supplemented these injunctions with a royal proclamation in the same year stating that,

The Queen's majesty [doth] straightly forbid all manner interludes to be played either openly or privately, except the same be notified beforehand and licensed within any city or town corporate by the mayor or other chief officers . . . and that they permit none to be played wherein either matters of religion or of the governance of the estate of the commonweal shall be handled or treated . . .¹⁰³

Unlike Edward's rather vague licensing requirements, Elizabeth specified that religion and the governance of the country were topics that could not be addressed under any circumstance. The

¹⁰¹ "Royal Injunctions, 1559"

¹⁰² "Royal Injunctions, 1559"

¹⁰³ "Prohibiting Unlicensed Interludes and Plays, Especially on Religion or Policy." In Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. Vol. II. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969, 115.

existence of these restrictions on the press and in the playhouse within the first year of her accession indicates the priority they took over other forms of representation. Because portraiture was left out of these Royal Injunctions it is, therefore, reasonable to presume that portraiture was not essential to the framing of her government or to the acceptance and visibility of her authority to her subjects. Had Elizabeth perceived that portraiture had as much influence on her subjects as the written or performed word, Elizabeth would have issued similar restrictions on and licensing procedures for its production. The existence of the draft proclamation of 1563 makes it clear that Elizabeth's council eventually took interest in this medium as a potential vector for propaganda/critique of the monarch. The fact that it remained in draft form, and that there is no evidence that Elizabeth sat for her portrait for several years thereafter suggests that Elizabeth did not value the portrait's potential benefits or potential damage to her personal image and authority. Although Elizabeth and her advisors attempted to be proactive in controlling the press from the beginning of her reign, religious dissent would boil over several significant times throughout her long rule.

Elizabeth revealed her ambiguous approach to religion from the start and unwittingly provoked discontent from Catholics and Protestants. The Injunctions required every parish to provide a volume of the Bible written in English containing the paraphrasing of Erasmus. Erasmus was Catholic who refused to convert to Protestantism, but his sharp criticisms of the Catholic Church made him a controversial and disliked character by both religious parties. The involvement of Erasmus' work in Elizabeth's settlement is emblematic of the middling position of her religious settlement, which would prompt such strong resistance from ardent Catholics and Protestants alike. The 1560s would reveal these tensions on both sides. Both Puritans and Catholics would wage a war of words against the royal government in the form of print

propaganda. Puritans also became unhappy with the way in which Elizabeth chose to enforce her religious settlement. Their hopes for a purely reformed Anglican Church dwindled as each year went by causing their frustrations to boil over. Puritans waited patiently for thorough reform at the beginning of Elizabeth's rule but became outspoken after several indicative events such as Elizabeth's rejection of reforms at the Convocation of 1563 and the suspension of non-conforming ministers in 1566.

The trade embargo Spain enacted against England in the Netherlands from 1563-1565 initiated the deterioration of England's relationship with Spain. The religious and political divide between England and Spain helps explain why Spain had little influence on England in regard to art and culture. In 1562, England tried to intervene in the French war of religion, aiding the Huguenots against the Catholic Guise family. Mary Stuart Queen of Scots was also a member of the House of Guise and remained a Catholic threat to England for her lifetime.

These foreign threats became domestic when a faction in Elizabeth's court secretly devised a plan to wed Mary Stuart to the duke of Norfolk. Elizabeth found out about this proposal and Norfolk fled court without royal permission.¹⁰⁴ Concurrently in the North of England, the earl of Northumberland perceived a blow to his honor when Elizabeth replaced him as holder of the wardenries of the Marches with people of lesser stature. In 1567, along with the royally estranged earl of Westmorland, Northumberland reconverted to Catholicism and gathered a rebellion against Elizabeth in the name of 'ancient nobility.' In the Manifesto of the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland the rebels justified their uprising as necessary in order to restore dignity of the 'ancient nobility' and the ancient religion of England as well as to settle the

¹⁰⁴ "The Crisis of 1568-72"

issue of succession (i.e., establish Mary Stuart's claim to the English throne).¹⁰⁵ The rebels referred to Mary Stuart as the Queen's Majesty rather than Elizabeth:

We have therefore, of just and faithful meaning to the Queen's Majesty, her commonwealth and the true successors of the same, assembled ourselves to resist force by force; wherein we commit ourselves, seeing no intercession will help, to the exceeding mercy and goodness of Almighty God and to all true favourers of this realm of England; resolved in ourselves to this so just and godly an enterprise wholly to adventure our lives, lands and goods; whereunto we heartily crave the true aid and assistance of all the faithful favourers of the quietness of this commonwealth and the ancient nobility of the same.¹⁰⁶

The rebels were aware of the rules and laws put into place by the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy and the Royal Injunctions. The earls severely underestimated England's loyalty to Elizabeth and the timing of events, miscalculations that undermined their every step. Mary Stuart was moved to Tutbury in 1569 after being accused of being an accomplice in the murder of her husband. The duke of Norfolk was imprisoned in the Tower for fleeing court without permission, and the nobles' most powerful supporter, the pope, did not expedite the papal bull of Elizabeth's excommunication to England until the rebellion had already been dismantled in 1570.¹⁰⁷ The rebels' emphasis upon the religious side of their discontentment not only ensured their own brutal downfall, with approximately 700 rebels being condemned to death, but also elevated the threat of Catholicism to Elizabeth's rule from mere recusancy to active sedition.¹⁰⁸

The papal bull excommunicating Elizabeth from the Church of Rome theoretically liberated all Catholics from the tyranny of her "unholy" rule. Elizabeth would have to contend with the stigma and threat of these words for the rest of her rule. Pope Pius V charged the "pretended Queen of England and the servant of crime," of usurping the crown and returning the

¹⁰⁵ "The Crisis of 1568-72"

¹⁰⁶ "The Manifesto of the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland." In David C. Douglas, Ian W. Archer, and F. D. Price, eds. *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V(A). New York: Routledge, 2011.

¹⁰⁷ MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England*, 121.

¹⁰⁸ "The Crisis of 1568-72"

kingdom of England to “miserable ruin.”¹⁰⁹ Even though the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity had been in effect for eleven years, her relationship with Catholics inside and outside of her realm had finally reached a crisis point. Pope Pius V seethed that Elizabeth:

has forbidden the prelates, clergy and people to acknowledge the Church of Rome or obey its precepts and canonical sanctions; has forced most of them to come to terms with her wicked laws, to abjure the authority and obedience of the pope of Rome, and to accept her, on oath, as their only lady in matters temporal and spiritual.¹¹⁰

Pius V took it upon himself to symbolically deprive Elizabeth of her crown and all privileges that came with it and absolved the people of her realm from any oath, allegiance, and obedience pledged to her. He went one step further by forbidding all English subjects to obey her laws on pain of their own excommunication. While people during this time placed a high value on the salvation of their souls, the immediate condition of their heads remaining attached to their necks generally won over their decision-making process. The papal bull represents a dangerous and seditious form of print that was created to undermine Elizabeth’s authority over her subjects. There is no portrait or image of Elizabeth that could counteract the power of the written word, and with these kinds of volatile domestic and foreign events it is no wonder that appointing a Searjeant Painter was not a top priority for Elizabeth.

In 1571, an Act whereby certain offences were made treason was passed, which was a direct result of the Northern Rebellion, the threat of Mary Stuart’s claim to the throne, and the papal bull of excommunication. It condemned any person, who would “within the realm or without compass, imagine, invent, devise or intend the death or destruction or any bodily harm tending to death, destruction, main or wounding of the royal person of the same our sovereign

¹⁰⁹ “Papal bull of 1570 excommunicating Elizabeth.” In David C. Douglas, Ian W. Archer, and F D. Price, eds. *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V(A). New York: Routledge, 2011.

¹¹⁰ “Papal bull of 1570 excommunicating Elizabeth”

lady Queen Elizabeth.”¹¹¹ The act condemns those who intended to depose her of her crown; declare she is not the rightful queen of England; assert that she was a “heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel or an usurper of the crown;” or claim inheritance to her crown as guilty of high treason.¹¹²

This sweeping document allowed for all forms of treason rather than narrowing it down to religious reasons, but it still effectively protected her from religiously sanctioned assaults without having to issue a direct response to the pope. Most relevant to this study is the inclusion of the censorship of words. The act made, “writing, printing, preaching, speech, express words or sayings, maliciously, advisedly and directly publish, set forth and affirm that the Queen . . . is an heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel or an usurper of the crown . . .” all forms of treason.¹¹³

1571 was the year Elizabeth was expected to be concerned with marriage negotiations with the Duke of Anjou, a French-Catholic. When analyzed within the context of foreign and domestic religious and political events one can see beyond the superficial exchange of negotiation portraits and see the motivation, or lack thereof, in this French-Catholic alliance. Had Elizabeth been serious about the match she would have played the courtly game of marital negotiation more sincerely. By the following year internal tensions were rising again within the Puritan faction.

In 1572, Puritan leaders attempted to send a bill through parliament to relax conformity to the Articles of Religion and the *Book of Common Prayer*. Elizabeth personally had confiscated the bill before it came to a vote.¹¹⁴ Outraged by this interference the Puritans John Field and Thomas Wilcox published their complaints in a radical pamphlet called *The Admonition to Parliament*. This tract was written in hopes of the government “abandoning all

¹¹¹ “An act whereby certain offences be made treason, 1571.” In David C. Douglas, Ian W. Archer, and F D. Price, eds. *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V(A). New York: Routledge, 2011.

