

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

07 January 2021

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Mears, N. (2022) 'Memorials of Queen Elizabeth I in early Stuart London.', *The Seventeenth Century*, 37 (1). pp. 1-22.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2020.1867626>

Publisher's copyright statement:

"This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor Francis in *The Seventeenth Century* on 22/01/2021, available online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2020.1867626>."

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Memorials of Queen Elizabeth I in early Stuart London

Natalie Mears

Department of History, Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom

Dr Natalie Mears, Department of History, Durham University, 43 North Bailey, Durham,
County Durham. DH1 3EX

Telephone: 0191 373 5380

Email: Natalie.Mears@durham.ac.uk

Orchid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5442-834X>

Memorials of Queen Elizabeth I in early Stuart London

At least thirty–eight memorials were erected to Elizabeth I in London parish churches between c. 1606 and c.1633. Though they have been interpreted as critiques of Jacobean foreign policy, this conclusion is not fully supported by extant evidence regarding when the memorials were commissioned, the parishes in which they were erected, and the inscriptions which they contained. This article suggests that, as commentaries on foreign policy, the memorials were directed more at Charles than James, and could have been designed or interpreted as criticism of Charles's and Buckingham's continental failures or an endorsement of their more militant response to continental events. Further analysis of the memorials' inscriptions and of parochial observance of royal anniversaries indicates a further range of motives, purposes and contemporary interpretations including the commemoration of key events in the Church of England's history, daily reminders to parishioners to thank God for his protection, and the memorialisation of patrons and their families.

Keywords: Elizabeth I; James I; Charles I; memorials; commemoration; divine providence.

From the late 1600s to the early 1630s, a third of parishes in and around the City of London commissioned memorials to Elizabeth I in their churches, painting images and texts directly on to the church's interior walls, on to wooden panels or on to canvas stretched over wooden frames. These memorials were unusual: the queen was the first deceased monarch to be repeatedly commemorated in parish churches, and memorials were still being constructed thirty years after her death. They were also striking because most of them bore inscriptions that drew on a group of common texts, even though the memorials were commissioned independently by vestries, churchwardens or parishioners in diverse types of parishes and were made by different craftsmen. They were largely a metropolitan phenomenon: only four other examples are known to have existed in the rest of England.¹

The London memorials have been understood as features of a broader public debate on early Stuart governance, in which Elizabeth's posthumous image provided an exemplar: they were celebrations of a lamented queen which acted as tacit criticisms of James I, and especially of the religious implications of his foreign policy. As early as 1650, Godfrey Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, asserted that they were painted "in hate and detestation" of James's "Scottish government".² Among modern scholars, Julia Walker argued that they expressed a "populist celebration" of Elizabeth as a warrior and as peerless among mortals.³ For Nicola Smith, their "extravagantly regretful and praiseful, almost adulatory" tone "could be interpreted as a challenge, a reproach or even a warning to the Stuart king".⁴ Julia Merritt argued that they were erected by people "increasingly frustrated by King James's pacific, if not pro-Spanish response to the outbreak of the Thirty Years War", for whom "Elizabeth became an emblem of the anti-Spanish, aggressively Protestant foreign policy that James was failing to pursue".⁵

Such interpretations are persuasive, but they are not without problems. They assume that the memorials articulated a single, uniform message. They privilege the concerns of social and political elites and specifically those who were ideologically committed to pursuing military intervention on the continent in support of fellow protestants. They do not consider the attitudes of lower-ranking Londoners, those who were happy with James's policies, or those who had grievances other than foreign policy and for which the late queen's posthumous reputation could (and did) act as a potent discursive weapon. They are not based on close analysis of all the evidence for the memorials,⁶ and do not take into account the material, spiritual and ritual context in which contemporaries would have encountered the memorials: the parish church. Nor do they explain why the most common inscription in the memorials did not comment on Elizabeth herself, but was a biblical passage on faith and salvation.

While accepting that growing opposition to James's pacific foreign policy has importance for understanding the memorials, this essay suggests a broader range of possible motives for their construction or how they were "read" which takes fuller account of the diversity of parishes in which memorials were erected, the long time period during which they were commissioned, and their principal audience: the parishioners. It argues that understandings of Elizabeth's posthumous reputation, on the one hand, have been defined principally, though perhaps unconsciously, by the concerns of social and political elites and, on the other, reflect the long-standing protestant- or puritan-centred narratives and interpretations of the period.⁷ Consequently, it calls for a more socially and ideologically inclusive approach, while acknowledging the evidentiary problems such an approach poses.

I

Memorials to Elizabeth were erected in at least 38 of the 113 parishes in the City of London and just outside its walls. None of them now survive. They are known primarily through Anthony Munday's descriptions in his revised edition of John Stow's *Survey of London* (1633),⁸ with further evidence provided in later surveys by Thomas de Laune and Edward Hatton as well as churchwardens' accounts and vestry minutes where extant.⁹ All were wall, panel or canvas paintings, except St Mildred Bread Street's which was an elaborate stained-glass window.¹⁰ The size of the memorial paintings is largely unknown, though churchwardens' accounts indicate that St Dunstan-in-the-West's required twenty-two and a half feet of canvas.¹¹ All the memorials included at least one inscription, and some had as many as six or seven.¹² Approximately sixteen incorporated an image of, or relating to, the queen, most likely that of her effigy and tomb in Westminster Abbey,¹³ which craftsmen could have copied directly or from contemporary engravings or woodcuts.¹⁴ The best

description of such an image comes from Hatton's account of St Olave Old Jewry's memorial, which also corresponds to the only surviving image of a memorial (at Geddington, Northants, destroyed in the 1860s (Figure 1):

Queen Elizabeth lying on a fine Tomb, adorned with Columns, of the Corinthian Order, with the Regalia, and under an Arched canopy, on which is placed her Arms bet[wee]n 2 Cupids.¹⁵

The location of the memorials within churches is known in only two cases: All Hallows the Great's was in the chancel near the vestry door, and St Mildred Bread Street's stained glass window was at the upper end of the chancel, between the north and south side windows.¹⁶ The cost of creating the memorials varied greatly, from about 15 shillings at St John the Baptist Walbrook to £11 at All Hallows London Wall.¹⁷

[figure 1 here]

Aside from their sheer number, the memorials are striking because many were similar in appearance; in particular the majority drew on a group of eleven texts for their inscriptions.¹⁸ At least nine memorials used translations of the Latin inscription on Elizabeth's tomb in Westminster Abbey, which had been completed in 1606; such translations were in circulation from at least 1612.¹⁹ St Anne Blackfriars cited the inscription nearly verbatim (Appendix, text 1), but most parishes adapted the text, with four using the same version (Appendix, text 1B).²⁰ The most popular text describing Elizabeth was the short verse "Spaines rod, Romes ruine," used at least eleven times. The inscription at St Mary le Bow (Appendix, text 2) indicates that it was probably part of a longer poem or ballad, which must have been in circulation before 1613, given the evidence in printed works.²¹ The next three most popular inscriptions that described Elizabeth, all used at least

nine times, were “If Royal Vertues ever crown’d” (Appendix, text 3), “Here lies her type” (Appendix, text 4), and Proverbs 31: 29 (“Many Daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest of them all”).²² “Here lies her type” may have been composed by John Davies, as he used a slight variation, “Lo here her type”, on an engraving of the queen printed in 1623.²³ The short verse, “Britaines Blessing” (Appendix, text 5), was used at least seven times, while “Th’admired Emperesse” (Appendix, text 6), which had been circulating since at least c. 1600, was used twice.²⁴

