University of Sheffield
School of English Literature, Language and Linguistics

'Where is the Court but Here?' Defining Elite Space in Early Modern Drama

Peter Sillitoe

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

12/04/2007

Abstract

This thesis analyzes definitions of 'the court' throughout the early modern period by assessing a range of theatrical texts from the reign of Elizabeth through to the outbreak of the civil wars. The introduction makes clear that there were various ways of defining a court in Renaissance England, a society preoccupied with two competing types of 'court', the space viewed as either a moveable realm defined by the monarch's presence, or a fixed architectural setting. An examination of Marlowe's *Edward II* reveals that dramatists were able to exploit this definitional tension at the public theatres. Chapter 1, on the Elizabethan progresses, then illustrates how monarchical presence could govern the court's meaning. Four chapters on the Jacobean period consider the expansion of the court as a signifier of elite space during the reign of James I, the first viewing the importance of the king's status as ruler of two realms and multiple courts alongside moments of spatial contact between a continued progressing culture, Whitehall Palace, and entertainments for the king's welcome into London. The second Jacobean chapter then evaluates the cultural impact on court definitions of the consort, Queen Anna, and her embrace of architecture and progressing. The significance of a masquing culture beyond Whitehall Palace is the primary focus for the third Jacobean section, as I inspect the implications of this for elite space. The last Jacobean chapter probes a contradictory fixing of courtly space at Whitehall, a manoeuvre closely associated with the emergence of the court masque at the royal palace. Chapter 6 then scrutinizes the reign of Charles I, stressing that the dualism of court space did survive, yet was under threat from the neglect of royal progresses and further interest in architectural discourse, as witnessed in the Caroline court masque. The conclusion then reveals that, when royalist writers in the 1640s looked back to Charles's court at Whitehall, they highlighted a problem with the king's political discourse, as their praising of his palace meant that a sense of wonder had passed from monarchical presence to an architectural space.

Contents

Thanks and Acknowledgements

The completion of this thesis necessitates the acknowledgement of the support and guidance of a number of people, without whom this research could not have been completed.

My supervisor at the University of Sheffield, Marcus Nevitt, devoted himself to my work and provided the most formative feedback of my academic career to date. His attention to detail and his continual provision of invaluable advice has been a source of support throughout my work. The first two years of my supervision were looked after by Mick Hattaway, I thank him for his advice and support during this period. I have also enjoyed the backing of my department, in particular, Sue Owen, Erica Sheen, Dominic Shellard and Cathy Shrank. My somewhat belated thanks also go to Peter Field, Andrew Hiscock, David Lindsey and Ceri Sullvan, who all started my interest in the early modern period.

Thanks also to Jayne Archer, Jerome De Groot, Jeanette Dillon, Gabriel Heaton, James Knowles, Goran Stanivukovic, Jane Rickard, T.S., and the anonymous reader at Blackwell for some useful criticism on Marlowe.

I would like to thank John Boulton for helping me to believe that the completion of a PhD was a logical choice and Hilary Boulton for endless support. I also thank my mother, Janet Holmes, for her love and affection, and my father for his continued support.

Above all, my thanks go to my wife, Elly, for constantly reminding me that '[t]o climb steep hills / Requires slow pace at first'. I owe her an immense debt for her unfailing support throughout this period of study.

Introduction: Defining Early Modern Court Space and Marlowe's *Edward II*

> *What is an ideology without a space to which it refers, a space which it describes, whose vocabulary and links it makes use of, and whose code it embodies?*[1] *(Henri Lefebvre)*

This study highlights the performance space of monarchy, rather than the performance itself. Since the emergence of New Historicism, literary criticism has been fascinated with the staging of the monarch as a subject at the theatres, but my thesis builds upon recent research that has prioritized space as an exclusive field in the study of Renaissance literature and culture, offering a new emphasis on elite realms in the period.[2] I explore and probe the definitional problems of 'the court' as depicted in Renaissance drama and culture, demonstrating that the problematic and overlapping distinctions circling around the word 'court' were available for appropriation by various groups just as many texts highlight the uncertainty of attempts at categorization. A strategic point underpinning my discussion is the understanding that the early modern court was a problematic space that often escaped exact description in public drama, court masques, progress entertainments, and other forms of literary and non-literary production. As I show, this is because contemporary descriptions included the idea of the court as the place where the monarch resided and, simultaneously, as a fixed and architectural, physical setting such as Whitehall Palace.

While there were alternative ways of defining the court in the period, such as a stage space in performance, my work reveals that these two concepts of portability

---

[1] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. by Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), p. 44.

[2] See, for example, David Scott Kastan, 'Proud Majesty Made a Subject: Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37:4 (1986), 459-475. For an update, see Kastan's *Shakespeare after Theory* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), pp. 109-27.

and fixity dominate contemporary usage as I illustrate that the permanence of a static space such as a royal palace can be contrasted with the strategic moveability of monarchical progresses. Crucially, this study examines the inherent duality of 'court' as a descriptive term, excavating some of the accompanying spatial and cultural tensions in the period covering the reign of Elizabeth I through to the civil war. Although recent critical discourse, including the work of Leah Marcus, has attempted to define the court, it is apparent that the early modern anxiety produced by the indeterminate nature of court worlds can be explored in far more detail, and the mining of literary texts for this purpose is a primary aim of this dissertation.[3] I highlight and respond to the cultural and ideological tensions attached to the open-ended nature of court space in the definitional sense in the period. In view of this, theatrical activity, including public and private drama, is of particular significance to this thesis, as much of this work articulates central concerns about the use of Renaissance court space because 'the court' had multiple links with the public theatre throughout our period, and masques and entertainments were the prime courtly form for theatrical display at physical courts and palaces.

Critical studies of Renaissance spaces: intellectual contexts

Correspondingly, although important research has theorized the concept of space in the period, including the excellent recent arguments of Janette Dillon and Russell West, my thesis highlights essential issues about the Renaissance court (or elite) space, such as an examination of the extent to which there was an ideological clash over the court's spatial and social meaning in Renaissance England.[4] Although the

---

[3] For a definition, see Leah S. Marcus, 'Jonson and the Court', in *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson,* ed. by Richard Harp and Stanley Stuart (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 30-42 (p. 30); Andrew McRae, *Renaissance Drama* (London: Arnold, 2003), pp. 105-06.

[4] See Janette Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). For the wider implications of space, see Russell

last ten years have witnessed an explosion of interest in the spatial dynamics of literature and culture, it is clear that the conundrum that circulates around elite space still awaits a full study. For instance, critical work of early modern space has been influenced by the theories of Henri Lefebvre, particularly his groundbreaking *The Production of Space*.[5] However, although Dillon's study, for instance, is concerned with the interactions between courtly and civic space, I emphasize the competing definitions of court space throughout this thesis.

In his study, Lefebvre theorizes that,

> (Social) space is not a thing among other things, nor a product among other products: rather, it subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity – their (relative) order and / or (relative) disorder. It is the outcome of a sequence and set of operations, and thus cannot be reduced to the rank of a simple object.[6]

This valuable insight has fed into various critical studies, including the research of Andrew McRae, Christopher Burlinson and Andrew Hiscock, with the latter two scholars particularly influenced by Lefebvre's idea of spatial production as outlined above.[7] Similarly, Lefebvre has been important for Dillon's study, because her work

---

West, *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage: From Shakespeare to Webster* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).

[5] See Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*. See also Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City*. James Knowles's work on the early Stuart masque is influenced by aspects of spatial theory. See, for example, *Politics and Political Culture in the Masque* (Forthcoming 2007). I am grateful to Professor Knowles for sharing with me the central points behind his research. See also Clare McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court, 1590-1619* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

[6] Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 73.

[7] See Andrew McRae, '"On the Famous Voyage": Ben Jonson and Civic Space', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 4.2 (1998) <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/04-2/mcraonth.htm> [accessed 14 January 2007]; Christopher Burlinson, 'Edmund Spenser and Early Modern Spatial Production' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2002); Andrew Hiscock, *The Uses of this World: Thinking Space in Shakespeare, Marlowe, Cary and Jonson* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2004). I would like to thank Dr Burlinson for sharing his research with me. Other useful studies that touch upon the issue of Renaissance space include Steven Mullaney, 'Civic Rites, City Sites: The Place of the Stage', in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. by Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 17-26; Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press,

perceives the complexities of culturally privileged space like the early modern court. As Dillon helpfully explains, her 'conception of space underpinning the discussion [...] is one that understands it to be a dynamic, a coming together of physical place and social life in ways that are always in process'.[8] This stress on 'in process' is a vital component in Lefebvre's theoretical ideas. However, despite the important influence of Lefebvre, even his work on space does not allow for the complexity of the contemporary Renaissance usage of 'court' to emerge as a signifier of a spatial realm. This thesis considers elite worlds in terms of fixed, static space and a moveable itinerant courtly structure because it is essential to understand that Renaissance usage of 'court' often inferred both definitions simultaneously. As will be established, however, at other times one meaning might be signified exclusively.

My emphasis on elite realms corresponds with the recent interest in the spatial dynamics of culture. For instance, Edward W. Soja charts considerations of space in various fields such as geography and philosophy, making clear that the intellectual contexts of spatial investigation are vital to an understanding of human existence.[9] Indeed, Soja discusses physical and imagined space, a critical manoeuvre that fits neatly with my own idea of an architectural palace and a imaginary conception of

---

1992); Kenneth Robert Olwig, *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World* (Wisconsin: Wisconsin University Press, 2002); Rhonda Lemke Sanford, *Maps and Memory in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002); Jerome De Groot, 'Royalism, Politics and Culture in Civil War Oxford' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Newcastle, 2000). I would like to thank Dr De Groot for supplying a copy of his thesis.

[8] Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City*, p. 10.

[9] See Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989). See pp. 11-12 for the 'incipient spatialization of critical theory'; pp. 16-21 for Michel Foucault on spatial theory, as well as pp. 39-42 for 'Marxism's spatial turn'. (p. 39). This theme continues in Soja's second chapter on Marxism and geography (pp. 43-75). Lastly, see pp. 79-88 for 'the organization of space as a social product'. (p. 79).

portable courtly space on a monarchical progress.[10] The competing ideas of space endorsed by the moveable progresses and the more static physical environment of the court masque allows this study to probe the spatial dualism of early modern culture. Furthermore, as Martin Butler has shown, New Historicism has demonstrated an interest in the spatial dynamics of masque performance, particularly in terms of 'the real' and 'the imaginary', though my own emphasis expands this to consider other types of elite entertainment.[11]

Marlowe and Elizabethan public theatre: representing court space

A particularly important example of the duality of 'the court' and the accompanying interpretive problems is found in the work of Christopher Marlowe. The dramatist's *Edward II* (1591) is of great significance to this thesis because, more than any other Renaissance play, this text probes and explores contemporary significations attached to the word 'court' and its social and spatial definitions. The play's prioritization of courtly subject matter can be established statistically, as the first printing of the play and control text for all editions (a quarto-form octavo from 1594), uses the word 'court' twenty-one times. The importance of 'court' in Marlowe's play is substantiated further when we note that the first printing of William Shakespeare's similarly 'courtly' chronicle play, *Richard II*, only uses the word on eight occasions in the 1597 quarto. Furthermore, the first printing of Shakespeare's *Richard III* uses 'court' only once in the 1597 first quarto. As will be demonstrated, the fact that Marlowe's play was performed at the public theatre in the early 1590s means that a popular audience could be sensitive to the dramatization of types of court space,

---

[10] See Soja, *Postmodern Geographies*, pp. 120-31, particularly pp. 121-22 on mental space.

[11] See Martin Butler, 'Courtly Negotiations', in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. by David Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 20-40. See particularly pp. 22-3 for 'the poetics of masquing space'.

particularly when a play like *Edward II* is so suggestive on this subject. It is vital to assess how the dramatic literature of the period interrogates the meanings of the various definitions of the court since, as we shall see in Marlowe's play, audiences were clearly interested in this politicized topic.

Edward II is of great significance because, at the most basic level, it is very much a 'courtly' play. Furthermore, the text makes a strategic point of highlighting different ways of interpreting and signifying court space, and we can speculate that this may even relate to the fact that the play was almost certainly performed at court as well as the public theatre, though historical evidence has not been able to prove which playhouse formed the performance location for the public audience.[12] Marlowe's work constantly draws attention to the problem of what we might term a fixed, architectural courtly space over a moveable realm, as exemplified in the Elizabethan progresses. The entertainment associated with the last Tudor court culture is the subject of my first chapter, but, at this stage, it is essential to focus on *Edward II* for a number of reasons.

Firstly, an examination of the play allows us to scrutinize in more detail the various ways in which the early modern court could be conceptualized. Secondly, the play's employment of an aestheticized court culture enables us to link Marlowe's public theatre to the entertainments and court masques that underpin the rest of this

---

[12] See Michael Hattaway, *Elizabethan Popular Theatre: Plays in Performance* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), p. 144, where two performances of the play at court are noted. Similarly, Clare Harraway observes that *Edward II* 'was [...] probably played both inside and outside the capital between 1592 and 1593, as part of the court entertainments and the touring repertoire of Pembroke's Men.' Harraway, *Re-citing Marlowe: Approaches to the Drama*, (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2000), p. 54. However, we must remember here the differences in staging and, possibly, performance techniques that would have shaped the play's reception at its various theatrical locations. See also Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 308, note 24. Lastly, Richard Dutton, discussing Marlowe's plays and the censor, observes that the Master of the Revels, Edmond Tilney, (1579-1610) 'probably only licensed the plays of companies with a realistic prospect of performing at court.' *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England: Buggeswords* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 196, note 7.

thesis, as that culture is articulated at the public theatres for the 'popular' voice. What Marlowe's play demonstrates, therefore, is that the wider culture beyond the aristocratic elite was certainly aware of the problems inherent in court description; so much so, in fact, that *Edward II* is able to stage this crisis for the pleasure of the London audience. Indeed, the forthcoming work of James Knowles on courtly polycentrism, the wide circulation of masque texts through the medium of print publication, and the importance of manuscript circulation underscores my own conclusions that masques were not always quite as closed-off as has been supposed through the history of criticism of the genre.[13] If, as I am attempting to show, public plays such as Marlowe's *Edward II* could examine the issue of court space along similar lines as the masque, then there is perhaps more inter-textual communication between the two forms than has been realized. Of course, the ultimate evidence for this is the dual emphasis of the career of men like Ben Jonson and James Shirley as public dramatists and masque-writers. Certainly, a 'courtly' yet 'public' play like Marlowe's seems to be entering into a dialogue with Elizabethan court culture and, by implication, the accompanying progressing tradition.

Marlowe's play has often been viewed through the critical lens as a deeply political play that examines topics such as the nature of kingship and monarchical power, aristocracy, and issues of social rank. Alternatively, the text has been perceived as a theatrical reading of sexual politics in Elizabethan society, with

---

[13] See James Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture,* particularly chapter 5. On a related point about public theatre, see Knowles, '"Infinite Riches in a Little Room": Marlowe and the Aesthetics of the Closet', in *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/Bodies/Spaces, 1580-1690*, ed. by Gordon McMullan (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 2-29. In this study Knowles points out that Marlowe 'take[s] 'open secrets' so central to the demarcations of society, order and subjectivity and [...] discover[s] them to the theatre-going public.' See p 5. Likewise, Dillon, in *Theatre, Court and City* observes on early modern drama in the general sense that 'an appetite for plays about the city and the court reflects the locations of the audience, given that these were the two primary places of performance [...] It is evident that London audiences were as fascinated by the doings of the court, to which they stood in such close proximity, as they were by the activities of their own [city] environment.' See p. 17.

particular emphasis given to the king's relationships with, primarily Gaveston, and also Spencer Junior.[14] Before such readings became the norm, earlier critical approaches often concerned themselves with the idea of the play as a tragic narrative of a flawed king, a reading that the 1594 title page helped to confirm.[15] Although many critical views of the play attempt to examine these major issues simultaneously, often studies give more emphasis to one topic or the other, the sexual being dependent upon the political, or vice-versa.

However, it is the court setting of the play that frames the dramatic portrayal of several discourses, including questions of a political or sexual nature. *Edward II* is

---

[14] Of course, many critical viewpoints examine both politics and sexuality in *Edward II*, either at the same time, or explicitly link the two together. However, many essays and chapters can possibly be categorized crudely: For political readings of the play and its contexts, see David H. Thurn, 'Sovereignty, Disorder, and Fetishism in Marlowe's *Edward II*', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 21, (1990), 115-41; Mark Thornton Burnett, '*Edward II* and Elizabethan Politics', in *Marlowe, History and Sexuality: New Critical Essays on Christopher Marlowe,* ed. by Paul Whitfield White (New York: Ams Press, 1998), pp. 91-107; Ronald Knowles, 'The Political Contexts of Deposition and Election in *Edward II*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England,* 14 (2001), 105-21. David Bevington and James Shapiro offer a discussion of the play in terms of ceremonial procedure; see '"What are kings, when regiment is gone?" The Decay of Ceremony in *Edward II*', *"A Poet and a filthy Play-maker": New Essays on Christopher Marlowe,* ed. by Kenneth Friedenreich, Roma Gill, and Constance B. Kuriyama (New York: AMS Press, 1988) pp. 263-78. For emphasis on male sexuality, see Simon Shepherd, *Marlowe and the Politics of Elizabethan Theatre* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1986), pp. 197-207; Claude J. Summers, 'Sex, Politics, and Self-Realization in *Edward II*', in *"A Poet and a filthy Play-maker"*, pp. 221-40; Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, pp. 191-223; Jonathan Goldberg, *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1992), pp. 105-43; Catherine Belsey, 'Desire's Excess and the English Renaissance Theatre: *Edward II, Troilus and Cressida, Othello*', in *Erotic Politics: Desire on the Renaissance Stage,* ed. by Susan Zimmerman (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 84-102; Lawrence Normand, '"What passions call you these?": *Edward II* and James VI', in *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture,* ed. by Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996), pp. 172-97; Normand, '*Edward II,* Derek Jarman, and the State of England', in *Constructing Christopher Marlowe,* ed. by J. A. Downie and J. T. Parnell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 177-93; Mario DiGangi, 'Marlowe, Queer Studies, and Renaissance Homoeroticism', in *Marlowe, History and Sexuality*, pp. 195-212; Thomas Cartelli, '*Queer Edward II*: Postmodern Sexualities and the Early Modern Subject', in *Marlowe, History and Sexuality*, pp. 213-23; Cartelli, 'King Edward's Body', in *Christopher Marlowe,* ed. by Richard Wilson (London and New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 174-90; John Archer, 'Marlowe and the Observation of Men', in *Christopher Marlowe*, pp. 191-214. For recent work on the play, sexuality and early modern politics, see Curtis Perry, *Literature and Favoritism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 185-228. For a general preface to early modern desire and theatre, see Zimmerman, 'Introduction. Erotic Politics: The Dynamics of Desire on the English Renaissance Stage', in *Erotic Politics*, pp. 1-11.

[15] See my discussion of the title page (p. 12). For an example of this type of approach to the play still resonating in fairly recent criticism, see Susan McCloskey, 'The Worlds of *Edward II*', *Renaissance Drama,* n.s. 16 (1985), 35-48, specifically p. 36.

more concerned with court politics than any other of Marlowe's plays, depicting a royal and aristocratic setting, with much of the action taking place at a 'physical' or 'architectural' court space. The play's subject matter, whether personal or political, constantly draws attention to the fact that these are court issues and matters of state, the court being the primary focal point for political interest, both in the text and in early modern culture generally. This court can be constituted as an important physical stage-space in performance and a social arena within the text that allows key elements in the play to unfold whilst simultaneously problematizing 'court' in the definitional sense. Indeed, Marlowe depicts a court world that, through its dramatization at the London theatres, feeds back into the culture that produces it as social commentary, possibly even as cultural critique.

Defining the court

At the Renaissance court monarchical power presented itself through highly theatrical display, staging royal identity, whilst ambitious men both sought patronage from the monarch and offered patronage to some of those below them. Groundbreaking historicist research by literary critics on both the court and the cultural self-presentation of royalty in the early modern period has significantly altered our view of monarchy and theatre. David Scott Kastan's work has been particularly insightful here, highlighting the performative, theatricalized nature of Renaissance monarchy, and also the potentially dangerous staging and unravelling of this process at the public theatres.[16] It is important, therefore, to observe the nature of the court and to define it,

---

[16] See Kastan, 'Proud Majesty'. For the theatrical nature of monarchy in the period, see p. 466, where Kastan writes that '[a] spectacular sovereignty works to subject its audience to – and through – the royal power on display, captivating, in several senses, its onlookers.' Although Kastan's article is primarily concerned with Shakespeare's English history plays, much of his argument may be accurately applied to *Edward II*, and Renaissance drama more generally. Michael Hattaway has similarly observed that various early modern dramatists 'used the art of the theatre to depict the theatricality of politics; ceremonies are frequently disrupted to signify the vanity of power sustained by theatrical form.' Hattaway, *Elizabethan Popular Theatre*, p. 2.

both in the play and in the wider Elizabethan culture, because this is the elite space that stages monarchical assertion.

Early modern understandings of the court actually meant that there were a variety of ways of defining this space and concept. Although my introductory section demonstrates the privileging of the court in *Edward II*, *The Oxford English Dictionary* shows that various dramatic texts from the period engaged with the public's desire for courtly definition. According to the *OED*, the word 'court' is first recorded in 1154, as '[a] formal assembly held by the sovereign at his residence: in early times, of his councillors and great lords, for purposes of administration; in later times to give state receptions, audience to ambassadors, and the like'.[17] This definition was clearly understood in the Elizabethan period, and various plays, including *Edward II,* partly present a fixed, centralized assembly of royal power to London audiences. However, a second meaning, recorded as early as 1175, is described as '[t]he place where a sovereign (or other high dignitary) resides and holds state, attended by his retinue'. The *OED* demonstrates that the word carried with it this particular usage in early modern England, Shakespeare's *As You Like It* (1600) being the first example from our period, as Duke Frederick tells Rosalind: 'Mistress, dispatch you with your safest haste, / And get you from our court.'[18] This second definition, however, can be read as slightly open-ended, in that although the Shakespearean quotation highlights the importance of monarchical presence ('our court') the emphasis on residence perhaps suggests an architectural structure. Additionally, a third meaning in the *OED*, again traced back to the medieval period, describes the court as '[t]he establishment and

---

[17] "court, *n.*" *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. 1989, *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, Oxford University Press, 27 Jan. 2007 <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/500523727>.

[18] William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition,* ed. by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1997), pp. 1591-1657, I. 3. 33-34.

surroundings of a sovereign with his councillors and retinue'. The *OED* cites Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1598) as the Renaissance example, quoting from the play, 'when the court lay at Windsor'.[19] This definition overlaps with the second version's emphasis on royal presence and suggests also a degree of fluidity and movement.

The third meaning, in contemporary usage in the same decade that Marlowe had produced *Edward II*, can be viewed as important to the power struggles that unfold in the play. If the court is perceived as being mobile, and moving around the country with the king, then early modern audience reaction to Edward's travels and torments around the country, as he battles the barons or is their prisoner, is more interesting than has been realized. Even when, before his deposition and subsequent murder, Edward is imprisoned, he is not only the anointed monarch, but is actually the embodiment of the English court, the social space accompanying him. As such, one might argue that the younger Mortimer's political authority can never be maintained, as power, and also the court, can never truly belong to him. *Edward II* read this way reveals that the court is not merely the geographic or cultural location of the setting of the play, but a significant and symbolic point of focus, politically and strategically important. Furthermore, that an Elizabethan audience may have been aware of this belief endows the court with power and substance in a theatrical sense, as *Edward II* depicts the struggle *for* the court's meaning, rather than simply the fight for supremacy *at* court.

Significantly, a fourth medieval and early modern definition of 'court' recorded in the *OED* is referenced as '[t]he body of courtiers collectively; the retinue (councillors, attendants, etc.) of a sovereign or high dignitary'. This meaning,

---

[19] Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, pp. 1225-1291, II. 2. 59.

although one that confirms the idea of the court as moveable and fluid could actually be interpreted as not only seizing the meaning and essence of the court away from the king's strict singular ownership, but also has the effect of stressing that another 'high dignitary' could be the figurehead for a court. However, although this section outlines four possible uses of 'court' in my reading of Marlowe's play, it is essential to see how these definitions overlap in terms of spatial understanding. Two rather generalized definitions of the court dominate Marlowe's play: one stressing the court as accompanying the king, wherever he may be, the other highlighting the fixed nature of the court, an architectural setting that is merely in need of a figurehead. As I demonstrate throughout this thesis, a variety of early modern texts from the period often highlight this duality of court signification.

These multiple interpretations of the court are not, however, restricted to the London stage. Dillon, writing on the complex relationships between the early modern theatre, court, and the city, in the slightly later period of 1595-1610, has stressed how the court was often seen as a cultural institution, not a place:

> Technically the court could not be conceived of in a particular location, since it moved around with the monarch, but under James, though he personally spent more time than Elizabeth had done out of London, the court tended to become both physically and conceptually more fixed at Whitehall, in the city of Westminster.[20]

Thus, two different Renaissance monarchs treated the court as a fixed place or moveable institution, and in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England different courtly distinctions could be dominant, and yet were changeable. The court could have different meanings attached to it at any one time, depending on who held power at that moment. When a play like *Edward II* commented on society and staged the court, it could be representing either a symbolic or a physical location that had

---

[20] Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City*, p. 9.

multiple definitions that were, in turn, subject to interpretation. The theatrical presentation of the court during performance could prioritize one definition over the other. We can imagine how one production might foreground the moveable court, perhaps by placing numerous courtiers alongside the king, who would then accompany the monarch onstage, whatever the implied dramatic location at any moment in the play. However, another staging might prioritize the fixed court, favoured in the early Stuart period according to Dillon, perhaps by highlighting physical connections with Whitehall, or by depicting the rebellious Mortimer as a more 'kingly' figure once in possession of the central court setting as the play reaches its climax. My reading of *Edward II* argues that dramatists could view the undefined nature of the Elizabethan court as a potential site of ideological contestation, and that the narrative potential of this approach is cleverly exploited in Marlowe's play.