¹¹² “An act whereby certain offences be made treason, 1571”

¹¹³ “An act whereby certain offences be made treason, 1571”

¹¹⁴ “The Admonition to Parliament, 1572.” In Jones, R. Tudur, Arthur Long, and Rosemary Moore, eds. *Protestant Non Conformist Texts Volume 1 1550-1700*. Vol. 1. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007, 37.

popish remnants both in ceremonies and regiment” and “bringing in and placing in God’s church those things only, which the Lord himself in his word commandeth.”¹¹⁵ The admonition continued with criticism of the practices of the Church of England on every point where it deviated from Reformed practices. Their chief complaints were concerned with preaching the Word purely, ministering of the sacraments sincerely, and the execution of harsh ecclesiastical discipline.¹¹⁶ One of the key contentions was the wording of the Lord’s Supper, which, as previously mentioned, was phrased to allow different personal interpretations. This rewording in the prayer book was Elizabeth’s attempt to encourage her Catholic subjects to reconcile with Reformed beliefs. Field and Wilcox complained that the Church of England borrowed from papists and that while the true Reformers took it with conscience, that the Church of England took it with custom.¹¹⁷ Field and Wilcox compared Reformed practices (“they”) with the practices of the Church of England (“we”) and reprimanded that:

They shut men by reason of their sinnes, from the Lord’s Supper. We thrust them in their sin to the Lord’s Supper. They ministered the Sacrament plainly. We pompously, with singing, piping, surplice and cope wearing. They simply as they received it from the Lord. We, sinfully, mixed with man’s inventions and devices.¹¹⁸

The patience of the ardent Protestants had reached its limits and the ambiguous wording and practices of Elizabeth’s Church of England would not satiate their needs for complete reform. When Puritans were dismissed, they would protest by writing books and pamphlets disparaging the government and the state-sponsored religion. This type of protest was on a much smaller and less threatening level than that of the Catholic rebellion in the North, but it caused anxiety to the

¹¹⁵ Jones, *Protestant Non Conformist Texts*, 37.

¹¹⁶ Jones, *Protestant Non Conformist Texts*, 37.

¹¹⁷ Jones, *Protestant Non Conformist Texts*, 38.

¹¹⁸ Jones, *Protestant Non Conformist Texts*, 40.

government all the same and would require more stringent regulations and censorship enforced upon the press. Elizabeth soon found thereafter that she had to monitor the pulpit.

Elizabeth's conservatism was personally and politically motivated to ensure a smooth transition of power in government and of religion among her subjects. The radical stirrings from Protestants elicited a direct response or rebuke from her on more than one occasion. Beyond personally removing the progressive Protestant legislation from being considered in Parliament, Elizabeth also reprimanded her Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal, for overstepping her boundaries for reform. Prophesying was a common practice in the reformed church in Zurich and promoted in England by Grindal and other bishops. Prophesying was a gathering of clergy in front of an appreciative lay audience in attempts to hone their preaching skills, debate scripture, and lift the uneducated out of ignorance.¹¹⁹

Elizabeth, however, did not approve of these uncensored religious gatherings. Her goal for religious reforms was not to have her preachers explore and expand, but to conform and obey. After the Catholics in the North rose against her in rebellion it would make sense for her to be suspicious of such gatherings. When she ordered Grindal to suppress these meetings he defied her and wrote a 6,000-word defense of prophesying and unwisely wrote the infamous line, "bear with me, I beseech you, madam, if I choose rather to offend your earthly majesty, than to offend the heavenly majesty of God."¹²⁰ The document prompted Elizabeth to take direct action over her bishops and issued an order for the suppression of Prophesying in 1577 in this order she addressed these concerns by stating that these exercises:

by which manner of assemblies great numbers of our people, specially the vulgar sort meet to be otherwise occupied with honest labour for their living, are brought

¹¹⁹ MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England*, 36.

¹²⁰ "Archbishop Grindal's letter to the Queen, 1576." In David Cressy and Lori Anne Ferrell, eds. *Religion and Society in Early Modern England*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005, 113.

to idleness and seduced and in manner schismatically divided amongst themselves into variety of dangerous opinions, not only in towns and parishes but even in some families, and manifestly thereby encouraged to the violation of our laws and to the breach of common order, and finally to the offence of all our quiet subjects that desire to serve God according to the uniform orders established in the Church, whereof the sequel cannot be but over dangerous to be suffered.¹²¹

Elizabeth threatened not only the people prophesying, but also the bishops who did not report them. She ominously warned them that their negligence in reporting offenders would lead her “to make some example in reformation of you according to your deserts.”¹²² Shortly after this order Elizabeth had Grindal put under house arrest to live out his days with abbreviated authority bringing reform to a standstill in the Church of England. Prophesying clearly presented a larger threat in the mind of Elizabeth and required more regulation than the portrait of any kind.

In 1579, John Stubbe wrote *The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf*, which objected to Elizabeth’s proposed marriage to the second Duke of Anjou based on religious differences. He believed it was against God’s law for a Protestant to marry a Catholic, and he objected to every point the Earl of Sussex made in support of the marriage. Stubbe aroused Elizabeth’s anger by interfering in personal and state matters over which he had no authority and by questioning her commitment to Protestantism. In the same year *Gaping Gulf* was written Elizabeth issued a royal proclamation forbidding its circulation. The men responsible for printing and distributing the book were arrested along with John Stubbe. Although Elizabeth wanted them executed, the jury refused to convict the men. Instead, they were sentenced to lose their right hands. This incident shows how seriously Elizabeth took this form of communication. It also shows the powerful reactions the wrong words could elicit from Elizabeth.

¹²¹ “Elizabeth’s order for the suppression of prophesying, 7 May 1577.” In David C. Douglas, Ian W. Archer, and F D. Price, eds. *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V(A). New York: Routledge, 2011.

¹²² “Elizabeth’s order for the suppression of prophesying, 7 May 1577”

In the meantime, Roman Catholics made plans to subvert Elizabeth's authority by sending missions to England. Over the next decade Rome began preparing a Jesuit mission to infiltrate England to help foment the now underground Catholic religion. This mission was a delicate situation because the papal bull issued in 1570 attacked Elizabeth's position both religiously and politically and the missionaries would be seen as political agents of the pope rather than mere religious converters, as was the case when the Jesuits, led by Edmund Campion, were discovered in 1581 and arrested. They were imprisoned, tortured, and executed on charges of treason.¹²³ The pope had interfered on more than strictly religious terms and by doing so gave the English government the ability to associate Catholicism with sedition. The discovery of the secret invasion of Jesuits led the English government to take action against any further subversion. In 1582, parliament passed a proclamation declaring all Jesuits traitors.

According to Catholics, however, these executed Jesuits were revered as martyrs rather than captured political assailants making Elizabeth's policies look no different from her sister Mary I's. In an attempt to counteract Catholic propaganda appearing against Elizabeth the government released a "declaration of the undutiful and traitorous affection borne against her Majesty by Edmund Campion, Jesuit, and other condemned priests" in 1582. The declaration addressed rumors, "slandorous pamphlets and seditious libels" that were being spread within and outside of the realm excusing and justifying the executed Jesuits actions in order to vilify Elizabeth.¹²⁴ It is hard to tell how effective this declaration was in winning over people's opinions, but its significance lies in its very existence. The English government thought it was

¹²³ Graves, Michael A. R.. "Campion, Edmund [St Edmund Campion] (1540–1581)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

¹²⁴ "The government's attempt to counter Catholic propaganda: A particular declaration or testimony of the undutiful and traitorous affection borne against her Majesty by Edmund Campion, Jesuit, and other condemned priests, 1582." In Douglas, David C., Ian W. Archer, and F D. Price, eds. *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V(A). New York: Routledge, 2011.

important enough to issue a response to the accusations of religious persecution justifying their use of capital punishment. According to the English government, these priests went beyond heretical behavior to threatening the safety of the queen, this difference justified the charge of treason. This declaration was a justification of the force used against them and a warning to other recusants that sedition would not be tolerated. Although these measures were created for Catholic extremists, they would also serve to make examples out of Protestant extremists.

In the rare case of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, the government acted on a law, which had been created in 1581, aimed at the threat of recusant Catholics and condemned the men to death “for the offence of writing and publishing seditious literature with malicious intent.”¹²⁵ The threat of words preoccupied the entirety of Elizabeth’s reign and demanded her attention far more than the portrait ever would. Elizabeth and her councilors constantly had to defend her authority and religion from internal and external written assaults. Dissenters were not relying on portraits to defame the Queen; words had the power to incite unrest and rebellion.

Not only did Elizabeth have to monitor and regulate the printed word in the form of books and pamphlets, but she and her government also had to monitor the theatre. In 1574 the role of Master of the Revels transitioned from censoring performances for the crown to include censoring performances for the public.¹²⁶ In 1574 Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester’s personal acting company, Leicester’s Men, were granted a royal patent authorizing members of the troupe:

to use, and occupie the arte and facultye of playenge Commedies, Tragedies,
Enteuludes, stage playes . . . aswell for the recreacon of oure loving subjectes . . .

¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Patrick Collinson, “Barrow, Henry (c.1550–1593).” In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1540> (accessed December 1, 2013).

¹²⁶ Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, 28.

¹²⁷ Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, 27.

And “that the said Commedies, Tragedies, enterludes, and stage playes be by the master of oure Revells for the tyme beyng before sene and allowed.”¹²⁸ Richard Dutton marks the patent as “the first document to associate the Master of the Revels with ‘seeing and allowing’ plays as a prior condition to their public performance.”¹²⁹ In 1581, Elizabeth gave the Master of the Revels, Edmond Tilney, a special commission, recorded in the patent rolls, which authorized him:

to warne commanunde and appointe in all places within this our Realme of England, aswell within franchises and liberties as without, all and every plaiers with their playmakers, either belonging to any noble man or otherwise, bearinge the name or names of using the facultie of playmakers or plaiers of Comedies, Tragedies, Enterludes or whatever other showes soever, from tyme to tyme and at all tymes to appeare before him with all such plaies, Tragedies, Comedies or showes as they shall in readiness or meane to sett forth, and them to recited before our said Servant or his sufficient deputie, whom we ordeyne appointe and aucthorise by these presents of all suche showes, plaies, plaiers, and playmakers, together with their playing places, to order and reforme, aucthorise and put downe, as shalbe thought meete or umeete unto himself or his said deputie in that behalf.¹³⁰

He was also given the authority to enforce these regulations through punishments he deemed fit. Richard Dutton marks this commission as the beginning of the Master of the Revels’ role as official censor and licenser of London’s professional theatre.¹³¹ Thus, Tilney was placed in a position of power to regulate the kinds of plays being performed and to assert censorship over them with royal authority. This patent was officially recorded in the patent rolls and carried out, unlike the patent proposed by George Gower, and serves as a telling comparison between the role of the word and the portrait and the value Elizabeth placed on each one. Gower had attempted to gain sole authority of the creation and distribution of all images of Elizabeth, except

¹²⁸ E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*. Vol. 2. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923, 87-88.