The presentation of Elizabeth in these inscriptions duplicated motifs that had abounded both in texts published during her lifetime and in the eulogies printed during the months after her death. As Walker and Merritt have emphasised, the memorials characterised the queen primarily as a protestant champion at home and abroad. She was “Spaines rod, Romes ruine, / Netherlands reliefe”, “Britaines Blessing, / Englands Splendor, / Religions Nurse / The Faiths Defender”, “The prop of belgia, the stay of France. / Spaines foile, Faiths shield”, a “Deborah”, and a “Mother / In our Israel” under whom, “Religion to its primitive sincerity restored”.²⁵ But Elizabeth was also presented as well-educated, virtuous and a good governor, a presentation that was not as uncommon as Walker has suggested.²⁶ The queen had “administred most prudently the Imperiall State thereof [for] 45. Yeeres”, established domestic peace and crushed rebellion, supervised the revaluation of the coinage, and supported and assisted the universities. She was to be remembered “For perfect skill in very many Languages, for glorious Endowments, as well of minde as body, and for Regall Vertues beyond her Sex” and lauded for her mildness, honour, courage, temperance, prudence and equity. The popular biblical passage “Many Daughters...” was a common statement of praise given to godly and virtuous women; a “garland of praise”, noted John Dods, “which he [the Holy Ghost] may set vpon the head of such a industrious woman” to distinguish her from others.²⁷ It was these virtues that exalted Elizabeth above all, and which ensured that she

lived on in her subjects' hearts "admir'd, ador'd". The most popular inscription, however, was the biblical verses 2. Timothy 4: 7–8, which addressed doctrines of salvation, as did Psalms 125: 1 (used at least five times) and 112: 6 (used at least three times); this matter will be considered below, in section IV.

Though most of the memorials drew on a common core of texts and images, they were erected over a period of more than two decades. As table 1 shows, only fourteen of the thirty-eight can be dated with much certainty: the earliest was in St John the Baptist Walbrook, painted between Easter 1609 and Easter 1610; the last may have been in St Olave Old Jewry, which may have been painted after 1633. However, broad periods in which a further five memorials may have been commissioned can be suggested, and a possible *terminus ad quo* can be hypothesized for another seven. Approximate dates for the remainder are suggested by periods of significant building or refurbishment work in the churches, given that the painting of most of the dateable memorials seems to correlate with such work: eight were created during major building works, three in the year after such works, and one during refurbishment of the interior (the remaining dateable memorial was a gift).²⁸ In at least some cases, such as at St Mary Magdalen Milk Street, memorials were commissioned as part of programmes of internal refurbishment works that included the erection or repair of the royal arms and/or boards of the Ten Commandments.²⁹

Dating the memorials has important ramifications for the argument that they were erected as tacit criticisms of James I, and especially in response to the religious implications of his foreign policy. If those whose date of creation can only be approximated are included, ten were painted before James's son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, was offered and accepted the Bohemian crown in August 1619, an action which intensified pressure on James to intervene militarily in support of continental protestants fighting against the Habsburgs. Nine memorials were painted between autumn 1619 and James's death in March 1625, a period in

which popular cries for intervention in the Thirty Years War increased, public demonstrations took place against the Spanish, rumours of Catholic conspiracy proliferated, and French Huguenot refugees arrived in the realm in large numbers.³⁰ However, eighteen memorials were painted or erected during Charles's reign; as many as fifteen of which may have been commissioned when the realm was at war with France and/or Spain.³¹

The broad time period during which memorials were commissioned -- particularly, the large number that were erected during Charles I's reign -- raises doubts that they were all designed to criticise James's policies, despite the commonalities of inscriptions and images that many shared. These doubts are reinforced by the diverse character of the parishes in which memorials appeared. They were painted in parishes that were likely to have been unsympathetic towards James's irenic politics, such as the godly parishes of St Anne Blackfriars and St Antholin,³² as well as All Hallows the Great, whose rector, Sampson Price, was openly critical of the king's foreign policy.³³ Some patrons had, or may have had, puritan sympathies: Sir Nicholas Crispe (St Mildred Bread Street) came from a puritan family, with connections to leading puritan preachers;³⁴ Thomas Chapman's (St Pancras Soper Lane) idiosyncratic will preamble suggests a deep godliness, rooted in beliefs in *sole fide*, predestination, and scripture as a manual for living.³⁵ But memorials were also commissioned in parishes that were led by moderate puritan ministers, such as John Dove at St Mary Aldermary, or in those led by men about whom we know little or nothing, such as Andrew Janaway (All Hallows London Wall).³⁶ Neither were memorials exclusive to rich parishes that could afford to invest substantial sums in one memorial. They were also commissioned by or in a number of poor ones, including two of the poorest: All Hallows the Great and St Katherine Cree.³⁷ Although All Hallows' memorial was paid for by a rich donor, Cissilia Rawlins, other poor parishes seem to have considered having a memorial sufficiently important to spend precious parish funds.

All of these factors suggest that the memorials may have been commissioned for a variety of reasons, that they may have been interpreted differently by parishioners and that those interpretations may have changed over time. The next section analyses the memorials' inscriptions, the changing patterns of inscriptions between 1608 and the 1630s, and parochial observance of royal anniversaries as a prelude to exploring what these purposes and interpretations may have been.

II

The extent to which donors chose the texts and images for the memorials is unclear. It seems likely that some patrons had a significant influence. Crispe oversaw the refurbishment of St Mildred at the time its memorial was erected.³⁸ After initially conceiving the memorial in St Pancras Soper Lane as part of a legacy after his death, Chapman instead chose to erect it during his own lifetime.³⁹ Elsewhere, decisions were probably made by churchwardens or prominent parishioners: the vestry of St Lawrence Jewry, for instance, left design decisions for other items to the churchwardens “with the advise of some other parishyoners”, and it may have adopted a similar course for its memorial to Elizabeth.⁴⁰ It is also possible that parishes copied from each other, as we know they did when commissioning other items: from 1612 to 1614, churchwardens from St Dunstan-in-the-West, toured “divers Churches for the best fashion of the newe pewes and to looke out for the best wainscot and deale”.⁴¹

Nevertheless, patterns in the choice of inscriptions are discernible in the dateable memorials, and these are supported further if the correlation between building works and memorials is accepted for those memorials which cannot be dated precisely or at all. These patterns reveal two things. First, there was a more even balance between representations of Elizabeth as a protestant champion and as a virtuous, good governor in the Jacobean memorials than Walker and others have suggested, the more so as these memorials tended to have fewer inscriptions (between one and three texts) than the Caroline ones (at least eight had four or more inscriptions). Indeed, the earliest memorial (St John the Baptist Walbrook) focused solely on Elizabeth's virtues.⁴² Second, that Elizabeth was depicted as an anti-Spanish, protestant champion far more commonly (and more exclusively) in Charles's reign than in James's. The earliest dateable use of "Spaines rod", the most popular text on Elizabeth solely as a protestant champion, is 1625-6 (St Botolph Billingsgate), even though the poem appears to have been in circulation since at least 1613. It was used again at St Benet Gracechurch (1630-1) and All Hallows the Great (1632-3).⁴³ These were also the first two parishes known to have used the verse "Britaines blessing", the other popular text presenting Elizabeth solely as a protestant champion.⁴⁴ All Hallows London Wall's unique text, which compared Elizabeth to bellicose depictions of Deborah, Judith and Hester, dates from 1628-9.⁴⁵ If the undated memorials assigned to the periods when parish churches underwent major building works are included, the shift becomes more obvious. Though "Spaines rod" was used in the memorials at St Bartholomew Exchange and St Mary Le Bow which might date to c.1620, the remaining six instances occur during Charles's reign, as do all five other occurrences of "Britaines blessing".⁴⁶