Edward II: foregrounding and defining court space

Several rather obvious points concern the play's title. An early modern audience observing a play carrying, as its full designation, *The Troublesome raigne and lamentable death of Edward the Second, King of England: with the tragicall fall of proud Mortimer*, (as the first printing of the text names the play, Q, from 1594), would have possibly noted the importance of the court world before the production even began.[21] Although we cannot be certain that the play carried this full title on playbills (with the title displayed on boards) outside, or at, performances in the London theatres, scholars can be confident that early modern readers of the printed 1594 text that we have today, had access to the full title. The fact that, like other history plays, the title names the king whose life it will partly depict, immediately

---

[21] For the original title page, see Christopher Marlowe, *Edward the Second*, ed. by Charles R. Forker (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 137-38. All further citations from Marlowe's play refer to this edition and appear in parenthesis after the quotations.

locates the play as a work that will centre on the court world, where kings both reign and literally exist. The title brings attention to the point that this particular king's life will be a retelling of history partly narrated through the genre of tragedy, as '*lamentable death*' notifies the reader of the king's fall from power. Similarly, the word '*raigne*' is, of course, also present in the title. This emphasizes that the play may privilege political concepts, such as kingship and monarchy, as opposed to a discussion of the 'personality' of King Edward. The naming of Mortimer in the title further adds to the stress on the court setting that the title evokes, as a member of the Elizabethan audience who was conscious of medieval history (and so Mortimer's position as an usurper) may have realized that the play would be a narrative of political struggle in a court world or setting. Lastly, '*the tragicall fall of proud Mortimer*' serves as another generic link to tragedy, and also emphasizes the medieval *de casibus* tradition of tragedy in England, in which upwardly mobile or over-ambitious men (even kings) would reach too far and fall dramatically from power.[22] This tradition, so fascinated with kings, queens and aristocratic figures, tends to be concerned with a court setting, and so suggests the court-world to an audience.

That the court setting is emphasized through the play's title relates to a specific mood that *Edward II* constantly evokes. Although critics now see literary terms such as 'perspective' as being rather old-fashioned, because postmodern theoretical viewpoints like New Historicism have shifted emphasis away from the text and toward historical and cultural context, I would argue that the term 'perspective' might still be usefully employed to describe the court environment in *Edward II*, and more specifically, to describe the relationship between the dramatization of the court and audience perception. In *Edward II* Marlowe depicts a court in which power is so

---

[22] See Toni Y. Grande, *Marlovian Tragedy: The Play of Dilation* (London: Associated University

easily appropriated that the court is both one of the play's settings, and also one of its governing structures for audience perspective. The court perspective is so well constructed by Marlowe that this social space is the symbolic location in which power is both articulated through, and fought for, in the play, as the court and its accompanying politics are staged. Of course, an Elizabethan dramatist was able to render the court setting on the theatre stage-space using a variety of methods and theatrical devices, such as the crowding of the stage with actors who were costumed in aristocratic dress, processions, and the employment of rhetorical and sophisticated verse, as opposed to prose, in order to linguistically highlight the sense of elite status; a feature that is prominent in *Edward II*. Likewise, '[i]n a play so centred on the acquisition of power, it is likely that the stage was adorned only with the 'state' or throne'.[23]

It is not surprising that Marlowe should be concerned in his history play with the court world, both as a theatrical setting and as an environment that carries with it a certain political resonance. John Archer links Marlowe with some of the subversive elements of Elizabethan society, arguing that the dramatist 'can be viewed as a writer situated at the margins of court society and its sexual anxieties rather than its center'.[24] The play's strategic emphasis on the court appears to have been somewhat obscured by the theory-driven political and sexual readings that have often dominated

---

Press, 1999), p. 10.

[23] Hattaway, *Elizabethan Popular Theatre*, p. 145. On costume, see pp. 85-88; on the 'spectacle' of processions, see p. 35; on acting, dramatic speech and verse, see pp. 72-79. For Elizabethan staging of various locations, (and possibly the rendering of the court onstage), see pp. 34-40. Hattaway also reminds us that '[Philip] Henslowe actually stored a throne in the hut of the Rose.' p. 32. The idea that this feature may have been lowered down on to the stage during the performance of a Renaissance play, perhaps even Marlowe's history play, suggests one way of staging the court. Henslowe's precise entry reads: 'throne In the heuenes the 4 of June 1595'. *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. by R.A. Foakes and R.T. Rickert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), p. 7.

[24] Archer, 'Marlowe and the Observation of Men', p. 192.

criticism of the text. Mark Thornton Burnett partly reverses this trend when he interestingly links Marlowe's play to some of the Elizabethan court's political characteristics and problems, noting that 'the rhythms of the play articulate some of the political uncertainties for which the Elizabethan court was noted'.[25] However, Burnett's fascinating article is primarily concerned with the play's relationship to various Elizabethan cultural and political discourses, as opposed to the way in which some of these discourses are articulated through a specific court setting. Marlowe allows important themes to unravel within this environment, such as the battle for political power, patronage, and a reflection on sexual excess. Although Burnett correctly traces various political elements, both in the play and the larger culture, these topics, taken alone and at face-value, do not explain the fact that *Edward II* is so explicit in its privileging of the court location. Through the portrayal of Gaveston's and Edward's sexuality and lifestyles, what Thomas Cartelli usefully calls 'an eroticized court life' versus the depiction of the barons' search for a traditional, ideal centre of power, the struggle for supremacy of two aesthetics of court life and value systems is portrayed in the play.[26] The wider Elizabethan discourse of the court may be viewed as a framework for the action of the play and its subordinate interpretations

---

[25] Burnett, '*Edward II* and Elizabethan Politics', p. 97. Earlier in the essay Burnett argues that *Edward II* may 'be seen to be responding to the dynamic of a contemporary crisis at court.' p. 93.

[26] Cartelli, 'King Edward's Body', p. 180. Cartelli uses the term to refer to Gaveston's court fantasy, and notes how this ideal would have remained, throughout the performance, as a dramatically pleasing suggestion or spectacle. Of course, this fantasy is the barons' nightmare. Cartelli goes on to note that '[t]he prospect of a carnivalized court presided over by a sexually 'ambiguous' lord of misrule' hangs over the play. p. 182. Hattaway, *Elizabethan Popular Theatre*, notes 'the homosexual glamour of the Court.' p. 157. Sara Munson Deats remarks that Gaveston's language in the play 'echoes the courtly love idiom, casting Gaveston as the courtly lover, Edward as the beloved and elevated courtly lady.' p. 178. See *Sex, Gender, and Desire in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Associated University Press, 1997). Archer, in 'Marlowe and the Observation of Men', mentions 'Edward's tenuous court society' and notes that the play 'underwrites the political erotics of Elizabeth's court.' p. 197. Here Archer cleverly locates *Edward II* as a play that dramatizes court display and observation. However, his study is primarily interested in court surveillance. Finally, DiGangi notes that 'the circulation of erotic desire in the court was in itself a political matter worthy of a dramatist's attention.' 'Marlowe, Queer Studies', p. 203.

of kingship, social climbing, sexuality, nationalism and xenophobia (Englishness versus foreign display in this case), amongst many other dispersed cultural discourses.

Early in the play the court is unsurprisingly marked as an important arena for politics and power. Yet the first onstage mention of the court by name comes from the three poor men, who tell Gaveston, 'We will wait here about the court' (I. 1. 48). The fixed court is immediately marked as a place of significance, a realm where those seeking servile work believe that they have a chance of gaining employment from powerful men. This 'court' is thus linked with issues of patronage and social caste, a location where a subordinate group gather to offer service to the aristocracy or royalty, and wealth and income are prioritized. Interestingly, the lines quoted above are spoken in the play just after Gaveston has exclaimed, 'I'll entertain you all' (I. 1. 45). According to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, the word may carry the suggestion of pleasurable entertainment in the more modern sense, because one of several meanings that 'entertain' can signify is '[t]o engage agreeably the attention of (a person); to amuse'.[27] The *OED* gives Francis Bacon's *Sylva*, from 1626, as the earliest example of this usage, but I suggest that Marlowe's play hints at this additional understanding. The court, therefore, is signified as a place of pleasure from the very beginning of the text, with an additional sexual or erotic meaning possibly present.

Yet Gaveston is lying to the three poor men, and has no intention of offering them work. The court now carries connotations of deceit and betrayal, and a subtext meaning can be glimpsed as the court is depicted as an institution where men are promised much but given little. A further irony can be detected here, as it is Gaveston who will possibly be the character whose expectations of English court life are most

---

[27] "entertain, *v.*" *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. 1989, *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, Oxford University Press, 27 Jan. 2007 <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50076190>.

disappointed. Indeed, he will not survive this 'court' at all. Gaveston's lie also prepares the audience for another (indirect) reference to deceit, or at least cunning, at court – in the next few lines of the play – when Gaveston explains how he will manipulate the king:

> Do. These are not men for me;
> I must have wanton poets, pleasant wits,
> Musicians that, with touching of a string,
> May draw the pliant king which way I please. (I. 1. 49-52)

Near the very beginning of Marlowe's work, therefore, the appearance of Gaveston introduces the court as a space marked by scheming, and yet aesthetic pleasure. However, this might remind a contemporary audience that the king has not yet been depicted as a central, authorizing presence for courtly space.

That the king does view the fixed, centralized court as his exclusive royal territory is made clear when he orders Mortimer away from his person: 'Out of my presence! Come not near the court' (II. 2. 89). Yet Edward attempts to signify not only the fixed court definition, as well as the stage-space that the characters are situated on at this moment in the performance of the play, but also the court as the place that the king inhabits wherever he may be, the 'kingly' version that the *OED* describes as '[t]he place where a sovereign (or other high dignitary) resides'. Mortimer is particularly concerned by this, exclaiming, 'I'll not be barred the court for Gaveston' (II. 2. 90). What is galling for Mortimer is that Gaveston's presence and influence has made it possible for Mortimer to be excluded from both the physical court itself, where the court is the centre of power, and also the king's royal presence. Denying Mortimer access to this elite space also denies the aristocrat participation in England's political culture. In fact, the king is here endeavouring to do far more than merely banish Mortimer from him in a personal, almost petty sense. This episode can

be read as an attempted political and cultural exile, with the court at the very centre of this highly politicized punishment.

That the barons begin to feel excluded from not only King Edward and political power, but also the court, is made explicitly clear in a later speech by Mortimer Junior to Edward: 'Thy court is naked, being bereft of those / That makes a king seem glorious to the world – / I mean the peers whom thou shouldst dearly love' (II. 2. 173-75). These lines remind us of the idea of the court as the place where not only the king, but also his councillors and retinue, are to be located. For Mortimer, the barons should be able to perform with the king at the theatre-space of the court in a mutually rewarding performance that would evoke the sense of intertwined dependence intrinsic to feudalism. Yet Mortimer's use of the phrase '[t]hy court', as he addresses his speech to Edward, reveals a fault line in the baron's objection: the phrase appears to allude to the kingly version of elite space, in which the monarch possesses and defines the court world as his own. Although Mortimer immediately qualifies his own expression by stressing the importance of the barons as a hierarchical presence at court, his argument is understandably confused, and so compromized, by the uncertainty that is inherent in various Elizabethan expressions of 'the court' as a cultural signifier of elite space. Certainly, power struggles in the play can be seen as taking place because of a difference of interpretation on the parts of the king and the barons over the exact social meaning of the court. For Edward the court is part of the king, the monarch synecdochically representing the court to his audience; for the barons, they themselves should be an integral link between the king and the court. Indeed, Marlowe then proceeds to highlight the difficulties in court definition, pointedly stressing the competing understandings of the signifier court

before a public audience, as differing interpretations are linked explicitly to opposing factions in the play.

It is noticeable that, as the king's political power comes under increasing attack, the presumed link between monarch and court space is repeatedly called into question. For instance, at the scene of his capture, Leicester makes it clear to Edward that he will be forced to travel against his will: 'Your majesty must go to Killingworth' (IV. 7. 82). As is well known, the 1594 text of Marlowe's play spells the aristocratic space of Kenilworth as 'Killingworth'. Of more importance in a spatial context, however, is the link this makes to Elizabeth's 1575 progress to this castle, then owned by Robert Dudley. The textualized account of the resulting entertainments is examined in the next chapter, but it is interesting to note this moment of inter-textuality between courtly progressing and entertainment and, on the other hand, the public theatre. Of course, it is rather ironic that, whereas Elizabeth chose to progress to Kenilworth, Edward is forced to visit the location of his own doom. This is highlighted in the next act, when Leicester tells the tormented king:

> Be patient, good my lord, cease to lament.
> Imagine Killingworth Castle were your court,
> And that you lay for pleasure here a space,
> Not of compulsion or necessity. (V. 1. 1-4)

Significantly, this comment underscores the fact that Edward will visit this space on a journey that can in no way be described as a progress. But Marlowe goes further and appears to abandon any sense of the court accompanying the monarch on his journey. Rather, Leicester seems to suggest that Edward has left a fixed architectural court behind. Similarly, as he tells the king, all that Edward can do is to imagine that Kenilworth resembles his former place of aestheticized splendour. However, the text is able to articulate problems of court definition and space in an even more telling exchange.

In a hostile dialogue later in the play, Edmund explicitly voices this interpretive crisis, as he strategically positions himself alongside his brother, Edward, and the kingly definition of a moveable courtly space. Gourney argues that the court is a fixed social place, irrespective of the king's location, while Edmund stresses the concept of a mobile court. The two political factions clearly possess opposing ideologies of court types:

> Gurney: Bind him, [Edmund] and so convey him to the court.
> Edmund: Where is the court but here? Here is the King,
> And I will visit him. Why stay you me? (V. 3. 58-60)[28]

The appropriation by Mortimer and his followers of the court definition favoured by both Edward and Edmund is made clear by Matrevis, who replies: 'The court is where Lord Mortimer remains' (61). Whichever definition Matrevis here refers to, the result still deeply undercuts Edmund's understanding of the court's meaning.

If the court accompanies the king, then Mortimer, in seizing power and appropriating authority, has fashioned himself into a symbolic king, in that the court can now be thought of as the place where Mortimer resides, and the regicidal faction may remove the old king. However, if the court has a fixed geographical location, literally as well as culturally, then Mortimer has still seized it, appropriated its cultural significance, whilst expelling Edward to a prison that is far removed from the court setting of the play's beginning.[29] It is perhaps in realization of the play's confusion of

---

[28] See also Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1597) in which, at one crucial point, the fortunes of the king are explicitly linked to the matter of court space. As Richard states: 'In the base court: base court where kings grow base / To come at traitors' calls, and do them grace. / In the base court, come down: down court, down King.' Shakespeare, *Richard II*, *Norton Shakespeare*, pp. 943-1014, III.3.179-81.

[29] Archer, 'Marlowe and the Observation of Men', makes the useful point that because Edward is thrown into the dungeon, the court is actually the domain of the nobles: 'The sovereign is watched over and to some extent controlled by his court after all, and he is eventually removed by that court from the presence chamber to the dungeon.' (p. 204). According to this definition, the court, rather than being Edward's exclusive political domain, has not simply been refashioned as a literally fixed physical space, but actually appropriated by the barons in the symbolic sense; they now possess the court, meaning that the barons, or at least Mortimer, are the court.

both the meaning and location of the court that Edmund remarks: 'O, miserable is that commonweal, where lords / Keep courts and kings are locked in prison!' (63-64). As if to further highlight one faction's change of fortune, the soldier makes sure that the resulting physical exit from the stage resonates with the political contestation taking place over elite space, exclaiming, 'Wherefore stay we? On, sirs, to the court' (65). At this point in the play, it seems increasingly unlikely that the court accompanies Edward wherever he may be, in this case to his dungeon. That Edward III will restore the court, like the throne, to Edward's royal line is in one sense too simple an ending for a play that confuses the boundary between legitimate and illegitimate authority. If Elizabethan drama sometimes highlights the unstable nature of elite space in the period, both physically and symbolically, then the justness or essential nature of the political authority that occupies that location may also be called into question.

Sexualized transformations of court space

Further evidence of the undetermined meaning of the court in *Edward II* can be traced when we read the play's possible homoeroticism beside the present argument. One of the central themes circulating within the play's larger depiction of a court world is the topic of sexual relations, and, more specifically, male homosexual and homosocial desire. Though there is not space here to allow an examination of the critical, Foucauldian-inspired arguments for and against the precise nature of homoerotic relations in the play or the wider Renaissance culture, it is important to stress that Marlowe is staging a union at least similar to what we now call a homosexual relationship. This topic is important in its own right, yet it is essential to place this narrative element within the court framework, because *Edward II* often explicitly links sexuality to the court environment and state politics. Archer has made this clear, pointing out that, through Gaveston's homoerotic speech (see I. 1. 50-70), '[c]ourtly

display becomes identical with the display of the male body, as indeed it often was at Elizabeth's court'.[30] In Marlowe's play, however, Gaveston's utilization of spectacle and display has a profound effect on the ideological landscape of English court life, and problematizes the meaning of this social and spatial realm.

Early in the play, Gaveston allows the audience a glimpse of the nature of the sexual relationship. Importantly, this union is evoked through a dexterous language of courtly love and classical allusion that signifies to the audience the lavish, decadent element of Gaveston's personality:

> Ah, words that make me surfeit with delight!
> What greater bliss can hap to Gaveston
> Than live and be the favourite of a king?
> Sweet prince, I come. These, these thy amorous lines
> Might have enforced me to have swum from France,
> And, like Leander, gasped upon the sand,
> So thou wouldst smile and take me in thy arms. (I. 1. 3-9)

This resulting speech and dialogue with the three poor men conveys the sense of entertainment and display that Gaveston is to some extent meant to evoke onstage. This is confirmed in another speech, partly quoted earlier, where Gaveston reveals the significant influence he wishes to have on Edward. To achieve this, Gaveston will rely on sumptuous display. This element is stressed as the speech conveys the exotic, foreign component of Gaveston's character in addition to the sexual overtones of the discourse.

---

[30] Archer, 'Marlowe and the Observation of Men', p. 198. For a closer inspection of this idea and related themes, see Archer's entire essay. This critic's discussion of homoeroticism and the court helpfully connects with my earlier discussion of the barons' exclusion from the king and the court, and also links these issues to social mobility in the play: 'Mortimer's paranoia [towards Gaveston] [...] reveals a confused perception of the dangers that homosexuality poses to the homosocial world of the feudal court, where king and nobles should 'love' one another according to their rank.' p. 201. Michael Young's discussion of King James's alleged homosexuality touches upon the difficulties of conduct brought about by the introduction of the stylized Renaissance court. See *James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality* (London: Macmillan, 2000), p. 73, where Young points out that '[t]he kind of refined behaviour and ostentatious clothing that flourished at the typical Renaissance court threatened conventional views of manliness.'

The language also brings to mind another function and understanding of the early modern court, that in which it is a privileged artistic centre for literature, theatre and music. Here Gaveston may be read as a patron at a distinctively Renaissance court, one who transforms the fixed space of the court through both physical alterations, such as 'pleasing shows', and social meaning:

> I must have wanton poets, pleasant wits,
> Musicians that, with touching of a string,
> May draw the pliant King which way I please.
> Music and poetry is his delight;
> Therefore I'll have Italian masques by night,
> Sweet speeches, comedies, and pleasing shows;
> And in the day, when he shall walk abroad,
> Like sylvan nymphs my pages shall be clad,
> My men, like satyrs grazing on the lawns,
> Shall with their goat-feet dance on antic hay.
> Sometime a lovely boy in Dian's shape,
> With hair that gilds the water as it glides,
> Crownets of pearl about his naked arms,
> And in his sportful hands an olive tree
> To hide those parts which men delight to see. (I. 1. 50-64)[31]

It is this fusion of what we would now term homoeroticism, as well as lavish display and the foregrounding of entertainment, exoticized foreignness, and the displacement of hierarchical social norms, that reside in Gaveston and make his presence at court threatening for the barons. Certainly, though, Gaveston could be played onstage as encouraging the barons' perception of him, or at least failing to hide this part of his character, exclaiming '*Mort Dieu!*' as the barons vocalize their dislike for him to Edward (89).

---

[31] On these lines, and Gaveston as a 'director' see Ian McAdam, *The Irony of Identity: Self and Imagination in the Drama of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Associated University Press, 1999), p. 209. See Dutton, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship*, pp. 1-15, who discusses the role of the Master of the Revels in the early modern period. I would argue that there is possibly an allusion to this role in these lines, through Marlowe's characterization of Gaveston. See also Dutton, p. 2, where his stress on the power given to Tilney in order to allow him to organize theatre at the Elizabethan court emphasizes my point about Gaveston.

When Edward first notices Gaveston's presence at the court, after his return from exile, the king too begins to utter a language that evokes classical learning and so further marks Gaveston as both exotic and continental, as well as emphasizing the sexuality that bonds them. Also present here is the disruption of status etiquette that is one of the results of their love:

> What, Gaveston! Welcome! Kiss not my hand;
> Embrace me, Gaveston, as I do thee.
> Why shouldst thou kneel? Knowest thou not who I am?
> Thy friend, thy self, another Gaveston!
> Not Hylas was more mourned of Hercules
> Than thou hast been of me since thy exile. (I. 1. 139-44)

Once more, it is important to note the classical emulation and allusion in Edward's rhetoric. This classicism feeds into the sense of the aestheticization of the court that Gaveston has brought with him to England. By doing so, the court can be appropriated for its significance as a new, Renaissance, court world that prioritizes classical learning, and, in this particular theatrical case, decadence, is put in place.

Yet, at this point, Gaveston helps King Edward to authorize the precise definition of the court by appropriating other designations as well: here the court really 'is' where the king resides, yet the physical, fixed space has also been marked, and so temporarily fixed in place, by the political authority of the king, his companion, and their sexual independence from the rest of society. This concurrence of court definitions is achieved through Gaveston's insistence on the court as the place of performance and spectacle. A rather exclusive relationship is acted out at a new court location that carries with it its own exclusivity in the play, as Gaveston has helped to fashion a world that displaces the hierarchical certainties of the old feudal order favoured by the aristocracy. The new court world as authorized by Gaveston allows the word 'court' (as signifier of elite space) to depend upon Edward's kingly presence, yet this court realm also co-opts the fixed definition favoured by the barons

by literalizing the court as the permanent place of performance. However, even this new, hybrid court has a central weakness in the long term, in that a court definition that is certainly able to signify and strengthen the royal authority of Edward has been assembled by Gaveston, a person lacking royal status. Indeed, Marlowe's play only allows this new court to flourish for a limited period, permitting the performative Gaveston to exhibit his own persona for theatrical effect and dramatic spectacle, and drawing upon these rhetorical 'pleasing shows' for Marlowe's own presentation.

At the physically fixed court space Gaveston displays his own personal Renaissance qualities, those of the court gentleman, as he is able to stage his own merits through court spectacle, and so alter the dynamics of court life in England. Gaveston's employment of the spectacle of the performative self shows him to possess a certain quality, that which the Renaissance period called *sprezzatura.*[32] It is partly because of Gaveston's influence upon English court life that Spencer Junior advices Baldock to 'learn to court it like a gentleman' (II. 1. 32). In turn, this charismatic character trait is fastened to the English court, and thus the act of self-presentation and a marked self-definition enables further appropriations of descriptive definitions in the wider public sphere of the court itself. Gaveston reconstitutes the cultural space of the fixed court through his transgressive sexuality and accompanying traits. The barons are understandably outraged by this assimilating process, Mortimer Junior, importantly stressing the fixed idea of court space, notes how Gaveston,

> jets it in the court
> With base outlandish cullions at his heels,
> Whose proud fantastic liveries make such show
> As if that Proteus, god of shapes, appeared.
> I have not seen a dapper jack so brisk;
> He wears a short Italian hooded cloak
> Larded with pearl, and in his Tuscan cap

---

[32] On this theme, see Frank Whigham's two important books: *Ambition and Privilege: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory* (Berkeley: California University Press, 1984), and *Seizures of the Will in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

A jewel of more value than the crown. (I. 4. 407-14)

Although Gaveston's personality and actions are of concern, the use of the word 'court' is again more telling. The court as fixed setting, as much the domain of the nobles as the king, at least according to this version, has been altered by an outside faction, and this unfamiliar presence has managed to strengthen the kingly court definition, albeit temporarily.

Such a performance has enabled Gaveston to alter the social dynamics of the court for both himself and Edward. Interestingly, this emphasis on a new court culture is present in another early modern narrative about the reign, Francis Hubert's *The Historie of Edward the Second*; a suppressed poem of the 1590s that was revised and published in 1629. Hubert's poem lacks the emphasis on the court space that is such a feature of *Edward II*, but Gaveston's particular influence is again made clear. Edward reports:

> The Court, which in my Fathers life-time seem'd
> A Senate-house of silver-headed Sages,
> Might now a pompous Theater bee deem'd
> Pester'd with Panders, Players, and with Pages,
> Of my ensuing fall too true presages.
> And yet in shew It seemed fairer farre.
> So Comets glister more than any Starre.[33]

Here 'Court' is viewed by Hubert's Edward as a place where aristocratic 'Sages' gather, a definition in opposition to the exclusively royal court world favoured by Marlowe's king, as those below royal rank help to authorize spatial definition. Tellingly, in the poem the court space is still transformed by the emphasis on spectacle brought about by the king's relationship with Gaveston, as the early modern

---

[33] Francis Hubert, *The Historie of Edward the Second*, in *The Poems of Francis Hubert*, ed. by Bernard Mellor (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1961), pp. 1-169 (p. 48), stanza 177. On this poem, see Perry, *Favoritism*, pp. 202-16.

period clearly links narratives of sexual difference, and maybe definition, to narrative moments focussing upon specific court transformations.

Perhaps owing to Gaveston's domination of the court in Marlowe's play, Isabella remarks that she will 'endure a melancholy life, / And let him frolic with his minion' (I. 2. 66-67). These lines appear very early in the play, as if Marlowe specifically emphasizes the speed by which Gaveston has already altered the dynamics of court life in England. Later in the play, Marlowe's Edward makes it quite clear that he values Gaveston above not only the queen, but also his royal kingdom. Indeed, he seems particularly concerned with the matter of space in terms of his relationship with Gaveston, as the king tells his enemies:

> If this content you not,
> Make several kingdoms of this monarchy,
> And share it equally amongst you all,
> So I may have some nook or corner left
> To frolic with my dearest Gaveston. (I. 4. 69-73)

The barons are perhaps beginning to re-appropriate the ideological meaning of elite space, as they eventually seek to return the court back to the militaristic world of the last king, Edward I. In turn, this responsive project weakens the political position of Edward and Gaveston, as their relationship is shown to be reliant on the matter of court space and a particularly adaptable Renaissance definition that they have fashioned. Of course, it should be added that Gaveston has not only usurped Isabella in terms of Edward's affection. In changing the court environment to such an extent, Gaveston has politically displaced the queen from what she would believe to be her rightful place at the head of the court, next to her husband, Edward. The seething peers acknowledge this problem, as if they relate the displacement of the queen to their own fall from favour at court. More generally, Gaveston and Edward are breaking the rules of both the court and social relations. Edward tells the barons:

'What, are you moved that Gaveston sits here? / It is our pleasure; we will have it so' (I. 4. 8-9).[34]

The undetermined nature of various Elizabethan court definitions means that monarchical authority encounters an ideological problem in the play. The fixed court requires Edward to acknowledge the importance of the barons. However, the kingly version, where the court is moveable with the monarch, has also required monarchy to consolidate its position, with outside help needed to achieve a suitable definition of the court for royalty. The relationship with Gaveston is needed to consolidate, or even refashion, this alternative court world. Thus, the usually moveable, king-centred version can only be successful, even in the short term, by simultaneously literalizing the court world, fixing this elite realm in place through the exclusive use of spectacle and the assumption of these performative energies. Yet in this hybrid court the king no longer has the exclusive authority to attempt to define the essence of the court merely through his royal presence.

