HI203 Referencing Examples

Footnote Examples:


Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Secondary Sources:
Norrie, Aidan, ‘Elizabeth I as Judith: Reassessing the Apocryphal Widow’s Appearance in Elizabethan Royal Iconography’, *Renaissance Studies*, 31.5 (November 2017), 707–722
presbyterianism was doctrinal heresy’, as well as itself being a shifting and debatable concept.” The increased emphasis on Elizabeth as a parliamentary queen and the role of counsel are being increasingly acknowledged by historians of Elizabethan politics as inextricable from and, to a certain extent, enabled by her status as a female prince. As John Guy writes, ‘The crux is increasingly gender.’

Anne McLaren has argued for a direct link between the development of ‘mixed monarchy’ in Elizabeth’s reign and Elizabeth’s gender. She writes that ‘the “mixed monarchy” was defined as a corporate body politic; one in which the wisdom of the many... “bridled” and imparted grace to a female prince.’ As the last chapter showed, these questions also circulated around Mary. What happens in Elizabeth’s reign, which is demonstrated at her coronation, is that Elizabeth as a parliamentary queen is also linked to a Protestant discourse, and good counsel serves as a particularly godly counsel. In Aylmer’s An Harborewe, Hales’s ‘Oration’ and Foxe’s ‘The miraculous preservation of Lady Elizabeth’, the emphasis on Elizabeth’s election by God and her position in Parliament is double-edged: it serves to pressurise Elizabeth into bringing about the godly reformation that they envisaged.

How would such a godly queen be anointed and crowned?

Since the early twentieth century, Elizabeth’s coronation has been interpreted variously by historians. The debate centres principally on what has become the supposed scandal of the coronation mass and the implications of this for Elizabethan England’s religion. Opinion remains divided on whether or not the consecrated host was elevated and, if it was, whether Elizabeth shunned this gesture by getting up and withdrawing into a hidden ‘traverse’, thereby rejecting Marian and Catholic ceremony and demonstrating commitment to the ‘new’ religion. The controversy stems from the fact that ambassadors’ letters, eyewitness reports and court records offer confused and often contradictory accounts of the ceremony. Furthermore, unlike the previous Tudor coronations, there is no extant ‘Device’ for Elizabeth’s coronation that anticipates the order of the ceremony. It is not certain who celebrated the mass – Bishop Oglethorpe or Dean Carew, the newly instated Dean of the Chapel Royal – whether the consecrated host was elevated or not, how the host was consecrated, and whether, or how, Elizabeth took communion.

It is unclear, then, whether Elizabeth’s coronation followed the order for a Catholic mass or reintroduced Protestant communion. The problem, though, is one of reading the ceremony correctly. Just as historians today still seek to decode and unscramble accounts and records of the coronation, looking for clues to Elizabeth’s personal beliefs, and thus to the religious policy and
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Historians and literary scholars have long noted and analysed the appearance of biblical analogies as part of Tudor and Stuart royal iconography. Using the example of a biblical figure, monarchs demonstrated the divine precedent for their decisions, and subjects in turn could counsel their monarch to emulate the actions of a divinely favoured biblical figure. Queen Elizabeth I of England was the subject of the greatest number of biblical analogies drawn in the early modern period: analogies were drawn both by apologists and by Elizabeth herself throughout the entire span of her reign, and for almost a century after her death. Elizabeth’s comparissons with Deborah the judge, Queen Esther, Daniel the Prophet, King Solomon, and King David have all received varying levels of attention in the existing scholarship; but the analogy to Judith, the chaste widow of the Apocrypha, has generally escaped detailed analysis.6

Judith was invoked in various ways throughout Elizabeth’s reign, and the diverse analogies reflect the changing religio-political climate of the time. This article offers a reexamination of the comparisons drawn between Elizabeth and Judith during the queen’s lifetime. In doing so, I argue that contrary to claims in some of the existing scholarship, Judith was routinely and consistently offered to Elizabeth as biblical precedent for dealing with Roman Catholics – with violence, not just diplomatic rhetoric – and for the providential emergence of a divinely favoured biblical figure. Queen Elizabeth I of England was granted strength by God to kill Holofernes after requesting it, and how God would also help Elizabeth as he had previously ‘against hir enimies’. With this analogy, Davies compared Judith’s providential victory over Holofernes with Elizabeth’s protection from the open violence of her enemies abroad. With the thought that their queen was unto exceeding the servitude of her Enemies abroad.
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a loss of authority during the war against Spain, especially as her preference was for a limited form of warfare, deemed “womanish” by hawkish commanders like the second Earl of Essex. Although she retained ultimate control over policy-making, there were several occasions when her commanders ignored or even disobeyed her express commands once on their campaigns. But we should not forget that disregard for royal orders could also happen to kings who did not accompany their troops on an expedition, as Henry VIII found to his cost during the 1512 campaign in Aquitaine when his army returned home “without his command.”

To compensate for her inability to take on an active military role, Elizabeth became a figurehead for a nation at war. Famously, at the time of the 1588 Armada scare, she went to Tilbury to review her troops, perhaps dressed—as it was later reported—“as armed Pallas”, and her presence was for a limited form of warfare, deemed “womanish” by hawkish commanders like the second Earl of Essex. Although she retained ultimate control over policy-making, there were several occasions when her commanders ignored or even disobeyed her express commands once on their campaigns. But we should not forget that disregard for royal orders could also happen to kings who did not accompany their troops on an expedition, as Henry VIII found to his cost during the 1512 campaign in Aquitaine when his army returned home “without his command.”
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TO KATHERINE PARR 5

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

From Saint James on the thirty-first of July.