These patterns suggest that James's foreign policy may not have been the only source of dissatisfaction for some London parishes, while the large number of

memorials that were commissioned from 1625 and the popularity of the verses “Spaines rod” and “Britaines blessing” in the same period suggests that many memorials may have been commentaries on Charles I, not James. Further insights are provided by the appreciable amount of evidence from parochial celebrations of royal anniversaries.⁴⁷ Observance of these occasions demonstrates Elizabeth’s and James’s popular appeal. Many of the parishes that had memorials to Elizabeth, including those who were among the first to commission one, had long histories of observing the anniversary of the queen’s accession, and sometimes her birthday.⁴⁸ They immediately shifted the focus of their celebrations from Elizabeth to James after 1603,⁴⁹ and quickly adopted observance of the two further Jacobean anniversaries, Gowrie Day (5 August) and Gunpowder Treason Day (5 November). The official liturgies of these occasions emphasised James’s role as the target of plots and as the agent through which divine providence worked to foil them. St Lawrence Jewry, St Botolph Billingsgate and St Benet Gracechurch stand out for their exemplary practice, celebrating James’s accession every year,⁵⁰ though others, such as St John the Baptist Walbrook, St Dunstan-in-the-West, and St Martin Orgar, also marked these events regularly.⁵¹ Observance of Gowrie Day was relatively widespread, and was a fixture in parishes such as St Mary Aldermary and St Stephen Coleman Street.⁵² There is no significant evidence to suggest that observance of Elizabeth’s accession day was widely revived and consistently observed during James’s reign as a symbolic display of dissatisfaction or resistance, nor that observance of James’s accession day or Gowrie Day declined dramatically during the king’s reign.⁵³ Indeed, St Stephen Coleman Street appears to have continued to celebrate the latter after James’s death.⁵⁴ This suggests that *both* Elizabeth and James were relatively popular; that praise of Elizabeth, either as a protestant champion or as a prudent and wise governor, could and did exist easily alongside praise of James, and,

consequently, that Elizabeth's memory was not necessarily invoked solely as a means to criticise her successor.

Parochial observance of Jacobean anniversaries challenges the assumption that James was inherently unpopular and that the memorials were *commissioned* as criticisms of him. While scholars have tended to define Elizabeth's posthumous image primarily as a rhetorical device for criticism, Daniel Woolf, Curtis Perry and John Watkins have revealed its discursive complexities.⁵⁵ One of these was how, in Perry's words, "the Elizabethan legacy could contribute to the erosion of support of the new king without being overtly critical of him." By providing "exemplars of royal conduct that were often at variance with James's own performances", representations of, and nostalgia for, Elizabeth could contribute to the "emergence of Jacobean dissatisfaction" and become a "conventional tool for its expression."⁵⁶ In other words, what could have originated as straightforward commemoration of the only monarch that most Londoners had ever known, could subsequently turn into a motif of criticism when James did not live up to expectations, governed in a different way or pursued different policies.

III

Analysis of the changing patterns of inscription texts, evidence of parochial celebration of royal anniversaries, and insights into how Elizabethan nostalgia worked in the early seventeenth century all provide valuable new perspectives for understanding the meanings of the memorials, especially given the long period during which they were commissioned and the diversity of the parishes that did so. They make it possible to add nuances to existing arguments and to suggest that the memorials may have had further purposes and meanings.

First, while they reinforce how important early Stuart foreign policy was to the commissioning and interpreting of the memorials, the changing patterns in the selection of inscription texts suggests that current orthodoxies need to be refined. The relatively even balance between inscriptions describing Elizabeth as a protestant champion and as good, virtuous and successful governor might indicate that, if the early memorials were criticisms of James, they may not have been provoked (solely) by his foreign policy. In representing Elizabeth as a good governor, patrons and parishes may have intended to articulate -- or parishioners may have understood -- a different, or broader, range of grievances with James by using Elizabeth as an exemplar of good governance. The crown's exploitation of monopolies, court corruption, the monarch's relationship with parliament, James's broadening of his range of advisors to include several Catholics, as well as the perennial problems of the absence of further church reform and the perceived lax enforcement of recusancy laws, were all bones of contention in these years and may have appealed to a wide cross-section of parishes and Londoners. Equally, however, evidence of James's popularity provided by parochial celebrations of key Jacobean anniversaries suggests that the memorials may not have been critical commentaries of the king at all. Decisions to include a visual depiction of Elizabeth's Westminster tomb in the memorials or to adopt the tomb's inscriptions, including statements which emphasised Elizabeth's role as a protestant champion, were not necessarily driven by dissatisfaction with the Jacobean regime. After all, the tomb and its texts represented the official commemoration of the queen: James had approved the contract for work -- indeed, he had planned to erect a memorial to the late queen as early as 1604 -- and, though oversight of the project was delegated to the Principal Secretary, Sir Robert Cecil, he must also have endorsed the choice of inscriptions.⁵⁷ Since its discovery, the Gunpowder Plot had been cast in the popular imagination as

"James's Armada" and it continued to be depicted as such into the 1620s, uniting, rather than dividing, the two monarchs as protestant champions and sustaining claims, made in many panegyrics printed in the months after James's English accession, that the Scottish king's protestant faith was proof that he was the queen's rightful heir. Indeed, some panegyrists went so far as to claim James was Elizabeth's metaphorical son and that the queen lived on through him.⁵⁸

Conversely, the large number of memorials that were commissioned from 1625 and the popularity of the verses "Spaines rod" and "Britaines blessing" in the same period suggests that many memorials were not commentaries on James at all, but of his son, Charles I. Here, there may have been two different motivations or interpretations. On the one hand, the memorials may have been commissioned to criticise Charles's actions, including his mishandling of requests for parliamentary taxation and his inadequate support of French Huguenots, as well as the actions of his chief advisor, the duke of Buckingham, who had led failed expeditions to Cadiz (1625), the Île de Rhé (1627) and La Rochelle (1628). In this scenario, a (mythical) Elizabeth who was an anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish protestant champion who secured triumphs against her enemies, governed her realms peacefully and always retained the love of her subjects embodied everything that Charles (and Buckingham) were not. On the other hand, memorialising Elizabeth as a protestant champion could have been understood as subtle praise of the new king. Charles had been celebrated for returning from Spain without the Infanta as his bride (1623), he had promoted a protestant "patriot coalition" against Spain in James's final parliament in 1624, he had declared war on both Spain (1625) and France (1627), and was the Elector Palatine's advocate.⁵⁹ Moreover, although news of the failure of the Cadiz expedition caused anger, especially in parliament, arguably the greatest and most widespread disillusion with Charles's foreign policy occurred after

the failure of the duke's Île de Rhé expedition became apparent in late 1627; disillusionment that was exacerbated by the positive reporting of events by the official and popular newsbook, *A continued iournall*, over the preceding months.⁶⁰ At least six, and possibly seven, memorials to Elizabeth date to the period 1625-1627.

Second, evidence provided by the inscriptions and parochial celebrations of royal anniversaries, as well as Perry's insights, suggest a range of other motives for commissioning memorials and ways in which they may have been interpreted by their viewers. Early memorials may have been partly and simply parochial funeral monuments for the late queen, attesting to her continuing popularity but without necessarily implying criticism of James. Munday did describe the memorials specifically as "Monument[s]"; St Anne Blackfriars' memorial ([c.1613?]) quoted the inscription from Elizabeth's tomb nearly verbatim and depicted its image, as probably did at least four, and possibly as many as six, of the ten memorials painted before c. 1619/20.⁶¹ The choice of inscriptions reflected memorial conventions, praising Elizabeth's achievements, skills and virtues: the most popular texts were the general encomia "Here lies her type" (used at least five times before 1619) and "Many daughters" (at least three times). Texts on salvation, which might also be expected to feature in a memorial, were also prominent: "I have fought a good fight" was used at least eight times, Psalm 112 at least twice, and other passages were used at St Michael Crooked Lane and St Mary Somerset.⁶² The memorial at St Pancras Soper Lane made explicit reference to its commemorative function: "this Memoriall of her was here erected, set up and Consecrated" "To the most happy, blessed and precious Memory, of the late famous, renowned, and never to bee forgotten Monarch, Q. Elizabeth."⁶³

It might be expected, if this was the case, that more memorials would have been commissioned immediately after Elizabeth's death or after the completion of her

