Birkbeck BA History of Art,
Art and Architecture at the Tudor Courts, Year 4
Laurence Shafe

How far can the Visual Representations of Elizabeth I be Interpreted as a Reflection of Political Ideology?

How far can the Visual Representations of Elizabeth I be Interpreted as a Reflection of Political Ideology?

The various images of Elizabeth reflect a rich and multifaceted use of symbols within themes that appear to reflect a clear political ideology. However, the extent to which this was orchestrated by Elizabeth and her closest advisors is uncertain. It is possible that much of the iconography reflected contemporary fashion or private lobbying rather than what Roy Strong and others imply was a programme of centrally control.[1]

Elizabeth was certainly beset by political problems throughout her reign, and Helen Beckett lists a few of the issues she faced, 'she came to the throne amid controversy about female rule; she remained unmarried, contravening Protestant ideology and royal precedent and leaving the succession in doubt; and the later years of her reign were sullied by various political tensions, including economic hardship and weariness of her regime.' [2] Elizabeth could have responded to these political issues with visual representations that supported her political ideology and there are many images of Elizabeth that have been interpreted as demonstrating such a response but in some ways they were following traditions and conventions of European and historical English monarchical representation.

Images of Elizabeth certainly contain symbols that can be interpreted politically but it is harder to demonstrate a political campaign based on visual representation. To do this it is necessary to show evidence both for an orchestrated and managed process of specification and control and a clear set of messages supporting a political programme. Such a requirement founders at the first hurdle as Elizabeth never even appointed a well paid court painter. The edicts concerning visual representation could be put forward to justify a commitment but they read more as an attempt to control a market that was already out of control than a planned programme.

[1] '…which led to the first deliberately orchestrated propaganda programme', R. Strong, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Pimlico, 2003), first published by Thames and Hudson 1987, p. 12.
[2] Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995), p. 10.

The State Control of Image Production

The first such edict was in 1563 and it took the form of a draft proclamation. It was never enacted but it did describe the well established system used by her sister Mary.[3] The full proclamation is shown in the Appendix and this makes it clear that many images of Elizabeth were being produced completely outside of State control, that many were of poor quality ('errors and deformities') and there was a strong demand for such images ('the contynuall requests of so many of hir Nobility and Lords'). The proclamation then describes a procedure to be followed in future.

> *some speciall Person that shall be by hir allowed shall have first finished a Pourtraicture thereof, after which fynished, hir Majestie will be content that all other painters, printers, or gravers…shall and maye at their pleasure follow the sayd patron or first portraicture.*

As far as we know this system was never used by Elizabeth and in 1575 the Painters Stainers' Company petitioned the Queen to try to prevent the spread of 'shoddy workmanship' followed in 1578 by another petition until in 1581 a Book of Ordinances was established which tried to give the Painters Stainers' a monopoly. This also failed and in 1584 a draft patent was drawn up by George Gower, the Serjeant Painter, giving himself a total monopoly on all images of Elizabeth except for limning, which was given to Nicholas Hilliard, but this was not enacted. Finally, in 1596, action was taken when the widespread circulation of poor images led to the Privy Council 'ordering public officers to aid the Queen's Serjeant Painter in seeking out unseemly portraits which were to her "great offence" and there to be defaced and no more portraits produced except as approved by the Serjeant Painter.' [4]

There were also many scurrilous images produced in Catholic countries, particularly France.[5] However, it is unlikely the proclamations related to these as the language would have been much stronger if they were referring to such traitorous images.