The exact meaning of the court was not always fixed or stable in the Elizabethan period, and its cultural significance could be contested and appropriated, as *Edward II* makes clear. That a social space so symbolically and literally near to Elizabethan authority could be portrayed as unfixed, open-ended, and undetermined, perhaps even vulnerable to outside interpretation, assimilation, or appropriation, can be viewed with hindsight as a dangerous dramatic acknowledgement during the uncertain later years of Elizabeth's reign.[35] In aligning at least two court definitions with two opposing political factions the play has to depict the defeat of either monarchical and absolutist will, or collective aristocratic power. Either defeat can be

---

[34] On the seating of Gaveston in the queen's place, see Knowles, '"Infinite Riches"', p. 11.

[35] On some of these issues, see Burnett, *'Edward II* and Elizabethan Politics', p. 91, p. 93; Perry, *Favoritism*, pp. 189-202.

viewed as dangerous when acted upon the Elizabethan stage. Whatever the outcome of the play, two types of elite discourse on space are being contested, and that contest is in turn being staged. Marlowe's text dramatizes some of the cultural and political problems that can arise during disputes about court interpretation within the elite, an issue that is linked in the play to matters involving the interpretation of an alternative sexuality, again also within the elite. *Edward II* employs some of these complications for one of its key narrative strategies: the staging of turmoil and strife at an English court. Yet, as we shall see throughout this thesis, even theatrical entertainment that was intended for a courtly audience could still illustrate the complexity of elite space.

The chapters that follow continue to observe courtly space and its definitional problems in a variety of dramatic texts and cultural documents from the period, demonstrating that, unlike Marlowe's *Edward II*, the writers of courtly entertainments could be subtler than the public dramatist in their examinations of elite space. Despite this, a range of texts from the reigns of Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I all testify to the inherent problems and central contradictions in a conceptualization of a court as both a fixed and architectural setting and as a space that accompanies the monarch. In light of this, the way in which a number of texts articulate spatial concerns about courtly, aristocratic, and civic spaces, allows us to trace the shifting understandings of the court throughout the period. As different monarchs succeeded to the throne it is clear that they brought with them their own conceptions of how a court could or should be viewed, and that this, in turn, shaped contemporary discourse.

As chapter 1 argues, Elizabeth's embrace of a progressing culture meant that when she visited an aristocratic or urban setting 'the court' really did accompany her, as aristocratic spaces such as Kenilworth were appropriated and consumed by the visiting monarchical spectacle. Yet, when attention turns to the Jacobean period, I

demonstrate the increased complexity attached to 'the court', as this signifier's meaning broadens and expands under James I. In keeping with this, the reign of the first Stuart king is given necessarily a greater emphasis in my work than that allocated to Elizabeth or Charles. Although this thesis demonstrates that Charles's neglect of a progressing culture has been exaggerated, it is still apparent that, by the later 1620s, this courtly form had lost some of its cultural significance for the monarch. Owing to this, the reign of James shows us the move from one type of court culture to another, as the transitional Jacobean period retained aspects of Elizabethanism through the use of the royal progress, yet looked forward also to Charles's fixing of monarchical authority at Whitehall Palace. As I reveal in chapter 2, the first of four Jacobean chapters, one of the main reasons for the expansion of 'court' under James is his status before 1603 as the monarch of Scotland, who then takes possession of multiple English and Scottish courts. Through an analysis of various textual recollections of a Jacobean progressing culture, alongside a series of civic entertainments for James, this second chapter analyses moments of spatial assertion for courtly authority in light of this dissertation's key focus on the two competing types of court space as moveable and fixed.

This duality and expansion is made clearer still in the third chapter, as I continue to analyse the complexity of the new court culture through the presence in England of James's consort, Queen Anna. By interpreting a number of key entertainments that relate to Anna, it becomes apparent that the queen's presence as consort had fascinating effects on the definition of courtly space as roaming or static. Crucially, the first Stuart queen's cultural activity meant that she in many ways came to personify the dualism and expansion of Jacobean courtly culture, as she was involved in progressing and architecture, and so underscored both courtly moveabilty

and fixity. The fourth chapter on masquing culture away from Whitehall builds upon critical work on the polycentrism of the Jacobean court in order to show that this culture was not quite as Whitehall-bound as has been presumed; a point that is consolidated by this section's closing analysis of James's royal progress to Scotland in 1617. Again, a key point of contact between this chapter and others is the emphasis on court space as open-ended because of the spatial duality attached to the early modern court as various definitions compete for cultural superiority. Likewise, my fifth chapter traces the simultaneous prioritization of architectural permanence in court space in the Jacobean period, revealing how masque performance helped to literalize elite space as somehow defined by the signifier 'Whitehall' as James's reign looked forward to the assertion of architectural permanence under Charles. Four Jacobean chapters, therefore, stress the contradictory nature of elite space in the early Stuart period, and so underscore the vitality, complexity and transitional status of the reign for our understanding of early modern elite space.

This theme develops substantially as the sixth chapter moves on to the Caroline court, demonstrating how Charles's absolutism retained aspects of Jacobean polycentrism, including the neglected topic of Caroline progressing, whilst, at the same time, it fixed monarchical power at Whitehall more than ever before through a cultural discourse that became dominated by architectural referencing, as articulated through court theatre. I examine how drama circulated discourses of the court to the elite, just as print then disseminated these conceptualizations further. The visual aspect of masques often differed from the printed account, as the textual recollections of a writer such as Ben Jonson allowed one discourse of the court to unfold, whilst the designs of Inigo Jones circulated a visual discourse. As John Peacock has demonstrated, visual display was vital to expectations of the masque, and so I discuss

the staged architecture as described in the printed accounts alongside the 'architecturalism' of the works.[36] Whereas physical architecture was displayed before the spectators at court, the textual accounts of the performances often conveyed an architectural discourse to those beyond Whitehall, as the masque spectators witnessed a 'physical' manifestation of the court, whereas texts and stage designs articulated a more 'authorial' vision of an 'imaginary' court through literary and visual discourse.[37]

Finally, the implications of the Caroline fixing of authority are addressed as the study concludes with a suggestive glimpse of court space in the 1640s, as royalist writers offer us valuable material on the former centre of authority at Whitehall Palace. In this final section, I demonstrate the extent to which Charles's court had been prioritized as an architectural setting because, when writers looked back from the vantage point of the 1640s it is apparent that Whitehall was personified as a structure with its own courtly authority. In its entirety, this thesis demonstrates that the competing definitions of court space as either mobile or fixed were a problematic yet useful strategy available to all three monarchs. Unfortunately for Charles, however, it becomes apparent that fixing a monarchical definition of the court in one place allows that space to possess a majesty and cultural importance of its own. Indeed, in 1649 Whitehall Palace survived as a type of architectural court, whereas Charles was removed from this same space outside the Banqueting House with his own execution.

---

[36] See John Peacock, *The Stage Designs of Inigo Jones: The European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). See particularly p. 6 for the important point that the Jacobean masque was often the first point of contact between the courtiers and classical architectural theory. See also p. 56. Similarly, see p. 44 for Jones and pictorial space, as well as pp. 55-112 on architecture in the masque designs. At p. 69 Peacock argues that architecture in the masques could be 'read' by the audience. See p. 70 for gothicism in the designs, a feature that contradicts many of the textual recollections. On this, see also p. 79. Lastly, see pp. 177-78 for landscape and architecture.

[37] For instance, in Jones's design for *Time Vindicated* the new Banqueting House features prominently. See Peacock, *The Stage Designs of Inigo Jones,* p. 90.

Chapter 1 'Where the Prince Lieth': Courtly Space and the Elizabethan Progresses

> *The court of England, which necessarily is holden always where the prince lieth, is in these days one of the most renowned and magnificent courts that are to be found in Europe. (William Harrison)*[1]

As the introduction made clear, the early modern court can be interpreted in a number of different ways, as description either indicates the fixed space of an architectural structure, such as the multiple royal palaces including Whitehall, Hampton Court and Nonsuch, or implies the courtiers who form collectively another type of court signification. A competing instance of court description foregrounds the importance of the monarch as a figurehead of courtly space, whereby the court accompanies monarchical authority wherever she or he may be. This understanding of elite space results in an open-ended description of the court as any space that welcomes the royal presence, the court being 'with' the monarch at all times. In the Elizabethan progresses, therefore, courtly space is always marked by a certain moveable fluidity and the lack of a fixed structure. The progresses acknowledged that a moveable, and so less spatially confined, court granted monarchy control over the court's meaning, as the court space accompanies the queen, and is reliant on her authorizing presence. In this version, then, monarchical presence defines elite space, turning a potential weakness – this unspecific space – into a strength. The monarch gives meaning to a realm through the stress on flexibility and portability. Elizabethan elite space, therefore, conforms to modern theoretical ideas on social space as outlined by Henri Lefebvre in my introduction: the court is a series of fluid, ongoing definitions and formulations, rather than a physical, fixed architectural structure.

---

[1] William Harrison, *The Description of England*, ed. by Georges Edelen (New York: Cornell University Press, 1968), p. 227.

However, as I demonstrate in this chapter, these progresses mean that the Elizabethan period embraced a less spatially-restricted court, though this is accompanied by further ambivalences. The historical research of Mary Hill Cole has shed light on the dynamic coupling of spectacle and politics in the progresses, as a 'temporary' Elizabethan court travelled parts of England. In this cultural and political communication between ruler and people, the court was moveable and symbolic, as Elizabeth's presence authorizes court definition. My chapter reads the progresses – and the literary texts of the accompanying entertainments – in conjunction with the idea of competing court definitions, assessing the tensions inherent in the nature of the court, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of a world of spectacle and monarchical presence rather than one of fixable space.

Progresses conceptualized

> *You must no more call it York Place – that's past,*
> *For since the Cardinal fell, that title's lost.*
> *'Tis now the King's, and called Whitehall.*[2] *(William Shakespeare)*

The Shakespearean quotation above (from *Henry VIII*) refers to that king's seizure, in historical actuality, of York Place from Cardinal Wolsey and the subsequent transformation of this aristocratic space into an official royal residence. However, as Simon Thurley has shown, Whitehall Palace did not merely become just one more among the many of Henry's palaces:

> Henry VIII's Whitehall, like Wolsey's, was charged with an administrative as well as a domestic role. This duality received official recognition in 1536 by Act of Parliament, when it was officially

---

[2] William Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition,* ed. by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1997), pp. 3111-3193, IV.1.97-99.

> designated as the King's palace, his principal seat and therefore the seat of government.[3]

Whitehall quickly became, it seems, the most important royal palace in the country, and when Henry converted Hampton Court, Wolsey's other great palace, it is notable that, as Thurley explains, '[i]n a decade of almost continuous building and after spending about £62,000, Henry had created at Hampton Court what was universally regarded as his most magnificent house *after* Whitehall'.[4] However, although it might be expected that Henry's fondness for Whitehall resulted in a kind of proto-Stuart project, in that the court becomes fixed at the new London palace, this is far from the case. Rather, Henry enjoyed the act of progressing, embracing this European triumphal form to a great extent, though not to the same degree as his daughter Elizabeth would in the later sixteenth century. As Thurley explains, it appears that,

> [u]nder Henry VIII, there was an important distinction between the itinerant Court and the royal progress [...] During his reign Henry VIII is known to have made some 1,150 moves between houses with his Court. Of these, 850 were to his own houses, the rest to ecclesiastical or courtier houses. Thus it can be seen that three-quarters of the moves made by the King were to houses which he owned.[5]

Henry, therefore, cultivated a situation in which his own court (in the architectural sense) could be construed as various buildings scattered across the English landscape. This was a very 'moveable' court indeed. In refusing to force the court to carry one exclusive meaning at Whitehall or elsewhere, Henry was able to embrace the fluidity of travel for his own pleasure and the necessity of court fashioning. Similarly, Thurley's 'important

---

[3] Simon Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), p. 54. I am grateful to Janette Dillon for this important reference.

[4] Thurley, *The Royal Palaces*, p. 52. Emphasis mine.

[5] Thurley, *The Royal Palaces*, p. 67, p. 73

distinction' between a moveable court and a progress means that, at least in Henrician times, the court was quite literally always on the move, whether progressing or not.

Yet, it is Elizabeth I who is rightfully regarded as the Tudor monarch who took the advantages of progressing to a logical conclusion. In fact, while Henry was keen to monumentalize his authority through numerous commissions for new buildings, Elizabeth was far happier to visit the houses of her courtiers. In doing so, the queen added a layer of mystery to the monarchical progresses in early modern Europe. Whereas Henry's court (defined, in this instance, as a royal train of courtiers and servants) followed him to what was often a house or palace that he actually owned, Elizabeth abandoned the need to fix monarchical splendour upon any kind of architectural setting. Rather, the court accompanied Elizabeth wherever she herself went. The court, therefore, really was 'with' the monarch. Elizabeth's reign marks the highpoint of progressing in England, and co-existed with a characteristic attempt to keep the cost of royal expenditure low in terms of architecture and building. Cole cites a description of this trait by the Elizabethan historian William Harrison: '[E]very nobleman's house is her palace, where she continueth during pleasure and till she return again to some of her own.'[6] Harrison's quotation usefully highlights the ambivalence that

---

[6] William Harrison, *The Description of England*, quoted in Mary Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Amherst: Massachusetts University Press, 1999), p. 65. Jayne Archer and Sarah Knight, 'Introduction', observe that '[a]s the peripatetic court settled briefly in the grounds of a private host [...] his or her household *became* the court – the centre of the nation's focus - and the court *became* the household'. For an update of work by Cole and other scholars, see the forthcoming collection of essays: *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, ed. by Jayne Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming 2007). I am grateful to the editors of this collection and to the authors of each of the chapters for permission to see this material prior to publication. See, in particular, Archer and Knight, 'Introduction'; Cole, 'Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses'; Hester Lees-Jeffries, 'Location as Metaphor in Queen Elizabeth's Coronation Entry (1559)'; C.E. McGee, 'Mysteries, Musters, and Masque: The Import(s) of Elizabethan Civic Entertainments'; David M. Bergeron, 'The "I" of the Beholder: Thomas Churchyard and the 1578 Norwich Pageant'; Elizabeth Goldring, 'Portraiture, Patronage, and the Progresses: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth Festivities of 1575'; Gabriel Heaton, 'Elizabethan Entertainments in

is innate in the cultural practice of progressing: non-royal, elite buildings become Elizabeth's new palaces, and so belong to her, yet, at the same time, she retains 'her own' palaces.

In a related point, because this chapter is partly concerned with the advantages of such a moveable court, it is worth reflecting upon Cole's key observation:

> The constant disruption of court life inherent in her [Elizabeth's] progresses generated a climate of chaos [...] whose effect was to keep the queen at the center of everyone's attention, as courtiers and hosts focused on welcoming, entertaining, and petitioning her. Elizabeth's travels inconvenienced every member of the court and hurt her treasury, but as queen she found power in the turmoil of an itinerant court and in a ceremonial dialogue with her subjects.[7]

It is apparent, therefore, that Elizabeth used the progresses to her own benefit, but Cole only hints at the definitional importance of this portable court. To take this further, it is evident that as well as finding 'power' in the progresses, Elizabeth was able also to consolidate a version of court space that had to feature her authorizing presence, in order to justify the use of 'court' in the first place.

Elizabeth's moveable status is reflected in contemporary portraiture from the period. This can be seen in the famous Ditchley portrait by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, that hangs in the National Portrait Gallery London, from 1592.[8] In this painting, the queen stands on a map of England, clearly transmitting the sense that the monarch is,

---

Manuscript: The Harefield Festivities (1602) and the Dynamics of Exchange'. Lastly, see also Heaton, 'The Queen and the Hermit: The "Tale of Hemetes" (1575)', (Forthcoming 2007). I am grateful to Dr Heaton for providing this material prior to its publication. See also Clifford Geertz, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', in *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*, 3rd edn, (New York: Basic Books, 1983; 2000), p. 125. See also Cole, 'Monarchy', for the fact that Elizabeth went on twenty three progresses altogether.

[7] Cole, *The Portable Queen*, p. 5. Elsewhere Cole refers to 'a dislocating confusion that reminded courtiers, citizens, and hosts of the queen's centrality in their lives'. See p. 10.

[8] On the Ditchley portrait, see William Leahy, *Elizabethan Triumphal Processions* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. 59; Jayne Archer and Sarah Knight, 'Introduction'; Elizabeth Goldring, 'Portraiture, Patronage'.

quite literally, everywhere, a probability that is only possible through her status as a superhuman and divine presence. By implication, according to Elizabethan political discourse, the extension of the queen's body throughout the realm also includes the circulation of the English court that her royal body carries with it: progresses bring the queen, and the court, to multiple areas of the English landscape, the court appropriating, and so politicizing, parts of England that would otherwise be out of its reach.

Of course, the most famous aspect of the Elizabethan progresses, besides the concept of progressing itself, is the entertainment and spectacle that either greeted or accompanied the queen as she travelled. Michael Leslie has persuasively argued that the move away from London necessitated a transferral of theatrical energy to the estates of Elizabeth's subjects.[9] Leslie, however, does not view this shift of theatrical emphasis in a positive light for the queen, and it is here that I disagree. Whereas Leslie believes that the queen is more vulnerable as a spectator of drama and entertainment away from her more settled courts in London, I believe that this was actually a strength that Elizabeth felt was worth highlighting. For instance, Leslie writes that 'instead of the ceaseless celebration of the monarch's absolute centrality and control, the absence of obvious physical restrictions in the [theatrical] landscape enabled the author [of the given entertainment] to compose discourses of marginality and instability'.[10] This may be true, but we only have to turn to Cole's important thesis to remember that Elizabeth was always central to these events, precisely because of the chaos of progress culture. In addition, what Leslie neglects is the importance of the social space of the court in these entertainments. According to aspects

---

[9] See Michael Leslie, '"Something Nasty in the Wilderness": Entertaining Queen Elizabeth on Her Progresses', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England,* 10 (1998), 47-72 (p. 53).

[10] Leslie, '"Something Nasty"', p. 54.

of political discourse in Elizabethan England, the court is always accompanying the queen, even when she visits the 'property' of a courtier. As Harrison had observed, these estates very quickly changed into Elizabeth's own palaces once the queen was present, and the transformative nature of drama and entertainment can only have assisted this process. Turning to the primary material, I now explore the fictional discourses that helped to transmit the idea of a moveable court space to members of the public.

'In entertainment to my princely queen': visited places / appropriated (courtly) spaces

The texts of the Elizabethan progresses, and, more specifically, the entertainments that took place at these events, are particularly important because, when taken in their entirety, they serve as a record of the complex interplay between reality and fiction that took place during each of the queen's progresses. For instance, as has long been acknowledged by the wealth of historical and literary work that has arisen from the groundbreaking research of Frances Yates and Roy Strong, most scholars now agree that the praise that was lavished on Elizabeth – the so-called 'cult' – actually enabled powerful aristocrats to voice their opinions on the political culture of the day, as well as their disguised criticisms.[11] It is well known that the Earl of Leicester made the most of his opportunity in 1575, when the queen visited his Kenilworth estate, as the Earl used the accompanying entertainments to comment on Elizabeth's possibilities in terms of marriage.[12] 'Progress studies', then, have advanced from simplistic notions of panegyric

---

[11] Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), particularly pp. 88-111; Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977).

[12] On this, see Jean Wilson, *Entertainments for Elizabeth I* (Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 1980), p. 119; Cole, *Portable Queen*, p. 133.

and rule to an argument that acknowledges politics and persuasion, as well as a sense of place and occasion. However, it is also important to recognize the ways in which these texts point up the spatial dynamics of the progresses, particularly in terms of the transformative power of the queen and, by implication, her travelling court.

'To discourse somewhat of Killingworth Castle': The Kenilworth entertainments

In 1575, therefore, Elizabeth visited Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester at Kenilworth Castle. The visit formed part of a lengthy summer progress covering the months of July and August of that year.[13] The queen was more than aware of the significant theatrical effect of her court's presence: to visit the castle was actually part of the performance, a theatrical spectacle that revolved around her own court rather than Leicester's entertainment. What I believe is important to uncover from the text of the entertainment is the realization that Elizabeth's presence at Kenilworth brought with it, in Elizabethan eyes, a sense of the actual English court accompanying the monarch. Similarly, Leicester's own elite space is appropriated during the progress and the entertainments, as the courtly space that arrives from the south incorporates the estate whilst Elizabeth is present. Correspondingly, if we turn attention to '[t]he mercer and minor court official' Robert Laneham's key description of the event, in his printed letter to his friend Humphrey Martin, it is clear that Laneham felt part of a court rather than a simple collection of courtiers and servants.[14] As we shall see, in many of the entertainment texts, the visit of Elizabeth is seen to transform the physical place into a courtly otherworld, just

---

[13] See Cole, *Portable Queen*, p. 188. Cole has complied a chronology of the progress, reporting that it took in various properties in Warwickshire and Staffordshire.

[14] This description of Laneham's status is by Goldring, in 'Portraiture, Patronage'. See this chapter also for the alternative spelling (Langham) and a brief survey of the debates about the authorship of Laneham's work.

as characters in the entertainments undergo various transformations owing to monarchical presence.

In his text, Laneham indicates that he believes that he has been, at the very least, a privileged spectator on the progress and at the entertainments. This is apparent from the text's title: *A LETTER: Whearin part of the entertainment vntoo the Queenz Maiesty at Killinwoorth Castl in Warwik sheer in this soomerz progress 1575 is signified / from a freend officer attendant in coourt vntoo hiz freend a citizen and merchaunt of London.*[15] What is striking about this designation is the nature of the announcement, as Laneham conveys news about 'this soomerz progress' as if an audience is waiting to be kept up-to-date on the events via the work's status as a type of newsletter.[16] It is also significant that the recipient of the original letter (Martin) is 'a citizen and merchaunt of London'. Clearly, this signifies as much about the social status of the two men as it does about progresses. Yet the letter's title hints at the concept of a news report distributing information about the court's progress for the London bookstalls. It is also worth remembering that the writer obviously sees himself as a courtier even when away from the London palaces, precisely because he is accompanying monarchical authority on the progress.

---

[15] See Robert Laneham, *A LETTER: Whearin part of the entertainment vntoo the Queenz Maiesty at Killinwoorth Castl in Warwik sheer in this soomerz progress 1575 is signified / from a freend officer attendant in coourt vntoo hiz freend a citizen and merchaunt of London.* (London, 1575). The text is available also in a modern, edited form. See *Robert Langham: A Letter*, ed. by R.J.P. Kuin (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983). On this visit, see Goldring, 'Portraiture, Patronage'. See also George Gascoigne, *The princelye pleasures at the courte at Kenelworth*, in *The whole workes of George Gascoigne Esquire* (London, 1587).

[16] See Heaton, 'Elizabethan Entertainments in Manuscript', which views the circulation of such progress texts. On the newsworthy nature of such texts, Heaton observes that '[t]hese written accounts were the only point of access to royal entertainments for many contemporaries'. Heaton continues later in his study: 'Entertainment texts, whether in manuscript or print, were not produced by or for a monolithic central authority.' In his appendix, Heaton makes it clear that there is no evidence of manuscript circulation for this text.

When Laneham begins his description to Martin he makes a point of stressing his place 'at Coourt':

> AFter my harty commendacionz, I commend me hartely too yoo. Understand ye, that syns throough God and good fre'ends, I am placed at Coourt h'eer (as ye wot) in a woorshipfull room: Whereby, I am not only acquainted with the most, and well knoen too the best, and euery officer glad of my company: but also haue poour, a dayz (while the Councell sits not) to go and too see things sight worthy, and too be prezent [sic] at any sheaw or spectacl, any whear this Progress reprezented untoo her highness.[17]

In this quotation, Laneham gives the moveable court a sense of architectural permanence by his use of the word 'room'. Whether this signifies his own private room in an aristocratic house is unclear, but it does display the Elizabethan sense of a travelling court whilst still utilizing architectural discourse. Similarly, Laneham points up the inherent theatricality of the progresses, as he immediately observes the shows and spectacles that underwrite the importance of the court's travels in Elizabethan political (and theatrical) culture. If we turn attention to the writer's description of the setting of the events, this is similarly revealing of a sense of awe and wonder on the part of Laneham:

> But h'eerin, the better for conceyuing of my minde and instruction of yoors, ye must gyue me leaue a littl, az well to preface vntoo my matter, az too discoors sumwhat of Kyllingwoorth Castl. A Territory of the right honorabl, my singular good Lord, my Lord the Earl of Leyceter: of whooz incomparabl cheering, and enterteynment thear vnto her Maiesty noow, I will sheaw yoo a part heer, that coold not s'ee all, nor had I seen all coold well report the hallf: Whear thinges, for the parsons, for the place, tyme, cost, deuisez [sic], straungnes, and aboundauns, of all that euer I sawe (and yet haue I been, what vnder my Master Bomsted, and what on my oun affayrs, while I occupied Merchaundyze, both in Frauns and Flaunders (long and many a day) I saw none ony whear so memorabl, I tell you playn.[18]

---

[17] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 1.

[18] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 2.

The writer makes it clear that he has been part of a privileged, elite social space, in which a sense of mystery and wonder only adds to the theatricality of both the entertainments and the progress of royal authority. Indeed, Laneham implies that the atmosphere of grandeur in the architectural setting of Leicester's castle is significantly increased by the arrival of the Tudor queen, just as the sensation of performativity accelerates that same process during the entertainments.