¹²⁹ Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, 28.

¹³⁰ Richard Dutton, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England*. New York: Palgrave, 2000, 2.

¹³¹ Dutton, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England*, 2.

miniatures, through the patent office in 1584. Madden perceptively pointed out that this draft patent was never dated, marked with an official seal, or listed in the patent rolls of November 1583-November 1584.¹³² When the authority of censorship is compared between the Master of the Revels and Elizabeth's Serjeant Painter it is obvious that control over her visible image was not a priority for Elizabeth. The Elizabethan theatre was a form of spoken communication that could reach a wide and popular audience. Plays were performed in private houses, inns, taverns, and in playhouses, and the nobility and the lower classes could readily see them. The painted portrait could only reach those who saw it where it hung.

The press, the pulpit, and the stage would reach a wider audience and, therefore, create a more significant impact on the public than the portrait, but that does not fully explain Elizabeth's neglect of its censorship. There was internal and external political and religious conflict in France at the same time, but the French government still enforced strict control on portraiture. In a letter from Walsingham to the earl of Leicester regarding the relationship between England and France and the potential marriage negotiations between Elizabeth and the duke of Anjou, Walsingham reported that he could not send Leicester portraits of the king or the duke. Walsingham wrote, "touching the pictures your Lordship desired, they can by no means be gotten, for no man may make any counterfeit of the King or his Brother, without license; if he do, the punishment is great."¹³³ Catherine de' Medici, queen regent and an avid portrait collector and patron of the arts, placed the stern regulations on portraiture that signal the prominent value she placed on the portrait. Elizabeth was neither an avid collector of nor patron of the state portrait. Elizabeth's reluctance to sit for a portrait artist at the beginning of her reign, her neglect

¹³² Madden, "Portrait Painters of Queen Elizabeth." 238.

¹³³ Francis Walsingham to the Earl of Leicester, January 28, 1571 in Digges, Dudley. *The Compleat Ambassador*, London, 1655, 30.

to issue the royal proclamation “Prohibiting Portraits of the Queen” in 1563, her delay in appointing a Serjeant Painter that specialized in portraiture, the disregarded patent drafted to give Gower and Hilliard monopolies on her portraiture, and her reluctance to appoint another Serjeant Painter after Gower died in 1596 during the so-called “official holocaust of portraits,”¹³⁴ reveal Elizabeth’s lack of concern over her portraiture. When compared to her involvement with regulation and censorship over the press, prophesying, and the theatre it is oblivious that Elizabeth did not place real value on the social and political effect of the portrait and, therefore, was not concerned with exerting control over it.

There was an incident in which the act of defacing a portrait of Elizabeth contributed to the condemnation of a Puritan traitor. In 1592, William Hacket was executed for treason for an attempted political coup against Elizabeth and her government. Physical evidence of his unsuccessful attempt to depose Elizabeth was a portrait of Elizabeth stabbed through the heart in his landlord’s house in London.¹³⁵ This incident reveals the importance Elizabeth’s subjects placed on displaying her portrait in their homes and the power her visible image held. There may have been a popular demand for her portrait, but Elizabeth chose to spend her money and energy on the forms of representation discussed here.

Elizabeth’s government could have used her royal visage to supplement a propaganda campaign like that of her father, but Elizabeth refused to cooperate with that concept. The existence of the draft proclamation of 1563, edited in Cecil’s hand, suggests that Cecil was interested in the idea, but Elizabeth’s evidently willful decision not to approve the proclamation of 1563, her unwillingness to sit for her portrait, and her delay in appointing a Serjeant Painter

¹³⁴ David Piper, *The English Face*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1957, 67.

¹³⁵ Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, 224.

that specialized in portraits thwarted any prospect of a government sponsored visual campaign like Henry VIII's. Elizabeth's subjects, however, ensured that her royal image would not go unnoticed. Elizabeth had a firm control over the words that she spoke and the words that she authored. This chapter shows that she also enforced control and censorship over the words that others voiced and composed. The dissonance between Elizabeth's concern and censorship over the word and the portrait are vast, thus proving that Elizabeth was not concerned with creating or controlling her visible public image.

Chapter 4: Analysis of Elizabeth

In order to understand Queen Elizabeth I's relationship with her painted portrait one must, study foremost of all, her very self, from her earliest days as a princess. This chapter will examine the significant events in Elizabeth's life and analyze her own words in relation to portraiture and the painted image. An emphasis is placed on Elizabeth's words, but it will also examine first-hand accounts and anecdotal accounts. The latter second-hand evidence, though less sure, tends on the whole to corroborate the peculiar and non-traditional ways in which Elizabeth used and viewed portraiture revealed in her own words. From an early age, Elizabeth was keenly aware of the role of the visible representation of a person and she made it clear that the painted image would never hold priority over her mind. It is important to start with Elizabeth as a princess, because the opinion she formed on public displays of image remained unchanged throughout her lifetime and was reinforced by the events she witnessed.

In 1544, at age 10, Elizabeth was reinstated as an heir to the English throne by the Act of Succession as third in line to the crown. At this time in her life, Elizabeth's path to the throne was not evident. Elizabeth's legitimacy remained in flux during the reign of her father, brother, and sister. The first blow to her legitimacy came with the sword that severed her mother's head. Whether or not Elizabeth had a relationship with her mother by the age of two—Elizabeth's age when Anne Boleyn was accused of adultery and beheaded—she was aware of the string of stepmothers that followed, and their individual fates at the hands of her father. In 1540, Elizabeth was old enough to be aware of the marriage and divorce of Henry's fourth wife, Anne of Cleves. This marriage had taken place based on a negotiation portrait painted by Holbein. Henry did not agree with Holbein's vision of Anne, and the unconsummated marriage was ended after six months. Anne's amiability and cooperation during the divorce proceedings ensured a

life-long friendship with Henry VIII and that her head would remain attached to her body. While Anne was fortunate, Thomas Cranmer, who arranged the disastrous marriage, was beheaded. This event was not the most pleasant introduction into the role of diplomatic and marriage negotiation portraiture for Elizabeth. This incident also contributed to the underlying element of insecurity that haunted the relationship with her father at all times, this anxiety is detected clearly in her early writings.

In Elizabeth's only known letter to her father, there are signs of the insecurity she felt about their relationship. This letter was written to preface her New Year's gift to him in 1545 of a trilingual translation of Queen Katherine Parr's *Prayers or Meditations*, bound in a cover she hand embroidered. In this short letter she mentioned their father-daughter relationship five separate times, and powerfully reiterated this connection by stating, "may I, by this means be indebted to you not as an imitator of your virtues but indeed as an inheritor of them."¹³⁶ As she did in this passage, Elizabeth would capitalize on the inheritance of her father's physical attributes when people, namely Catholics (including her sister Mary), questioned her legitimacy.¹³⁷

In 1545 while Henry was confident in the Tudor succession, having produced a son and heir, Princess Elizabeth was devoted to her studies in the humanist and Protestant teachings of her personal tutors William Grindal, Roger Ascham, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. She valued the education she received and spoke of it often in her letters, although, often in an insincere self-deprecating way. She found a way to excuse her "simple wit and small learning" or "slight and unfinished studies and childish ripeness of mind,"¹³⁸ even though she

¹³⁶ Princess Elizabeth to Queen Katherine, July 31, 1544, quoted in Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose, eds. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 5-6.

¹³⁷ Riehl, *The Face of Queenship*, 32-33.

¹³⁸ Princess Elizabeth to Queen Katherine, December 31, 1544, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 7.

was an erudite humanist scholar, far abler than the average child and female of her time. Her humility can be seen as a rhetorical device used by many contemporary writers of her time. While it seems self-effacing, it only makes the intelligence she displays in the rest of the letter strikingly more evident. Elizabeth would utilize this self-effacing rhetoric as a tactic for the rest of her life in speeches and writings to make her points more cutting or to solicit compliments.

During her time as a princess, before Elizabeth was burdened with juggling political policy and public image, she seemed to have a strong view on the important qualities of a person. She clearly valued the qualities of the mind over physical appearance. In a letter to Queen Katherine in 1545, Elizabeth described her intent to translate John Calvin's *Institution de la religion chrestienne*. Elizabeth saw her task of reproducing such an important and eloquent work of the mind as exceeding the worth and accomplishments of artists who reproduce the "simple" physical image of a person. When referring to artisans who created physical effigies of people she noted, "all of these together never could and cannot yet represent or reveal by their works the mind or wit, the speech or understanding of any person."¹³⁹ These qualities of wit and mind would be something she always valued and displayed without hesitation. Her opinion on this matter would not change over time.