This history of failure suggests that Elizabeth did not take the issue of the circulation of poor quality images very seriously, at least until 1596. When she wrote to her brother in 1547, 'For the face, I graunt, I might well blushe to offer, but the mynde I shall never be ashamed to present' she was expressing the view of someone who regarded ideas as more

[3] Strong (2003), pp. 14-15
[4] Strong (2003), p. 14.
[5] R. Content, 'Fair is Fowle: Interpreting Anti-Elizabethan Composite Portraiture', in J.M. Walker (ed.), *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana* (1998), pp. 229-251.

important than appearance. I am arguing that although Elizabeth took an interest in paintings of herself, particularly during the portrait miniature and Mask of Youth period, she was never concerned enough to develop and control an orchestrated programme of visual propaganda.[6] I will take a small number of key images throughout Elizabeth's reign that contain symbols that reflect a political ideology, but at each stage I will examine whether this was part of an orchestrated campaign, political lobbying by her courtiers or just artists following accepted conventions.

The Early Years – Representing a Female Monarch

John Knox published a book in 1558 attacking the ability of women to govern.

> *Nature, I say, doth paynt [women] furthe to be weake, fraile, impacient, feble and foolishe…in the nature of all women, lurtketh suche vices, as in good gouernors are not tolerable.*[7]

Although his pamphlet was written as an attack on Mary he continued to defend his attack on women in letters to Elizabeth after she had become queen and his view was supported by others. However, he also hinted at a political solution as he contrasted contemporary queens with virtuous female rulers in the Old Testament such as Deborah. This was a suggestion from a private individual for a programme to enhance the image of the Queen. In her coronation pageant the following year the display in Fleet Street showed Elizabeth as 'Debora' assisted by her three estates, perhaps signifying that a woman could rule as long as she was aided by God and her estates, but there is no evidence that this was centrally planned.[8]

The other strategy that was used to counter the problem of her gender was the theory of the King's Two Bodies. This enabled her to distinguish between her physical female body and her 'masculine' body politic.[9] We see the issue of gender being grappled with by

[6] Horace Walpole wrote 'There is no evidence that Elizabeth had much taste for painting; but she loved pictures of herself', quoted in Strong (2003), p. 10.
[7] From *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, see Hackett (1995), p. 38.
[8] Hackett (1995), p. 44.
[9] This is clearly expressed in her Tilbury speech of 1588 but unfortunately we have no reliable eyewitness account of what Elizabeth said or wore, see S. Frye, The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol XXIII, No. 1 1992, pp. 94-114.

Elizabeth when she said to her Council in an early speech, 'I am but one Bodye naturally Considered though by his permission a Bodye Politique to Governe.' [10]

We can examine official images produced in many media in the first ten years of her reign to see how the gender issue was handled.[11] These include the Great Seal, a variant of this image of the enthroned monarch in John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* of 1863 and a woodcut from Richard Day's *Christian Prayers and Meditations* of 1569. The page from Foxe's book shows three men on the left and Helen Hackett suggests they represent the three wise men, 'such as to make Elizabeth Christ-child and Virgin Mother in one'.[12] However, Susan Doran points out that the men depict the printer John Day, Foxe himself and Robert Cecil (Foxe's sponsor) and their presence simply follows the conventions of the time. This shows the danger mentioned earlier of failing to interpret symbols in the context of contemporary conventions and how an orchestrated programme of visual Mariology becomes the conventional inclusion of the writer, printer and patron.

Roy Strong and Frances Yates have argued that images of Elizabeth as the Virgin Queen were used to replace the gap left by the ban on religious imagery and this achieved the political aim of finding a role for an unmarried queen.[13] Recent analysis by Doran, Louis Montrose and others has questioned this interpretation by looking at each image in the light of the conventions of the time.[14] Doran maintains that there is little evidence for a clear Marian iconography or that the queen herself was directly responsible for her own image.[15]

[10] A. Heisch references a British Museum manuscript containing these words in Stow MS 361, fol. 1, in 'Queen Elizabeth I: Parliamentary Rhetoric and the Exercise of Power', *Signs*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Autumn, 1975), p. 33.
[11] Some of these were produced by the female artist Levina Teerling, see S. Bergmans, 'The Miniatures of Levina Teerling', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 64, No. 374. (May, 1934), p. 232, Strong (2003), pp. 55-57 and S. Doran, 'Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I', in S. Doran and T. Friedman (eds.), *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp.172-174.
[12] Hackett (1995), p. 80
[13] For examples, see Strong (2003) and F. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).
[14] Doran (2003) and L. Montrose, 'Idols of the Queen: Policy, Gender, and the Picturing of Elizabeth I', *Representations*, No.68. (Autumn, 1999), pp. 108-161.
[15] Doran (2003), pp. 171-172.