Because the progressing Elizabethan court necessarily lacked a genuine architectural presence, it is interesting to view the way in which Laneham's description of the events transfers this missing architectural discourse onto Kenilworth Castle. The court's appropriation of the physical structure endows the building with a sense of courtliness, just as the fluidity of the court's meaning is mapped directly onto the estate during the visit. As Laneham observes:

> These armonioous blasterz, from the foreside of the gate at her highnes entrauns whear they began: walking upon the wallz, vntoo the inner: had this musik maynteyned from them very delectably while her highnes all along the Tiltyard rode unto the inner gate next the baze coourt of the Castl: whear the Lady of the Lake (famous in king Athurz book) with too Nymphes wayting vpon her, arrayed all in sylks attending her highnes comming.[19]

In the medieval and early modern periods, a base court meant a certain area of a castle or palace, and did not signify, in itself, royal authority. Yet it is worth highlighting the fact that Laneham brings this to our attention, as the base court gathers momentum as a privileged space owing to the presence of Elizabeth and her court. Furthermore, the description of the castle as a court continues:

> So passing intoo the inner Coourt, her Majesty (that never rydez but alone) thear set dooun from her Pallfrey, waz conueid vp too chamber: when

[19] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 10.

> after, dyd follo so great a peal of gunz, and such lyghtning by fyer woork a long space toogyther: as Iupiter woold sheaw himself too be no further behinde with hiz wellcoom.[20]

As is often the case in the early modern period, the word 'court' carries with it various significations, intentional or unintentional on the part of the writer. In this example Laneham clearly means the inner court of the actual castle, a physical space. Yet this process of signification is complicated by the visit of *the* court itself, in that Elizabeth's royal presence means that Laneham's discourse resonates with the moveable court as they continue on the progress. Likewise, in this text it is often virtually impossible to distinguish which definition of a court Laneham intends to signify by his use of the word. Later in the work, he tells the reader: 'Az the cumpany in this order wear cum into the coourt, marueyloous wear the marciall acts that wear doon thear that day.'[21] In this instance, then, 'court' may imply part of the castle structure, as Laneham feels that Kenilworth has been incorporated into the English court owing to the presence of the queen and her courtiers.

This theme continues as Laneham introduces the concept of a palace as a signifier of royal authority:

> But beeing heer noow in magnificens and matters of greatnes: it fallz well too mynde. The greatnes of hiz honorz Tent, that for her Maiestyez dyning was pight at long Ichington, the day her highnes cam to Kyllingwoorth Castl. A Tabernacl indeed for number and shyft of large and goodly roomz, for fayr and eazy officez: both inward, and ooutward all so likesumin [likesome] order and eysight: that iustly for dignitee may be comparabl with a beautifull Pallais, & for greatnes and quantitee with a proper Tooun, or rather a Cittadell.[22]

---

[20] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 15.

[21] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 30. See also p. 38: '[B]rought all ind'eed intoo the great coourt, 'een vnder her highnes windo too haue b'een s'een.'

[22] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 78.

Here a discourse about one type of elite space cannot avoid being transformed into a discourse about another (greater) type of elite space, as the description of an aristocratic, non-royal setting turns sharply into a depiction of a courtly space through the use of the signifier 'Pallais'. This happens in the text precisely because of the appropriation of Kenilworth by the visiting court, despite the fact that this aristocratic space was regarded as a castle. As Laneham puts it, 'waz euer Kenelwoorth more nobled then by thiz, hiz lordships [Leicester's] receiuing [sic] her highnes noow.'[23] Similarly, as the text makes clear, the visit of Elizabeth greatly increases the presence of nearby aristocrats: 'That thiz thing amoong the rest waz for full signifiauns of hiz Lordships honorabl, frank, frieendly and nobl hart toward all estatez. Which, whither cum they to stay and take cheer, or straight to returne: too see or too be seen: cum they for duty too her Maiesty or looue.'[24] Indeed, this comment reveals a tension in the progresses, in that it is unclear if the visitors flock to an aristocratic space owned by Leicester, or a courtly space because of the queen's presence.

As I reveal throughout this thesis, one definition of the court that was current in the early modern period included the idea of the social space being formed by a collection of courtiers. For the progresses, the growth of the courtly space accelerated further because the travels allowed greater access to the monarch, thus allowing the court to expand as the queen greeted dignitaries, more aristocrats, and, perhaps, even the

---

[23] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 82.

[24] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 76.

common people.[25] This is confirmed in Laneham's description of the visit to Kenilworth Castle on two separate occasions in the text. As the work makes apparent: 'Tuisday, according too commaundement, cam oour Coventree men.' Laneham also points out that Elizabeth greeted these people with much care, mentioning her 'highness myrth and good acceptauns'.[26] Later in the text, Laneham comments upon the interest generated by the visit of the queen:

> The Parcae (az earst I should haue sayd) the first night of her Maiestiez cumming: they heering and seeing so precioous adoo heer, at a place vnlookt for, in an uplondish Cuntree, so far within the Ream: preassing intoo euery steed whear her highness went, whereby so duddld with such varietee of delyghts, dyd set asyde their huswifry, coold not for their harts tend their work a whyt. But after they had seen her Maiesty a bed, gat them a prying intoo euery place: olld hags, az fond of nuellries, *az yoong girls that had neuer seen Coourt afore*: but neyther full, with gazing nor wery with gadding, leaft of yet for that time, and at high midnight, gate them giggling, (but not alooud) *into the prezens Chamber*: minding in deed with their prezent diligens, too recompens their former slaknes.[27]

Whether the attention was desired or not, the progresses led to an expansion of the court space as far greater access was possible away from the confines of the great London palaces and 'physical' courts, such as Hampton Court and Whitehall. As this quotation demonstrates, ordinary subjects were able to witness the queen's presence on the progresses, and, as Laneham describes, this meant that the court was a visible space for those present. In fact, these people were able to witness court fashioning and definition because of Elizabeth's royal attendance.

---

[25] For more on the 'common people' in Elizabethan progressing culture, see Leahy, *Elizabethan Triumphal Processions.*

[26] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 45.

[27] Laneham, *A LETTER*, pp. 63-64. Emphasis mine.

The court's transformation of the visited environment is also clear when we look at Laneham's description of one of the entertainments and, more specifically, the famous Lady of the Lake scene that was devised to both entertain and persuade the queen. As the text recollects:

> from the midst of the Pool, whear, vpon a moouabl Iland, bright blazing with torches, she [the Lady of the Lake] floting too land, met her Maiesty with a wel penned meter and matter after this sorte: First of the auncientee of the Castl, whoo had been ownerz of the same, een till this day, most allweyz in the handes of the Earls of Leyceyter, hoow she had kept this Lake syns king Arturz dayz, and noow vnderstanding of her highnes hither cumming, thought it both offis and duety in humbl wyze too discoouer her and her estate: offring vp the same, her Lake and poour thearin, with promis of repair vnto the Coourt. It pleazed her highnes too thank this lady and too ad withall, we had thought indeed the lake had been oours, and doo you call it yourz noow? Well we wyll heerin common more with yoo hereafter.[28]

Here the mythical and fictional discourse of the entertainment resonates with a touch of reality in terms of the appropriation of the landscape by the courtly space. Evidently, the entertainment meant to signify that the land would belong to Elizabeth if she accepted Leicester's marriage proposal. Yet it is revealing that, although Elizabeth thanks the lady in the fictional entertainment, she cannot resist an opportunity to utilize the political interaction that progressing allowed her.

If, as Laneham reports, the queen believed the land to already belong to her, this is an apparent indication of the appropriation of a visited place by the progressing court space in all its mysterious guises. Furthermore, Cole has pointed out that, at the visit to Kenilworth, Elizabeth was annoyed with Leicester because of complications involving the genuine ownership of the estate: 'Elizabeth took Robert Dudley to task when he forgot to recognize her royal ownership of his borrowed estate Kenilworth during the

---

[28] Laneham, *A LETTER*, pp. 10-11.

queen's visit.'[29] In this instance, then, it may be that progressing allowed the queen to reclaim a space that had always been, in reality, part of the courtly realm. This sense is also picked up in Laneham's narration of the visit, when he informs the reader of the splendour of the setting: 'who that considerz, vntoo the stately seat of Kenelwoorth Castl, the rare beauty of bylding that hiz honor hath auaunced.'[30] Here Laneham hints at an act of elite spatial transformation, as his register acknowledges Kenilworth as both 'Castl' and 'stately seat'. Thus we can view the complex interplay between courtly and aristocratic elite spaces. Similarly, at the end of the printed account, Laneham makes it clear that he has written the letter to his friend whilst still on the royal progress, though the queen has now left Kenilworth. As Laneham signs off: 'Well onez agein fare ye hartely well. From the Coourt. At the Citee of Worceter, the xx. of August. 1575.'[31] Having regained one royal space, the progress has moved on to another location, whilst always being 'the court'.

'Yonder comes the Fairy Queene': The visit to Woodstock

As part of the summer progress in 1575, Elizabeth also visited Sir Henry Lee at Woodstock.[32] As Jean Wilson has shown, the visit and accompanying entertainment was meant to be, in part, a reply to the Kenilworth event.[33] In this progress, and, particularly in the entertainments, the queen's presence is able to transform events, and one of the

---

[29] Cole, *Portable Queen*, p. 65.

[30] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 66.

[31] Laneham, *A LETTER*, p. 87.

[32] See *THE Queenes Maiesties Entertianement AT WOODSTOCK* (London, 1585). See also Heaton, 'The Queen and the Hermit'.

[33] Wilson, *Entertainments*, p. 120. Wilson glosses the event as part of a 'chivalric romance'. She traces the narrative of the story on the same page. See also David M Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971), pp. 35-36.

texts, the anonymous 'The Tale of Hermetes', was available in a collection printed ten years after the events (*THE Queenes Maiesties Entertianement AT WOODSTOCK*), thus testifying to the continued public interest in courtly events, the progressing culture, and such transformations.[34] In 'The Tale', the Hermit's sight is restored by the appearance of the great queen.[35] Similarly, the arrival of Elizabeth is carefully described by the writer at the opening of the text:

> This said, he bringeth them al to ye place where the Quenes Maiestie stood (in a fine Bower made of purpose couered with greene Iuie, and seates made of earthe with sweete smelling hearbes, (euen suche a place as you shall coniecture) and after some reuerence beginning his tale.[36]

On one level, it can be argued that all that is happening here is that the queen is being greeted with a sense of conformity and celebration, as one would expect for a monarch in the early modern period. However, this quotation also helps to point up a key feature of the progresses and the accompanying entertainments: the arrival of Elizabeth and her court alters the landscape as the queen's entry is registered in a pastoral diction that conveys her relationship with the physicality of Woodstock.

After the Hermit has concluded the tale, the author of the prose supplement to the entertainments observes that Elizabeth followed the fictional character:

> This learned or long tale being brought to his end: the poore Hermit loden as it were with beades and other such ornaments of his profession-, begins to tread the way before the Queen, which her Maiestie espying, refused her steed, and betook her self in like sort to the use of her feet, & accompanying the Hermit (her self waited on of the rest) fel into some discourse & praise of his good tale, which not ended, or rather scarce fully

---

[34] See Heaton, 'The Queen and the Hermit', for the authorship of this text. Heaton suggests the possibility that George Garrett was the writer. Also, his study charts the complex history of the text's manuscript transmission.

[35] See Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*, p. 35.

[36] *THE Queenes Maiesties Entertianement AT WOODSTOCK*, sig. B1r.

> begun, the Q, Ma. had in sight the house, which indeede was a place by art so reared from the ground, as neuer before, nor hereafter, shal I see ye like.[37]

In this quotation, it is apparent that the house that the queen noticed is actually a building owned by Lee. Unsurprisingly, the structure is clearly magnificent, as the narrator informs the reader. In this sense, then, an elite space is again made more important by the regal presence. However, this passage also gives us a unique glimpse of the fusion of theatrical and fictional space with the space of historical actuality that takes place during the performance of the entertainment. As we shall see in later chapters, this is a characteristic that the court masque would return to in the early Stuart period. Significantly, the Hermit is still 'in character' as he discourses with the queen. At this moment, therefore, Elizabeth vacates the 'real' space and transfers her performative energies to the fictional space of the entertainment. In a similar fashion to the encounter with the Lady of the Lake in the Kenilworth entertainment, fiction and reality merge in the moment of performance, just as the progress has allowed the courtly world of the area in and around London to travel to, and so appropriate, aristocratic spaces elsewhere in the country.

Another crossover of fictional and 'real' spaces occurs when the Hermit leaves the setting:

> Thus the Hermite departes, & the Queenes Maiesty addresseth her selfe with merry cheere to banqueting, which to encrease a diuine sound of vnacquainted instruments in the hollow roome vnder the house, made such stroakes of pleasure, & moued such delights, that if Apollo himselfe had byn there, I thinke hee would haue intreated the learning of their skill, or at leaste forgotten the pleasant remembrance of his sweete Daphnes. Her Maiesty thus in the middest of this mirth might espy the Queen of the Fayry drawen with 6. children in a waggon of state: the Boies bravely

[37] *THE Queenes Maiesties Entertianement AT WOODSTOCK*, sig. B4r.

> attired, & her selfe very costly apparrelled, whose present shew might wel argue her immortality, and presenting her selfe to the Queens Maiesty.[38]

Here the conventions of progressing allow Elizabeth to leave behind the world of the entertainment (the Hermit) and to re-enter the 'real' world (the banquet). Furthermore, the arrival of another monarch (the Queen of the Fairies) enables Elizabeth's courtly space to engage once more with the fictional world. This time, however, the fictional space of the entertainment can be seen also as a courtly realm, owing to the presence of the Fairy Queen. Indeed, the conventions of progressing and accompanying theatrical entertainment allow two different court spaces to mingle at the moment of performance. This view is confirmed a little later in the narrative, when Elizabeth interacts once more with the fictional characters. As the narrator informs the reader:

> I think (good sir) I haue within little repeated the names of those that were Ladies and maides of Honor, at these sightes, wherein you shall see the vaine, that runneth to the liking of such kinds. Now her Maiestie being risen: with good cheere, accompanied with the Queene of the fay r ye and the Ladye Caudina; she commeth from her banquite, and at her departure the Lady Caudina sayth:
>
> Let thankes suffice in worde where strength in pow're doth faynte.
> lette pith in prayer from Heauen to crave requite.[39]

Again, then, the concept of Elizabethan progressing allows various spaces to merge and interact, as a fictional courtly realm is able to enter into a discourse with the reality of Elizabeth's courtly space. Later in the text the actions of the Fairy Queen appear to mirror those of the progressing Elizabeth. As Alexandro states: 'But yonder comes the Fairy Queene, / and brings with her in trayne, / My lord the Duke with merry looke, / I hope

---

[38] *THE Queenes Maiesties Entertianement AT WOODSTOCK*, sig. B4v.

[39] *THE Queenes Maiesties Entertianement AT WOODSTOCK*, sig. C2r.

weis home againe.'[40] Like Elizabeth, the fictional queen of the entertainment is able to progress with her court and so is capable of accessing alternative spaces and worlds. The implication of 'I hope weis home againe' signifies that, at least in the world of the Fairy Queen, there is a more fixed courtly base to return to. This type of spatial interaction is visible also when Elizabeth visited civic spaces that were supposedly 'non-courtly'.

'That they may see with what maiestie a prince raigneth': the appropriation of urban space

In 1578 Thomas Churchyard published his account of the queen's visit that year to Suffolk and Norfolk as his 'discovrse' on the events.[41] This additional account of a progress mainly deals with the entertainments and shows that greeted the queen as she entered the city of Norwich, possibly because these were devised by Churchyard himself. The beginning of the work is of particular interest because of the writer's address to a certain Master Gilbert Gerrard, the queen's attorney general. As Churchyard remarks:

> I haue presented you with a little Booke, that makes not only report of the noble receiuing of the Queenes Maiestie into Suffolke and Norffolke, but also of the good order, great cheere, and charges that hir highnesse subjects were at, during hir abode in those parties. And because I sawe most of it, or heard it so credibly rehearsed, as I know it to be true, I meane to make it a mirror and shining glasse, that al the whole land may loke into, or use it for an example in all places (where the prince cometh) to our posteritie hereafter for euer.[42]

This quotation reminds us of the earlier opening to Laneham's report, in which the relaying of information about the court's progress is viewed as vital for the public good.

---

[40] *THE Queenes Maiesties Entertianement AT WOODSTOCK*, sig. F2r.

[41] See Thomas Churchyard, *A DISCOVRSE OF The Queenes Maiesties entertainement in Suffolk and Norffolk: With a description of many things then presently seene. (London: 1578).* On this progress and the entertainments see Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*, pp. 37-44; Bergeron, 'The "I" of the Beholder'. C.E. McGee, 'Mysteries, Musters'.

[42] Churchyard, *A DISCOVRSE*, sig. A2v.

In addition, we are able to witness once again a recollection of the expansion of the courtly space, as the 'common people' rush to greet the court and its queen. Lastly, Churchyard testifies to the importance of entertainments and theatrical spaces as he voices the idea of his pamphlet as a kind of manual for other areas, should the court decide to visit them. It is crucial, therefore, for a location to embrace theatrical space in order to permit the arrival of a courtly realm. Indeed, Churchyard continues on this topic when he states that he hopes 'that euery other Sheere, where the Queenes highnesse hath not bin, will rather strive to follow this lanterne when occasion is offered'.[43]

The next section of the pamphlet features an address to the reader. Significantly, it is at this point that Churchyard engages with familiar subject matter for the early modern progress, as he records the good behaviour of the people when they meet their queen:

> And albeit it seemeth strange, that people nurtured farre from Courte, shoulde vse much courtesie, yet will I prooue by the humblenesse of the common people, where lately the Prince hath passed, that if in a manner all ciuilitie were vtterly decayed, it might haue bin found freshly flourishing in many of those parties and places specifyed before: *for so soone as the presence of the Prince was entred in their boundes, by a meere motion of homage and fealty, a generall consent of duetie and obedience* [sic] *was seene* thorough the whole Countrey, and well a were they that first find occasion by any meanes to welcome a Courtier, and not with feyned ceremonies, but with fr'iedlye entertaynemente.[44]

Again, it is noteworthy that Churchyard identifies Norwich as, obviously, a non-courtly space without the presence of monarchical authority. However, this changes with the entry of the queen, as the progress appropriates the city, transforming it into a royal territory. Owing to this, the role of the common people alters: it is not that the people join the court as courtiers, as this is clearly not the case. Rather, as the court space expands

---

[43] Churchyard, *A DISCOVRSE*, sig. A3r.

[44] Churchyard, *A DISCOVRSE*, sig. B1r – B1v Emphasis mine.

and renegotiates the boundary between royal space and urban space, the common people behave differently, even though they have been 'nurtured farre from Courte'.[45] Thus, the courtly presence of the monarch redefines the urban space and the accompanying behaviour of the citizens, at least according to Churchyard's account.

Yet the remainder of Churchyard's pamphlet is mostly concerned with the descriptions of the entertainments that he provided, and his fictional narrative engages with issues of space that underscore the stress on fluidity that the progresses insist upon. For instance, Lady Beauty states:

> MOst royall Prince, speede on thy comely pace,
> Make hast in time, to do thy subjects good,
> Go runne with me, to stay this heauie cace,
> Take paynes good Queene, to gayne the giltlesse bloud.[46]

Here literary discourse interacts with the moveable nature of the Elizabethan court and the monarch herself, as Elizabeth's portability is underscored by the use of 'speede',

---

[45] Churchyard, *A DISCOVRSE*, sig. B1r. This theme continues throughout the rest of the address to the reader, and it is interesting to observe the emphasis Churchyard places upon the queen's court (or at least her 'trayne'), rather than the figure of the monarch alone. The visit of the court is also significant: 'And although it be a custome, and most laudable manner for the poore commons to runne in flockes to see their soueraigne, yet there, as me thought, their desire was so great, that they hadde neuer ynough of the sight so long wished and desired: and such reuerence and humilitie they vsed towardes all the trayne, wheresoeuer they encountered anye of them, that the inwarde affections of the people was playnely expressed by their outward apparance, and manifest courtesies: in so much, that the meanest persons that followed the Court, stood maruellously contented with that they saw, and wondered at the rare & good maner of the people, especially in Norwich, where the entertainemente was so greate, that all degrees, from the highest to the lowest, were had in such admiration, *that it seemed another worlde to beholde*: which newe kinde of reuerance, and comely custome of the Countrey (as it may be properly applyed) makes the old haughtinesse, and stiffe-necked behauiour of some places, to blushe, and become odious, yea in soyles, that the Prince generally keepeth hir residence, & most abode in, where proude people will passe by many of the Nobilitie, without mouing eyther cappe or knee, a stubborne stoutenesse, and an vnmannerly disordered boldness.' Churchyard, *A DISCOVRSE*, sig. B1v – B2r. Emphasis mine. In this passage, note how the movement from a description of the Norwich location to the London one resonates with a sense of these different spaces altering the actions of the people who live in the two areas. Also, we can observe the suggestion of spatial transformation in the passage I have emphasized.

[46] Churchyard, *A DISCOVRSE*, sig. F1v. See Bergeron, 'The "I" of the Beholder' for the abandonment of parts of Churchyard's show for the queen, owing to the poor weather.

'comely pace', and 'hast in time'.[47] Likewise, 'runne with me' suggests also the communal embracement that was so important to the concept of Elizabeth's progresses. Evidently, Churchyard envisaged that his audience would be well aware of the transportable nature of Elizabeth's reign. However, as a device for the praise of the monarch the strategy has a fault, in that the quotation seems to imply that Elizabeth's court should be at the service of the people as it travels the country.

Conclusion: progresses in the 1590s

As has been well documented, Elizabeth continued to progress throughout her rule, even through the troublesome 1590s. However, the progresses were scaled down as her reign drew to a close.[48] It is odd, therefore, that some of the more famous progress entertainments took place in the 1590s, though this may have more to do with their survival in 'good' texts rather than anything to do with the actual occasion.[49] What is striking about these works is the way in which a sense of transformation still underpins the later entertainments. Although Wilson's introductory notes to the progresses are not at all concerned with the spatial dynamic of the events or the texts, it is worth remembering her insistence on the alteration of fictional narrative in the four texts she selects for her edition, all of which date from the 1580s and 1590s. As Wilson states: 'The transformations of landscape effected in these entertainments are astonishing in

---

[47] Note also the title of Cole's book on the progresses (*The Portable Queen*). As is clear, this highlights the importance of constant travel to the queen and her cultural self-presentation.

[48] See Cole's *Portable Queen* in its entirety, but particularly pp. 158, 161.

[49] In her collection of *Entertainments*, Wilson chooses four texts to edit and freshly reproduce. Of the four entertainments selected, only *The Four Foster Children of Desire* (1581) dates from outside the 1590s. The other three texts are the entertainments at Cowdray and Elvetham (both 1591) and the famous events at Ditchley in the following year.

their nature.'[50] This is quite clear in the texts themselves. For instance, in the Cowdray text it is once more noticeable that we can observe the same slippage from a 'real' space to a theatrical and so fictional landscape:

> The Queen, having dyned at Farnham, came with a great traine to the Right Honorable the Lord Montacutes, vpon saterdaie being the 15₄ daie of August about eight of the clocke at night. Where upon sight of her Majestie, loud musicke sounded, which at her enteraunce on the bridge suddenly ceased. Then was a speech delivered by a personage in armour, standing between two Porters, carved out of wood, he resembling the third: holding his club in one hand, and a key of golde in the other, as followeth.[51]

Later in the same entertainment, Elizabeth is greeted by a wild man who remarks:

> 'Mightie Princesse, whose happines is attended by the heavens, and whose government is wondered at upon the earth: vouchsafe to heare why this passage is kept, and this Oke honoured. The whole world is drawen in a mappe: the heavens in a Globe: and this Shire shrunke in a Tree: and what your Majestie hath often heard of with some comfort, you may now beholde with full content.'[52]

In this passage it is apparent that the progresses and ensuing entertainments permit access, yet again, to a fictional and magical space. Similarly, the spatial dynamics of the whole world can be altered and gazed upon through the court's presence and the accompanying theatrical energy. It is not surprising that a moveable court should be concerned, through its entertainments, with different social spaces, whether aristocratic or monarchical, fictional or real. However, when James I came to the throne in 1603 an entirely different court began to grow around Whitehall, as the court masque helped to fix the court space as an architectural setting. In the four Jacobean chapters that follow, I continue to engage with the definitional riddle of 'the court' in the early modern period.

---

[50] Wilson, *Entertainments*, p. 42.

[51] *Cowdray: 1591*, in Wilson, *Entertainments*, pp. 86-95 (p.88).

[52] *Cowdray: 1591*, p. 91.

As I demonstrate, however, in the Jacobean period the significance of 'court' becomes more open-ended and wide-ranging, as definitions develop into further subjective categorizations.

Chapter 2 'In the Circuit of that Restless Space': Jacobean Court Culture, Early Progressing and Civic Entertainments

Introduction

The following four chapters on Jacobean court culture stress the duality of the court as fixed, yet moveable. Whereas scholars have unearthed the existence and complexity of this polycentric culture, I highlight the contradictory fixing of authority at Whitehall alongside this expansion. My key point in these chapters is that accelerated Jacobean polycentrism clashes with the prominence of Whitehall and the growth of a fixed understanding of court space. As the introduction has demonstrated, public drama in the early modern period was capable of examining and articulating apparent tensions in the interpretation and definition of courtly spaces. The first chapter then illustrated how the Elizabethan progresses acknowledged that a moveable court granted monarchy control over the court's meaning, as the elite space accompanies the king or queen, and is reliant on his or her authorizing presence. However, as we shall see, in this later period the signifier 'court' begins to expand so as to imply monarchical presence, architectural fixity and an aristocratic, elite culture with a far wider semantic field of reference.