Westminster tomb (1606) and that the Westminster epitaph would have been more widely cited.⁶⁴ As only fourteen can be dated, it is possible that some were commissioned between 1603 and 1609, notwithstanding the correlation between the memorials and building work. Equally, the memorials may have been commissioned in reaction to the erection of the tomb of Elizabeth's Catholic rival and focus of plots, Mary Stuart, which was completed in 1612. As Peter Sherlock has demonstrated, Mary's tomb was bigger and more expensive than Elizabeth's, her epitaph was considerably more laudatory, and, by condemning the "instigator and perpetrator" of her "violent murder" and "slaughter", it could even be interpreted as a reproof of Queen Elizabeth.⁶⁵ Although not all Londoners would have been able to read Mary's Latin epitaph for themselves, the size and splendour of the monument was readily apparent, and the arrival of her corpse at Westminster had been witnessed by many.⁶⁶ Some may have resented that Mary had, in Sherlock's words, been "accorded the same honour" as English monarchs by being reburied in the Abbey.⁶⁷ Moreover, Mary's reinterment was arranged to coincide with the marriage celebrations for James's daughter, Princess Elizabeth, to the Elector Palatine. While James intended the tomb and the marriage to be public declarations of his dynastic legitimacy and its future, to others the tomb could have appeared as a slur against the late queen at a time when her namesake was entering into a longed-for protestant dynastic alliance. After all, a number of City parishes had rung their church bells on the receipt of the news of Mary's execution.⁶⁸

The memorials could have been commissioned, or interpreted, as visual reminders of a momentous episode in the Church of England's history, memorialising Elizabeth's role in restoring the "true church". Again, this did not necessarily signal disapproval of James. The elaborate window in St Mildred Bread Street (1625-8) depicted the Gunpowder Plot as well as Elizabeth's tomb and the defeat of the

Armada.⁶⁹ Similarly, Chapman's memorial at St Pancras Soper Lane was originally conceived alongside plans to establish annual sermons commemorating not only Elizabeth's accession and the defeat of the Armada, but also the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot.⁷⁰ Although the memorials of the queen were the most numerous and striking visual examples in the City of commemoration of the protestant past, they were not alone. Paintings of the Armada and Gunpowder Plot were erected in St Michael Queenhithe in 1638-9, and annual sermons to commemorate the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot were founded by parishioners in St Bartholomew Exchange (c.1608), St Martin Orgar (1607-9), St Michael Crooked Lane (1625) and elsewhere.⁷¹

Their purpose -- and that of the sermons that Chapman and others founded -- was not just commemorative; it was also didactic. The memorials were to remind parishioners of their debt to divine providence, to exhort them to offer thanks, and to encourage them to live godlier lives. This was most explicit at St Mildred Bread Street.⁷² Elizabeth's reign, the defeat of the Armada, and the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot were "Stories past" that demonstrated God's special protection of the realm and were reminders "To after ages, that / in their distresse, / They might Gods goodnesse / still expresse." They were accompanied by an image depicting the outbreak of the plague of 1625, which served both as a warning that divine providence could be forfeited and as a reminder of God's mercy:

... But sure we were ingrate,
For now, behold, in stead of sweet protection,
Thousands are swept away by foule Infection.
But marke Gods mercy, in midst of greatest cryes,
He sheath'd his sword, and wip't teares from our eyes.⁷³

These commemorative and didactic purposes may partly explain why memorials seem to have been painted during, or shortly after, periods of church rebuilding or

refurbishment, and why so many were commissioned in a wide range of parishes in London. They were conceived as integral parts of the church fabric, recording key moments in the Church's history and establishing ideal examples of how parishioners should behave; they reflected deeply entrenched beliefs, which were common topics for sermons from the City's many pulpits; and they complemented the spiritual and ritual practices of the church, including the observance of national anniversaries.

A handful of memorials had more personal commemorative functions: to celebrate the patron and their families. This is most obvious at St Mildred Bread Street, where the installation of Crispe's elaborate stained-glass window coincided with his tenure as churchwarden and his elevation to *pater familias* of this prominent merchant family. The window depicted Crispe and his family and, although the accompanying inscription asserted that the memorial was "not so much / to represent / The Founders Person, / as his zealous care / T'expresse Gods love / and mercies rare", this was false modesty: the window very much drew attention to Crispe's zeal and his actions.⁷⁴ At the time this window was commissioned, Crispe also erected memorials to his grandparents, father, and four of his children, and persuaded his mother and brother to give two further windows to the church. The family monuments emphasised the Crispes' social standing and their contribution to the City.⁷⁵ The memorial commissioned by William Wigmore, a plaisterer, at St Botolph Billingsgate may have had a similar purpose, even though Wigmore appears to have held a much humbler rank: it was also erected during his tenure as churchwarden, the most important office that he held.⁷⁶

IV

The biblical verse, “I have fought a good fight” (2 Timothy 4: 7-8), was the most commonly-cited text, used in at least twenty-six of the thirty-eight memorials and across the whole period in which memorials were created. Yet, the verse has gone unnoticed by historians, and its significance and meaning left unexplained. Although verse eight (“Henceforth there is laid up for me...”) echoed the words spoken by the archbishop of Canterbury at the moment in the coronation service when the sovereign was crowned, and so may have reminded well-informed readers of the late queen,⁷⁷ the passage as a whole was a declaration of salvation. Nor was this the only inscription that referred to this subject: Psalm 125: 1 (“They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever”) was used at least five times and Psalm 112: 6 (“The Righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance”) was used at least three times; other similar texts were used by individual parishes.⁷⁸ The verse “I have fought a good fight” and the two psalms were commonly used as texts of comfort at the point of death, as testimonies of one’s faith, and as assurances of God’s salvation, so their appearance in the parochial memorials may not seem surprising. But was their use merely conventional or did they have more specific purposes?

The consistent popularity of these biblical passages suggest that the memorials had further didactic purpose, similar to the scriptural texts which were painted on church walls in increasing numbers during the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth.⁷⁹ They were reminders to parishioners to keep the faith, to live according to the scriptures, and to trust in the Lord for their salvation. As Thomas Hall wrote in his *A practical and polemical commentary*, the “fight” in 2 Timothy 4: 7–8 referred to man’s struggle against his own sin and weakness or against unbelievers; the “course” was a “life spent in the service of Christ”; keeping the faith was the “keeping the doctrine of

Faith ... from corruption, and in a faithful propagation of that choice Treasury to posterity.” If people struggled sincerely against sin, were faithful to God’s doctrine and believed in the grace of salvation, they would be rewarded with eternal life.⁸⁰ Preachers and ministers often directed their parishioners to Psalms 112 and 125 to help them to strengthen their faith in times of adversity – “no feares, no rumors nor euill tidings, shall make him quake, who standeth in the Lord”, declared John Milwarde in a Gowrie Day sermon at Paul’s Cross in 1607.⁸¹ These psalms were also assurances that it was only faith in the Lord that brought happiness, health and wealth to them and generations to come⁸² and that God’s promise of salvation could never be broken.⁸³

This message was especially appropriate for godly parishes like St Anne Blackfriars and St Stephen Coleman Street, as well as for individual godly patrons, like Chapman (St Pancras Soper Lane).⁸⁴ But the popularity of these inscriptions, even in religiously more “moderate” parishes, suggests a wide appeal. More pointed messages about the doctrines and workings of salvation may also have been intended or construed, because these passages were placed alongside inscriptions about, or images of, Elizabeth. Patrons or viewers may have identified the Elizabethan church as the “true church” and understood that it was only by living according to its tenets – however they might be interpreted – that they would gain salvation.⁸⁵ The memorials may even have been intended to counter, or interpreted as challenges to, the official commemorations of Elizabeth and Mary Stuart in Westminster Abbey which claimed that Mary had already “exchanged the fate of a transitory life for the eternity of an heavenly kingdom”, while Elizabeth still awaited resurrection (“she left here her mortal relics, until at Christ’s command they rise immortal”).⁸⁶ This may explain the inclusion, or provide an interpretation, of Proverbs 10:7 (“The memoriall of the just shall bee blessed, but the name of the wicked shall rot”) in St Mary Somerset’s

memorial, which was probably created before 1614 and thus when the Westminster tombs were erected. Was this inscription intended to allude to -- or was it read as an allusion to -- Elizabeth and Mary respectively?⁸⁷

V

By close analysis of the full range of popular inscriptions, by considering previously neglected ones, and by acknowledging that the memorials were experienced in the particular material, ritual and spiritual context of the parish church, a wider range of meanings and purposes become apparent. Parochial memorials to Elizabeth were not just subtle criticisms of Stuart policies or styles of kingship. They may have been celebrations of a popular queen and endorsements of either James's providential credentials or Charles's championing of the continental protestant cause. They memorialised key events in protestant history, exhorting parishioners to give thanks to God for his protection and encouraging them to live godlier lives. They memorialised individual parishioners and may have been interpreted by parishioners as challenges to the official commemoration of Mary Stuart. They used the fame and example of Queen Elizabeth as means to express messages of spiritual comfort, acknowledging parishioners' daily struggle against sin, and providing assurance that they could be saved.