The Flemish Allegories

During the 1560s Flemish exiles started to create cult images of Elizabeth and one of the first was a medal produced by Steven van Herwyck in 1565.[16] This presents Elizabeth as a Fountain of Virtue, Knowledge and Beauty nourishing Faith.

Two paintings that reflect a political ideology were possibly produced by friends of Herwyck, *Queen Elizabeth and the Three Goddesses*, 1569 and Lucas de Heere's *The Allegory of the Tudor Succession*, 1572.[17] The former was the first to introduce a clear allegorical message into royal portraiture. It is possible it was commissioned by William Cecil to celebrate Elizabeth's victory over the Northern Rebellion or it may have been presented to Elizabeth by the Flemish Protestant exiles. In either case it would again have been a private individual or group engaged in political lobbying.

The Three Goddesses was hung in Whitehall and was seen by many visitors and so became used by the State for political purposes but it was not part of a larger orchestrated campaign. It shows how Elizabeth triumphs over three goddesses which itself emphasizes the multifaceted roles of powerful women but this also has a negative association as it was a man, Paris, who chose between the three women. This negative association is addressed by showing Elizabeth in the role of Paris, and she does not even need to judge but simply overawes them with her presence. It is also interesting to note that although the goddesses are modelled in three dimensions and shown in the open countryside following Netherlandish painting conventions, Elizabeth is shown flattened and enclosed in her own hieratic space in the English convention.

During this period she was the most eligible prospective bride in Europe and there was a desperate need for accurate portraits to encourage the princes of Europe. There is little evidence that Elizabeth colluded in producing such images and Catherine de' Medici's commented in 1860 'After what everyone tells me of her beauty, and after the paintings that I have seen, I must declare that she did not have good painters.' [18] This may have been an

[16] Strong (2003), pp. 62-63

[17] Strong (2003), pp. 64-77. *Queen Elizabeth and the Three Goddesses* is attributed by Strong to Herwyck's friend Joris Hoefnagel but it is signed 'HE' and so has been attributed to Hans Eworth although the monogram slopes unlike Eworth's upright form. It has also been attributed to Lucas de Heere see K. Hearn, *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1996), pp. 73-74. Also see J. King, 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 1. (Spring, 1990), pp. 44-48

[18] Strong (2003), p. 23.

accurate comment on English painters but the *Three Goddesses* indicates it may have been a misunderstanding of English visual conventions of the period.

Later in the 1860s the influx to Britain of Protestant artists from the Netherlands and France introduced a new depth of symbolic and allegorical representation. This was a critical period for Elizabeth as she faced multiple Catholic uprisings; first the Northern Rebellion of 1560 followed by the Ridolfi Plot the following year and her excommunication.

The Middle Years of Pelicans and Sieves

By the 1570s the likelihood of the Queen's marrying was diminishing. Her Habsburg alliance had switched to the French Duke of Anjou but Elizabeth delayed so long in sending her portrait that the match had fallen through and the alternative marriage with his brother Francis, Duke of Alençon foundered when Elizabeth considered him too young.[19]

The number of allegorical elements in Elizabeth's portraits increased and Roy Strong and Frances Yates use this to justify the idea that Elizabeth consciously controlled and created what is called the Cult of the Virgin Queen. However, the State control of image production was poor or non-existent, many images were produced by patrons for their own political purposes and Montrose also argues that the word 'cult' is misleading as it suggests genuine worship rather than what he sees as the use of the image to create a political dialogue between the patron and the monarch.[20]

Two portraits in the early 1570s known as the 'Pelican' and the 'Phoenix' portraits are often attributed to Nicholas Hilliard, although the evidence is inconclusive.[21] The two portraits are the first to indicate a personal iconography although it is confined to the jewels suspended from her necklace. The phoenix, however, is one of the most common of all Renaissance emblems and is used to praise her uniqueness and chastity while asserting the perpetuity of her hereditary right to rule and it also appeared with her motto 'Semper Eadem' (Always the Same).[22] The pelican was also a common Renaissance symbol in this case of redemption and charity as it was believed to pluck its own breast to shed its blood to feed its young.