The expansion of the court during James's reign relates to his status as monarch of Scotland before 1603 and his position as ruler of both Scotland and England after that year. Unlike Elizabeth, therefore, James possessed multiple courts in two kingdoms. Similarly, the role of James's Queen consort, Anna, meant that an alternative court culture co-existed alongside the central one at Whitehall.[1] In these chapters I reveal that

---

[1] On this theme, see Clare McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court, 1590-1619* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002). See also McManus's edited collection, *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), particularly the chapter by James Knowles, '"To Enlight the Darksome Night. Pale Cinthia Doth Arise": Anna of Denmark, Elizabeth I and the Images of Royalty', pp. 21-48.

the court continued to be a problematic space, as a variety of sources testify to different ways of viewing the court during the reign of the first Stuart king. Despite James's dislike for London, (he preferred to spend his time at one of his various hunting retreats, such as Royston and Newmarket), his continued use of progressing is a crucial theme in this section, as 'court' expands into a more open-ended realm than before. Owing to this courtly extension, both spatially and thematically, there are further, related definitional problems for this elite culture, including clashes between courtly, civic and aristocratic spaces in the Jacobean period.[2]

A key focus in these chapters is an attempt to synthesize surviving progress texts with masques performed at Whitehall Palace, along with those masques performed at another royal space, such as Hampton Court, or an aristocratic space, for example that which housed the 1613 entertainment for Queen Anna. My work investigates a key paradox of courtly and elite space in the period: one in which 'court' means both Whitehall more than ever before and an elite world which extended far beyond the confines of Whitehall Palace.[3] Because of my approach, much of this first Jacobean

---

[2] On polycentrism, see James Knowles, 'The "Running Masque" Recovered: A Masque for the Marquess of Buckingham (c. 1619-20)', *English Manuscript Studies*, 9 (2000), 79-135. Likewise, in a later study Knowles observes that, 'the Jacobean court is distinguished from both its predecessor and its successor by the competing political and cultural centres delineated by the different royal households, the court magnates and factions, and even the educational and religious institutions of the Jacobean state.' See Knowles, '"To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise"', p. 23. See also Knowles, '"Tied / to Rules of Flattery?": Court Drama and the Masque', in *A Companion To English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), pp. 525-44 (p. 529).

[3] On Jacobean progressing, see G. P. V. Akrigg, *Jacobean Pageant or the Court of King James I* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1962), pp. 164-65; Philip Harrison and Mark Brayshay, 'Post-horse Routes, Royal Progresses and Government Communications in the Reign of James I', *Journal of Transport History*, 18:2 (1997), 116-33. Doctoral candidate Emily Cole will be arguing that, in all, James undertook twenty-three progresses, the exact same number as Elizabeth. I would like to thank Ms Cole for sharing the fruits of her research with me. See *The State Apartment in the Jacobean Country House* (forthcoming unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sussex). See also E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1945; repr 1961), IV, pp. 115-30; Pauline Croft, 'Robert Cecil and the Early Jacobean Court', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 134-47, particularly pp. 136-37; Neil Cuddy, 'The Revival of the Entourage: The Bedchamber of

chapter is necessarily focussed on moments when courtly space jostles for predominance with civic space, as the open-endedness of various definitions of the Jacobean court requires an examination of moments of assertion by monarchical authority, and courtly space grows in several directions. Indeed, because this space interacts in telling ways with civic space, the elite and monarchical realm of the court was always involved in a fluid negotiation with the wider society as elite culture attempts to define itself. However, before engaging with civic textual material by Ben Jonson, Thomas Dekker, Gilbert Dugdale and Stephen Harrison, it is important to survey and reassess certain misconceptions about the Jacobean court and to offer an analysis of James's first royal progress, because this was, in 1603, the first time that the new Jacobean courtly space interacted with English culture.

'Such distinct rooms of state': Whitehall and Jacobean progressing

> I wishe I waited now in her [Elizabeth's] Presence-chamber, with ease at my foode, and reste in my bedde. I am pushed fro the shore of comforte, and know not wher the wyndes and waves of a Court will bear me.[4]

It has become common in literary and historical studies of the early modern period to stress that, unlike Elizabeth, James was not keen on unrestricted exhibition, pageantry and civic and rural ceremony.[5] Certainly, the first Stuart king did not embrace the

---

James I, 1603-1625', in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. by David Starkey (London: Longman, 1987), pp. 173-225 (p. 193).

[4] Sir Robert Cecil to Sir John Harington, after King James had just left Theobalds, in *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court,* ed. by John Nichols, 4 vols (London: J. B. Nichols, 1828), I, p. 146.

[5] See Andrew Hadfield, *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Matter of Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 53. See also David M Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry: 1558-1642* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971). Bergeron deals with the Jacobean period in his second chapter, pp. 65-104; Richard A. Burt's '"Licensed by Authority": Ben Jonson and the Politics of Early Stuart Theater', *English Literary History*, 54:3 (1987), 529-60, at pp. 540-41; Judith M. Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI: "National" Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England', *English Historical Review*, 472 (2002), 513-35, particularly p. 523, p. 529, and pp. 532-35; Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I: Two Kings or One?', *History*,

performative aspects of progressing to the extent of Elizabeth I, though the exact figures are difficult to substantiate.[6] Likewise, James's 'court' increasingly favoured Whitehall Palace as his reign continued, and the reign had a preference for the court masque as opposed to the earlier Elizabethan pageant or entertainment.[7]

For instance, thirteen years into the reign, on 30th April 1616, John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carleton and discussed the possibility of a royal progress to Scotland:

> There is much speech of the King's going to Scotland the next year. For my part I shall believe it when I see it; for many times *multa cadunt inter calicem &c* [much falls between the cup and the lip].[8]

68:19 (1983), 187-209; Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), p. 21; Martin Butler, 'Private and Occasional Drama', in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, ed. by A. R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 131-63 (p. 137); Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), particularly p. 54. See also an important essay by Smuts in a collection of essays: 'Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change at the Court of James I', in *The Mental World*, pp. 99-112, particularly p. 103. For James's alleged disregard for public display in seventeenth-century accounts, see Arthur Wilson, *The History of Great Britain, being the Life and Reign of King James the First* (London, 1653), pp. 12-13; Anthony Weldon, *The Court and Character of King James* (London, 1651). For a description from James's actual reign, see Nicolo Molin from 1607, in *James I by his Contemporaries: An Account of his Career and Character as seen by Some of his Contemporaries* ed. Robert Ashton (London: Hutchinson, 1969), pp. 8-10. We might usefully add, however, that a lack of enthusiasm for display could have been regarded positively by some Puritans.

[6] This is partly because historians and literary critics have not, as yet, arrived at a consensus as to what differentiates a progress from a move from one royal palace to another. For instance, few would claim that King Charles's flight from London to Hampton Court in 1642 was a royal progress in any sense of the word, but a trip from Whitehall to Theobalds for Elizabeth may (possibly) have meant a royal progress to the early modern cultural consciousness. I am grateful to Mary Hill Cole for clarification on this important point.

[7] See Mary Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Amherst: Massachusetts University Press, 1999), p. 26. See also p. 134. According to Cole, even when Elizabeth scaled down the progresses in the 1580s, she did not prioritize Whitehall Palace: '[T[he queen did not have an extended progress between 1580 and 1590. Instead, she stayed in the London area or in the Thames River palaces: Nonsuch, Beddington, Chobham, Windsor, Eltham, Woking, and Syon. In London her residence often was St. James's Palace or Somerset House, in part because the sprawling palace at Whitehall was hard to defend.' p. 158.

[8] In *The Progresses of King James the First*, III, p. 166. Note also John Chamberlain's observation, on March 15, 1617, that 'I never knew a journey so generally misliked'. See *The Chamberlain Letters: A Selection of the Letters of John Chamberlain Concerning Life in England from 1597 to 1626*, ed. by Elizabeth McClure Thomson (London: Putnam, 1965), p. 140.

Although James did indeed progress to Scotland for the first and only time in 1617, it is revealing that, the year before, his courtiers were so cynical about the venture's potential for actually taking place. To them, it was not a realistic expectation for James to actually progress to his homeland.

Yet James progressed throughout his reign (for instance, to Oxford in October 1605, Nottinghamshire in 1612, and to Scotland in 1617), and took part consistently in what might be termed 'micro-progresses' from one royal estate to the next (these 'removes' might include a visit to Hampton Court from Whitehall, and so on). But in the Jacobean period Whitehall acted as a homing beacon for the royal court: all progressing eventually led back to the confines of the London palaces, and Whitehall in particular.[9] A case in point has survived from January 1605, when Carleton wrote to Ralph Winwood about the Jacobean regime's forthcoming plans in terms of which elite spaces to occupy:

> The King is gone to Huntington, where he will stay till towards Candlemas. The Queen goes to Greenwich this week, to give Whitehall some ayre against the time.[10]

Here Carleton opens up a fascinating point about the nature of Jacobean elite culture, in that there were three royal courts, with the spaces of Anna and Henry breaking away from James's dominant and centralizing Whitehall.[11] This quotation privileges Whitehall

---

[9] See *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, p. 300, where Nichols prints a letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury from Michael Hickes, written December 6th, 1603: 'They say the Court comes to Hampton Court sometyme this weeke, or els to Wyndsore; but it is thought rather to Hampton Court.' This quotation helpfully highlights the early modern open-endedness in terms of the signifier 'court'. With a spatially-minded subjectivity that is typical of the period and open to interpretation, Hickes refers to a court as a fixed, static palace as well as a collective of courtiers headed by the actual presence of monarchical authority. Information about the Nottinghamshire progress may be found in Harrison and Brayshay, 'Post-horse Routes'.

[10] In *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, pp. 470-76 (p. 473)

[11] See Curtis Perry, 'Court and Coterie Culture', in *A Companion*, ed. by Hattaway, pp. 106-18 (p. 115). Kristen McDermott, in 'Jonson's Gossips and Stuart Family Drama', *Early Theatre*, 9:1 (2006), 61-83, notes that 'James was apparently growing increasingly resentful of the popularity of his charismatic son,

as the space needs to be 'ayre[d]' precisely because the London palace is so central to the monarch and his court. Indeed, the passage read this way seems to prioritize an absence at Whitehall rather than a visit elsewhere. Likewise, on the 28th October, 1608 Chamberlain wrote to Carleton: 'The Queen came to Whitehall the last week; and the King is looked for to-morrow or Monday.'[12] This time there is a sense of James and Anna circling around the fixed site of splendour of Whitehall Palace, the monarchs returning to the principal architectural court.

As my four chapters on Jacobean court culture demonstrate, then, it is vital to be alert to these competing uses of court in the definitional sense. In the Jacobean period, no one definition of court space can be said to be dominant: the court is with the king on his progresses, yet Whitehall becomes 'the court'. Additionally, 'court' now incorporates aristocratic spaces even without the king's presence, and we can examine some of the tensions in this formulation, stressing the complex interactions that take place when various types of courtly space interact with, and possibly displace, civic and aristocratic spaces. In Jacobean court culture, therefore, no one definition attaches to a space permanently, as such spaces are more malleable than ever before.

Henry, and of his demands for an autonomous court of his own.' See p. 61. See also Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Thomas and Hudson, 1986); Martin Butler, '*The Masque of Blackness* and Stuart Court Culture', in *Early Modern English Drama: A Critical Companion*, ed. by Garrett A. Sullivan, JR., Patrick Cheney, and Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 152-63 (p. 156).

[12] In *The Progresses of King James the First*, II, p. 211. See also p. 246 where Nichols prints a letter from Chamberlain to Carleton, from the 3rd March, 1609: 'The King comes hither [to Whitehall] on Saturday, and means not to stir for all this Lent, unless it be two or three days in a week to Hampton Court or Otelands.' Lastly, see p. 601, where Nichols prints another letter from Chamberlain to Carleton, dated the 25th February, 1613: 'The King *went away* on Monday the 22d to Theobalds, and so towards Royston and Newmarket.' Emphasis mine.

The first progress and the civic entertainments, 1603-04

In this section I build on recent work about courtly polycentrism, as this helps us to address the question of the nature of the undefined space of the court. Equally, a critical response that stresses this complexity allows us to target some of the definitional queries of the Jacobean court as elite, moveable space and fixed entity or structure. Where my argument differs from past critical discourse, however, is that I situate these texts within contemporary understandings about the definitional structure of the court. In turning to works that document James's first progress and, in turn, several accounts of his welcome to London as England's new king, we can begin to see how courtly space interacts with other, contrasting spaces and so is continually involved in a process of self-fashioning in a spatial and definitional sense.

The initial progress

In 1603 Thomas Millington published an account of the first ever Jacobean progress, as James travelled from Scotland to London to take up the throne of England. The title of the work is revealing in itself, as the text is headed as *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Maiestie, from the time of his departure from* Edenbrough; *till his receiuing at London: with all the most speciall Occurrences.*[13] Firstly, then, one of the very first printed accounts of England's new king presents the monarch to his southern subjects as a travelling ruler who transports his administrative culture with him as he heads south. Crucially, the title also foregrounds the key word 'entertainment'. Although the word can signify the aristocratic hospitality that James enjoyed on the journey south, it is revealing that, in the early modern period, a monarch's journey is

[13] Thomas Millington, (London, 1603). The printer of the text was Thomas Creede. See Richards, 'The English Accession', p. 522.

always troped with a discourse of performativity: the progress of a monarch is steeped in the proud performance history of spectacle and pageantry, as a progress is seen as one long entertainment for both ruler and ruled.

This theme is continued as Millington emphasizes his entrepreneurial, newsgathering and editorial skills when he disseminates his supposedly unique information about the progress to the consumerist readers: 'the rest is from his Highnesse departure from *Edenbrough*: his comming to *London*, so exactly set downe, as nothing can be added to it, but superfluous words, which we haue striued to auoyd.'[14] The text then proceeds to offer a description of the journey south, whilst continually highlighting the enthusiasm that awaits James in London. However, unlike Elizabeth, James was in a unique situation in 1603, as he has to leave one set of subjects for another. As the narration follows James's departure from Edinburgh, Millington reports of the inhabitants that,

> as ioyfull as they were of his Maiesties great aduancement and enlarging of his Empire, so were they [...] for their priuate want of him no lesse filled with griefe, as aboue all other times was most apparantly expressed at his departure from *Edenburgh* towards *England*: the cries of poore people being so lamentable and confused, that it moued his Maiestie to much compasssion: yet seeing their clamors was only of affection, and not grounded on reason, with many gracious and louing words he left them, and proceeded on his Progresse.[15]

Thus, unlike many of the Elizabethan progressing texts, a discourse of separation is played out by Millington as James leaves Scotland behind. The first Jacobean journey acknowledges various problems for elite space. For instance, if we recall Elizabeth's entertainment at Kenilworth, we have seen how her portable court allowed the English

---

[14] Millington, *The True Narration*, sig. A4v.

[15] Millington, *The True Narration*, sig. B4r-B4v. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

monarch and her court culture to appropriate, perhaps even consume, Leicester's aristocratic space, as one elite realm (of monarchy) takes over another, aristocratic place. However, as a king of two realms that he could never properly merge into Britain, James is abandoning one for the other. At the beginning of the reign James is leaving Scotland and his old court behind, and so this culturally significant location retains a sense of itself as a monarchical, courtly space because it resonates with the royal past and accompanying court culture. Despite this, we can speculate that it is difficult to envisage a true 'court' in Edinburgh without its significant figurehead. Indeed, after 1603 it is tempting to think of the Scottish court as an architecturally complimentary, alternative court world. This demonstrates the expansion of the term 'court' in the Jacobean period, as the definition is broadened by the original Scottish contexts, and these are formative in terms of the future English court. Millington certainly suggests this early in his work, when, just after it is clear to the Scottish court that James will become King of England, he observes the gathering of the local nobility:

> [T]here draw to the King hourely most of the Nobilitie in *Scotland*, with sundry Knights and Gentle-men, gratulating the great blessings befallen his Highnesse, and attending his Royall pleasure.[16]

This passage hints at the Scottish court as a collection of officials and dignitaries. That they gather together for the king suggests a fixed location of some permanence. Evidently, then, elements of this court are retained once James has left for England. In addition, the text gestures towards a hierarchy of court spaces, as James is congratulated and 'great blessings' have 'befallen' him.

---

[16] Millington, *The True Narration*, sig. B3r. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

It is perhaps telling that, for the rest of the work, Millington tends to avoid use of the word 'court', as if he knew that further fashioning of the new court culture would have to wait until the king arrives in London. It is not until Millington narrates the king's presence at Newark that Millington mentions the court as a moveable (and so present) entity:

> In this towne and in the Court, was taken a Cutpurse doing the deed: and being a base pilfering theefe, yet was all Gentleman-like, in the outside: this fellow had good store of Coyne found about him; and vpon his examination confessed that hee had from *Barwick* to that place, plaied the cut-purse in the Court: his fellow was ill mist, for no doubt he had a walking mate: they drew togither like Coach-horses, and it is pitie they did not hang togither: for his Maiestie hearing of this nimming gallant, directed a Warrant, presently to the Recorder of New-warke, to haue him hanged, which was accordingly executed. This bearing smal comfort to all the rest of his pilfering facultie, that the first subject that suffered death in *England*, in the raigne of King *Iames*, was a Cut-purse, which fault if they amend not, heauen sodainly send the rest.[17]

It has taken time on the progress for the Jacobean court to register its authority, as Millington names the progressing space as a 'court' for the first time once James has journeyed deep into English territory. In a related point, it is apparent that this definition coincides with the first instance of the new king utilizing his regal authority as he becomes a law-giver and pronounces justice and punishment. In one early modern definition, then, the court is the place of legal authority and law. Yet, it is only when James actually arrives at Whitehall Palace in London that there is a sense of him truly taking possession of the new court culture, and this is, perhaps unsurprisingly, expressed in architectural terms: 'Then his Royall person *arriued at his owne staires*, so called the

---

[17] Millington, *The True Narration*, sig. E1v-E2r. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

Kings staires.'[18] From the very beginning of James's reign, therefore, there is something particularly important about the possession of the Whitehall state-space.

One final point on this text relates to critical debates about James's failure to embrace the propagandist potential of progressing and display. Millington reports what constitutes a challenge to the negativity attached to James's reign by contemporaries like Arthur Wilson and scholars including David Bergeron, as James, when he approached York, is meant to have said, '*I will haue no Coach, for the people are desirous to see a King, and so they shall, for they shall aswell see his body as his face.*'[19] Although this report must be viewed contextually as part of a propagandist exercise for the new English court and its subjects, it is still interesting that Millington sketches such a different king when compared to the description offered by Wilson (see footnote 5). At the very least, the desire to attempt to offer this portrait of James links the new monarch to the performativity of the last reign, as Jacobean court culture gestures towards Elizabethanism as a useful form of monarchical presentation. Certainly, the new reign is referencing and acknowledging the earlier progressing culture of the last. Likewise, the quotation reveals the importance James attaches here to the body of the royal person, as the perceived need for the display of physicality embraces the watching public far more than a glimpse of the king's face. Clearly, then, one link between the old Elizabethan period and the new court culture of James was a desire to display quite fully the human, personal aspects of monarchical self-assertion. Also, links between the old and the new surfaced in the ways that James affirmed his court in the spatial sense.

---

[18] Millington, *The True Narration*, sig. G2r. Emphasis mine.

[19] Millington, *The True Narration*, sig. D3r. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

Elite space and court formation

We can trace an element of spatial contestation in the way James and his councillors attempted to align the king's authority with the city of London, not just the court at Whitehall. In a 1603 letter to Robert Lee, Lord Mayor of London, James makes this quite plain, describing his new realm with a microcosmic focus and attachment to the city, stating 'our Citie of London, being the Chamber of our Imperial crowne'.[20] As well as highlighting the importance of civic duty for the new monarch, this remark also reminds us of James's aborted project of unification, with the king styling himself as the Emperor of Britain. This would imply also that James was potentially the figurehead for the accompanying courtly world of Jacobean expansionist foreign policy and imperial ambition. As Hadfield has shown, '[w]hen James [...] assume[d] the English throne he tried to enforce a constitutional union of Britain in his first parliament, but found that he did not have the power to enforce his prerogative.'[21] This insight, therefore, reminds us of the continually fragmented nature of the early modern court, as the realms of Scotland and England fail to fashion a united British court as an undisputed centre of administration and monarchical power.

Of course, the new Jacobean court took time to settle at any one location, as spatial fluidity does not simply disappear with a change of monarch. For instance, James literally authorizes the moveable court by his own hand, signing off a letter to Sir John Harington with the phrase, '[f]rom owr Cowrte at Hollyreid Howse, / April the thirde,

---

[20] 'Letter to Robert Lee, Lord Maior of our City of London', in *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, p. 41.

[21] Hadfield, *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Matter of Britain*, p. 3.

1603.'[22] Conversely, it is a matter of interpretation as to which court, whether fixed or moveable is alluded to in a 1603 poem by Samuel Daniel:

> There, great Exemplar! Prototype of Kings!
> We find the good shall dwell within thy Court:
> Plain Zeal and Truth, free from base Flatterings,
> Shall there be entertain'd, and have resort.[23]

Here it is apparent that poetry in praise of monarchical authority can be a difficult task for Daniel, particularly when the court is referenced in the same panegyric. For instance, if 'good shall dwell within [James's] Court', this certainly suggests that the presence of good is certainly not a given formality. Similarly, although James's court is to be free of flatterers, intertextuality dictates that *de casibus* literature as a warning to the monarch is immediately referenced in the discourse. Also, that James's new court at England is in the process of formation, and has not actually been fashioned by the Stuart monarch at Whitehall, inserts into the poem a feeling of future potential, and by implication, a possible warning. Indeed, Daniel's use of the word 'entertain'd' shows the poet to be predicting the future for James's court with the emphasis firmly on the performative possibilities at the new realm.

More interesting still, is an important mention of the court in another 1603 poem by John Savile:

> Nor then, indeede, 'till wee doe all resort
> To see your face shining in England's Court,
> And then (O but till then make haste) (sometime) your Grace shall see

---

[22] In *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, p. 51.

[23] Samuel Daniel, 'A Panegyric Congratulatory', in *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, pp. 121-134, at p. 125. On this, see Knowles, '"Tied / to Rules of Flattery?"', p. 527; Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 25.

Your stranger subjects faithfull loyaltie.[24]

Here we have an instance of an accumulation of fantasies about the new court to be fashioned by King James as he succeeds to the throne of England. The court is being interpreted, in one reading, before it actually exists. Similarly, the quotation highlights the duality of Jacobean court space, as the poem hints at a sense of fixity in court fashioning without a king, yet, at the same time links England's court to the monarch by implication, thus resonating with the moveable court of progresses. Furthermore, the later lines testify to the idea of the court as the place defined through a collection of courtiers, who already form the court before the arrival of the new king and there wait to display their 'faithfull loyaltie'.

It is also possible for us to relate to other examples of discourse about the court that still carry with them the older Elizabethan sense of the court as a moveable, unfixed social entity, particularly at the start of James's reign. In a proclamation issued on 11 July 1603, the king announced the following to his new London subjects:

> The care we have to prevent all occasions of dispersing the infection amongst our people doth sufficiently appear by our former Proclamations, and that for that cause we are contented to forbear at our Coronation all such ceremonyes of honor and pompe used by our progenitors, as may drawe over great confluence of people to our City, for which cause alsoe being informed that usually about the day of our Coronation intended, and for some daies after, a fair hath been used to be kept in the fields neare our house of St. James's and City of Westminster, commonly called *St. James's Fair,* which yf it should hold at the tyme accustomed being the very instant of our Coronation, could not but draw resort of people to that place much more unfit to be neer our Court and Trayne.[25]

---

[24] John Savile, 'A Salutatorie Poem to the Majestie of King James', in *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, pp. 140-44 (p. 144).

[25] Issued on 11 July 1603, in *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, p. 202.

That this document testifies to the idea of the court as a moveable entity that could tour London is clear enough. Interestingly, though, the court has not yet had the chance to become more physically concrete and literalized by the new king through the presentation of masques and official ceremony. The proclamation is, to some extent at least, a transitional document, in that the moveable court displays a distinct sense of portability, an assertion that reminds us of the courtly peripateticism of the Elizabethan progresses. We have here a factual account of the danger of infection for the court space, in at least one of its guises. Significantly, the act of touring and moving around makes the court both harder to define here and, literally, more likely to suffer infection. It is also worth noting that, in this instance, James has already begun to possess the court, defining it as 'our Court'. The proclamation differs from Savile's thoroughly 'Englished' approach to the definition of court space. Likewise, a 1604 declaration sought to rid the court of 'the dangerous number of masterless men, boyes, and rogues serveing in every office and lodging in our Court, ready to commit any disorders or outrages'.[26] This ordinance testifies to the need for the court to be a controlled, rarefied social space, so as to maintain a degree of mystery for the 'common people'.

Yet it is also apparent that a complimentary, perhaps even competing court culture existed far away from Whitehall, and discussing both approaches together illustrates the emergence of Jacobean polycentrism. Likewise, on the first progress discussed earlier, in August 1603, Nichols tells us that the new king was entertained at Sir George Moore's Loseley Park.[27] Nichols prints several lines of poetry that he attributes to William Fowler,

---

[26] 'Ordinances of the household of King James, 1604', in *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, p. 447.

[27] See *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, p. 251.

'an attendant on the Court during this progress'.[28] These lines are revealing because they not only express some of the frustrations of the royal progresses, they also give voice to the potential of the court for alteration and change, as well as lending emphasis to the intrinsic fluidity of aspects of early modern elite space:

> Court hath me now transform'd into a Clock,
> And in my braynes her restless wheeles doth place,
> Wch makes my thoughts the tack ther to knock,
> And by ay-turning courses them to chase.
> Yea, in the circuite of that restles space
> Tyme takes the stage to see them turne alwaies,
> Whilst careless fates doth just desires disgrace,
> And brings me shades of nights for slyness of daies.[29]

At first glance it might be speculated that, because this Jacobean text dates from so early in the reign, the poet's acknowledgement of a very current and widespread progressing culture says more about the Elizabethan reign that has only just ended than it does about James's preferences. However, the poem was written on the first Jacobean progress, and there is clearly more than a hint of the 'here and now' of the poetic discourse. In the poem the personified female court's 'restless wheeles' are figured very much in the present tense, and the 'restles space' is an ongoing process. Equally, however, it must be admitted that the use of the female persona for a court is revealing, in that another marker of Elizabethanism seems to articulate courtly culture, and, particularly, a moveable court conceptualization. Indeed, a discourse of femininity will be returned to later in this thesis when I examine the texts for Queen Anna's 1613 progress into Bath, as it seems that the wider culture held on to the sense of progressing as a particularly female political

---

[28] In *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, p. 251.

[29] In *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, p. 251.

gesture. Returning to the progress poem, however, this is part of an ongoing process and complex deployment of courtly description, as the former Elizabethan concept of a court is in literary negotiation with the new Jacobean formation of elite space that has not yet been fully fashioned during the arrival in London at the end of this first progress.

An urban welcome?