Some of these meanings -- the commemoration of patrons, the messages of spiritual comfort -- seem prosaic but they might explain why so many memorials were commissioned for display in churches in a variety of parishes over a long period of time. They help to account for the expenditure of large sums or scarce resources on durable additions to the fabric of the church, by pointing to more universal and enduring

meanings compared to what could be regarded as important, but more transient, political issues. They provide insight into how male and female civic elites sought to use the material fabric of the parish church to shape the public worship, religious beliefs and moral behaviour of others, especially those of lower ranks, during a period in which what constituted an appropriate church interior and how it influenced worship were the subjects of increasingly divisive debate.⁸⁸ Equally, without suggesting that lower-ranking subjects were uninterested in the struggles of continental protestants, this analysis has attempted to shift attention away from civic elites and matters of early Stuart foreign policy to a more socially diverse audience – parishioners – and a broader, and at times more universal, range of beliefs and concerns, such as popular monarchism, divine providence, and salvation.

In challenging earlier interpretations of the London memorials to Elizabeth, this essay has argued that our broader understanding of Elizabeth's posthumous image and how it was used is both "classed" – defined by elites' (political) concerns – and, despite studies to the contrary by Woolf, Perry and Watkins, remains predicated on a specific set of contemporary protestant/puritan narratives: the myth that Elizabeth was a protestant champion, that England should take a leading role in defending militarily European protestant brethren from Catholic attack, and that the early Stuarts were either lax or incompetent in doing so.⁸⁹ The former is a product of evidence: what ordinary subjects thought of Elizabeth is often only found in brief indictments for slanderous and seditious words brought before the courts during the queen's lifetime. The London memorials are no different as there is no extant evidence either for what motivated less socially- and economically-privileged patrons, like Wigmore at St Botolph Billingsgate, to commission memorials or for what parishioners thought of them. Indeed, even evidence of elites' commissioning of memorials is very fragmentary: churchwardens'

accounts and vestry minutes do not survive for all parishes; wills are not extant for all patrons, and there are no personal statements about why memorials were commissioned. The latter reflects the long-standing and continuing dominance of protestant/puritan perspectives in Elizabethan and early Stuart history, in which the Elizabethan nostalgia and anti-Stuartism of polemicists, historians and other writers since the seventeenth century has been unconsciously reinforced, first, by the revisionists' and post-revisionists' focus on early Stuart parliaments, particularly the House of Commons, and, more recently, by the growing interest in news and newsbooks and the privileging of contemporary print evidence all of which has accentuated the voices of elite and semi-elite puritan discontents. By changing perspective from patron to parishioner, analysing closely what evidence remains, placing representations in their spatial, material and ritual contexts, and thinking creatively around absences in the archive, a fuller, more comprehensive, more inclusive and more varied understanding of how and why Elizabeth was “remembered” during the seventeenth century and beyond is possible.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Alex Barber, John Cramsie, Julie-Marie Strange, Philip Williamson and Andy Wood for their helpful and constructive feedback on earlier drafts of this essay. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewer for their enthusiastic comments and suggestions.

Disclosure statement: no financial interests or benefits have arisen as a result of this research.

¹ Suffolk Record Office (Ipswich), HD 474/1, 171–5, Robert Ryece, “The Breviary of Suffolk”;
Whinney, *Sculpture in Britain*, 433n9; Markham, *History and Antiquities of Geddington*,
19; Smith, *Royal Image*, 94, 114n16. Fuller's claim in that similar memorials could be
found in “many Countrey Churches” seems to be unfounded: Fuller, *Church–History of*
Britain, Book X, 4–5.

² Brewer, *Court of King James*, I, 97-8.

³ Walker, “Bones of Contention,” 252-76, esp. 258-62; Walker, “Reading the Tombs,” 510-30,
esp. 528-30.

⁴ Smith, *Royal image*, 92-7, quotation from 96.

⁵ Merritt, “Puritans, Laudians,” 953.

⁶ Walker's essays are the most detailed, but they do not consider all the available evidence, for
such matters as the date of creation or the identity of the patron. She does, however, note
broad periods during which churches underwent refurbishment work, a matter also
discussed below (see esp. “Bones of Contention,” 258 and 273n10). The memorials are
not the main focus of Smith's and Merritt's work.

⁷ On the latter issue, see particularly Questier, *Dynastic Politics*, 2-6.

⁸ Stow, *Survey*, 859-60. Although Munday appears to have missed the memorials at St Antholin
and St Olave Old Jewry, Merritt demonstrates that his survey of churches is largely
accurate: Merritt, “Puritans, Laudians,” 939.

⁹ De Laune, *Present State of London*, 27-80; Hatton, *New View*, 95-578 (continuous pagination
across the volumes).

¹⁰ Stow, *Survey*, 859-60.

¹¹ St Dunstan-in-the-West, Churchwardens' Accounts, London Metropolitan Archives [LMA],
P69/DUN2/B/011/MS02968/002, fo. 97v.

¹² E.g. Stow, *Survey*, 861-2, 871.

¹³ These figures are based on Munday's, De Laune's and Hatton's descriptions, and on churchwardens' accounts and vestry minutes. The phrases "monument of queene Elizabeth" (in churchwardens' accounts and vestry minutes only), "the queenes tombe", "the hearse of Queene Elizabeth", and references to texts being "over her" or "under her", have been interpreted as indicating an image of the queen. Munday's use of "Queene Elizabeths Monument", which he used for all the memorials, seems to have been a more generic reference and has not be used as evidence that the memorial contained an image of the queen.

¹⁴ Contemporary prints: van Passe, "The Tomb of Elizabeth I"; Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, 52–3; Mountin, "Tumulus Elizabethæ Reginae Angliæ &cc". Frontispieces and book illustrations: Purchas, *Purchas His Pilgrimes*; Camden, *Tomus alter*. At least three memorials, described as "Queene Elizabethes monument", "the Queenes Tombe" or "the hearse of Queene Elizabeth", were erected before these prints/books were produced, suggesting craftsmen either copied the actual tomb or other prints that are now no longer extant: St Dunstan-in-the-West, Churchwardens' Accounts, 2, f. 97v; St John the Baptist Walbrook, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/JNB/B/006/MS00577/001, fo. 27v; St Lawrence Jewry, Vestry Minutes, LMA, P69/LAW1/B/001/MS02590/001, p. 233.

¹⁵ Hatton, *New View*, II, 448.

¹⁶ All Hallows the Great, Vestry Minutes, LMA, P69/ALH7/B/001/MS00819/001, fo. 56v; Stow, *Survey*, 859.

¹⁷ The equivalent of £100 and £1,343 in 2017 respectively, or 15 and 157 days wages for a skilled tradesman in 1610 and 1630 respectively. St John the Baptist Walbrook, Churchwardens' Accounts, f. 27v (materials only; no record of payment for labour); All Hallows London Wall, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/ALH5/B/003/MS05090/002, fo. 223r; The National Archives, currency converter at <<https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency-converter/>> [accessed 30 April 2020]

¹⁸ "At least" is used because there are no descriptions of the texts used at St Antholin and St Olave Old Jewry.