---

[19] Strong (2003), p. 24.
[20] Montrose (1999), pp. 108-161
[21] Strong (2003), p. 79.
[22] Strong (2003), p. 83, quoting W. Camden *Elizabeth*, London, 1688, pp. 31-32. There is only ever one phoenix alive at a time and it renews itself by self-immolation.

The 'Darnley' portrait of 1575 became a standard pattern for many portraits such as the portraits by George Gower and in 1579 his 'Sieve' portrait.[23] This is the first portrait to include an unequivocal symbol in the form of a sieve held by Elizabeth. The sieve is the symbol of the Roman Vestal Virgin Tuccia and so represents chastity and as a sieve separates the good from the bad it also represents wisdom.[24] It could have been commissioned by Sir Christopher Hatton, a favourite of the Queen, as there is a figure in the background with Hatton's emblem of a white hind on his sleeve. If this is the case the painting represents a political agenda being promoted by a private subject and it links the portrait with John Dee and Martin Frobisher and Dee's, and Hatton's imperial vision based on sea power. All the sieve portraits were painted at the time of the marriage negotiations with the Duke of Anjou and so could be private lobbying against the marriage using a positive image of virginity which by implication is presented as preferable to a Catholic king.[25]

A painting of *Elizabeth I Holding the Badge of the Gartere, the 'Lessert George'* ('Garter' portrait), c. 1575-80 by an unknown artist, now in The Royal Collection, shows a reversal of the traditional power relation between men and women.[26] The typical St. George painting shows a heroic saint on horseback killing a dragon while a fair damsel covers in the background. In this painting St. George is reduced to a small badge firmly held by Elizabeth. In fact the 'uterine shape of the narrow ringed ovals sewn into the queen's dress' make it look as if the Queen is about to make it disappear inside her. This is not part of an orchestrated campaign but shows an alternative way of dealing with gender issues. The representation of Elizabeth's in military attire is a myth constructed in the seventeenth century.

By the late 1570s most of Europe had given up hoping to find a suitable marriage partner for Elizabeth and Helen Hackett describes how Elizabeth entered a state of 'perpetual virginity' supported by her visual images.[27] The Queen is often shown as the moon-goddess Cynthia or Diana, Gloriana, Belphoebe or Astraea. Each goddess has slightly different

[23] Strong attributes the Darnley portrait to the Italian Mannerist painter Federigo Zuccaro but the evidence is inconclusive.
[24] Strong (2003), p. 95. Tuccia was accused of impurity and demonstrated her intactness (that is her lack of 'holes') by using a sieve to carry water from the Tiber.
[25] In the sixteenth century virginity had negative associations of failure and the sieve portraits countered this by creating positive associations of independence, wisdom and self-destiny.
[26] P. Erikson, '"God for Harry, England and Saint George": British National Identity and the Emergence of White Self-Fashioning', in Erikson, P. and Hulse, C. (eds.), *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race and Empire in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), p. 327-328 for the information in this paragraph and the quote.
[27] Hackett (1995), p. 80.

associations and Frances Yates believes that her representation as Astraea provides a key to the other roles.