In 1547, King Henry VIII died and left Elizabeth's younger brother, Edward, the crown. King Edward VI was only nine years old, and Elizabeth thirteen years old, when this transition took place. She was sent to live with Katherine Parr and her new husband Lord Thomas Seymour of Sudeley, who was also the new king's uncle. This period in Elizabeth's life is important to note because Thomas Seymour compromised her reputation and called her chastity into question. Her virginity was another source of insecurity, which she would spend the rest of

¹³⁹ Princess Elizabeth to Queen Katherine, December 30, 1545, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 11.

her life defending and ultimately using it to her advantage. There are written accounts of Thomas Seymour's inappropriate behavior with princess Elizabeth, preserved in the Calendar of State Papers in the archives of Simancas, of the interrogations of Elizabeth, Kat Astley, her governess, and Thomas Parry, her cofferer, but none too damning of Elizabeth.¹⁴⁰ After Katherine died in childbirth in 1548, Thomas briefly entreated to marry Elizabeth. When his proposition was rejected, he went straight for the top and attempted to seize control of the young king. He was arrested and convicted of high treason in 1549 and his previous misconduct with Elizabeth was brought to light and investigated by the Privy Council. Although Elizabeth was never found guilty of any wrongdoing, her reputation was marred by this episode.

After this scandal, Elizabeth devoted herself to becoming a "model protestant maiden" and to her studies with Roger Ascham.¹⁴¹ In 1549 in a letter to her brother, King Edward VI, she again demonstrated the importance of her intellect over her outward form and presentation. With this letter she also sent a portrait of herself, requested by the king, but she made sure to stipulate the physical representation of herself would always defer to her intellect. Elizabeth wrote:

For the face, I grant, I might well blush to offer, but the mind I shall never be ashamed to present. For though from the grace of the picture the colors may fade by time, may give by weather, may be spotted by chance, yet the other nor time with her swift wings shall overtake, nor the misty clouds with their lowerings may darken, nor chance with her slippery foot may overthrow.¹⁴²

This exchange shows that while obtaining a portrait of Elizabeth was clearly important to Edward VI, or someone in his council, Elizabeth devalued her visible image in comparison to her mind. She showed here that she was capable of painting a far more vivid and beautiful image with her words. Her rhetorical flourish would only improve with time and practice.

¹⁴⁰ For more detailed accounts of these incidents see: Anne Somerset, *Elizabeth I*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991, 18-20., Patrick Collinson, *Elizabeth I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, 13-15.

¹⁴¹ Judith M. Richards, *Elizabeth I* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 23.

¹⁴² Princess Elizabeth to King Edward VI, with a present of her portrait, May 15, 1549, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 35.

Edward VI carried on his father's Protestant legacy until his death in 1553 at the age of 15. He was so concerned with this Protestant legacy that he denied his father's will and his established line of succession and named their Protestant cousin Lady Jane Grey as his heir. In doing this, he disqualified both of his sisters from inheriting the throne in order to eliminate any chance of Mary becoming queen. He did this so his older sister Mary, a Catholic, would not inherit the throne and undo all of the religious reforms that had taken place in England.¹⁴³ At that point, Elizabeth's royal status was again uncertain.

It only took nine days for Mary to gather enough support to overthrow the Protestant contender, Lady Jane Grey, and establish herself on the throne of England. This act of restoration did not make Elizabeth's position any less vulnerable than it had been before. Mary was a devout Catholic and had had a strained relationship with Elizabeth since their childhood. Henry VIII had divorced Mary's mother, Katherine of Aragon, in a nasty political and religious battle that resulted in Katherine's exile, Mary's bastardization, and England's break with Rome. Mary did not think highly of Anne Boleyn and her half-sister, Elizabeth, from the start.

One of Mary's first acts as queen of England was to confirm the legality of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon's marriage, thus ensuring her own legitimacy. The intended or unintended by-product of this act was reconfirming Elizabeth's illegitimacy.¹⁴⁴ Between this act and Mary's suspicion of Elizabeth's feigned Catholicism, the sisters' relationship deteriorated further. At that point Elizabeth's physical resemblance to Henry VIII helped to salvage her reputation, at least in the eyes of others. Mary would often try to reinforce Elizabeth's illegitimacy by commenting on her likeness to Mark Smeaton, the musician accused of having an affair with Anne Boleyn. Fortunately for Elizabeth even visitors to the court such as the

¹⁴³ Richards, *Elizabeth I*, 24-25.

¹⁴⁴ Richards, *Elizabeth I*, 28.

Venetian ambassador Giovanni Michiel could see the resemblance between the princess and her father. Michiel noted “everybody [is] saying that she also resembles [Henry VIII] more than the Queen does.”¹⁴⁵

In 1554, Elizabeth left Mary’s court for Ashridge in an attempt to minimize the tension between them, especially since Mary was considering marrying the Catholic Philip II of Spain. This match did not please Protestant subjects since Mary was already persecuting Protestants in England. Unfortunately for Elizabeth, in 1554 Thomas Wyatt the younger led a failed rebellion against Mary with the hopes of placing Elizabeth on the throne. Although she was never implicated in having knowledge of the plot, Mary imprisoned Elizabeth for ‘her own safety.’¹⁴⁶ Elizabeth’s imprisonment in the Tower marks yet another period in her life that was riddled with anxiety and insecurity. She was being held in the same tower in which her own doomed mother had been imprisoned in before she was executed on exaggerated charges. Mary consented to Elizabeth’s imprisonment without hearing Elizabeth’s case, which was a familiar scenario for prisoners that needed to be disposed. Elizabeth’s anxiety, strength, and intelligence can be seen in a letter she wrote to Mary I before being escorted to the tower:

If any ever did try this old saying--that a king’s word was more than another man’s oath--I most humbly beseech your majesty to verify it in me, and to remember your last promise and my last demand: that I be not condemned without answer and due proof. Which it seems that now I am, for that, without cause proved, I am by your Council from you commanded to go unto the Tower, a place more wonted for a false traitor than a true subject. Which though I know I deserve it not, yet in the face of all this realm appears that it is proved. Which I pray God I may die the shamefullest death that ever any died afore I may mean any such thing...¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ Riehl, *The Face of Queenship*, 32.

¹⁴⁶ Richards, *Elizabeth I*, 32.

¹⁴⁷ Princess Elizabeth to Queen Mary, March 16, 1554, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 42.

In this passage, Elizabeth boldly reminded Mary of a promise she made to her sister not to condemn her without direct proof of the offense and, most of all, not to take another person's words over her own. This promise was directly related to the gruesome destinies of the people whom Elizabeth had close connections. Elizabeth knew her fate hung by a thread no stronger than that of her mother, Thomas Seymour, or Jane Grey, all of whom lost their lives for the sake of political dominance. More importantly, it is Elizabeth's utilization of the "old saying--that a king's word was more than another man's oath."¹⁴⁸ An old saying indeed, and it was seen again in a letter to James VI of Scotland in 1583. Elizabeth stated,

I would Isocrates' noble lesson were not forgotten, that wills the Emperor his sovereign to make his words of more account than other men their oaths, as meetest ensigns to show the truest badge of a Prince's arms.¹⁴⁹

She learned the lesson of "the oath of a prince" when she was a princess, and it carried her through the turbulent road to the throne. Her use of it as advice to James VI shows her fundamental belief in its function. She knew her words were of her own creation and did not depend on another to represent her. Therefore, her words meant more than any other person's words or representations of her. This concept did not translate to portraiture and therefore, she had little use for it for diplomacy and negotiations.

Ultimately, no proof of Elizabeth's involvement in the Wyatt Rebellion was found and with no heir apparent, Mary released Elizabeth from the Tower and kept her under house arrest in Woodstock. In 1554 Mary wed Philip II of Spain and by 1555 she was thought to be pregnant. Elizabeth was summoned to court and quickly became a favorite of Philip II. After this move to court, her position improved with the queen and her freedom was restored. Mary,

¹⁴⁸ Princess Elizabeth to Queen Mary, March 16, 1554, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 42.

¹⁴⁹ Elizabeth I to James VI, 7 August 1583. In G B. Harrison, ed. *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968, 159.

however, never gave birth, and Elizabeth found herself at the center of yet another plot against her sister. Sir Henry Dudley attempted another unsuccessful plot against Mary resulting in further suspicion of Elizabeth. Fortunately for Elizabeth this tense episode passed without incident and the remaining time spent under Mary's rule was relatively quiet. Although her time as princess proved to be full of turbulent anxiety, Elizabeth learned how to adapt and survive the political intrigues of a volatile court. Before Mary's last illness and death Elizabeth's life may be described as a state of constant upheaval and vulnerability, but it proved to be an excellent lesson in political and personal endurance. Elizabeth learned many valuable lessons as a princess that she would carry with her to the throne. She learned that her words were her most powerful weapon and defense, and that a man could tarnish her reputation like Thomas Seymour did, or usurp her political power like Philip II did when he Mary I and used England's army and resources for Spain's interests. Elizabeth learned that being second in line to the throne created perpetual insecurity to both the ruler and the successor. She also learned that the diplomatic use of portraiture was useless to her political needs. No portrait in the course of her life would ever accomplish what she was able to achieve with her words.

On November 17, 1558, Mary I died leaving the kingdom of England to Elizabeth. Elizabeth's accession would transform the vulnerable princess into a queen who ruled with a divine right and supreme authority. The role of humble young princess who constantly had to prove her worth and show deference was reversed. Elizabeth would have to use her own mind, which she valued so much to adapt to this new responsibility with an entirely different set of problems. Immediately following her accession, parliament was concerned with her marital status. Elizabeth also made it clear from the beginning that she had no desire to marry. Although she was yet to be seen as the revered virgin queen married to her country, she made it

clear that she would be content to play that role. Elizabeth attempted to ease the anxiety of parliament by not ruling out a potential marriage, but she also made it clear that she was prepared to rule England alone. She closed her first speech before parliament by stating:

And albeit it might please almighty God to continue me still in this mind to live out the state of marriage, yet it is not to be feared but He will so work in my heart and in your wisdoms as good provision by His help may be made in convenient time, whereby the realm shall not remain destitute of an heir that may be a fit governor, and peradventure more beneficial to the realm than such offspring as may come of me. For although I be never so careful of your well-doings, and mind ever so to be, yet may my issue grow out of kind and become, perhaps, ungracious. And in the end this shall be for me sufficient: that a marble stone shall declare that a queen, having reigned such a time, lived and died a virgin.¹⁵⁰

These bold statements were not without an addendum. Cleverly, she did not rule out the possibility of marriage at the beginning of her reign. She conceded, “nevertheless, if God have ordained me to another course of life, I will promise you to do nothing to the prejudice of the commonwealth, but as far as possible I may, will marry such an husband as shall be no less careful for the common good, than myself.”¹⁵¹ Thus, Elizabeth was able to redirect concern to other matters of state. She was able to quell the anxiety over her ring finger by entertaining many suitors throughout the first several years of her rule. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly what dissuaded Elizabeth from the married life, but it is safe to say that her father and sister did not set ideal marital precedents. Although Elizabeth claimed she would entertain the idea of marriage, her actions and words proved otherwise. If Elizabeth was not serious about the idea of marriage then she would have no real need of a portrait artist to genuinely participate in the exchange of marriage negotiation portraits.