-
- ¹⁹ Speed, *Theatre*, 881–2; Hakewill, *Ansvvere*, 73–4; Cade, *Iustification*, sigs. li4v–li5r.
- ²⁰ Stow, *Survey*, 826–7, 849–52, 854–5, 861–2, 869–70.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 849, 857. The stanza beginning “She was, she is...” appears as a marginal comment in Bayly, *Practise of Piety*, 534; the verse beginning “Spaines rod” is in Camden, *Remaines*, 379. Note that the stanza beginning “She was...” was inscribed on the memorial at St Michael Crooked Lane: Stow, *Survey*, 857.
- ²² Some parishes, e.g. St Dunstan-in-the-West, used “well” instead of “virtuously”. Proverbs 31: 29 was also used in an engraving of Elizabeth in Heywood’s *Englands Elizabeth*.
- ²³ Davies, “Lo Here Her Type”.
- ²⁴ “Queen Elizabeth Holding Orb and Sceptre”.
- ²⁵ E.g. Stow, *Survey*, 822, 823, 826–7, 843.
- ²⁶ Walker, “Bones of Contention,” 258.
- ²⁷ Dod, *Bathshebaes Instructions*, 66.
- ²⁸ For building work in early Stuart London, see Merritt, “Puritans, Laudians,” 935–60.
- ²⁹ St Mary Magdalen Milk Street, Vestry Minutes, LMA, P69/MRY9/B/001/MS02597/001, p. 4. See also All Hallows London Wall, Churchwardens' Accounts, 2, fo. 224v; All Hallows the Great, Vestry Minutes, fo. 56v; St Dunstan-in-the-West, Churchwardens' Accounts, 4, fo. 97v; St Michael Woodstreet, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/MIC7/B/003/MS00524/001, p. 9; St John the Baptist Walbrook, Churchwardens' Accounts, fo. 24r.
- ³⁰ Questier, *Dynastic politics*, ch. 7.
- ³¹ Memorials dated to c. 1625 are attributed to Charles’s reign because most of the calendar year fell into this period. These figures do not include St Michael Crooked Lane’s memorial which could date to either c.1610 or c.1621.
- ³² Merritt, “Puritans, Laudians,” 952–4
- ³³ Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, July 1621, in Birch, *Court and Times*, II, 265–6.

-
- ³⁴ Will of Ellis Crisp, 7 Nov. 1625, TNA, PROB11/147, fos. 148v-55r; Will of Hester Crisp Pye, 18 Mar. 1643, TNA, PROB11/191, fos. 183r-186r; Robert Pooley, “Crisp, Tobias (1600-1643),” *ODNB*.
- ³⁵ Will of Thomas Chapman, 15 Aug. 1620, TNA, PROB11/136/140r-140v, 142v, 143r. I acknowledge the problems of using will preambles as evidence for religious beliefs. See Spufford, *Contrasting Communities*, 320-43; Spufford, “Scribes of Villagers’ Wills”; Zell, “Use of Religious Preambles,” 246-9; Alsop, “Religious Preambles,” 19-27.
- ³⁶ Merritt, “Puritans, Laudians,” 952-4; Clergy of the Church of England Database [CCEd], Location ID 11544.
- ³⁷ Finlay, *Population*, 168-72; Archer, *Pursuit of Stability*, 151.
- ³⁸ Stow, *Survey*, 859–60.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 866; TNA: PRO, PROB11/136, fo. 140r; St Pancras Soper Lane, Churchwardens’ Accounts, LMA, P69/PAN/B/009/MS05018/001, fo. 3r.
- ⁴⁰ St Lawrence Jewry, Vestry Minutes, 287, 290.
- ⁴¹ St Dunstan-in-the-West, Churchwardens’ Accounts, 2, fo. 82r
- ⁴² Stow, *Survey*, 838.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 829-30, 821-2.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 829, 821-2.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 823.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 828, 832, 839, 848, 849, 851-2, 861-2, 871.
- ⁴⁷ On some of the evidential problems of these celebrations, see Mears and Williamson, “Holy Days,” 213-16.
- ⁴⁸ E.g. St Mary Woolchurch (from 1566; and the queen’s birthday from 1579), All Hallows London Wall (from 1569), St Michael le Querne (from 1569; birthday from at least 1582), St Benet Gracechurch (from 1574), St Antholin and St Mary Magdalen Milk Street (from 1576), and St Martin Orgar (at least 1578), St Lawrence Jewry (from 1581) and St Dunstan-in-the-West (customary by 1585: Churchwardens’ Accounts, 1, fo. 350v).

-
- ⁴⁹ No order for the observance of James's accession day is extant but the anniversary was added to the Church calendar and a form of prayer was "Set fourth by Authoritie" in 1604. Unlike the anniversaries for 5 August and 5 November, there appears to have been no attempt to enforce observance of accession day, suggesting that parishes chose to celebrate it.
- ⁵⁰ St Lawrence Jewry, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/LAW1/B/008/MS02593/001, fos. 128r-287r; St Botolph Billingsgate, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/BOT3/B/007/MS00924/001, fos. 5v-100r; St Benet Gracechurch, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/BEN2/B/012/MS01568, pp. 399-518
- ⁵¹ St John the Baptist Walbrook, Churchwardens' Accounts, fos. 19v- 54v; St Dunstan-in-the-West, Churchwardens' Accounts, 1, fos. 491v-539r and 2, fos. 8r-209v; St Martin Orgar, Vestry Minutes, LMA, P69/MTN2/B/001/MS00959/001, fos. 97r-146r.
- ⁵² St Mary Aldermary, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/MRY3/B/010/MS06574, fos. 40v-113r; St Stephen Coleman Street, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/STE1/B/012/MA04457/002, fos. 75r-230v.
- ⁵³ Strong, "Popular Celebration," 86–103, esp. 87-100; Cressy, *Bonfires & Bells*, chs. 4, 8; Hutton, *Rise and Fall*, 146–51.
- ⁵⁴ St Stephen Coleman Street, Churchwardens' Accounts, 2, fos. 257v, 272v.
- ⁵⁵ Woolf, "Two Elizabeths?," 167–91, esp. 182-4; Perry, "Citizen Politics," 89–111; Watkins, "Old Bess in the Ruff," 95–116, esp. 96, 98-9.
- ⁵⁶ Perry, "Citizen politics," 92.
- ⁵⁷ Sherlock, "Monuments," 269-70.
- ⁵⁸ Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth*, ch. 1.
- ⁵⁹ Cressy, *Bonfires & Bells*, ch. 6; Cogswell, *Blessed Revolution*; Questier, *Dynastic Politics*, 416-52.
- ⁶⁰ Cogswell, "'Published by Authoritie'," esp. 17-18, 22.

⁶¹ Based on descriptions of the memorials as the queen's "tomb" (St John the Baptist Walbrook, Churchwardens' Accounts, fo. 27v; St Pancras Soper Lane, Churchwardens' Accounts, fo.3r) or "monument" (St Anne Blackfriars, Stow, *Survey*, 827; St Dunstan-in-the-West, Churchwardens' Accounts, 2, fo. 97v; St Lawrence Jewry, Churchwardens' Accounts, fo.262v).

⁶² The other inscriptions were "Christ is to me life, Death is to me advantage" (Philippians 1: 21) and "The memorial of the just shall be blessed, but the name of the wicked shall rot" (Proverbs 10:7; mis-attributed in *Survey* to Proverbs 6). It should be noted that the memorial at St Michael Crooked Lane could date to either c.1610? or c.1621?. Stow, *Survey*, 857, 850.

⁶³ Stow, *Survey*, 866.

⁶⁴ The epitaph was not widely cited until after 1620.

⁶⁵ Sherlock, "Monuments," 274-80.

⁶⁶ Henry Howard, earl of Northampton to Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester, [10 Oct.] 1612, TNA, SP14/71/17, fo. 24r.