Virgil's Eclogues predict the virgin Astraea returning to earth in the new golden age of empire and Emperor Constantine took this as a prophecy of the Virgin Mother of Christ and so he amalgamated imperial and Christain traditions.[28] The Elizabethan age of national expansion was seen as a rebirth of this golden age of imperial empire and the Divine Right of Kings arose out of the medieval controversy concerning the respective powers of Popes and Emperors.[29] With the Reformation the imperialist arguments became of the greatest importance to England and led to the view of the Pope as the Antichrist. This was described in Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* where he compares Elizabeth with the English born Constantine and the image of Elizabeth mentioned earlier is written inside the capital 'C' of his name. This also explains the images of Elizabeth standing alongside the imperial columns of the Holy Roman Emperors.[30] These are well established and conventional symbols of imperialism.

The Political Significance of Wearing the Queen's Portrait

From 1558 it became the custom to hold an Accession Day tilt in honour of Elizabeth and this became a romance of chivalry in which the Queen was heroine.[31] This re-feudalization of court spectacle was taking place all over Europe to focus religious loyalty on the national monarch. In England it was one of the few traditional forms of pageantry to survive the Reformation and although images of St. George were destroyed by Edward VI they were brought back by Mary and kept by Elizabeth.

Nothing remains of the imagery of the tilts themselves but in the mid-1580s it became very fashionable to wear a portrait of Elizabeth, possibly as a response to Catholic assassination plots.[32] It became the Queen's custom to bestow a relatively cheap portrait miniature on a favoured courtier and the receiver was then expected to incur great expense enclosing it in a bejewelled locket.[33] Examples are the 'Drake' and 'Armada' Jewels which became vehicles for a personal allegorical tribute. As mentioned earlier, this is a clear case of

[28] Yates (1975), p. 34
[29] Yates (1975), pp. 38-39.
[30] Strong (2003), pp. 104-107.
[31] Yates (1975), pp. 88-111.
[32] Montrose (1999), pp. 135-136.
[33] Stone (2003), pp. 29-30.

Elizabeth controlling and orchestrating the dissemination of an approved version of her image for political purposes.

The Armada and the Final Years of the Virgin Queen

As early as 1577 John Dee published a book called, *General and Rare Memorials Pertayning to the Perfect Arte of Navigation*, that put forward the argument that Britain should build a larger navy to take control of the seas in order to reinstate our place as the Western Empire of antiquity.[34] This farsighted vision was never actively pursued but happened by default as the defeat of the Armada eleven years later was a result of the weather rather than an investment in the navy. However, the iconology of sea power was frequently used and it fitted the association of Elizabeth with Cynthia or Diana and the power of the moon to control the tides. The earliest known reference in her portraits to the moon-goddess is Hilliard's miniature of *c.* 1586-7. This association with the oceans replaced the Vestal Virgin sieve portraits and laid the groundwork for Raleigh's poem *Book of the Ocean to Cynthia*. The defeat of the Armada reinforced it as the predominant theme of the last decade—the imperial domination of both land and sea. One well known example is *The Armada Portrait* (1588, George Gower) which declares the magnificence of Elizabeth and her realm.[35]

One of Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger's best known works is his 'Ditchley' portrait of *c.* 1592, in which the Queen is standing over a map of southern England with her feet near Ditchley in Oxfordshire.[36] It is thought it was commissioned by Sir Henry Lee in connection with his private entertainment of the Queen at his house in Ditchley and for his private political lobbying purposes. The Queen is shown bestriding England with her foot pointing at Ditchley and her head calming the stormy heavens. The sonnet on the right of the picture compare's Elizabeth's godlike powers with those of the natural elements and she is wearing an earring in the form of an armillary sphere that also indicates her authority over nature. As Queen's Champion Sir Henry has been responsible for much of the symbolism of the Accession Day tilts and the sphere was also his emblem at the tilts.

[34] B. Belsey and C. Belsey, 'Icons of Divinity: Portraits of Elizabeth I', in L. Gent & N. Llewellyn (eds.), *Renaissance Bodies* (1990), p. 15.
[35] Belsey (1990), p. 13-14.
[36] K. Hearn, *Marcus Gheeraerts II: Elizabethan Artist in Focus*, (London: Tate Publishing, 2002), pp. 31-32.