To place the draft proclamation of 1563 into context one must examine the other events occurring in the same year. From the beginning of her reign, Elizabeth’s abilities as a ruler were

¹⁵⁰ Queen Elizabeth’s first speech before Parliament, February 10, 1559, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 58.

¹⁵¹ Queen Elizabeth’s answer to [the Commons’] petition that she marry, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 59.

tested on every front. By 1563, the year of the draft proclamation, she was inundated with political and religious turmoil far exceeding the importance of sitting for a portrait painter, which is possibly why the proclamation remained in draft form and never executed. In 1563, England lost all prospect of regaining Calais, which was something that devastated Elizabeth. Elizabeth sent troops to help the French Huguenots in battle against the oppressive Catholic regime in hopes of recovering Calais in return for her aid. However, the Queen Mother, Catherine de' Medici, made a truce with her Huguenot countrymen with the Edict of Amboise and the Huguenots turned against Elizabeth's troops at Le Havre. In addition to the loss at Le Havre, her troops brought back the plague to England. In 1563, the Council of Trent completed its final session hashing out the details of the Counter Reformation. In 1563 Elizabeth instated the Thirty-Nine Articles, which laid the foundations for the moderate Anglican Church of England, angering zealous Catholics and Protestants.

Not only did Elizabeth have to contend with Catholic threats inside and outside of her country, but she also had to constrain internal Protestant extremism within her own government. In 1563, in an attempt to place economic pressure on Elizabeth for her heretical and piratical policies, Spain placed an embargo on all cloth imports from England to the Netherlands. In the same year, Elizabeth took measures to prevent from being carried out an act that was being forced through by the militantly Protestant House of Commons, which made refusing the oath of supremacy twice high treason. She did this by forbidding bishops to administer the oath a second time. Elizabeth was continually pressured by Parliament to secure the succession through marriage and the production of an heir or by naming another to succeed her. The pressure to marry intensified in 1563, after her brush with death in 1562 from smallpox. An argument could be made that the reason Elizabeth was reluctant to sit for her portrait during this time was

because of the scars left on her face from this bout with smallpox as noted by the Spanish ambassador and Catholic bishop, Álvaro de la Quadra, in 1562 and 1563. In a letter to the duchess of Parma he wrote “she [Elizabeth] is now out of bed and is only attending to the marks on her face to avoid disfigurement.”¹⁵² Later, in 1563 in a letter to Phillip II, Quadra wrote that Elizabeth reprimanded her councilors for their concerns about her age and ability to produce and heir by angrily retorting “that the marks they saw on her face were not wrinkles, but pits of smallpox . . .”¹⁵³ When considering this evidence it is important to remember that the writer, Bishop Quadra, was a Spanish Catholic whose king, Phillip II, had already been rejected as a possible suitor for Elizabeth and tensions between the two countries were high. It is also important to note that English portrait style did not emphasize naturalism and that the patron of a portrait had considerable control over the commissioned painting’s composition and format.¹⁵⁴ Therefore, any possible blemish could have been corrected at Elizabeth’s request. These concessions do not, however, explain why she was reluctant to sit for her portrait for the five previous years. When placed in this perspective, it is understandable that there were more pressing matters that Elizabeth had to attend to than the circulation of “unseemly” portraits.

An essential courting practice for European royalty in the sixteenth century was the exchange of royal portraits for marriage negotiations. Had Elizabeth been serious about the possibility of marriage she would have been more willing to engage in this type of royal courtship. Elizabeth, however, refused to sign a marriage contract with a man she had never met in person. As a result, the act of exchanging negotiation portraits was not a serious endeavor for Elizabeth. Therefore, it is reasonable to deduce that this contributed to the twenty-three year

¹⁵² Martin Hume, ed. *Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, 262.

¹⁵³ Frederick Chamberlin, *The Private Character of Queen Elizabeth*. New York: Dodd Mead, 1922, 54.

¹⁵⁴ Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*, 17-18.

delay in appointing an official court painter who specialized in portraiture because she had no use for one in this regard. Although the real reason Elizabeth avoided marriage may elude the modern scholar, it is telling that she witnessed two nasty marital episodes revolving around negotiation portraits. The first involved her father and Anne of Cleves, who was chosen over her sister Amelia to be his wife based on the negotiation portraits by Holbein. There was apparently such a discrepancy between portrait and lady that Henry begrudgingly married Anne then divorced her six months later.

Mary's marriage negotiation with Philip II also left an impression on Elizabeth. In 1565, during an attempted marriage negotiation with Charles II Archduke of Austria, Elizabeth recalled "how the King of Spain had cursed the painters and envoys when he first beheld Queen Mary, and she would not give the Archduke Charles cause to curse." This then led Elizabeth to proclaim "that she would take no man whom she had not seen; that she was and ever would be of the same mind."¹⁵⁵ This comment was reported by the Venetian ambassador Adam von Zwetkovich to Emperor Maximilian II in 1565. In 1572, Elizabeth later reiterated these sentiments in a letter to Sir Francis Walsingham, during her marriage negotiations to the Duke of Anjou. Elizabeth instructed Walsingham to relay this message to Catherine de 'Medici:

Neither yet do we otherwise propound it but that it may be friendly interpreted, and not to conceive that thereby we mean any abuse to the disgrace of the duke, whom we have great cause to love and esteem; but that surely in this sort our opinion by sight may be satisfied, which otherwise, we perceive, cannot be by report of any other, for that none of our own dare to adventure to deliver their advice for our own liking of him.¹⁵⁶

These stipulations made the likelihood of a royal marriage most improbable, and she knew from experience that this tactic was an effective way to keep suitors at bay. By requiring a suitor to

¹⁵⁵ Both quotes were recorded in Adam von Zwetkovich to the Emperor Maximilian II, London, 4 June 1565: V. von Klarwill, *Queen Elizabeth and Some Foreigners*, London, 1928, p. 218.

¹⁵⁶ Queen Elizabeth to Sir Francis Walsingham, Ambassador to France, July 25, 1572, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 210-211.

come to her, on her terms, on her home soil she created unheard of obstacles in the negotiation process. When the second duke of Anjou agreed to these terms and paid Elizabeth a visit in person, she used delay tactics to avoid this eager suitor. Thus, Elizabeth ensured she would never be subjected to the vulnerable marital situations she had witnessed in her youth or to a marriage that would threaten her supreme authority and religious settlement. By eliminating the power of the negotiation portrait Elizabeth demonstrated that she did not value them or their purpose.

Although Elizabeth did not exploit the public form of official royal portraiture in the ways other royal courts did for marital and diplomatic purposes, there is evidence that Elizabeth had a private relationship with the painted portrait. Just like many other aspects of her life and career, there was nothing typical about Elizabeth's relationship with portraiture. Unlike the extensive art galleries of Catherine de 'Medici, there are very few portraits that can be traced back to Elizabeth's collection or commission. One of the few portraits of Elizabeth that was displayed at Whitehall during her reign was the allegorical painting of Elizabeth and the Three Goddesses. In 1600, Baron Waldstein described it in his diary with a description of its location.¹⁵⁷

This painting shows Elizabeth with the classical goddesses, Juno, Pallas Athena, and Venus in a recreation of the Judgment of Paris, with Elizabeth assuming the role of Paris. It is accompanied by an inscription that reads: "Juno was the queen of might / Pallas had the sharpness of mind / And the rosy face of Venus was shining bright / Then Elizabeth came and Juno, disheartened, took flight / Pallas was astounded and Venus blushed for shame."¹⁵⁸ Tarnya Cooper, curator of the sixteenth century collection at the National Portrait Gallery, suggests that

¹⁵⁷ Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*, 58. See note 3.

¹⁵⁸ Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*, 58.

this painting was most likely a gift and not commissioned by Elizabeth.¹⁵⁹ It is clear from its display at Whitehall that the Queen appreciated this kind of representation and flattery. The painting is dated 1569. The role of Venus fulfilled the allegorical trio and served as a superficial flattery toward Elizabeth, but the most significant elements of this painting are the roles of Juno, Athena, and Elizabeth herself. Juno was the queen of heaven, the protector of the state, and the goddess of marriage. The mere existence of Elizabeth made Juno's presence on Earth unnecessary. Juno's gesture in this painting, however, seems to implore that Elizabeth follow her, perhaps not in her flight back to heaven, but in her role as the goddess of marriage. In 1569, the possibility that Elizabeth would marry and produce an heir was still a viable hope for her councilors and subjects.¹⁶⁰ Pallas Athena was the goddess of wisdom, courage, and justice. Athena was also unmarried and masculine like Elizabeth. As a ruler, Elizabeth embraced a masculine persona in order to legitimize her rule and ease tensions in her realm over having an unmarried female monarch. In the painting, Elizabeth retained the orb for herself (the metaphorical golden apple), and the goddesses are left to react to Elizabeth's supreme authority. The act of Elizabeth keeping the orb in her possession displays her power and control. Rather than tossing the orb to the goddesses and planting the seed of discord, as Paris did, Elizabeth prevents chaos and keeps the peace in heaven and on earth. If this painting was a commission, it shows that the image Elizabeth wished to portray to her people was being understood and adopted by her subjects. The image was presented to her to flatter her and show deferential loyalty to her authority.