⁶⁷ Sherlock, "Monuments," 280 (and fn 60), 284.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 286; St Antholin, Churchwardens' Accounts, LMA, P69/ANL/B/004/MS01046/001, fo. 31v; St Botolph Aldgate, Churchwardens' Accounts, P69/BOT2/B/012/MS09235/002/001, fo. 11v; St Christopher le Stocks, Churchwardens' Accounts, P69/CRI/B/007/MS04423/001, p. 17; St Mary Woolchurch, Churchwardens' Accounts, P69/MRY14/B/MS01013/001, fo. 48v; St Peter Westcheap, Churchwardens' Accounts, P69/PET4/B/006/MS00645/001, fo. 123r.

⁶⁹ Stow, *Survey*, 860.

⁷⁰ St Pancras Soper Lane, Book of Miscellanies, LMA, P69/PAN/B/009/MS05020, fos. 91r-93v; Stow, *Survey*, 866.

⁷¹ Archer, "Discourses of history," 225-6 citing LMA, P69/MIC6/B/005/MS04825/001, fo. 175v; St Bartholomew Exchange, Vestry Minutes, LMA,

P69/BAT1/B/001/MS04384/001, p. 238; Will of Humfrey Walweyne, 5 Feb 1614, TNA: PRO, PROB11/123, fo 154v; Will of Paul Pemberton, 27 Sept. 1625, TNA: PRO, PROB11/146, fo. 284v.

⁷² See also St Pancras Soper Lane: LMA, P69/PAN/B/009/MS05020, fos. 91r-93v; Stow, *Survey*, 866.

⁷³ Stow, *Survey*, 860.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 860.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 859-61.

⁷⁶ St Botolph Billingsgate, Churchwardens' Accounts, fos. 132v, 100v, 116r, 119v, 130v, 115r, 118v, 122v, 125v, 130r; St Botolph Billingsgate, Vestry Minutes, P69/BOT3/B/001/MS00943/001, fos. 33r, 34v-35r, 36r, 37r, 38v, 41r, 41v, 45v, 49v.

⁷⁷ I am grateful to a journal reviewer for this suggestion. See Legg, *English Coronation Records*, 120, 261.

⁷⁸ See note 62 above.

⁷⁹ Whiting, *Reformation*, 131-3.

⁸⁰ Hall, *Practical and Polemical Commentary*, 375-407.

⁸¹ Milwarde, *Jacobs great day*, sig. H3r.

⁸² Harsnett, *Cordiall*, 543-44.

⁸³ Greenham, *Workes*, 496, 531; Wilson, *Saints by Calling*, 293.

⁸⁴ TNA: PRO, PROB11/136/140r-140v, 142v, 143r.

⁸⁵ Note that Munday still described memorials that only used “I have fought a good fight” as “Queene Elizabeths Monument[s]”.

⁸⁶ Sherlock, “Monuments,” 274-80.

⁸⁷ The other inscriptions were “I have fought...” and Psalm 112: Stow, *Survey*, 850.

⁸⁸ See especially Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*.

⁸⁹ See note 55 above.

Bibliography

Manuscript sources

- London Metropolitan Archives [LMA], All Hallows the Great, churchwardens' accounts, P69/ALH7/B/013/MS00818/001
- LMA, All Hallows the Great, vestry minutes, P69/ALH7/B/001/MS00819/001,
- LMA, All Hallows London Wall, churchwardens' accounts, P69/ALH5/B/003/MS05090/002
- LMA, St Antholin, churchwardens' accounts, P69/ANL/B/004/MS01046/001
- LMA, St Bartholomew Exchange, vestry minutes, P69/BAT1/B/001/MS04384/001
- LMA, St Benet Gracechurch, churchwardens' accounts, LMA, P69/BEN2/B/012/MS01568
- LMA, St Botolph Aldgate, churchwardens' accounts, P69/BOT2/B/012/MS09235/002/001
- LMA, St Botolph Billingsgate, churchwardens' accounts, P69/BOT3/B/007/MS00924/001
- LMA, St Botolph Billingsgate, vestry minutes, P69/BOT3/B/001/MS00943/001
- LMA, St Christopher le Stocks, churchwardens' accounts, P69/CRI/B/007/MS04423/001
- LMA, St Dunstan-in-the-West, churchwardens' accounts, P69/DUN2/B/011/MS02968/002
- LMA, St John the Baptist Walbrook, churchwardens' accounts, P69/JNB/B/006/MS00577/001
- LMA, St Lawrence Jewry, churchwardens' accounts, P69/LAW1/B/008/MS02593/001
- LMA, St Lawrence Jewry, vestry minutes, P69/LAW1/B/001/MS02590/001,
- LMA, St Martin Orgar, vestry minutes, P69/MTN2/B/001/MS00959/001

LMA, St Mary Aldermary, churchwardens' accounts, P69/MRY3/B/010/MS06574

LMA, St Mary Magdalen Milk Street, vestry minutes, P69/MRY9/B/001/MS02597/001

LMA, St Mary Woolchurch, churchwardens' accounts, P69/MRY14/B/MS01013/001

LMA, St Michael le Querne, churchwardens' accounts, P69/MIC4/B/005/MS02895/001

LMA, St Michael Woodstreet, churchwardens' accounts,
P69/MIC7/B/003/MS00524/001

LMA, St Pancras Soper Lane, churchwardens' accounts,
P69/PAN/B/009/MS05018/001

LMA, St Pancras Soper Lane, Book of Miscellanies, P69/PAN/B/009/MS05020

LMA, St Peter Westcheap, churchwardens' accounts, P69/PET4/B/006/MS00645/001

LMA, St Stephen Coleman Street, churchwardens' accounts,
P69/STE1/B/012/MA04457/002

Suffolk Record Office (Ipswich), HD 474/1

TNA, SP14/71

TNA, PRO, PROB11/123; PROB11/136; PROB11/146; PROB11/147; PROB11/191

Contemporary engravings

Davies, John. "Lo Here Her Type who was of latt [sic], the Propp of Belgia [by] Io. Davies." London, 1623.

"Queen Elizabeth Holding Orb and Sceptre Standing in a Room with a Latticed Window." c. 1600. British Museum, 1867,0713.1.

van Passe, Willem and Magdalena. "The Tomb of Elizabeth I, in Westminster Abbey", in *Heroologia Anglica*. Arnhem, 1620. British Museum, 1875,0213.145.

Printed primary sources

Bayly, Lewis. *The Practise of Piety Directing a Christian How to Walke That He May Please God*. London, 1613.

Birch, Thomas, ed. *The Court and Times of James the First*. 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1848.

Brewer, J.S. ed. *The Court of King James the First; by Dr Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester*. 2 vols. London: Richard Bentley, 1839.

Cade, Anthony. *A Iustification of the Church of England*. London, 1630.

Camden, William. *Remaines, concerning Britaine but especially England, and the Inhabitants thereof*. London, 1614.

Camden, William. *Tomus Alter, & Idem: or The Historie of the Life and Reigne of that Famous Princesse, Elizabeth*. London, 1629.

Dod, John. *Bathshebaes Instructions to Her Sonne Lemuel*. London, 1614.

Fuller, Thomas. *The Church–History of Britain from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the Year M.DC.XLVIII*. London, 1655.

Greenham, Richard. *The Workes of the Reuerend and Faithfull Seruant of Iesus Christ M. Richard Greenham*. London, 1612.

Hakewill, George. *An Ansvvere to a Treatise vvritten by Dr. Carier*. London, 1616.

Hall, Thomas. *A Practical and Polemical Commentary, or, Exposition upon the Third and Fourth Chapters of the Latter Epistle of Saint Paul to Timothy*. London, 1658.

Harsnett, Adam. *A Cordiall for the Afflicted Touching the Necessitie and Utilitie of Afflictions*. London, 1638.

Hatton, Edward. *A New View of London; or an Ample Account of that City*. 2 vols. London, 1708.