In *c*. 1592 Isaac Oliver drew a sketch of the Queen that may have been intended as a pattern.[37] It had the attributes of what the Elizabethan's called 'curious painting', that is, images with correct perspective and chiaroscuro. It was a return to the style of painting used by Hans Holbein at the court of Henry VIII and Anthonis Mor at the Court of Mary I, but it was not favoured by Elizabeth and only one miniature survives with a softened version of the pattern. In *c*. 1594 Hilliard created an image of Elizabeth known as the 'Mask of Youth' that was widely used for most of her portraits until she died. The Mask of Youth image created the illusion of eternal youth and this put off the difficult question of succession that concerned both Elizabeth and her courtiers.

Louis Montrose also points out that patrons who commissioned portraits of the Queen were motivated by self-interest and could use Elizabeth's glory to enhance their own, as for example, Edward Somerset does in Robert Peake's *Eliza Triumphans* or *Elizabeth I in Procession*, *c*. 1600-1. He also feels that Strong overstates his case when he describes the 'Rainbow' portrait as a 'sacred icon in which Royal Astraea is unambiguously presented as an object of worship.' [38] Montrose argues that 'the cult of Elizabeth' is neither a quasi-mystical object of belief nor a mere 'courtly game' but a core component of Elizabeth's statecraft. Courtiers, such as Raleigh, 'fused the courtship of the Queen's patronage with the courtship of her person.' [39]

The 'Rainbow' portrait, c. 1600-03, by Marcus Gheeraerts was one of Elizabeth's final portraits. The eyes and ears and the serpent on her dress were a common symbols taken from Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia* and signifying control over dominions through surveillance and the formulation of strategies based on secret wisdom.[40] There are also many exotic interpretations of this image, such as hinting at Elizabeth's 'autonomous sexual practices while also affirming the queen's political authority by virtue of the gaze she maintains and

[37] Stone (2003), p. 143.
[38] Montrose (1999), p. 132 quoting from Strong's *The Cult of Elizabeth* but note that in *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (2003) the same paragraph is used but with the contentious sentence removed.
[39] Montrose (1999), p. 134.
[40] Montrose (1999), pp. 140-144, Doran (2003), pp. 190-191, and R. Graziani, 'The "Rainbow Portrait" of Queen Elizabeth I and Its Religious Symbolism', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 35. (1972), pp. 247-259.

the intelligence she receives while touching herself.' [41] However, these interpretations are based more on modern analysis than contemporary evidence.

The death of the queen gave rise to a new demand for her likeness which faded away only to surge again in the 1620s with a decline in the popularity of the Stuart rule and Elizabeth became the golden age ruler and the posthumous heroine of the Protestant cause.[42]

Conclusion

We have seen how visual representations of Elizabeth have been used to associate her image with the Virgin Mary as well as many classical goddesses, to support an imperialism based on sea power, as part of chivalric code of courtly love and to counter concerns about the succession with a mask of eternal youth. Many of the visual representations of Elizabeth reflected the political response to problems that arose from her gender. In the early part of her reign the solution to the problem of her gender was marriage to a partner who would not bring the problems of Philip II. In the middle part of her reign the idea of marriage faded to be replaced by the Cult of the Virgin Queen which emphasised her power to reign based on its Marian associations and the Two Bodies of the monarch. In the later part of her reign the question of succession started to loom large and it was addressed by denying the problem with the Mask of Youth and by the chivalric love affair between Elizabeth and her Court.

The political associations of the symbols in royal portraits were concerned with the court and it is too simplistic to talk of a 'Cult of the Virgin Queen'. As Montrose points out, it is misleading to talk of Elizabeth's state in a way that implies a coherent set of policies. Factions with her Privy Council and political elite pursued their own interests and struggled over policy amongst themselves and with their sovereign. Courtiers engaged in games of courtly love to further their own interests and they commissioned portraits that got the attention of the Queen in order to do so. For example, Sir Henry Lee put Ditchley 'on the map' with his portrait and reconciled the Queen to his living with his mistress Anne Vavasour.