¹⁵⁹ Cooper, *Elizabeth I & Her People*, 58.

¹⁶⁰ In a telling comparison Isaac Oliver recreated this painting in 1590 and Juno's gesture is noticeably different. Rather than gesturing Elizabeth to follow her, she has turned her back in a more genuinely fleeing motion. In 1590, there was no realistic hope left that Elizabeth would marry and produce an heir. Thank you to Professor Frank Romer for the observation and analysis of these two paintings, July 7, 2014.

One painting Elizabeth did commission was *The Family of Henry VIII: An Allegory of the Tudor Succession*, in 1572. This painting was a gift to Sir Francis Walsingham and the inscription on the frame reads:

THE QVENE. TO. WALSINGHAM. THIS. TABLET. SENTE. MARKE. OF.
HER. PEOPLES. AND. HER. OWNE. CONTENTE. A FACE OF MVCH
NOBILLITYE LOE IN A LITTLE ROOME. FOWR STATES WITH THEYR
CONDITIONS HEARE SHADOWED IN / A SHOWE A FATHER MORE
THEN VALYANT. A RARE AND VERTVOUVS SOON. / A ZEALVS
DAUGHTER IN HER KYND WHAT ELS THE WORLD DOTH KNOWE /
AND LAST OF ALL A VYRGIN QVEEN TO ENGLANDS IOY WE SEE
SVCESSYVSLY TO HOLD THE RIGHT, AND VERTVES OF THE
THREE¹⁶¹

This painting shows Henry VIII and his three children. Edward VI is kneeling beside Henry receiving the sword of justice. Mary I is on the opposite side of Henry next to her husband Philip II, and they are flanked by the god of war, Mars. Elizabeth is in the foreground on the same side as Edward, and she is shown ushering in the personifications of Peace and Plenty. Strong suggested that this painting could have been commissioned to commemorate the Treaty of Blois. Walsingham was the ambassador to France at the time this treaty was forged between Elizabeth and Catherine de' Medici to end hostilities between the two countries and form an alliance against Spain.

During this time, Walsingham was also instrumental in negotiating the delicate marriage negotiations between Elizabeth and the first duke of Anjou. These negotiations were delicate because it is clear from Elizabeth's letters to Walsingham that she was not seriously interested in the match for several reasons, the first being her preference for remaining unmarried. The other reasons Elizabeth was not interested in this match were the disparities between age and

¹⁶¹ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 81.

religion.¹⁶² The duke was almost twenty years younger than Elizabeth and was a devout Catholic. When Elizabeth expressed her concerns to Catherine, they were quickly dismissed. Elizabeth then had to utilize her unprecedented refusal to commit to a royal marriage with someone whom she had never seen in person. In Elizabeth's letters to Walsingham, she instructed him on what excuses to give Catherine and her councilors and how to reply to their objections. When she instructed him to give the marital deathblow, the rejection of an agreement based on negotiation portraits, Elizabeth also anticipated their reaction. Elizabeth prepared Walsingham that they would probably object to sending the Duke to England out of respect for the king and because no other child of France had to be subjected to such a rigorous courting. Elizabeth told Walsingham that they would probably suspect her of trying to increase her own reputation without real intent to marry the duke, and she gave him replies to all of these possible objections. Elizabeth wrote:

As to the first you may say as of yourself that you are not so acquainted with their own stays and with the marriage of the children of France, yet you dare affirm that you know there can be no example showed us of the like of this: that is, that either the elder son of France or any younger was at any time to be matched in marriage with such a prince having such kingdoms as we have, by whom such an advancement might have grown as may by marriage with us, both to the duke himself and to the king and crown of France. And therefore this special cause can have no former example answerable to rule this, but this ought to be followed with all manner of means and all respect set aside.¹⁶³

Elizabeth's preparedness shows that she had experienced this situation before and, therefore, knew appropriate ways to respond. It also shows she was doing everything in her power to avoid and delay the match, perhaps, to keep the Treaty of Blois intact. Further evidence of Elizabeth's intentional avoidance of this marriage was the delay in sending a portrait

¹⁶² Queen Elizabeth to Sir Francis Walsingham, Ambassador to France, July 25, 1572, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 208.

¹⁶³ Queen Elizabeth to Sir Francis Walsingham, Ambassador to France, July 25, 1572, quoted in Marcus, *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, 211.

of her that had been requested by Catherine. By the time Elizabeth sent the requested portrait to France, the marriage negotiations had already deteriorated.¹⁶⁴ Elizabeth may have witnessed the downside to negotiation portraits in her past, but these events taught her that by eliminating the authority placed in them, she could control her fate. This tactic almost guaranteed that she could remain husbandless and powerful. The second duke of Anjou would complicate this strategy when he accepted her challenge and crossed the English Channel. Elizabeth then, had to find other ways to avoid this marriage.

Elizabeth may have been reluctant to participate in the diplomatic exchange of portraits for public purposes, but she most certainly had predilection for the miniature portrait. Painting in miniature was often referred to as limning. Lucas Horenbout from Ghent and Hans Holbein the Younger from Germany were the first most significant artists to practice limning in England, although in the Elizabethan era Nicholas Hilliard would become synonymous with the work.¹⁶⁵ The art of the miniature represented an aspect of portraiture in which Elizabeth did participate. These miniatures represented private affections and preferment. They were encased in gold frames and ornamented with jewels. They could be kept in personal cabinets to be taken out and viewed at the owner's pleasure, or they could be worn in public and shown at the owner's discretion. Regardless of preferred presentation these miniature represented the private world of portraiture.

Although evidence shows that Elizabeth collected and commissioned these types of portraits and that Nicholas Hilliard was often her artist of choice, Elizabeth did not show her favor with an official appointment or substantial pension for his services. This slight indicates what little value she placed in his contribution to her royal image. Elizabeth was not against

¹⁶⁴ Strong, *Gloriana*, 24.

¹⁶⁵ Hearn, *Dynasties*, 117.

showing preferential treatment or granting monopolies to individuals and companies for their services, so her neglect to do so for Hilliard shows the lack of importance or urgency she placed on what Strong called a form of propaganda.¹⁶⁶ Even though she had more interaction with this style of portraiture it was clearly not something she wished to control.

Proof of her esteem for the miniature can be shown when Sir James Melville, Scottish ambassador for Mary Queen of Scots, was visiting England to negotiate marriage options for his queen. Elizabeth took him into her bedchamber and showed off her collection of miniatures. One of the suitors Elizabeth wished Mary to consider was her own courtier, Robert Dudley the earl of Leicester. Melville reported that Elizabeth,

Took me to her Bed-chamber, and opened a little Cabinet, wherein were divers little pictures wrapped within Paper, and their names written with her own hand upon the Papers. Upon the first that she took up was written, *My Lord's Picture*.¹⁶⁷

When Melville realized this painting was of Leicester he asked permission to take it back to Mary in Scotland, but Elizabeth “refused, alledging that she had but that one picture of his.”¹⁶⁸ Most scholars present this incident to show Elizabeth’s deep affection for Leicester, but what is relevant to this study is what she did next. Melville reported that Elizabeth then “took out the Queens picture [Mary Queen of Scots] and kissed it, and I adventured to kiss her hand, for the great love therein evidenced to my Mistress.”¹⁶⁹ This gesture was a diplomatic act involving portraiture, but it was done in a private setting during a personal interaction, not for the display of the masses. Therefore, her actions could not be judged by the court or other ambassadors, giving her the ability to refute or deny the actions if diplomatic circumstances changed.

¹⁶⁶ Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature*, 119.

¹⁶⁷ Sir James Melville in George Scott, ed. *The Memoires of Sir James Melvil of Hal-Hill*. London: Turks-head in Corn-hill, 1683, 49.

¹⁶⁸ Melville, *Memoires*, 49.

¹⁶⁹ Melville, *Memoires*, 49.

Elizabeth also used the miniature to show personal preference and gratitude toward her chosen courtiers. Whether they were gifts from the queen or personal acquisitions, their purpose was to denote preferment or to show loyalty in a subtle and personal way. The most significant aspect about this type of portrait, for this study, is that even if it was being worn the face did not have to be on display. It was at the wearer's discretion to conceal or expose the small yet significant portrait. The miniature portrait ornament showed a personal connection to Elizabeth. Elizabeth's preferment of the private miniature portrait suggests that she had no intention of using portraiture as propaganda. The audience for a miniature portrait worn on the clothing or kept in a cabinet was even smaller than a large state portrait hung in a long gallery or in her royal collection.

Hilliard also provided the only known first-hand account of Elizabeth sitting for her portrait. In 1600, Hilliard began writing *A Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning*, it remained unfinished and unpublished upon his death in 1619.¹⁷⁰ In it, he recorded a conversation he had with Elizabeth about shadow and lighting. This conversation is estimated to have taken place around 1572, the year of his first limning of her. Most authors have used this passage as an opportunity to analyze Elizabeth's supposed opinion on the use of shadow and lighting in portraiture, but for the sake of this study it represents a rare willingness to sit for her portrait. In 1563 Elizabeth was and had been unwilling to sit for an artist, but by 1572, she was willing to make that commitment for a limner.