Heywood, Thomas. *Englands Elizabeth her Life and Trovbles*. London, 1631.

De Laune, Thomas, *The Present State of London*. London, 1681).

Legg, L.G. Wickham, ed. *English coronation records*. Westminster: Archibald Constable & Co., 1901.

Markham, Christopher Alexander. *The History and Antiquities of Geddington, Northamptonshire*. Northampton: W. Mark, 1899.

Milwarde, John. *Jacobs Great Day of Trouble, and Deliuerance A sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse, the Fifth of August 1607*. London, 1610.

Purchas, Samuel. *Purchas His Pilgrimes In Fiue Books*. London, 1625.

Speed, John. *The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine*. London, [1612].

Stow, John. *The Survey of London: Containing the Originall, Increase, Modern Estate, and Government of that City ... Now Completely Finished by the Study and Labour of A[nthony]. M[unday]. H.D. and Others*. London, 1633.

Wilson, Thomas. *Saints by Calling: or Called to be Saints*. London, 1620.

Database

Clergy of the Church of England Database [CCED] <www.theclergydatabase.org.uk>

Secondary bibliography

Alsop, James D. "Religious Preambles in Early Modern English Wills as Formulae." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 40 (1989): 19-27.

Archer, Ian W. "Discourses of History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart London." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68, no. 1-2 (2005): 205-26.

Archer, Ian W. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Cogswell, Thomas. "'Published by Authoritie': Newsbooks and the Duke of Buckingham's Expedition to the Île de Ré." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67, no. 1 (2004): 1-25.

Cressy, David. *Bonfires & Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar*. 1989. Reprint, Stroud: The History Press Ltd, 2004

Fincham, Kenneth and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Finlay, Roger. *Population and the Metropolis: The Demography of London, 1580-1650*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Griffiths, Antony. *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603–1689*. London: British Museum Press, 1998.

Hutton, Ronald. *The Rise and Fall of Merry England. The Ritual Year 1400–1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Mears, Natalie, and Philip Williamson. "The 'Holy Days' of Queen Elizabeth I." *History* 105 (2020): 201-28. doi: 10.1111/1468-229X. 12971

Merritt, J.F. "Puritans, Laudians, and the Phenomenon of Church-Building in Jacobean London." *Historical Journal* 41, no. 4 (1998): 935-60.

Perry, Curtis. "The Citizen Politics of Nostalgia: Queen Elizabeth in Early Jacobean London." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23, no. 1 (1993): 89–111.

Questier, Michael. *Dynastic Politics and the British Reformations, 1558-1630*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Sherlock, Peter. "The Monuments of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart: King James and the manipulation of memory." *Journal of British Studies* 46, no 2 (2007): 274-80. doi: 10. 1086/51088.

Smith, Nicola. *The Royal Image and the English People*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

-
- Spufford, Margaret. *Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Spufford, Margaret. "The Scribes of Villagers' Wills in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and their Influence." *Local Population Studies* 7 (1971): 28-43.
- Strong, Roy. "The Popular Celebration of the Accession Day of Queen Elizabeth I." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 21, no. 1-2 (1958): 86-103.
- Walker, Julia M. "Bones of Contention: Posthumous Images of Elizabeth and Stuart Politics." In *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, edited by Julia M. Walker, 252-76. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Walker, Julia M. "Reading the Tombs of Elizabeth I." *English Literary Renaissance* 26, no. 3 (1996): 510-30.
- Watkins, John. "Old Bess in the Ruff: Remembering Elizabeth I, 1625-1660." *English Literary Renaissance* 30, no. 1 (2000): 95-116.
- Watkins, John. *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Whinney, Margaret. *Sculpture in Britain, 1530-1830*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Whiting, Robert. *The Reformation of the English parish church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Woolf, D.R. "Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory." *Canadian Journal of History* 20, no. 2 (1985): 167-91.
- Zell, M.L. "The Use of Religious Preambles as a Measure of Religious Belief in the Sixteenth Century." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 50 (1977): 246-9.

Appendix: Texts used in the memorials to Elizabeth I

TEXT 1: Translation of the inscription on Elizabeth's tomb in Westminster Abbey

Sacred unto the memory:

Religion to its primitive sincerity restored, Peace thoroughly settled, Coine to the true value refined, Rebellion at home extinguished, France neere ruine by intestine mischiefes relieved, Netherland supported, Spaines Armado vanquished, Ireland with Spaniards expulsion, and Traitors correction quieted, both Vniversities Revenues, by a Law of Provision, exceedingly augmented, Finally, all England enriched, and 45. yeres most prudently governed, Elizabeth a Queene, a Conqueresse, Triumpher, the most devoted to Piety, the most happy, after 70. yeeres of her life, quietly by death departed.

For an eternall Memoriall

Vnto Elizabeth Queene of England, France and Ireland, Daughter of King Henry the eighth, Grandchild to King Henry the seventh, great Grandchilde to King Edward the fourth, the Mother of this her Country, the Nurse of Religion and Learning: For perfect skill in very many Languages, for glorious Endowments, as well of minde as body, and for Regall Vertues beyond her Sex.

began 17 No. 1558.

She her raigne

ended 24 Mar. 1602.

TEXT 1B: the most common of the variation on the Westminster inscription

Elizabeth Queene of *England, France, and Ireland, &c.* Daughter to King *Henry* the eighth, and Grandchild of King *Henry* the seventh, by *Elizabeth*, eldest Daughter of *Edward* the fourth, Having restored true Religion, reduced Coyne to the just value, assisted *France* and the Low-Countries, and overcame the Spanish invincible Navy, enriched all *England*, and administred most prudently the Imperiall State thereof 45. yeeres in true piety, In the 70. yeere of her age, in most happy and peaceable manner departed this life, leaving her mortall parts interred in the famous Church of *Westminster*, till the second comming of Christ.

TEXT 2: "Spaines rod, Romes ruine" (St Mary le Bow)

Fame blow aloud,
and to the world proclame,
There never ruled
such a Royall Dame.

The Word of God
was ever her delight,
In it she meditated
day and night.

Spaines rod, Romes ruine,
Netherlands reliefe,
Earths joy, Englands jem,⁸⁷
Worlds wonder, Natures chiefe.

She was, and is,
what can there more be said?
On Earth the Chiefe,
in Heaven the second Maid.⁸⁸

Text 3: "If Royal Vertues"

If Royal Vertues ever crown'd a crowne,
If ever Mildnesse shin'd in Majesty,
If ever Honour honour'd true Renowne,
If ever Courage dwelt with Clemency,
If ever Princesse put all Princes downe,
For Temperance, prowesse, prudence, equity,
This, this was she, that in despight of death,
Lives still admir'd, ador'd, ELIZABETH.

TEXT 4: "Here lies her Type"

Here lies her Type, who was of late,
The prop of belgia, the stay of France.
Spaines foile, Faiths shield, and Queene of State,
Of Armes, of learning, Fate, and Chance:
In briefe, of Women ne're was seene,
So great a Prince, so good a Queene.

Sith vertues Her immortall made,
Death (envying all that cannot dye)
Her earthy parts did so invade.
As in it wrackt selfe Majesty.
But so her Spirit inspir'd her Parts,
That she still lives in loyall hearts.

TEXT 5: "Britaines Blessing"

Britaines Blessing,
Englands Splendor,
Religions Nurse
The Faiths Defender

TEXT 6: "Th'admired Empresse"

Th'admired Empresse
through the world applauded,
For supreme Vertues,
rarest Imitation,
Whose Scepters Rules, Fames
loud voyc'd Trumpet lauded,
Vnto the eares
of every forraine Nation.
Canopied under
powerfull Angels wings,
To her immortall praise

sweet Science sings.

Endnotes to appendix

⁸⁷ In many of the memorials that cite only this verse, this line is rendered “Heavens jem, Earths joy”.

⁸⁸ This verse is similar to a slightly longer one used at St Michael Crooked Lane: Stow, *Survey*, 857.