[41] D. Fischlin, 'Political Allegory, Absolutist Ideology, and the "Rainbow Portrait" of Queen Elizabeth I', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 1. (Spring, 1997), p. 186.
[42] Stone (2003), pp. 162-165.

All power resided with the Queen so ideological messages did not need to disseminate down to her courtiers. Courtiers achieved their objectives in this environment by obtaining the monarch's agreed. They did this not by worshipping her as part of a 'Cult of the Virgin Queen' nor by merely flattering her but by engaging in a discourse that that involved gaining her attention and obtaining her support.

Many examples have been mentioned of images produced by private individuals and groups for their own political purposes and there are specific examples of Elizabeth controlling her own image but the evidence for an orchestrated, centrally-controlled campaign of political propaganda based on visual images is weak. It is possible most Elizabethans would have agreed with Sir John Harington who wrote that paintings should be valued 'as pleasing ornaments of a house, and good remembrances of our friends.' [43]

[43] J. Buxton, *Elizabethan Taste* (London: Macmillan, 1963), p. 109.

Bibliography

Auerbach, E., 'Portraits of Elizabeth I', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 95, No. 603 (Jun., 1953), pp. 196-205

Belsey, B. and Belsey, C., 'Icons of Divinity: Portraits of Elizabeth I', in L. Gent & N. Llewellyn (eds.), *Renaissance Bodies* (1990), pp. 11-35

Bergmans, S., 'The Miniatures of Levina Teerling', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 64, No. 374. (May, 1934), pp. 232-233, 235-236

Brayley, E., *Londiniana: Or, Reminiscences of the British Metropolis* (London, Hurst, Chance, and co., 1828)

Buxton, J., *Elizabethan Taste* (London: Macmillan, 1963)

Content, R., 'Fair is Fowle: Interpreting Anti-Elizabethan Composite Portraiture', in J.M. Walker (ed.), *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana* (1998), pp.229-251

Dalton, K., 'Art for the Sake of Dynasty: The Black Emperor in the Drake Jewel and Elizabethan Imperial Imagery', in P. Erikson & C. Hulse (eds.), *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race and Empire in Renaissance England* (2000), pp. 178-214

Doran, S., 'Virginity, Divinity and Power: The Portraits of Elizabeth I', in S. Doran and T. Friedman (eds.), *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp.171-259

Erikson, P. and Hulse, C. (eds.), *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race and Empire in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000)

Erikson, P., '"God for Harry, England and Saint George": British National Identity and the Emergence of White Self-Fashioning', in Erikson, P. and Hulse, C. (eds.), *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race and Empire*

in Renaissance England (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 315-345

Evett, D., 'Some Elizabethan Allegorical Paintings: A Preliminary Enquiry', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 52. (1989), pp. 140-166

Fischlin, D., 'Political Allegory, Absolutist Ideology, and the "Rainbow Portrait" of Queen Elizabeth I', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 1. (Spring, 1997), pp. 175-206

Frye, S., 'The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol XXIII, No. 1 1992, pp. 94-114

Gent, L., and Llewellyn, N., *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture* c*. 1540-1660* (London: Reaktion Books, 1990)

Graziani, R., 'The "Rainbow Portrait" of Queen Elizabeth I and Its Religious Symbolism', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 35. (1972), pp. 247-259

Hackett, H., *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen. Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995)

Hammer, P., 'Sex and the Virgin Queen: Aristocratic Concupiscence and the Court of Elizabeth I', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 1, Special Edition: Gender in Early Modern Europe, (Spring, 2000), pp.77-97

Hearn, K., *Marcus Gheeraerts II: Elizabethan Artist in Focus*, (London: Tate Publishing, 2002)

Hearn, K., *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1996)