Elizabeth's willingness to sit for Hilliard and her patronage of his work should not be exaggerated. Although there are records of periodic payments to Hilliard, he was never granted an official post or a monopoly over her portraiture. Strong noted that in 1599, only four years

¹⁷⁰ Howard, *The Tudor Image*, 30.

before her death, Elizabeth granted Hilliard a meager annuity.¹⁷¹ Hilliard's livelihood depended on his work as a limner, engraver, goldsmith, and jeweler.¹⁷² Hilliard's worked on commission for people of Elizabeth's court and produced some of the most influential large-format, three-quarter length paintings of Elizabeth.¹⁷³ Hilliard was rarely without work, but he never had royally sponsored job security until after Elizabeth's death, when James I acknowledged his artistic contributions. Most royal courts during this time valued and sought out professional artists to have on retainer to supply portraits which were used for the many different personal and diplomatic ends. Elizabeth's relationship with Hilliard reveals that she did not value the portrait artist as an essential asset of statecraft, but rather as a novelty for personal pleasure. To provide perspective, James I and his wife Anne of Denmark would each have their own personal limner on royal salary.¹⁷⁴

Strong credited Hilliard as the creator of his "mask of youth" concept. Strong's initial assessment that Elizabeth most likely did not sit for portraits in the last decade of her reign is probably correct.¹⁷⁵ In trying to connect the emergence of this age reversing "mask" to his theory of the cult of Elizabeth Strong overstretched the scanty evidence.¹⁷⁶ It is true that there was a culture of praise surrounding Elizabeth, as with any ruler. From poets, to playwrights, to artists she was praised as an eternally youthful and beautiful goddess. Strong's attempt to connect this theme to a government sponsored Elizabethan propaganda machine, however, is flawed. Strong asserted that the miniature portraits later in her life exemplify the "mask of

¹⁷¹ Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature*, 65.

¹⁷² According to Bentley-Cranch and Strong Hilliard struggled financially until the Stuart period. Bentley-Cranch, *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England*, 196-197. Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature*, 65.

¹⁷³ 'The Phoenix Portrait' and 'The Pelican Portrait' are attributed to Hilliard.

¹⁷⁴ Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature*, 126.

¹⁷⁵ Strong, *Gloriana*, 147.

¹⁷⁶ Strong, *Gloriana*, 147.

youth” and could be seen as the start of official propaganda because they were given as gifts.¹⁷⁷ The simpler explanation would be that the artist creating them was not allowed another sitting, and rather than invent an updated portrait based on an accurate account of an aging queen, the artist used facial patterns that were readymade in his studio. The only governmental policies Strong provided as evidence were the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council order of 1596 and they had nothing to do with perpetuating a “mask of youth,” but rather, the destruction of “unseemly” and “deformed” images of Elizabeth.¹⁷⁸ It would be more appropriate to associate these government documents with censorship similar to legislation that was enacted in the press and the theatre. These enforced censorship laws pertained to seditious and libelous words and actions against Elizabeth’s religion and regime. None of these proclamations or orders was proactive, which is how a propaganda machine would function. Propaganda would prescribe how Elizabeth and her government were to be presented to the public, or at least stipulate where they had to get official portraits from. These proclamations and orders were all reactive, censoring, banning, and sometimes ordering the burning of books and plays that were already created.

It is, therefore, more likely these portraits, embodying the “mask of youth,” were born out of necessity and simplicity. At most they were attempts to flatter and please the person who commissioned them, whether that was Elizabeth, or, as is more likely, one of the men and women of her court. It must also be remembered that native English artists did not adopt continental Renaissance naturalism. English portraits were meant to be recognizable depictions,

¹⁷⁷ Strong, *The English Renaissance Miniature*, 119.

¹⁷⁸ Strong, *Gloriana*, 12-14.

but not life-like.¹⁷⁹ Thus, the various stylistic features of portraits of Elizabeth were not new and exclusive to her station, but common in English art of her era.

To put the Privy Council order of 1596 into context, it is important to note the religious and social turmoil of the last decade of Elizabeth's reign. The 1590s ushered in a period of economic, political, and religious challenges. The 1590s began with a series of bad harvests and the continuation of wars in the Netherlands and Ireland causing great financial strain. Several of Elizabeth's top advisors died in the 1590s, leaving her to cope with a new generation of gentlemen that had significantly different motives and plans for England's future. Elizabeth also had to contend with Catholic and Protestant dissenters, who were actively publishing books and pamphlets against her religious settlement. This type of religious dissent also reached the medium of portraiture in an extreme event. In 1592, zealous Puritan, William Hacket was executed for treason. In an act of symbolic violence Hacket "maliciously and traitorously put in and thrust an yron Instrument into that part of the sayde picture, that did represent the Brest and Hart of the Q. Maiestie."¹⁸⁰ This incident gives a better insight into the type of action and behavior that the government was worried about concerning any public display of dissent. This incident was not a case of a poorly executed painting that needed to be rectified by a Serjeant Painter; it was the act of symbolically harming Elizabeth through the piercing of her image. This incident shows that the government was more concerned with traitorous actions and images than with "unseemly" representations. Thus, the reason Elizabeth did not immediately appoint a new Serjeant Painter after Gower's death in 1596, the year of the Privy Council order, may have been that there were other matters more pressing than Gower's plans for the search and seizure of

¹⁷⁹ Cooper, *A Guide to Tudor & Jacobean Portraits*, 17.

¹⁸⁰ Richard Cosin, *Conspiracie, for Pretended Reformation: viz. Presbyteriall Discipline*, London, 1592, 67. In Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits*, 224.

unseemly images. Unless the portraits were traitorous and harmful to Elizabeth's wellbeing this would have been a waste of money and manpower, something the government was short of in the 1590s.

When one takes a close look at Elizabeth's words and actions regarding portraiture, it is evident she had an antithetical relationship with it. Her first exposure to it, fired by her father's dramatic temper spoiled its diplomatic purpose for her throughout the rest of her life. As peculiar as her feelings toward the use of diplomatic portraiture were for a Renaissance queen, it served her purposes well in the end. By refusing to allow negotiation portraits to take the place of a meeting in person saved her the time and threat of a possible marriage, since most foreign suitors were unwilling to yield to her strange demand. Although Elizabeth did show a fondness for the miniature portrait, her spotty patronage of it exhibits her casual relationship to it. During the years of the attempted government controls, Elizabeth and her regime contended with far more pressing political and religious matters to attend to than strictly enforcing her superficial visage. When studied within the framework of historical context Elizabeth's relationship to portraiture appears to be of avoidance and casual novelty.

Conclusion

This is the first study to consolidate information regarding Elizabeth's recorded opinion about the political portrait and to analyze her relationship to it in order to understand her views on its function and creation outside of the context of the artwork itself. This study has examined Elizabeth I's relationship to civic portraiture through Elizabeth's words, written and spoken, and through the written accounts of those who witnessed events and conversations relating to her view of the state portrait. This study focused narrowly on Elizabeth's recorded opinion of state portraiture pertaining to her and those closest to her. This examination also provided a comparative analysis of Elizabeth, her Tudor predecessors, and her contemporary royal peers, in Western Europe to show that her position regarding the civic portrait was distinct. By framing the examination in this manner it removes the temptation to view Elizabeth as an active agent in the creation or control of the artwork, and allows an objective analysis of the existing evidence to guide the reader to the conclusion that Elizabeth did not place sufficient value in the civic portrait to prompt her to oversee its creation, function, or censorship. This study is necessary because there is still a pervasive misconception in modern scholarship that Elizabeth desired and attempted to control the creation and distribution of her portraits. By removing Elizabeth as an active agent in the generation of these portraits, more fruitful research can be conducted on the people who actually did create these images and what roles they played in Elizabethan society.

In order to prove that Elizabeth's involvement and concern for the state portrait was minimal, I took a closer look at the evidence reported by other scholars in their efforts to connect Elizabeth with the censorship and creation of the state portrait. I examined letters of correspondence between Elizabeth and her royal peers and also foreign and domestic ambassadors. I also examined letters from ambassadors written to their personal monarch

reporting the conversations they had with Elizabeth. Royal legislation was surveyed to gauge Elizabeth's involvement in governmental action regarding the state portrait. The analysis of these legislative measures was the key to revealing the inconsistencies between scholars that argued for Elizabeth's desire for direct control over her portraiture and Elizabeth's ambivalent words about the subject. By understanding who created the laws and edicts on the control of her portraiture and why they were created, one can see that many people were involved, Elizabeth not being one of them. William Cecil wished to maintain public order and therefore, attempted to control the creation and distribution of portraits of Elizabeth. George Gower wished to obtain a monopoly over the production of images of Elizabeth, and loyal councilors wished to protect Elizabeth's reputation from zealous Protestant and Catholic visual propaganda against her.

The common misconception of Elizabeth's desire for control over her state portraiture has been traced back to Roy Strong's presentation of these legislative acts. Omitting key elements of the draft proclamation of 1563 and the Privy Council Order of 1596, and not analyzing who created these measures and why, Strong propagated the generally accepted notion that Elizabeth was their architect, or that her regime was attempting to conduct visual propaganda like her father. These omissions were systematic because Strong was also developing his theory on the cult of Elizabeth and a government sponsored visual propaganda campaign. Although that theory has since been debunked and replaced by a focus on the contribution of Elizabeth's courtiers to her visual iconography, the misconception about her personal involvement still appears in studies of Elizabeth. Strong's scholarship still heavily influences opinions regarding the image of Elizabeth, but an updated analysis is needed. It is important to identify the source of misinformation and rectify it for the benefit of future studies on Elizabeth, her image, and her involvement in its creation.

To understand Elizabeth's relationship and involvement with the state portrait, beyond her words, an analysis of the major cultural shifts had to be considered. By analyzing the role of the Renaissance and the Reformation across Western Europe, the reader is provided with an understanding of how the state portrait came to be used and viewed in Tudor England. By analyzing Elizabeth's relationship with her Tudor predecessors and her royal peers the reader is provided with the cultural and comparative context with which to understand Elizabeth's acceptance and adoption of the civic portrait. The civic portrait was introduced and used in England by way of contact with the Low Countries and did not develop a native style or workshop until after Elizabeth's death. This delay was perhaps, due to Elizabeth's failure to accept this form of representation as vital to her rule. Elizabeth was not unaware of the power of her image because she was greatly involved with the control and production of other forms of media that could both help and hinder her image. Her involvement with censorship over the press, the theatre, and the church proves that she was thoroughly involved with controlling what people could and could not see, therefore, proving that the state portrait was not of significant importance to her.