In 1604, after a plague-induced delay, James was finally welcomed as the new monarch of England by the citizens of London. Luckily, the resulting pageantry and entertainments survive in a number of texts and have been mined for their political and aesthetic interests in the work of Bergeron.[30] However, in light of this chapter's emphasis on non-Whitehall courtly spaces, I wish to offer a discussion of these texts that properly contextualizes them in terms of my interest in elite realms. These civic entertainments are particularly important for this study, as the performance space for the texts – the city of London – requires close attention to be paid to issues that are spatial in nature. London is an interesting location here because it encompasses so many of the king's own courtly residences, including, of course, Whitehall, although there may have been further spatial tension in the period, as the palace was technically located in the city of Westminster. As such, when James is welcomed into the civic environment the whole city becomes, in a

---

[30] Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*, pp. 71-89. This section of my thesis on the 1604 civic entertainments owes much, like any study on these texts, to Bergeron's description of the entertainments. Bergeron points out that the event was delayed from July 1603 to 15 March 1604 at p. 71. Also, he observes that 'Jonson [...] devised the drama which took place at the first and last arches and the brief scene in the Strand [...] Thomas Dekker [...] was responsible for the remainder of the entertainment, excepting the two arches erected by the Italian and Dutch merchants of London'. p. 71. On the same page, Bergeron informs us that Thomas Middleton wrote a speech for the day's entertainment. See also Gail Kern Paster, 'The Idea of London in Masque and Pageant', in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. by Bergeron (Georgia: Georgia University Press, 1985), pp. 48-64; Knowles, 'The Spectacle of the Realm: Civic Consciousness, Rhetoric and Ritual in Early Modern London', in *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts*, ed. by J R Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 157-89; Nancy E. Wright, '"Rival Traditions": Civic and Courtly Ceremonies in Jacobean London', in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. by David Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 197-217.

sense, an extension of his court. Of course, this is particularly true in the early modern period, owing to the understanding of a court as any space occupied by the sovereign. At the same time, however, these texts are obviously urban-based entertainments that foreground the space (and separate identity) of the city. It is the tension between court and civic space that is most interesting about these texts, and the open-endedness of the works as both civic and courtly documents adds an interesting dynamic to the polycentric nature of the Jacobean court.[31] As I demonstrate, various textual accounts of James's entry show different writers struggling with the nature of the theatrical spaces they describe in their texts, and I excavate moments of spatial assertion for both the court and the city. That this court space is so open-ended highlights the sophistication of this elite realm, as the court seeks to appropriate the urban landscape.

Crucially, however, this demonstrates also the malleable nature of court space, as it defines itself against and through the alternative landscape of the city. The fact that courtly space attempts this process consolidates my belief that, in the Jacobean period, 'court' is the signifier for both a moveable and static space more than ever before. As that space is following continually a course of action that defines itself as either fixed or fluid, it interacts with alternative spaces (both civic and aristocratic) in order to both define itself and expand. That Elizabeth I had progressed to aristocratic and urban spaces meant that this process began much earlier. Despite this, however, it is the Jacobean court's embrace of polycentrism that meant that this court was defining itself more

---

[31] In his revised book, Bergeron points out that '[c]ivic pageants remind us [...] that more than one center of power existed [...] Local, guild, and national politics manifest themselves in the political concern of the pageants.' See *English Civic Pageantry*, rev edn, (Arizona: Mrts, 2003), p. 5. Similarly, Parry informs us 'that for this special day the City of London had been transformed into the King's Chamber or 'Court Royal'.' See *The Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 4.

vividly than earlier courtly cultures. This is apparent, as we shall see, in a variety of Jacobean theatrical texts.

The authorship of the surviving texts of the 1604 entry testifies to this polycentric world of court culture, as we have several contributions from different authors, and these, in turn, constitute a whole narration of the event when taken together. Disparate spaces, then, are articulated by a multifaceted sense of authorship, as literary production mirrors the complex nature of the culture's politics and multiple authorship means that, although there is an overreaching theme throughout the texts (united, as they are, by the formal occasion itself), there is still an emphasis on the interpretation of the individual pageant writer. This is made clear by the title of Jonson's own contribution to the festivities, *B. JON: HIS PART OF King James his Royall and Magnificent Entertainment through his Honorable Cittie of London, Thurseday the 15. of March. 1603.*[32] It might be argued that this is not typical of Jonson, the author having to admit that his contribution is only a part of the whole. Similarly, it is notable that once more the word 'Entertainment' figures prominently in a title, as we have already seen with Millington's recollection of the 1603 progress.

A royal civic entry was still a kind of monarchical progress and had a long, wide-reaching history in early modern Europe generally. It is interesting, then, to see Jacobean London embracing the performative aspects of Elizabethan progressing culture. This makes more sense when we remember that a series of triumphal arches were offered to the new king, as he made his way through the city. This is apparent on Jonson's title

---

[32] London, 1604. I have used the edited version of the text by C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, in *Ben Jonson*, 11 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), VII, pp. 81- 109. The title page is reproduced on p. 81.

page as he once more draws attention to the partial nature of his dramatic entertainment: 'So much as was presented in the first and last of their Triumphall Arch's.'[33]

In Jonson's text the scene is heavily classicized, with the city referred to early on as 'LONDINIVM'.[34] Though this foregrounds the city's own cultural identity as a civic space, it is worth remembering that the classicizing of the landscape noticeably adds a layer of monarchical meaning, as this is to be James's royal entry, after all. This is made explicit only a few lines on in Jonson's text, when the scene is referred to as featuring 'THE KINGS CHAMBER'.[35] From the very beginning of the text, therefore, what might be simple signifiers of performance spaces in Jonson's dramatic and textual world can be politicized once we acknowledge the complications inherent in elite space in Jacobean England. As we shall see throughout this thesis, multiple urban and courtly spaces often resonate with various cultural tensions that are apparent because of the uncertainty of elite space in the period. Indeed, because 'court' signifies a fluid and also fixed space, other spaces (urban, aristocratic) are often ripe for appropriation. In terms of Jonson's text, his classicism articulates London's civic identity, whilst, at the same time, it observes that the king's presence means that courtly space overtakes the city.

The theme of simultaneous appropriation of social space by both court and city recurs later in Jonson's work when he reports the occasion's 'speeches of Gratulation' as spoken by 'GENIVS':

> Now London reare
> Thy forehead high, and on it striue to weare
> Thy choicest gems; teach thy steepe Towres to rise

---

[33] Jonson, *HIS PART*, p. 81.

[34] Jonson, *HIS PART*, p. 83, line 6.

[35] Jonson, HIS PART, p. 83, line 27.

> Higher with people: set with sparkling eyes
> Thy spacious windowes; and in euery street,
> Let thronging ioy, loue, and amazement meet.[36]

In this passage, the duality of interpretation in terms of the entertainment's performance space is particularly revealing. On the one hand, Jonson's personification of the city as a feminized being who should put on her jewels in order to display aesthetic beauty and finery puts the civic space in the subordinate role to the king and his visiting court. Yet, at the same time, the city might be viewed as a queenly figure who is actually the equal to James, or, spatially speaking, the equal of his court. Even then, however, it is possible that what Jonson had in mind for London's personification was a figure resembling a queen consort, a strategy that would have marked London as necessarily important yet still subordinate.

To complicate matters further, Jonson's texts continues to describe the scene and the accompanying performance, and this later section is noteworthy for its articulation of an architectural aesthetic, as classicism adds grandeur to the civic landscape:

> The other at Temple-barre.
>
> CArried the frontispice of a temple, the walls of which
> and gates were brasse; the pillars siluer, their capitalls
> and bases gold.[37]

In a similar fashion to the earlier passage, it is difficult to decide which space is being prioritized here. Is one to assume that London's classical demonstrativity signals its perfection on its own merits, or is this only possible because of the visit of the king and the accompanying courtly space? Also, it is part of Jonson's achievement that he is able

---

[36] Jonson, HIS PART, p. 91, lines 276-81.

[37] Jonson, HIS PART, p. 95, lines 372-74.

to flatter the king whilst simultaneously paying homage to his current patron, the city itself. This occurs again in Jonson's text in the section set at the Strand, when Electra contextualizes London alongside a classical and, importantly, urban, past: 'The long laments I spent for ruin'd *Troy*, / Are dried; and now my eyes run teares of ioy.'[38] Again, London is being reborn as a second Troy, and this has much to do with the arrival of her new king. However, Jonson hints that there is something mysteriously wonderful about this classicized city, as London is viewed as capable of undergoing such a transformation in the first place, just as Troy was wondrous long before King James. The employment of the Troy image is particularly complicated, as any acknowledgement of a classical past hints at the potential for a social space to be magnificent without the presence of James.

An accompanying text was provided by Jonson's fellow playwright, Thomas Dekker in 1604. In his *Magnificent Entertainment*, Dekker makes use of similar themes. For instance, owing to the presence of the triumphal arches it is understandable that both writers combined praise for James with a detailed architectural discourse that relates London to the classical past and so Romanizes the early modern city.[39] However, it is perhaps surprising that it is Dekker rather than Jonson who makes the city bow to James's presence at the start of his text. For instance, Dekker points out that James,

> was to be conducted through some vtter part of this / his Citie, to his royall Castle the *Tower*, that in the age of a man (till / this very minute) had not bene acquainted nor borne the name of a / Kings Court. Which

---

[38] Jonson, HIS PART, p. 107, lines 701-2. Italics are reproduced from the text.

[39] Dekker, *THE MAGNIFICENT, Entertainment: Giuen to King Iames, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, vpon the day of his Maiesties Triumphant Passage (from the Tower) through his Honourable Citie (and Chamber) of London, being the 15. of March. 1603.* (London, 1604), in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. by Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), pp. 229-309. The full title page from 1604 is provided on p. 229. See also the conflation of Dekker's text with the Jonsonian parts inserted in Richard Dutton, *Jacobean Civic Pageants* (Staffordshire: Keele University Press, 1995), particularly pp. 19-25.

> Entrance of his (in this maner) being fam'de / abroad, Because his louing Subiects the Citizens would giue a taste / of their dutie and affection: The *Deuice* following was suddeinly / made vp, as the first seruice, to a more royall and serious ensuing / Entertainment.[40]

James's royal presence has the power to transform an urban space into something altogether more courtly and appropriate, or, as Dekker states, 'a more royall' scene.

In the same way, when Dekker describes the multitude gathering to catch a glimpse of the King, it is important to observe the way in which the writer removes architectural aspects of London, as if James's presence conjures up something more natural:

> All Glasse windowes taken downe, but in their places, sparkeled /so many eyes, that had it not bene the day, the light which re- / flected from them, was sufficient to haue made one: hee that should / haue compared the emptie and vntroden walkes of *London*, which / were to be seen in that late mortally-destroying Deluge, with the / thronged streetes now, might haue believed, that vpon this day, / began a new *Creation*, and that the Citie was the onely Workhouse / wherein sundry Nations were made.[41]

James's courtly presence is able to fill the streets with dutiful subjects who have altered the urban landscape (the windows) to participate in James's cultural discourse with his people.[42] Empty streets are filled and buildings are physically altered as the court comes to the civic world. Indeed, Dekker makes it much clearer than Jonson that the urban landscape has been appropriated by the courtly realm when he in turn arrives at 'The Kings Chamber':

---

[40] Dekker, *Entertainment*, pp. 253-54, lines 22-29.

[41] Dekker, *Entertainment*, pp. 258-59, lines 182-89.

[42] Similarly, see Ian Donaldson, *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 70, where Donaldson discusses Jonson's 1603 *Panegyre* along slightly similar lines. See also Butler, '"Servant, but not Slave": Ben Jonson at the Jacobean Court', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 90 (1995), 65-93 (p. 73-4).

> Too short a time (in their opinions that were glewed there / together so many houres, to behold him) did his Maiestie dwell vpon / this first place: yet too long it seemed to other happy Spirits, that / higher vp in these *Elizian* fields awaited for his presence: he sets / on therefore (like the Sunne in his Zodiaque) bountifully dispersing / his beames amongst particular Nations: the brightnesse and warmth / of which, was now spent first vpon the *Italians*, and next vpon the / *Belgians*: The space of ground, on which their *magnificent Arches* / were builded, being not vnworthy to beare the name of the great / Hall to this our Court Royal: wherein was to be heard and seene the / sundry languages and habits of Strangers, which vnder Princes / Roofes render excellent harmony.[43]

This quotation illustrates the way in which Dekker was prepared to fully subordinate civic space beneath the presence of the court and royal authority. In fact, just the possibility that a banqueting or masquing hall could be situated here is presented as a supreme achievement of the entertainment's pageantry. Similarly, not only does the progress of James through the city give hope to native Londoners; like a true European court, James's royal train permits (and even houses) a multiculturalism in keeping with the European origins of the triumphal arch.

As the author recounts the king's progress through the city and the entertainment continues, Dekker continues to subordinate urban space to the royal presence. This is particularly obvious in a song sung by choir boys from St Pauls:

> *Troynouant* is now no more a Citie:
> O great pittie! is't not pittie?
> And yet her Towers on tiptoe stand,
> Like Pageants built on Fairie land,
> And her Marble armes,
> Like to Magicke charmes,
> Binde thousands fast vnto her,
> That for her wealth and beauty daily wooe her,
> yet for all this, is't not pittie?
> *Troynouant* is now no more a Cittie.[44]

---

[43] Dekker, *Entertainment*, p. 261, lines 264-75.

[44] Dekker, *Entertainment*, p. 280, lines 884-93.

In this song, London's imaginary classical past is negated by the arrival of James and his new court culture, as the city is, quite literally in the text, transformed into a courtly realm. Despite this, Dekker makes it apparent that London still has an architectural permanence, as the city's towers and marbled edifices remain intact. Later in the song the transformation of the urban landscape is taken further: '*Troynouant* is now a Bridall Chamber, / whose roofe is gold, floore is of Amber.'[45] Dekker's own prose offers a conciliatory textual response to this passage, the author remarking that,

> all the scope of this fiction / stretching onely to this point, that *London* (to doo honour to this / day, wherein springs vp all her happiness) beeing rauished with / vnutterable ioyes, makes no account (for the present) of her ancient / title, to be called a Citie, (because that during these tryumphes, shee / puts off her formall habite of Trade and Commerce, treading euen / Thrift it selfe vnder foote,) but now becomes a Reueller and a / Courtier.[46]

These lines offer a fascinating glimpse of the spatial dynamics that underpin the politics of this civic event. It is noticeable that Dekker is more than aware of the problems inherent in his continued subjection of the civic space to the new courtly realm. What is perhaps more surprising is that he feels the need to articulate this, as well as the fact that he has the confidence to offer this approach in what is, essentially, a work of panegyric to England's new monarch and his accompanying royal dynasty. Equally, it is apparent that Dekker is still subordinating the city to the glory of the monarch, the urban landscape placed in a humbling position in which it can be 'rauished'. Indeed, the court's appropriation of the city space is so thorough that London is essentially 'de-classicized', stripped of a formal title and placed in the role of dutiful courtier. Yet, as if to keep

---

[45] Dekker, *Entetainment*, p. 280, lines 904-05.

[46] Dekker, *Entertainment*, p. 281, lines 917-24.

things in order, Dekker stresses the temporary and fictional nature of this transformation, as once more Jacobean space is shown to have the ability to be two things at once, occupying as it does (in the text) the dual roles of civic and courtly spaces. By implication, this testifies to the duality of courtly space as open and undefined owing to its fixity and simultaneous fluidity.

This understanding is consolidated in another work from 1604 that chronicles the royal entry. Gilbert Dugdale's *The Time Triumphant* offers a further account of the day's key events, though Dugdale is more of a reporter than Jonson or Dekker, as, unlike the two playwrights, he did not participate in the literary and dramatic writing that greeted the king.[47] The text's existence testifies to the widespread interest in James's official arrival into London, and so acts as another textual recording of the clash of civic and courtly space. For the purposes of this study, this spatial conflict is worth exploring because as the court is shown to attempt the act of spatial appropriation it thus bears witness to the pliable nature of Jacobean space. In other words, by attempting to seize another type of space, the courtly realm reveals that it is always 'in process' and so open to interpretation itself.[48] A space that can attempt to consume alternative spaces must, therefore, be a space that continues to grow and change. As we see throughout this thesis,

---

[47] Dugdale, *THE Time Triumpant Declaring in briefe, the ariual of our Souraigne liedge, King IAMES into England His Coronation atWestminster: Together with his late royal progresse, from the Towre of London through the Cittie, to Highnes mannor of Whitehall.* (London, 1604). See also Bergeron, *Practicing Renaissance Scholarship: Plays and Pageants, Patrons and Politics* (Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press, 2000), pp. 147-63.

[48] The phrase 'in process' comes from the work of Janette Dillon, as quoted at p. 4 in the introduction to this study. See Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 10. Whereas Dillon rightfully points to the nature of courtly and civic space as always 'in process', I am arguing here that this very fact underscores the urgent need of 'the court' to define itself, as we see in both conceptualizations of a court as a fixed location and as a portable space.

this point underscores the duality of Jacobean courtly space as a realm partly fixed at Whitehall, but is also in continual dialogue with other spatial realms.

Interestingly, Dugdale's full title once more makes use of the word 'progresse' and so fuses the courtly discourse implied by the use of this word with the competing civic discourse which is more readily available, as this is, after all, a text about a civic entry into a city space. Similarly, yet another account survives through the writing of Stephen Harrison, whose own text is entitled *The Archs of Trivmph.*[49] Harrison was the architect who designed the arches for the occasion, and so it is fascinating to view his own interpretations of the objects that had to unify civic and courtly spaces for the day.

In Harrison's account, it is made clear that he wishes to give due credit to his city patrons, and so the first page of his text features a (necessarily civic) address to London's mayor. Harrison is at pains to stress the generosity of his urban patrons who have allowed the monarch's entertainment to take place:

> That Magnificent *Royalty*, and glorious Entertainement, which you your selues for your part, out of a free, a clear and verie bounteous disposition, and so many thousands of woorthy Citizens, out of a sincere affection and loyalty of his Maiestie, did with the sparing of no cost, bestowe but vpon one day is here newe wrought vp againe, and shall endure for euer.[50]

It is evident that the author wishes to fully prioritize the city authorities.[51] However,

---

[49] Stephen Harrison, *THE ARCHS OF TRIVMPH Erected in honor of the High and mighty prince James the first of that name King of England and the Sixt of Scotland at his Maiesties Entrance and passage through his Honorable Citty chamber of London vpon the 15th day of march 1603* (London, 1604). Again, it is worth stressing that the title tells us much about the different prioritizations given to elite civic and courtly spaces. Clearly, in referring to the city as the king's chamber, the courtly space is gaining ground on the urban landscape. On this text, see Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*, p. 72; Bergeron, *Practicing Renaissance Scholarship*, pp. 164-92.

[50] Harrison, *The Arches of Trivmph,* sig. B4r. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

[51] Donna B. Hamilton comments that 'the City offered space for the dissident that the Court did not, its focus on commercial success, self-governance and autonomy being constitutive of common ground'. See *Anthony Munday and the Catholics: 1560-1633* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. 154. Similarly, John Twyning has pointed out that London 'was at once in a state of flux and in the continuous process of

more interesting is the register and tone of the praise, as Harrison appears to stress the quasi-royalty of the city's authority (or the city authorities). Indeed, it is important that the city is seen here to be lending the civic space to the monarch for the day, rather than a straightforward act of courtly appropriation taking place as one might expect. Harrison makes it noticeable that the classically-inflected arches of his own design are marked by a civic distinctiveness and are placed to welcome James to the city, by the city:

> For albeit those Monuments of your *Loues* were erected vp to the Cloudes, and were built neuer more strongly, yet now their lastingnes should lieu but in the tongues and memories of men: But that the hand of Arte giues them here a second more perfect beeing, aduanceth them higher then they were before, and warrants them that they shall doe honour to this Citie.[52]

This passage is explicit in its statement that the city authorities, in commissioning the monuments, were actually granting monarchical and courtly authority the occasion to be magnificent through display for the citizens. Harrison gives much power to his own textual authority to reproduce the drawings in his printed account and so continues to 'doe honour to this Citie'. The role of the arches as an important cultural marker for the greeting of the new monarch seems to have been downgraded here, owing to the employment of a civic discourse.

To summarize the various textual remembrances of the 1604 royal entry, then, it is quite apparent that the different writers are well aware of the need to balance praise in terms of courtly and civic spaces, yet, at the same time, they do so through different prioritizations. Whereas Jonson favours a courtly discourse, and Dekker balances this

---

reinventing itself'. See *London Dispossessed: Literature and Social Space in the Early Modern City* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), p. 3.

[52] Harrison, *The Arches of Trivmph,* sig. B4r. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

approach with a dual civic and courtly emphasis, it is the architect of the shows who truly offers us a text that is marked by an obvious urbanity and sense of civic pride as Harrison's text continues to do the same cultural work as his magnificent arches. Although the courtly architecturalism of Inigo Jones has come to dominate our understanding of building in the period (most notably through his construction of the Whitehall Banqueting House), it is actually the city authorities and Harrison who first offer a classicized architecture through a civic presentation to the king and his accompanying court at the very beginning of the period.[53] This Jacobean prioritization of an architectural discourse is particularly apparent when we turn to the first Jacobean masque at a fixed location in the next chapter, as 'the court' becomes even more open-ended in the Jacobean period, both spatially and geographically. Of course, this last point relates to James's domestic policy and his rather fruitless attempt to unify his Scottish and English kingdoms into 'Great Britain': even if James's project was relatively unsuccessful, my investigation into Jacobean courtly space demonstrates that a result of James's attempt at unification meant that courtly space was continually expanding in the early Stuart period. As the next three chapters show, however, this increased open-endedness results in a problem for monarchical authority in terms of what the word 'court' signifies.

---

[53] See Bergeron, *Practicing Renaissance Scholarship*, pp. 164-92.

Chapter 3 'A Temple in their Sight': Queen Anna and Courtly Duality

The last chapter demonstrated the expansion of the cultural meaning and significance attached to 'the court' in the Jacobean period, arguing that this growth occurred because of the contexts of James's status as a king of Scotland who already possessed a northern court before coming to England. With this in mind, I observed that the extension of court culture meant that elite space interacted with the resonance of Elizabethan progressing culture and London's own civic identity as a social space. In this second Jacobean chapter, the argument turns to the role of James's royal consort, Anna, as her status as queen adds greater complexity to the court's spatial and thematic expansion. Crucially, however, whereas Anna's importance has recently been stressed in critical discourse, my work prioritizes the role of the consort alongside contemporary definitions of the court as both geographically fixed and yet moveable, a point made explicit in my analysis of the first masque of the reign.

Daniel and the emergence of masquing's architecturalism

As we have seen, Jacobean courtly space utilized civic display in order to attempt to define itself as an elite realm. Turning to the first Jacobean masque, however, allows us to continue to stress this court's duality as both fixed and mobile, the performance location of Hampton Court signifying an architectural fixity and a simultaneous embrace of a polycentric court away from the confines of Whitehall. Indeed, a crucial text from 1604 documents this first instance of masquing culture at the Jacobean court. Importantly, Samuel Daniel's *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* was not only the first of the early Stuart Christmas masques, it was also performed at Hampton

Court, as the Jacobean elite avoided London due to the plague.[1] Owing to this, Whitehall Palace and the Banqueting House in all of its guises would only later become known as the space for masque performances. It is not that Hampton Court constituted an alternative masquing space. Rather, in 1604 this royal residence was *the* place of masque performance for James and his court. Correspondingly, although a trip from Whitehall or any other of the London-based royal palaces would not constitute a progress for the court, it would have been a remove, indeed, an extended one. Thus, although not a progress text, the surviving work by Daniel must be viewed as a performance for a court that has arrived at one palace after an enforced journey from another.

The work of Clare McManus has already begun to offer a revaluation of Daniel's masque in terms of its performance location. As she has shown, this text, 'together with White's *Cupid's Banishment*, was one of only two major Jacobean court masques to be performed outside Whitehall Palace.'[2] McManus observes that the Whitehall Banqueting House at this time was constructed out of wood, dating from 1581, whereas the Great Hall at Hampton Court offered something more unyielding, dating as it did from the reign of Henry VIII, and so the use of Hampton Court gave the Stuart court and the masque itself a kind of architectural permanence.[3]

---

[1] Samuel Daniel, *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, ed. by Joan Rees, in *A Book of Masques in Honour of Allardyce Nicoll*, ed. by T.J.B Spencer and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967; repr. 1980), pp. 17-42. See p. 22 for brief information about the use of the hall at Hampton Court and the need to avoid London.

[2] Clare McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court, 1590-1619* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 102. However, this remark only applies if we see Buckingham's later 'running masque' and the Essex house masque as 'minor' entertainments. The idea of a 'major' entertainment is clearly an open-ended topic. See chapter 3, particularly pp. 100-11 on Daniel's masque. McManus suggest that we should pay attention to 'the particular resonances surrounding the building and playing space' because they 'participated in the creation of the masque's meaning'. See p. 102.

[3] McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, p. 102. McManus goes on to argue for the politics of the performance space on the grounds of awareness of the building's importance to the old Tudor dynasty and the construction of the new Stuart culture. See McManus, *Women on the Renaissance*

A further point is that the text echoes the Elizabethan progressing culture as a female monarch is at the centre of a theatrical performance away from the Banqueting House. My own reading views Daniel's masque as an attempt to negotiate the definitional boundaries between two general views of the Jacobean court as both fixed and moveable space. As we shall see, Hampton Court houses a performance that articulates architectural permanence, and this is perhaps unsurprising. However, when we contextualize Daniel's masque within the competing discourse of a disparate Jacobean court we can see how, once more, 'court' stresses duality and its own open-ended, subjective nature.

Turning to the text itself, Daniel seems to have been acutely aware of the importance of the performance space, as the text is littered with architectural references. For instance, in the prefatory material addressed to Lady Lucy, Countess of Bedford, Daniel explains aspects of his literary creation:

> And to this purpose were these Goddesses [the masquers] thus presented in their / proper and several attires, bringing in their hands the particular figures of / their power which they gave to the Temple of Peace, erected upon four / pillars, representing the four Virtues that supported a globe of the earth.[4]

Of course, the reference to the Temple of Peace is a precise appropriation of an architectural discourse and pays homage to James's fondness for styling himself as a peace-loving monarch who sought to end the European wars of religion through a series of dynastic alliances involving his children Henry, Charles, and Elizabeth. Equally, a curious omission from critical discourse in light of Daniel's masque has

---

Stage, pp. 106-09. At p. 108 McManus notes the parallels in the masque between the female masquers' bodies and architectural references in the text itself. Similarly, at p.109 McManus observes the importance of Anna playing Pallas, 'a singularly Elizabethan icon.' McManus's work usefully charts the Elizabethanism of the entertainment in terms of the location of the performance (a Tudor palace) and Anna's use of Elizabeth's wardrobe. See also Sophie Tomlinson, *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 37.