Heisch, A., 'Queen Elizabeth I: Parliamentary Rhetoric and the Exercise of Power', *Signs*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Autumn, 1975), p. 31-55

Hervey, M., 'Notes on Some Portraits of Tudor Times', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 15, No. 75. (Jun., 1909), pp. 151-155, 158-160

King, J., 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', Renaissance Quarterly, Vol. 43, No. 1. (Spring, 1990), pp. 30-74

Montrose, L., 'Idols of the Queen: Policy, Gender, and the Picturing of Elizabeth I', *Representations*, No.68. (Autumn, 1999), pp. 108-161

Richards, J., 'Love and a Female Monarch: The Case of Elizabeth Tudor', *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 2. (Apr., 1999), pp. 133-160

Shemek, D., review of Juliana Schiesari's 'The Gendering of Melancholia: Feminism, Pyscholanalysis, and the Symbolics of Loss in Renaissance Literature', in *Italica*, Vol. 72, No. 3. Theatre (Autumn, 1995), pp. 393-395

Strong, R., *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Pimlico, 2003), first published by Thames and Hudson 1987

Strong, R., *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Pimlico, 1999)

Walker, J., *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999)

Westfall, C., 'Painting and the Liberal Arts: Alberti's View', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec. 1969), pp. 487-506

Yates, F., *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975)

Appendix

The following is an extract from E. Brayley, *Londiniana: Or, Reminiscences of the British Metropolis* (London, Hurst, Chance, and co., 1828), pp. 62-64.

'…a proclamation respecting her Portraitures which was issued in the year 1563, and a copy of which is here given from the original draught in the hand-writing of Secretary Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley, now preserved amongst his papers in the State-Paper Office.

> *"Forasmuch as thrugh the natural desire that all sorts of subjects and people, both noble and mean, have to procure the Portrait and Picture of the Queen's Majestie, great number of Paynters, and some Printers and Gravers have allredy and doe dayly attempt to make in divers manners Portraictures of her Majestie in payting, graving, and pryntyng, wherein is evidently shwen that hytherto none hath sufficiently expressed the naturall representation of hir Majesties person, favor, or grace, but for the most part have also erred therein, as thereof dayly complaynts are made amongst hir Majesties loving subjects, in so much that for redres hereof hir Majestie hath lately bene so instantly and so importunately sued unto by the Lords of hir Consell and others of hir nobility, in respect of the gret disorder herein used, not onely to be content that some speciall coning Paynter might be permitted by access to hir Majestie to take the naturall representation of hir Majestie, whereof she hath bene allwise of hir own right disposition very unwillyng, but also to prohibit all manner of other persons to draw, paint, grave, or pourtrayit her Majesties personage or visage for a time, untill by some perfect patron and example the same amy be by others followed.*
>
> *"Thefor hir Majestie being herein as it were overcome with the contynuall requests of so many of hir Nobility and Lords, whom she cannot well deny, is pleased that for thir contentations, some conyng Person mete therefor, shall shortly make a Pourtraict of hir person or visage to be participated to others for satisfaction of hir loving subjects, and fardermore commandeth all manner of persons on the mean tyme to forbear from payntyng, graving, printing, or making of any portrait of hir Majestie, until some speciall Person that shall be by hir allowed shall have first finished a Pourtraicture thereof, after which fynished, hir Majestie will be content that all other painters, printers, or gravers, that shall be known men of understanding, and so thereto licensed by the hed officers of the plaices where they shall dwell (as reason it is that every person should not without consideration attempt the same), shall and maye at their pleasure follow the sayd patron or first portraicture. And for that hir Majestie perceiveth that a gret nomber of hir loving subjects are much greved and take great offence with the errors and deformities already committed by sondry persons in this behalf. She straightly chargeth all hir officers and ministers to see to the due observation hereof, and so soon as may be to reform the errors already committed, and in the mean tyme to forbydd and prohibit the shewing or publication of such as are apparently deformed until they may be reformed which are reasonable."'*