This research is limited to the pre-existing and known records of Elizabeth's words and correspondences on this subject. No archival research was conducted to contribute new and unseen information to this study. Although it was not needed to prove the points listed here, this research could benefit greatly from more in-depth research into Elizabeth's involvement and interactions with the state portrait, as could the field as a whole. If little more is found concerning Elizabeth and her involvement with the state portrait then it further suggests that it was not a significant concern of hers. As technology increases, further research on the portraits could help provide more insight into this relationship as well. Until then, researchers must

depend heavily on written records to better understand the provenance of the portraits of Elizabeth.

This study would benefit from further research and the discovery of new material to substantiate or refute these claims, but the most beneficial course of research would be to study the true creators of Elizabeth's official painted image. The further study of Elizabeth's courtiers and subjects and the possible meanings, and motives to create images of Elizabeth, would provide the field with a more complete understanding of Elizabethan society. The field would also benefit from a further study of the Flemish artists living in Elizabethan England and their motives to contribute to Elizabeth's visual iconography.

Because Elizabeth's visual iconography is such a popular subject and is analyzed by a variety of disciplines it is essential to understand Elizabeth's relationship to it. By eliminating the misconception of Elizabeth's need for control over her state portrait, scholars will be able to expand their studies to incorporate the people who were most likely to create these images and how they affected Elizabethan society.

References

Primary Sources

Marcus, Leah S., Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose, eds. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

- Princess Elizabeth to Queen Katherine, July 31, 1544
- Princess Elizabeth to Queen Katherine, December 31, 1544
- Princess Elizabeth to Queen Katherine, December 30, 1545
- Princess Elizabeth to King Edward VI, with a present of her portrait, May 15 1549
- Princess Elizabeth to Queen Mary, March 16, 1554
- Queen Elizabeth’s first speech before Parliament, February 10, 1559
- Queen Elizabeth to Sir Francis Walsingham, Ambassador to France, July 25, 1572

English Historical Documents Online

Williams, C.H., eds., *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V. New York: Routledge, 1967. – “An act for the king’s highness to be supreme head of the Church of England and to have authority to reform and redress all errors, heresies and abuses in the same (1534).” <http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=1765> (Accessed July 4, 2014).

Douglas, David C., Ian W. Archer, and F D. Price, eds., *English Historical Documents*. Vol. V(A). New York: Routledge, 2011.

“The Act of Supremacy, 1559.”

<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=1847> (Accessed November 13, 2013).

– “The Crisis of 1568-72.”

<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=1932> (Accessed November 13, 2013).

– “Royal Injunctions, 1559.”

<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=1849> (Accessed November 13, 2013).

– “The First Act of Uniformity 1548.”

<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/document/view.html?id=1797#> (Accessed May 26, 2014)

– “The Manifesto of the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland.”

<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=1947> (Accessed November 13, 2013).

– “Papal bull of 1570 excommunicating Elizabeth.”

<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=1949> (Accessed November 13, 2013).

– “An act whereby certain offences be made treason, 1571.”

<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=1950> (Accessed November 13, 2013).

- “The government’s attempt to counter Catholic propaganda: A particular declaration or testimony of the undutiful and traitorous affection borne against her Majesty by Edmund Campion, Jesuit, and other condemned priests, 1582.”
<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=2335> (Accessed November 13, 2013).
- “Elizabeth’s order for the suppression of prophesyings, 7 May 1577.”
<http://www.englishhistoricaldocuments.com/document/view.html?id=2354> (Accessed November 13, 2013).

Hughes, Paul I., and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. Vol. II. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

- “Prohibiting Unlicensed Interludes and Plays, Especially on Religion or Policy.”
- “Prohibiting Portraits of the Queen [draft].”

Letters and Miscellaneous

Adam von Zwetkowich to the Emperor Maximilian II, London, 4 June 1565. In Von Klarwill, Victor, ed. *Queen Elizabeth and Some Foreigners*. New York: Brentano’s Publishers, 1928.

Ambassador Smith to Queen Elizabeth, Paris, 1 April 1563. In Lebel, Gustave. “British-French Artistic Relations in the XVI Century.” *Gazette des Beaux Arts* 32 (1948).

Archbishop Grindal’s letter to the Queen, 1576. In Cressy, David, and Lori Anne Ferrell, eds. *Religion and Society in Early Modern England*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Bishop Quadra to the Duchess of Parma, 17 October 1562. In Hume, Martin, ed. *Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Bishop Quadra to Phillip II, 7 February 1563. In Chamberlin, Frederick. *The Private Character of Queen Elizabeth*. New York: Dodd Mead, 1922.

Cosin, Richard. *Conspiracie, for Pretended Reformation: viz. Presbyteriall Discipline*, London, 1592.

Elizabeth I to James VI, 7 August 1583. In Harrison, G B., ed. *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968.

Francis Walsingham to the Earl of Leicester, 28 January 1571. In Digges, Dudley. *The Compleat Ambassador*, London, 1655.

Henry Cobham to Walsingham, Paris, 22 January 1581-2 Public Record Office, London, sp 78/7/12. In Campbell, Lorne. *Renaissance Portraits*. New Haven: Yale University Press,

1990.

Leicester's Men's Patent in Chambers, E. K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. Vol. 2. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923.

Maisse. *De Maisse: A Journal of All That Was Accomplished by Monsieur De Maisse Ambassador in England from King Henri IV to Queen Elizabeth Anno Domini 1597*. Translated by G. B. Harrison. Bloomsbury, England: The Nonesuch Press, 1931.

Sir James Melville in Scott, George, ed. *The Memoires of Sir James Melvil of Hal-Hill*. London: Turks-head in Corn-hill, 1683.

Sir Walter Raleigh, *History of the World*, 1614. In Eliot, Charles W., ed. *Prefaces and Prologues: To Famous Books*. Vol. 39. New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1909-14. <http://www.bartleby.com/39/15.html>. (Accessed May 5, 2014).

"The Admonition to Parliament, 1572." In Jones, R. Tudur, Arthur Long, and Rosemary Moore, eds. *Protestant Nonconformist Texts Volume 1 1550-1700*. Vol. 1. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007.

"Unauthorized Portraits of the Queen," In Dasent, John, ed. *Acts of the Privy Council of England*. Vol. 26. London: Mackie & Co LD, 1902. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=1201>. (Accessed April 1, 2014).

Secondary Sources

Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Bentley-Cranch, Dana. *The Renaissance Portrait in France and England: A Comparative Study*. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2004.

Brown, Christopher. "British Painting and the Low Countries 1530-1630." In Hearn, Karen, ed. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630*. New York: Rizzoli, 1996.

Campbell, Lorne. *Renaissance Portraits*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Clegg, Cyndia, ed. *Censorship and the Press, 1580-1720*. Vol. 1. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009.

- Collinson, Patrick. "Barrow, Henry (c.1550–1593)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1540> (accessed December 1, 2013).
- Collinson, Patrick. *Elizabeth I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Coope, Rosalys. "The 'Long Gallery'; its Origin, Development, Use and Decoration." *Architectural History* 29 (1986): 43-84.
- Cooper, Tarnya, *A Guide to Tudor & Jacobean Portraits*, London: 2008
- . *Elizabeth I & Her People*. London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 2014.
- Cressy, David. "Book Burning in Tudor and Stuart England." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 36, no. 2 (2005): 359-374.
- Doran, Susan. *Queen Elizabeth I*. New York: New York University Press, 2003.
- Doran, Susan. "Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I." In *The Myth of Elizabeth*, ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke, 171-199. England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Dutton, Richard. *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- . *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1991.
- Edwards, Steve, ed. *Art and Its Histories: A Reader*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Frye, Susan. *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Graves, Michael A. R. "Campion, Edmund [St Edmund Campion] (1540–1581)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4539> (accessed December 1, 2013).

- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Hearn, Karen, ed. *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630*. New York: Rizzoli, 1996.
- Howard, Maurice. *The Tudor Image*. London: Tate Publishing Ltd, 1995.
- Howarth, David. *Images of Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Johnson, Paul. *Elizabeth I: A Study in Power and Intellect*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974.
- King, John N. *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Lees-Milne, James. *Tudor Renaissance*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1951.
- Loades, D. M. "The Theory and Practice of Censorship in Sixteenth-Century England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 24 (1974): 141-57.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Madden, F. "Portrait Painters of Queen Elizabeth." *Notes and Queries* 6 (September 11, 1852): 237-38.
- Matthews, P. G., 'Lyzard, Nicholas (d. 1571)', In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17317> (Accessed June 14, 2014)
- Martines, Lauro. *Power and Imagination: City-States in Renaissance Italy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.
- Montrose, Louis. *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Nauert, Charles G. *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*. 2nd ed. Cambridge:

- Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Ormond, Richard. *The Face of Monarchy*. Oxford: Phaidon Press Limited, 1977.
- Piper, David. *The English Face*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1957.
- Pomeroy, Elizabeth. *Reading the Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. Hamden, CT: Archon, 1989.
- Richards, Judith. *Elizabeth I*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Riehl, Anna. *The Face of Queenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Somerset, Anne. *Elizabeth I*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.
- Stokstad, Marilyn, and Michael W. Cothren. *Art: A Brief History*. 5th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2012.
- Strong, Roy. *The English Renaissance Miniature*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1983.
- . *The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- . *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1987.
- . *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1977.
- Walker, Julia M., ed. *Dissing Elizabeth*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Walpole, Horace. *Anecdotes of Painting in England*. London: Alexander Murray, 1871.
- Waterhouse, Ellis. *Painting in Britain 1530 to 1790*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1953.
- West, Shearer. *Portraiture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Yates, Frances A. "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 10 (1947): 27-82.