[4] Daniel, *The Vision*, p. 26, lines 55-58.

been the Hampton Court Conference meeting with the Bishops and puritans in January 1604. Although this would not take place until almost a week after the performance of the masque, it should be remembered that the conference was initially scheduled for November 1603 and had been rescheduled for the following January. Daniel seems to have been offering a reference to Hampton Court as a monarchical centre of peaceful negotiation. It must be recalled that 1604 became a momentous year for England as the country signed the peace treaty with Spain later that year. Because the court's architectural permanence acts as a vessel for the negotiations it is telling that a further architectural reference is clearly evident in the mentioning of the four pillars, as the Stuart court is classicized necessarily through more than a hint of Daniel's Romanization of the masquing scene. Even in his prefatory material, Daniel seems to be making a point about the solidity of the new Jacobean regime.

Later, in the description of the performance, Daniel returns to the Temple's place in the masque:

> Iris (the messenger of Juno) descends from the top of a mountain raised / at the lower end of the hall, and marching up to the Temple of Peace, / gives notice to the Sibylla of the coming of the Goddesses.[5]

The temple, therefore, is an architecturally fixed centre of peace and righteousness, and the arrival of the Goddesses at the temple might be viewed as signifying the end of their progress to the sacred space. This processional aspect of the masque is confirmed only a few lines later when Daniel describes the entry of the goddesses:

> And between every rank of / Goddesses marched three torch-bearers in the like several colours, their / heads and robes all decked with stars and in their descending the cornets / sitting in the concaves of the mountain and seen but to their breasts in the / habit of satyrs sounded a stately march which continued until the God- / desses were approached just before the temple and then ceased, when the / consort music [...] began.[6]

---

[5] Daniel, *The Vision*, p. 29, lines 144-46.

[6] Daniel, *The Vision*, p. 29, lines 160-66.

It is clear that the fixed courtly space of a temple is meant to reference Hampton Court and the emergence of the new Jacobean era. More importantly for this study, this is the first articulation of a distinct architectural discourse in the Jacobean masques, a feature that would become increasingly dominant during the future reign of Charles. From the onset, then, the Stuart dynasty is given a concrete permanence.

At the same time, the arrival of the twelve goddesses necessarily implies a journey, allowing Daniel to reference simultaneously the court's continued employment of a progressing culture. As Somnus makes clear in the masque:

> Make this to seem a temple in their sight,
> Whose main support, holy Religion frame:
> And 1 Wisdom, 2 Courage, 3 Temperance, and 4 Right,
> Make seem the pillars that sustain the same.[7]

The architectural durability of the pillars is a 'sustain[ing]' force for the wider culture's religion and, by implication, the governance of the kingdom. Similarly, this persists in the masque through the speech of Iris, who, as messenger of the goddesses effectively speaks for them, as Daniel neatly blends architectonics with the alternative for elite space, the continuation of the mutability of a moving space:

> I, the daughter of wonder (now made the messenger of Power) am / here descended to signify the coming of a celestial presence of / Goddesses determined to visit this fair Temple of Peace which holy / hands and devout desires have dedicated to unity and concord.[8]

Both the visited space of the temple and the wonder of the arrival of the goddesses are given equal priority. Later in the text, however, the female entrance is allocated more prominence as Daniel has Sibylla voice a sense of wonder at the goddesses that downgrades the importance that the text attaches to the temple:

> What have I seen? where am I, or do I see at all? or am I any where? / was this Iris (the messenger of Juno) or else but a phantasm or /

---

[7] Daniel, *The Vision*, p. 31, lines 226-29.

[8] Daniel, *The Vision*, p. 32, lines 252-55.

> imagination? will the divine Goddesses vouchsafe to visit this poor / temple? Shall I be blest, to entertain so great Powers? It can be but a / dream: yet so great Powers have blest as humble roofs, and use, out / of no other respect than their own gracefulness, to shine where they / will.[9]

The temple's status is lowered as the goddesses conclude their progress by entering the scene. Of course, with Queen Anna as Pallas, the goddesses possess the royal authority of James and his new court, and it is tempting to view this as a textual gesture towards the superiority of the Stuarts over the earlier Tudor dynasty, as the temple / Hampton Court is figured as a 'poor' and 'humble' structure. However, as the next section makes clear, there were other times when the new Stuart court and Queen Anna were more than happy to take control of architectural spaces.

'Full of state': spatial awareness and architectural ownership

In May 1607 Queen Anna obtained Theobalds from the Earl of Salisbury, and Jonson was asked to write the entertainment that commemorated this symbolic acceptance, as monarchical power appropriated an aristocratic space in a very real sense. Jonson's surviving text, *An Entertainment of King James and Queene Anne at Theobalds* can be read as part of an explanation of the complex spatial negotiations that took place in and around the period's courtly and literary culture.[10] This aspect of architectural possession is yet another example of the sophisticated interplay between aristocratic and monarchical conceptualizations of elite space, as the physical and literal exchange of property is such a very real aspect of the courtly culture. This is a

---

[9] Daniel, *The Vision*, pp. 32-33, lines 280-86.

[10] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James and Queene Anne at Theobalds*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), VII, pp. 151-58. Aspects of the following discussion are indebted to a recent study by James Knowles. See '"To Raise a House of Better Frame": Jonson's Cecilian Entertainments', in *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils*, ed. by Pauline Croft (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 181-95. However, whereas Knowles has highlighted usefully the Cecilian embrace of architecture and theatrical culture as evidence of the polycentrism of the Jacobean court, my emphasis suggests that, as the courtly space of James and Anna interacts with the aristocratic space of Cecil's great house, the courtly space is continually engaged with the process of defining itself as both fixed and roaming space.

particularly resonant point once we remind ourselves of the polycentrism that lay at the heart of this court culture, an elite world that embraced both monarchical and aristocratic participation in the processes and discourses that fashioned an elite cultural milieu.

Recent work by James Knowles on aspects of the cultural self-presentation of Robert Cecil, the Earl of Salisbury, has opened up a discussion of the relation between his patronage of dramatic entertainments and the importance Cecil attached to architectural magnificence and a sense of permanence through building.[11] In terms of the entertainment commissioned by Cecil for Jonson, Knowles points helpfully to the use of architecture and how this articulates

> the formal exchange of the house, ostensibly to Anne of Denmark, [as] Jonson and Jones conjured up a 'glorious place'(line 127) [...] to translate the handover into an image of the Cecil dynasty's longevity and service [...] [using] architectural classicism to align Cecil with royal uses of Augustan imagery, while establishing familial hospitality as symbol of their loyal submission.[12]

In this interesting formulation, then, the architectural handover of elite property is figured as a gift from Cecil to his cultural superiors. However, I will now illustrate some of the ways in which Jonson's text enters into a dialogue with the civic and courtly entertainments discussed in the last chapter and at the start of this section, as once more Jonson has to establish a balanced approach to both aristocratic and monarchical types of elite, courtly space. Again, there is a fascinating tension in the entertainment between the different categories of space, and Jonson, like Cecil, is certainly aware of this spatial interplay. Furthermore, Anna, as the beneficiary of

---

[11] Indeed, as Knowles has argued persuasively, the earl 'regulated his patronage carefully, describing himself as an 'architector', and architecture was the model which informed his wider patronage practice besides providing his most public expression of patronal and dynastic magnificence'. See Knowles, '"To Raise a House of Better Frame"', p. 187.

[12] Knowles, '"To Raise a House of Better Frame"', p. 189.

architectural magnificence is a key component here in this instance of court fashioning.

In *An Entertainment of King James* the Jacobean interest in architectural discourse, and that of Anna more specifically, is both expressed and explored. Likewise this entire spatial and theatrical encounter underscores both of the dominant meanings of the early modern court, as royal presence appropriates an alternative space, a move that adds to the definition of court space based on monarchical residence. At the same time, this space is clearly beyond the margins of Whitehall and so consolidates the polycentrism of the court culture. The fact that this entertainment celebrates an architectural structure fixes the court's visit within the fabric of the walls, thus aiding the expansion of the court beyond Whitehall, yet solidifying the importance of architectural setting through its theatrical articulation.

The occasion for the entertainment is made apparent from the very beginning, as the reader is informed that this was staged 'When the House was deliuered vp, with the possession, to the QVEENE, by the Earle of SALISBVRIE, 22. of May, 1607'.[13] Monarchical authority, then, is immediately given prominence over Cecil in the elite's hierarchy. However, up until this stage it had been the earl who has possessed a space desired by monarchy. Of course, the transfer of the architectural space has fascinating connotations for an understanding of the word 'court' in the period. For instance, Cecil's grand house has the importance of elite space attached to it when it was 'merely' an aristocratic realm, but becomes part of court culture when Anna takes possession. Once the queen has the property, Theobalds becomes part of the wide-ranging king's court, yet is part of the supplementary queen's court headed by Anna. This point underscores my belief that the Jacobean understanding of elite

---

[13] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 154.

space is open-ended to a greater extent than before. As we have seen in the first chapter on Elizabeth, the mere presence of James and Anna means that, according to aspects of Renaissance thought, Theobalds becomes a court, owing to the authorizing presence of the sovereign. Secondly, if we embrace the complex nature of this court culture, then the all-powerful and highly influential Cecil has to be seen as part of the make-up of the court, with Theobalds viewed necessarily as a courtly space. The possession of the property by the royal family can only have made this more evident.

If we turn back to Jonson's text, the 'Genivs' of the house begins the entertainment with a lament:

> LEt not your glories darken, to behold
> The place, and me, her GENIVS here, so sad;
> Who, by bold Rumor, haue beene lately told,
> That I must change the loued Lord, I had.
> And he, now, in the twy-light of sere age,
> Begin to seeke a habitation new;
> And all his fortunes, and himselfe engage
> Vnto a seat, his fathers neuer knew.
> And I, vncertaine what I must endure,
> Since all the ends of dest'ny' are obscure.[14]

The speaker clearly acts out the role of the building personified. Despite the fact that it is perfectly obvious from these lines alone that Jonson's panegyric to monarchy will mean that the building will have to embrace royal ownership enthusiastically, the extract still stands as a commentary on the complicated politics of spatial ownership in this court culture. For example, in the text Jonson still has to impose a tone of sadness at the passing of the house's ownership, not so much to Anna, as away from Cecil. Indeed, the house will have to come to terms with becoming a royal space after years of aristocratic ownership. Likewise, as Knowles points out, the scene is then classicized through the employment of an architectural discourse, as the

---

[14] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 154, lines 12-21.

audience sees the stage '*erected with Columnes and Architrabe, Freeze, and / Coronice*'.[15] As he observes, the employment of classicism creates an aestheticized sense of calmness as the scene changes for the better. To this assertion I would add that this implies that the classicized scene was not possible before the arrival of the royal court, despite Cecil's own lofty ambitions.

The 'Genivs' of Theobalds is left dumbfounded at the transformation of the scene: 'WHat sight is this, so strange! and full of state! / The sonne of a MAIA, making his descent / Vnto the fates, and met with *good Euent*.'[16] We can detect here a significant interplay between both Jacobean conceptions of the early modern court, as architecture (the 'Genivs') is given enough prominence to articulate astonishment and so the importance of aesthetic display and the permanence of the building is conveyed. On the other hand, the scene demonstrates wonder at precisely the opposite definition of courtly space, as a visiting monarchical presence transforms elite space and the court is 'with' monarchy. As the entertainment progresses, it is made obvious just how much Cecil is required to submit to royal authority, as the new owners of the house are lavished with praise, a eulogy that subordinates Cecil absolutely. As Mercury explains, it is important that the Genius understands how lucky he is for the building to be appropriated into the royal household: 'That he may know, and knowing, blesse his lot, / That such a grace, beyond his hopes, hath got.'[17] That this is because of the monarchical status of the new owners is then made explicit by Clotho: 'When, vnderneath thy roofe, is seene / The greatest King, and fairest Queene, / With

---

[15] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 155, lines 29-30. Italics are reproduced from the edited text. See Knowles, '"To Raise a House of Better Frame"', p. 189.

[16] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 155, lines 44-46. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[17] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 155, lines 56-7.

Princes an vnmatched payre.'[18] Of course, whereas this quotation implies monarchical presence, what is actually taking place is the transfer of a courtly space. Even then, however, the complications of the conveyance of elite space are expressed as the Genius stays loyal to Cecil:

> But is my Patron with this lot content,
> So to forsake his fathers moniment?
> Or, is it gaine, or else necessitie,
> Or will to raise a house of better frame,
> That makes him shut forth his posteritie
> Out of his patrimonie, with his name?[19]

Although the entertainment is paying the necessary compliments to the royal family, it is also true that we can still detect a Cecilian self-assertion. The subtle point that a new, better building might be raised that outdoes Theobalds does not seem to entirely support a view of total subordination to monarchical presence and ownership.[20]

The reply to the Genius's query from Mercury might be interpreted as a little blunt: 'Nor gaine, nor need; much lesse a vaine desire, / To frame new roofes, or build his dwelling higher; / He hath, with mortar, busied beene too much, / That his affections should continue such.'[21] Even then, the Genius of the place continues to back Cecil's right to the property, forcing Mercury to order him to obey. Following on from this, it is left to Lachesis to voice the divinity of the new owners in order to firmly assert the monarchical dominance of this elite space:

> The person, for whose royall sake,
> Thou must a change so happie make,
> Is he, that gouernes with his smile,
> This lesser world, this greatest Isle.
> His Ladies seruant thou must be;

---

[18] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 156, lines 59-61.

[19] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 156, lines 74-9.

[20] On Cecil's involvement with patronage, see Knowles, '"To Raise a House of Better Frame"'.

[21] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 156, lines 81-84.

> Whose second would great NATVRE see,
> Or FORTVNE, after all their paine,
> They might depaire to make againe.[22]

This passage cleverly contextualizes the space of Theobalds into the wider realm that makes up James's whole kingdom. Owing to this assertion of divine control, the seizure of the aristocratic space becomes the logical conclusion to the debate. Instantly, when the new owners are revealed so strikingly to the Genius, the full implications hit home: 'Mourn'd I before? Could I commit a sinne / So much 'gainst kind, or knowledge, to protract / a ioy, to which I should haue rauish'd beene, / And neuer shall be happie, till I act?'[23] Like the Dekker entertainment from 1604, discussed in the last chapter, it is interesting to note how the commandeering of an alternative space by monarchy (whether that is a civic or aristocratic space) requires that space's former identity to be 'rauish'd' away and consumed. After the full assertion of monarchical authority, the Genius has no choice but 'To yeeld these keyes' to Anna.[24] Yet Theobalds was not the only space that was to submit to the presence of the queen consort. As we shall see, Anna's use of progressing and the accompanying entertainment culture further strengthened links between the court as the place of monarchical presence and as a literalized and fixed architectural setting.

'Her princely court': progressing and Anna of Denmark

Throughout the period, a multitude of surviving textual evidence adds weight to the diverse, polycentric world of Jacobean court culture and its various spaces and landscapes. For instance, from earlier in the period we have other texts from 1606 that relate to the visit of the king of Denmark, such as John Ford's *HONOR*

---

[22] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 157, lines 96-103.

[23] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 158, 114-17.

[24] Jonson, *An Entertainment of King James*, p. 158, line 120.

TRIVMPHANT, another account of the visit to London and also to Theobalds by Henry Robarts, as well as a description of the Danish king's departure by the same author.[25] Also, we have a text for John Marston's entertainment for the Dowager-Countess of Derby from 1607, as well as a series of texts that relate to Prince Henry from 1610.[26] Correspondingly, the marriage of James's daughter, Princess Elizabeth, to the Elector Palatine in 1613 resulted in the printing of an assortment of entertainments that celebrated the match.[27]

However, in this section I continue to assess the importance of Anna of Denmark, as it is the Stuart queen, rather than Prince Henry, who constitutes the greatest alternative court culture to James's one at Whitehall and beyond. Crucially for this study, it was also Anna who participated in her own progressing culture, helping the Jacobean court to extend itself further away from London than is usually acknowledged in modern critical and historical discourse, thus spreading the court to other areas of the kingdom whilst also defining a separate feminine court world for

---

[25] See John Ford, *HONOR TRIVMPHANT. OR The Peeres Challenge, by Armes defensible, at Tilt, Turney, and Barriers [...] ALSO The Monarches meeting: OR The King of Denmarkes welcome into England.* (London, 1606); Henry Robarts, *THE Most royall and Honourable entertainment, of the famous and renowned King, CHRISTIERN the fourth, King of Denmarke* (London, 1606); Robarts, *Englands Farewell to Christian the fourth, famous King of Denmarke: with a relation of such shewes & seuerall pastimes presented to his Maiestie, as well at Court* (London, 1606).

[26] John Marston, *THE ENTERTAINMENT of the Dowager-Countess of Darby*, (also known as the *Ashby Entertainment*), in *The Poems of John Marston*, ed. by Arnold Davenport (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1961), pp. 191-207; *CHESTERS TRIVMPH IN HONOR OF HER PRINCE* (London, 1610); *LONDONS LOVE TO THE ROYAL PRINCE HENRIE* (London, 1610); *The Order and Solemnitie of the Creation of the High and mightie Prince HENRIE* (London, 1610). On the Marston text, see Knowles, 'Marston, Skipwith and *The Entertainment at Ashby*', *English Manuscript Studies*, 3 (1992), pp. 137-92.

[27] George Chapman's *Memorable Masque* was actually performed at Whitehall, but see also John Taylor, *Heauens Blessing, And Earths Ioy. OR A true relation, of the supposed Sea-fights & Fire-workes, as were accomplished, before the Royall Celebration, of the al-beloved Marriage, of the two peerlesse Paragons of Christendome, FREDERICKE & ELIZABETH.* (London, 1613); John Taylor, *THE MAGNIFIcent marriage of the two great Princes, Fredericke Count-palatine, & c and the Lady Elizabeth, daughter to the imperiall maiesties of King Iames, and Queene Anne to the comfort of all great Britaine.* (London, 1613). Lastly, there is also the anonymous *THE MAGNIFICENT, Princely, and most Royall Entertainmnets giuen to the High and Mightie Prince, and Princesse, FREDERICK, Count Palatine, Pallgraue of the Rhyne: and ELIZABETH, sole Daughter to the High and Mighty King of England, Iames, our Soueraigne Lord.* (London, 1613).

Anna and her train.[28] However, whereas McManus has investigated the existence of this alternative court culture, in this section I situate this important point within contemporary debates about court definitions.

That Anna progressed on her own without James is perhaps less surprising after the research of Knowles and McManus, stressing, as it does, the self-assertion of the queen in this fluid culture.[29] In a related point, Knowles has argued that Anna's 1613 western progress (her most significant progress on her own, without James) gestures towards a more aggressive-than-usual self-assertion of independence from the 'central' definition of Jacobean courtly authority at Whitehall. Importantly, Knowles correctly makes a direct link with a nostalgic Elizabethanism, because

> the elaboration of the 1613 progress [...] belongs to this assertion of distance by Anna and that she opportunistically used the Elizabethan echoes in the entertainments offered *en route* to stress her political and aesthetic divergences from the Jacobean court.[30]

It is imperative to recognize how Anna strengthened the Jacobean court's claim to a complex polycentrism by expanding the implications of the signifier 'court'. In doing so, I believe, Anna's embrace of Elizabethan-type progressing means that the court retains this stress on portability and monarchical presence in addition to an overall extension. This progress embraces the idea of the court as the place visited by the sovereign because Anna's presence encourages the expansion of the court. It also foregrounds spatial complexity by locating aspects of that court beyond Whitehall.

---

[28] For Anna's assertion of a female court alongside and also in opposition to James's court, see McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage* in its entirety. See also, McManus's edited collection, *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), particularly her introduction (pp. 1-17), as well as Knowles's chapter, '"To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise": Anna of Denmark, Elizabeth I and the Images of Royalty', pp. 21-48. See also Leeds Barroll, 'The Court of the First Stuart Queen', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 191-208.

[29] See McManus, *Women and Culture*, p. 2.

[30] Knowles, '"To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise"', p. 23.

Despite this, however, the importance placed on Anna's own monarchical attendance undercuts the usual stress in this definition that normally places great emphasis on the genuine ruler being present (in this case James). Rather, here progressing defines a separate and yet complimentary alternative court space that solidifies aspects of Jacobean and courtly spatial definition but calls into questions and fractures elements of these definitions. As courtly culture expands during the reign of James, therefore, there are other factors for this development, other than the king's identity as a Scottish king.

For instance, with the death of Henry and Cecil, as well as the departure of Princess Elizabeth, had it not been for the queen, the Jacobean reign would have been less polycentric than before, as so many potential sites for patronage (and the accompanying articulation of multiple political discourses) had now disappeared. Not only were Cecil and the prince keen patrons of the arts, it was this patronage that added to the multiplicity of voices in the period. Equally, in 1613 the outgoing and ambitious future Duke of Buckingham, George Villiers, was not yet on the scene and therefore had not had the chance to add another layer of complexity to the courtly culture, as he would, for instance, with his circle's 'running masque' towards the end of the decade.

Not only was Anna utilizing Elizabethan imagery, she was partaking in a very Elizabethan way of doing things in progressing, as well as witnessing what might be termed progress entertainments. Even without the imagery and use of Spenserianism that Knowles has mined for us, we have to stress that the very independent, self-assertive nature of a (female) progress marked the entire event as a culturally significant intervention in the early modern discourse of court culture and space. Having decided to progress, Anna embraced the entertainment culture favoured

previously by the Elizabethan system, marking her court as a moveable and, crucially, performative structure of royal authority. The queen witnessed two entertainments on her progress, and these texts were viewed as important enough to justify contemporaneous publication through the London press. Likewise, the printing of these texts underscores the polycentric nature of this world, as knowledge about these elite spaces is dispersed to the wider literate public.

One of the entertainments, Campion's *Entertainment at Caversham*, was a distinctly Elizabethan affair, recalling as it did the queen's progressing culture.[31] Likewise, the other entertainment at Bristol was really a civic entry, and so recalled the royal entries of both Elizabeth and James, whilst meaning that, at the same time, aspects of the Jacobean court continue to partake in a cultural dialogue with alternative, civic spaces.[32] However, I now wish to draw attention towards the court's continued employment of an architectural discourse in the two entertainments. Indeed, although Anna's embracement of a progressing culture signals her acceptance of spatial fluidity in terms of court space, the competing presence of architecturalism in these entertainments suggests Anna's awareness of a need to formally distance herself from James's Whitehall by utilizing other fixed structures that her presence was able to fashion into semi-courtly spaces.[33]

---

[31] See Knowles, '"To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise"', p. 24. See also Thomas Campion, *The Caversham Entertainment*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 92-101.

[32] See Robert Naile, *A RELATION OF THE ROYALL MAGNIFICENT, AND sumptuous Entertainement, giuen to the High, and Mighty Princesse, Queene ANNE, at the renowned Citie of Bristoll, by the Mayor, Sheriffes, and Aldermen thereof; in the Moneth of Iune last past, 1613.* (London, 1613).

[33] As Knowles has already shown, Anna was particularly interested in building and architecture, and had her own palaces in several locations, most notably Somerset / Denmark House. Similarly, she altered aspects of Greenwich House. See '"To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise"', pp. 30-33.

The spectacle at Bristol

In the civic entertainment for Anna's procession into Bristol, it is noticeable that the text was rushed out of the presses. This example of the link between an entrepreneurial printing culture and royal progresses means that the text that survives had to be printed and available for literary consumption as quickly as possible. As the author tells the mayor of Bristol in the prefatory material,

> I haue thought good to tempt your acceptance in this small presentment of her Maiesties royall Entertainment: which although it be not beautified with refined words, nor yet sufficiently adorned with Poetical tearmes, as the worthinesse of the subiect requireth, yet resting on your fauourable censures, and therewithall, desiring you that euen as the skilfull Geometritian, who at the games of *Olimpus* by the bignes of *Hercules* foot gessed of the stature of his whole body: euen so by the outward view of this small treatise you would vouchsafe to measure the willingnes of mine inward intent, if that my power were correspondent to my ready heart.[34]

The entertainment, then, in whatever form, was an important textual marker of the queen's visit, an entry that 'should not be forgotten'.[35] This point is reiterated in the author's address to the reader, in which the consumer of the text is warned '[*e*]*xpect not heare a refined phrase in these my verse I sing, / My Muse hath neuer dranke as yet of the* Castalian *Spring*'.[36] Naile goes on to blame the lack of literary and aesthetic skill on offer in the text on his own inabilities as a poet. However, this surely has more to do with the need to spread the word about Anna's important visit. As a poem to the writer by John Payne makes clear before the actual entertainment is recalled, it is crucial that the 'entertainment of our gracious Queene' is distributed around the wider country.[37] Despite a lack of literary skill, this is a story that must be told.

---

[34] Naile, *A RELATION*, sig. A2r-A2v. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

[35] Naile, *A RELATION*, sig A2v.

[36] Naile, *A RELATION*, sig. A3v. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

[37] Naile, *A RELATION*, sig. A4v.

As the entertainment begins the reader is immediately greeted with a monumentalizing architectural metaphor that fixes the importance of the queen's visit into a tangible space:

> The monuments so much renown'd that mighty Monarches reare,
> *Piramids* and *Colosso's* great doe moulder downe and weare
> In tract of time; so that no forme nor fashion they retaine,
> Whereby the Passengers may say, Here once they did remaine:
> But vertuous deedes, which by the Muse preserued are for aye,
> Shall still abide when date of these is passed cleane away:
> For virtues fame immortall is, and neuer shall it dye,
> Though vnderground, consum'd to dust, a thousand yeares we lye.
> Great *Peleus* Sonne, by *Hectors* death, had neuer famous beene,
> Had *Homer* grac'd him not with his immortalizing penne.
> Shall I let sleepe in silence then what these mine eyes haue seene,
> *Bristols* renowned prayse, set forth in welcomming our *Queene?*[38]

This passage is vitally important, as architectural magnificence is downgraded beneath literary achievement in Naile's opinion. Nevertheless, the immediate assertion of the architectural trope of early Stuart culture is still prominent, as the italicization of '*Bristol*' automatically classicizes the civic structure of the city alongside great figures such as *Peleus*, *Hector*, and *Homer*.[39] Indeed, implying that 'mighty monarches reare' structures that disappear like dust over the centuries is not exactly a brilliant manoeuvre of panegyric persuasion to the visiting queen, particularly when we remember her architectural interests, as evidenced at Greenwich House and Somerset House.

Later in the text, civic pride is severely downgraded as the queen consort approaches with her court:

> No sooner did her *Graces* Traine approach our Cities bound,

---

[38] Naile, *A RELATION*, sig. B1r. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

[39] For the familiar comparison between architect and writer, something that Jonson acknowledged, see Ian Donaldson, *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), particularly p. 66. For a thorough discussion of Jonson, Renaissance poetry, and architectural theory, see A. W. Johnson, *Ben Jonson: Poetry and Architecture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

> And that her Harold gan draw neere, with blast of Trumpets sound. Submissiue prostrate on his knees, the Mayor then fell downe.[40]

In this passage the emphasis on Anna's 'Traine' makes a self-referential point about the accompanying progress culture and the sense of this occasion as a royal entry into a city space. Equally, the civic realm is marked by an architectural permanence emphasized by the 'Cities bound'. The theme of civic subordination to the crown is continued in the speech by the Recorder of the city, who exclaims that,

> Bristoll, *which to our ioy and great content hath beene*
> *For euermore the accounted still the Chamber of the* Queene
> *Of* England, *is and euer will, as yet hath beene to fore, (more*
> *Vnto* Queene ANNE, *our gracious* Queene, *much bound for euer*
> *And I this Cities worthlesse mouth, which tasted haue full oft*
> *Your Princely fauours bountifull, on me bestow'd for nought Of worthinesse in mee you found.*[41]

Therefore, the civic space of Bristol is promoted into a courtly space or queenly 'Chamber', but, of course, this manoeuvre necessarily prioritizes the courtly above the civic in the hierarchy of elite spaces. Likewise, the city's Recorder / speaker is actually 'worthlesse' until Anna's presence bequeaths a sense of 'worthinesse'. Again, then, the battles and interactions present when Jacobean courtly space interacts with civic space draw our attention to the paradox of Jacobean courtliness that is the central concern of this chapter. Yet again, a courtly visit overwhelms other spaces, revealing the way in which definitions of courtly space can exist side by side. Here we have a set of complex interactions between competing discourses of architecture, progressing and court formation.

As the text continues, however, something interesting and unexpected happens to the rival worlds of city and courtly space and the accompanying duality of

---

[40] Naile, *A RELATION*, sig. B1v. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

[41] Naile, *A RELATION*, sig. B2v. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

progressing culture and fixed architectural permanence: the 'concrete' civic world is able to protect the moveable courtly domain:

> Admiring at this sodaine sight, the viewes these martiall Bands,
> How each in his assigned place, in order firmely stands
> On eyther side of *Bristoll* streetes firme ioyned like a wall
> To guard her *Grace* vnto the Court, lest ought might her befall
> Through rashnesse of the multitude, which might her grace annoy,
> By pressing on for to behold, their loue, their life, their ioy.[42]

Here the courtly space of Anna and her train is presented as slightly vulnerable, needing the civic space to offer protection from the crowds. At the same time, it is evident that it is these very people who belong to the city and they are, of course, part of that same civic structure. Equally, there is a sense in which the city space is upgraded so as to offer protection to the visiting courtly realm. In order to do this, Bristol and its citizens have to architecturalize the space by forming a protective and symbolic wall, as the Bristol text illustrates the complex negotiation of space, and, particularly, courtly and elite space, in Jacobean society.

'Refined by travel': Caversham and Queen Anna

If Naile's work underscores the expansion of the Jacobean court, then the performance of Campion's *Caversham Entertainment* for Anna later on the same progress meant that other areas of the English landscape participated in this revaluation of court culture. In order to continue the exploration of courtly and aristocratic spaces and any trace of an architectural aesthetic I now analyse Campion's text, as the interrelation of these spaces is vital for my understanding of Jacobean court culture, as well as the role of the queen consort. Again, then, we can see how these cultural interactions inform competing definitional approaches to Jacobean court space.

---

[42] Naile, *A RELATION*, sig. B3r. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

In Campion's text, the subtitle of the printed work makes it clear that this entertainment was for a monarchical presence, yet took place at an aristocratic space: 'A Relation of the Late Royal Entertainment / given by the Right Honourable the Lord Knollys / at Caversham House near Reading / to our most gracious Queen. Queen Anne, / in her Progress toward the Bath / upon the seven and eight and twenty days of April. / 1613.'[43] This statement draws attention to the nature of a progress in which aspects of the court visit the realm of an important aristocrat. Owing to this, Elizabethanism and progress culture are foregrounded by use of the word 'entertainment' rather than 'masque'.[44] Therefore, imagery and the importance of progressing link together to form a combined sense of Elizabethanism, which in the court culture is coupled together with the Whitehall-based emphasis of the masques of writers like Jonson.

Significantly, the text was an important marker of Anna's own royal authority independent of James. As Campion's introduction to the entertainment makes apparent, the performance and textual recording of the event '*hath been much desired in writing, / both of such as were present at the performance thereof, as also of many / which are yet strangers both to the business and place, it shall be / convenient in this general publication a little to touch at the description / and situation of Caversham seat.*'[45] This quotation situates yet another masque or progress entertainment within a culture of newsgathering and circulation for the wider public, as the polycentric nature of Jacobean court culture actually meant that the importance

---

[43] Campion, *Caversham*, p. 92.

[44] Also, as Knowles has made clear, 'Campion [...] establishes considerable aesthetic and political distance from Jonson's antique classicism.' See Knowles, '"To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise"', p. 35.

[45] Campion, *Caversham*, p. 92, lines 1-5. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

of print history, print runs, and the general circulation of masque texts has often been ignored by literary criticism and cultural history.[46] The passage also adds weight to the theory that this courtly structure was not confined to the Whitehall masquing space. The entertainment is keen to stress an overtly aristocratic space in the text, pointedly referring to the fact that this masquing scene is far removed from London and Whitehall.

Campion then consolidates this viewpoint by pointing out the permanence and solidity of the aristocratic space by employing an architectural register: "*The house is fairly built of brick, / mounted on the hillside of a park within view of Reading, they being / severed about the space of two miles.*"[47] Of course, this passage stresses a notable pastoralism, figuring the elite space as part of a rural community, whilst the mention of Reading hints at a very subtle sense of civic identity. Simultaneously, however, the text points to the travelling court of Anna, often referring to her presence as "*the Queen and her train*" or similar.[48] Likewise, later in the work Campion highlights the advantage of being "refined by travel" for the academic visitor.[49]

Owing to the various devices employed by Campion, such as pastoralism, courtliness, Elizabethanism, and the acknowledgment of the importance of a progressing culture, the text manages to achieve its central aims, as the Jacobean court is honoured, whilst, at the same time, Anna's own independence is presented subtly. Notably, Campion manages to preserve the spatial integrity of an independent

---

[46] See Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture in the Masque*, (forthcoming 2007); Richard Cust, 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 112 (1986), 60-90.

[47] Campion, *Caversham*, p. 92, lines 5-7. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[48] Campion, *Caversham*, p. 92, line 15. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[49] Campion, *Caversham*, p. 98, lines 218-19. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

aristocratic house, while still paying homage to Anna's court.[50] However, as this chapter has demonstrated, such a move has multiple influences on the definition of court space, as theatrical activity helps fashion a court world beyond Whitehall, yet still requires Anna's queenly presence to authorize spatial definition of the court. Furthermore, of particular importance is Anna's involvement in the complex assertions of Jacobean courtly space and so, in the surviving texts surveyed in this chapter, the queen is a crucial part of the expansion of the court during the reign of James. With this in mind, I now turn to other texts that emphasize a courtly, elite culture beyond Whitehall as 'the court' visits aristocratic spaces.

---

[50] The later 1617 masque, Robert White's *Cupid's Banishment*, had complementary yet different points to make. See McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, particularly pp. 164-201. At p. 165 McManus places a useful emphasis on 'the nature of the institution of the court' in light of this entertainment's performance. White's text has been edited and is reproduced in *Renaissance Drama by Women: Texts and Documents*, ed. by S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wyne-Davies (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), pp. 76-90.

Chapter 4 'The Finer Walled Places': Expanding Courtly Space in Aristocratic Entertainments and the Major Jacobean Progress

Introduction

This chapter demonstrates the continued expansion of the court of James I by investigating aristocratic entertainments away from Whitehall together with an analysis of the major progress of the reign, as the court journeyed to Scotland in 1617. The wealth of surviving masquing activity from Whitehall, analyzed in the next chapter, might suggest that this generic form should be closely associated with the principal royal residence. However, as I illustrate in this section, such an explanation does not do justice to the dualism of Jacobean court space. As we have seen, from 1603 the Jacobean period brought with it an extraordinary growth in terms of ways of conceptualizing elite space, and separate chapters have demonstrated this by highlighting James's status as a king of two realms and Anna's position as queen consort. With this in mind, I now build on recent studies on aristocratic and courtly masquing activity away from Whitehall Palace. However, departing from previous criticism, I demonstrate that these entertainments exemplify the expanding, dual definition of the early modern court as both moveable and architecturally fixed in the Jacobean period, as 'the court' indicates a more subjective series of competing categorizations than was the case during the reign of Elizabeth.

Thanks to the recent efforts of James Knowles, Martin Butler, and Timothy Raylor, we are now able to explore textual evidence that testifies to the existence of an 'alternative' masquing culture in the Jacobean period.[1] Nevertheless, although a text such

---

[1] See James Knowles, 'The "Running Masque" Recovered: A Masque for the Marquess of Buckingham (c. 1619-20)', *English Manuscript Studies*, 9 (2000), 79-135; Martin Butler, 'Jonson's *News from the New World*, the "Running Masque", and the season of 1619-20', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*,

as the anonymous 'Essex House Masque' offers proof of this substituted scene. like White's *Cupid's Banishment*, the entertainment allows us only a glimpse of a different, non-Whitehall space and hints suggestively at the idea of a moveable masquing world. Many of these texts carry an 'alternative' status, in terms of the venue of their theatrical performance, but other masques, such as Ben Jonson's *A Masque of the Metamorphosed Gypsies* (1621) and, particularly, in the case of this chapter, the anonymous 'running masque', allow us to probe aspects of moveable and fixed courtly space.[2] Both texts are slightly unusual in that they were repeatedly staged at different royal, aristocratic and courtly spaces.

I believe the 'portable masque' helps us to contextualise Jacobean masques, as well as progress entertainments. As the early Stuart era witnessed the continuation of a progressing culture, the later reign did, at least partially, reject the pageantry and entertainments that marked the Elizabethan progresses. Owing to this, there was a contradictory shift towards the Whitehall masque. However, the recent revaluation of Jacobean entertainment culture (particularly the discovery of the 'running masque' and its accompanying portability) means that we can now examine the complex negotiation of progressing and masquing culture, as the supposedly concrete world of the Jacobean masque is energized by the portability of the Elizabethan entertainment. Therefore, an understanding of elite space is vital to a critical re-contextualization of the Jacobean

---

6 (1993), 153-78; Timothy Raylor, *The Essex House Masque of 1621: Viscount Doncaster and the Jacobean Masque* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2000).

[2] On Jonson's masque, see Dale B. J. Randall, *Jonson's Gypsies Unmasked: Background and Theme of 'The Gypsies Metamorphos'd'* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1975). See also Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture in the Masque* (forthcoming 2007), particularly chapter 3.

masque in light of my central concern with competing definitions of the early modern court.

Buckingham's 'running masque'

Our ideas about Jacobean masquing culture have been greatly altered since the 2000 publication of Buckingham's aristocratic entertainment.[3] A 'running masque', of course, differed from the more common form of the genre owing to its multiple performances at a variety of aristocratic and courtly spaces, and the text derives from the circle around the (then) Marquess of Buckingham, from 1619-20.[4] Alongside Jonson's 1617 *Lovers Made Men* and the discovery of the 'Essex House Masque' (see pp. 117-21), we can now explore three 'London house masque[s] [...] [and view] how such occasions differed from the more familiar country-house masques'.[5] This adds to our emerging sense of Jacobean court culture's portability, enabling us to 'examine how the polycentric elite of early modern England utilised masques, tilts, entertainments, entries and processions as tools of cultural and political negotiation, part of a widespread intertextual interaction between court masques and a wider 'masquing culture''.[6] Rather than prioritizing Whitehall, therefore, many masques actually enhanced the open-endedness of the Jacobean court. Furthermore, once this is acknowledged it becomes evident that this point should be taken further: masque performances at both Whitehall and those beyond

---

[3] See Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered'. As Knowles has discovered, edited and commented extensively on this entertainment, any discussion of the performance and text, like this study, is influenced by his work. See also Butler, 'Jonson's *News from the New World*'.

[4] Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered', p. 79. He observes, 'only two possible periods for the performance [...] [are possible]: July 1619 to July 1620 and December 1620 to July 1621'. p. 84.

[5] Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered', p. 79.

[6] Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered', p. 79.

the principal royal palace meant that this peculiarly early Stuart form of activity embodied the development of courtly space under James.

Yet there is a further observation to be made here about the text, as, unlike the 'Essex House Masque', the 'running masque' belongs to a sub-genre of the non-Whitehall entertainment culture, 'so-called because it was 'run' (transported) from house to house.'[7] Owing to this development, I want to conjecture an intermediary path for the 'portable' masque, whether that be the new 'running masque', or a more familiar multi-performance masque such as Jonson's 1621 *Gypsies*, which had three performances. Certainly, in terms of the much-travelled Buckingham text, there is a sense of the portability of not just the masque, but also of the accompanying courtly structure that evolved around the leading courtiers, and, particularly, the powerful Buckingham (see footnote 7). Furthermore, we can imagine the polycentrism of court culture being consolidated by the trail of 'running masque' performance, both around London and away from Whitehall. I suggest that there was a sense of 'the court' at these performances, despite the fact that the events are not at a royal palace, and are without the authorizing presence of the monarch. This points once more to the complex negotiation of elite spaces in the Jacobean period.

In relation to this, Knowles observes that '[t]he itinerary of the running masque, between the major London aristocratic houses, illustrates the diaspora of masquing

---

[7] Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered', p. 83. He continues: 'It was performed at the French Ambassador's residence on 3 January, at Lady Hatton's on the 4th, at the Earl of Exeter's on the 5th, at the Earl of Warwick's on the 7th, at Viscount Doncaster's on the 8th, with an additional performance planned at Somerset House on the 9th, but perhaps cancelled, and with further out-of-town performances during the first two weeks of February.' These dates refer to the January 1620 Masquing season. Knowles has excavated this material from a variety of contemporary sources that mention the performance of an unspecified masquing text that 'ran' from place to place in the season. It is almost certain that this is the same masque discovered by Knowles and discussed here. Even if this is not the case, the contemporary evidence points to the definite existence of a courtly running masque entertainment culture.

culture'.[8] Taking this further, we can view the move as something of an intercession in terms of a static masquing culture and the perseverance of the need for courts to travel and to grace other elite spaces. Despite the existence of many of the 'courtly' entertainments beyond Whitehall, it is tempting to see the dominance of the Jonsonian masque and men like Buckingham (who danced, for instance, in Jonson's *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* in 1618), as offering a fixed idea of a court setting at Whitehall, particularly because of the number of entertainments performed there. One conclusion to be drawn from this, therefore, might be that an important courtier like Buckingham who took part in such entertainments at Whitehall helped to solidify courtly activity at the royal residence. However, it is vitally important to stress that Buckingham's 'running masque' complicates this picture immensely by further consolidating the open-endedness and moveability of Jacobean court space, an elite realm that was constantly redefining conceptualizations of itself.[9]

The masque begins with the entrance of the Master of the Revels. Significantly, this beginning locates the performance(s) as part of an ongoing tradition and entertainment culture, as, clearly, the court culture has a need for such a figure in the first place. The dramatization of the Master foregrounds Whitehall's dual position as a space of officialdom as well as of theatrical activity and vibrancy. This sense of the 'here and

---

[8] Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered', p. 91.

[9] Of course, the same point can refer to Jonson's *Gypsies* and Buckingham's role in that masque. See also Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered', p. 95, where he observes that the portability of the running masque amongst a small, elite circle of courtiers (unlike the 'popular' progress texts) had a certain suitability for James's court, as he enjoyed a 'peripatetic hunting entourage'. Similarly, '[t]he familiarity of this mobile court [...] generated a jokey, bawdy, almost 'laddish' culture, typified by hunting, drinking, practical jokes and improvised amusements.' p. 95. For a very recent investigation of Buckingham and the discourse of favoritism, see Curtis Perry, *Literature and Favoritism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

now' of courtly performance (despite the performance not being at a royal palace) is highlighted by the Scholar's acknowledgement, as he speaks to the Master, of the high levels of expenditure associated with masquing culture:

> you know allready, that the kinge, and many / of his Subiect for Maskes, Playes, Shewes, Tilltinges and other / Triumphes are putt to a great, and to a yearely charge in Liueryes, / Caparasons, Embroderies, Lace, and such Complements of State and / Brauery.[10]

The text acknowledges the growing sense of an aestheticization at Whitehall and at the other elite spaces forming part of the court culture. The most notable feature of this, however, is the semi-confessional status of the acknowledgment: in registering the cost of Whitehall masques, the entertainment beyond Whitehall self-referentially becomes a part of that court culture and space. There is absolutely no sense of James's palace at Whitehall being an entirely separate elite culture in this text, because this performance and its participants are merely an extension of the court.

This theme continues later in the text, when the Master, observing a procession of antimasquers, remarks how 'Theis I confesse are pretty fellowes, and would do well at the Sea / Syde at a fishinge for Pilcherds but the kinge will neuer like them.'[11] This begs a question: in the fictional world of the masque, where 'are' the actors and spectators meant to be situated at this moment in time? If this is Whitehall, owing to the Master's presence and the gesture towards James, then an alternative aristocratic space is able to stage Whitehall. On the other hand, it could be that this venue is so much a part of the court culture as to really be part of 'the court' itself, particularly with the presence of

---

[10] Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered', p. 107, lines 92-6. See p. 101 for more on the text's articulation of the cost of masquing, including the expenditure on the new Banqueting House by Jones.

[11] Knowles, '"The Running Masque" Recovered', p. 110, lines 205-06.

aristocrats such as Buckingham. Once more in Jacobean culture, there is a marked, self-referencing openness about elite spaces, be they 'courtly' or 'aristocratic', or part of a unified whole.

'From out of this stony judgement': 1621 and the 'Essex house masque'

Further evidence was unearthed by Raylor when he discovered the manuscript for a masque in 1995. In conjunction with the work of Butler and Knowles, the existence of this masque helped critical discourse to a better understanding of what Raylor terms 'the 'lost' festive season of 1620-21'.[12] Moreover, this breakthrough added strength to the work on the polycentrism of Jacobean court culture by revealing another masquing space and its aristocratic patron or commissioner. As Raylor makes clear, the entertainment 'was danced for the king, the court, and the visiting French ambassador on the evening of 8 January 1621 at the London residence of James Hay, Viscount Doncaster'.[13] Indeed, Raylor contends that 'the court' in this instance really does signify royal and aristocratic presence: 'Doncaster's guests included [...] the king and Prince Charles, the marquess of Buckingham and his wife, [and] the countesses of Dorset and of Warwick. [...] [With] the ambassador [also] present, the court was on display here, no less than at Whitehall. And with James present, also, Doncaster's residence became, out of courtesy, the king's.'[14] However, as far as we are aware, the masque was danced on just the one occasion, meaning that this was no running or portable masque. Even so, its relationship to the Buckingham masque, as well as the merging of monarchical and aristocratic

---

[12] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. xi. The text of the masque is presented at pp. 17-42. Raylor speculates that the masque was written by George Chapman with Inigo Jones, pp. 138-51.

[13] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p.1.

[14] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 70, p. 71.

spaces at the performance mean that a brief discussion of this text belongs in this chapter, rather than the next chapter's exploration of the Whitehall masques.

Raylor's examination of the politics of the performance and its manuscript points to the courtly nature of this event, despite the removal of the proceedings to a space beyond the Banqueting House:

> As a transaction between the courtier and his king, its substitution of Pallas for Hercules praises the king for his wisdom and abhorrence of violence. For despite Pallas's militarist and potentially subversive symbolic value, the manner of her victory requires no act of violence. The masque thus locates itself firmly within the iconographic program of James's court, a program in which the king's association of himself with Pallas played a central symbolic role. But in its introduction of the Worthies, the masque also registers Doncaster's commitment to the Protestant cause.[15]

Political discourse, therefore, is still very much apparent in a masque away from a more familiar setting. Although Raylor stresses correctly the way in which the house becomes part of the visiting king's property as the court appropriates an aristocratic space, I wish to gesture towards the complexity of this spatial negotiation. As we have seen throughout this thesis, the seizure and refashioning of one type of elite space into another variation is hard to achieve and transformations in the text often indicate areas of problematization.

In 'The Essex House Masque' the idea that a social space can be available for appropriation, seizure or refashioning is made clear from the entertainment's beginning. After a song by Tellus the antimasquers appear, disappear, and then nine rebellious

---

[15] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, pp. 108-09. Of course, the figure of Pallas also reminds us of the appearance of Anna at Hampton Court as far back in the reign as 1604. Similarly, in 1616 Jonson used the figure of Pallas in his Whitehall masque, *The Golden Age Restored*. Raylor also links the text to the earlier running masque by reminding us that '[a]lthough the masque bears witness to an alliance between Doncaster and Buckingham on certain domestic policies, it also suggests a degree of rivalry between them over, among others things, the conventions of masquing – a rivalry which involved a quest for the apt employment of French styles of court entertainment'. p. 111.

giants emerge. After a speech by one of their number, '*they fall into a warrlike dance which is performed to loud musicke.*'[16] Their assertion is not only marked by the long speech (line 40 onwards); the text's report of their actions points out that the giants also '*clime to theire places, where settling themselves*'.[17] The rebellion (initiated because of the Titans' defeat by the gods) requires the imaginative space of the masque to be appropriated by the giants.[18] Of course, as we shall see in more depth in the next chapter's discussion of Jonson's *Masque of Blackness*, these entertainments make considerable theatrical capital out of the blurring of the boundary between real and imagined space. Owing to this, it could be conjectured that the real, non-fictive world of the masquing hall at Essex House is also invaded by the giants, just as James's court has settled upon this aristocratic realm for the performance. As Raylor observes, the first speech by one of the giants pointedly threatens the courtly beauties who have visited Doncaster for the masque performance, as spatial obstacles are shown to be no problem for the threatening rebels.[19]

The revolt is easily thwarted by the emergence of Pallas, who 'locke[s] up [their] madness' by turning the giants to stone.[20] Although the entry of Pallas does not constitute a full architectural reference, it is interesting to note that the transformation of the giants into stone gives their punishment a kind of 'concrete' permanence, as authority has the power to alter what might be seen as the body's architecture. Pallas remarks, 'Fastned to

---

[16] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 20, line 84-85. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[17] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 20, line 86. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[18] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 80.

[19] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 100.

[20] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 20, line 88.

shame wee leave them.'[21] Also, the song that celebrates Pallas's victory over the giants provides an architectural configuration to the event, describing the 'ruine' of the punishment: 'Such be his ruine that can find / So foule a thought about his mind / As the pleasure to conceave.'[22]

The masque then presents a second part, in which the fire of Prometheus is used to change the statues into the first members of the human race. As Raylor points out, when compared with the Jonsonian masque, this is surprising and unique: '[S]omething very unusual now takes place – something the conventional vocabulary of masque criticism [...] does not readily account for [...] [T]he antimasquers are once more transformed', meaning that 'a double transformation' occurs.[23] Interestingly, if we consider the spatial, performative aspects of this second transformation, the aristocratic space is able to outdo the king's own palace by allowing this unique, unconventional transformation of the scene. Certainly, the text links this back to the architectural discourse through the words of Prometheus: 'Make up this lamp of fire: by which we can / Deale soule into cold stone, and raise up man.'[24] Equally it could be speculated that this is deferential to the visit of monarchical authority, as royal presence authorizes the landscape and its accompanying theatrical presence to reanimate stone. The architectural metaphor continues as Prometheus mentions the 'Recov'ringe [of] my ruin'd auncestry / From out this stony judgment.'[25] Finally, there is a necessary ambivalence about the

---

[21] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 21, line 117.

[22] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 21, lines 124-26.

[23] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 81, p. 83.

[24] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 22, lines 174-75.

[25] Raylor, *The Essex House Masque*, p. 23, lines 181-82.

scene, leaving it open as to whether this is an independent magical space, or one supernaturalized by the presence of James and his court.

In both the 'running masque' for Buckingham and his circle and the 'Essex House Masque', we can see how these texts, akin to those discussed earlier in this chapter, consolidate points made by various scholars about the Jacobean court's polycentrism. However, a further, crucial point for this study's overall emphasis is that these works are further textual examples of courtly space attempting to define itself against and through other spaces. In the case of these entertainments, these other spaces are aristocratic and elite, and are thus quite different from the civic spaces examined in chapter 2. Yet all these texts, when grouped together as entertainments away from Whitehall Palace, demonstrate the court's domination by two competing definitions of a court as fixed space and as portable realm. This is made even clearer in my final section in this chapter, as I examine the key progress of the reign.

The 1617 progress

As has been established, in the Jacobean period 'the court' still meant far more than Whitehall Palace or a kingly presence throughout the reign. For instance, as mentioned previously, in 1617 Jonson's *Lovers Made Men* was 'presented in the house of the right honourable the Lord / Hay by divers of noble quality his friends, for the entertainment of / Monsieur le Baron de Tour, extraordinary ambassador for the / French king'.[26] As the text unfolds, it is clear that this aristocratic space has been influenced by the court's classicizing and architecturalizing aesthetic: '*The front before the scene was an arch*

[26] In *Ben Jonson: The Complete Court Masques*, ed. by Stephen Orgel (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1960), pp. 256-62 (p. 256).

triumphal' as the work begins.[27] More familiarly, in 1621, Jonson's *A Masque of the Metamorphosed Gypsies* was presented to the king on three occasions, at Burley-on-the-Hill, Belvoir and Windsor.[28] Lastly, in terms of non-Whitehall Jonsonian masquing, in 1624 *The Masque of Owls* was presented at Kenilworth Castle, in a performance that must have been heightened by the inherent Elizabethanism of the venue, owing to the famous progress entertainment from the previous century. That Jonson, of all writers, participated in the circulation of a courtly / masquing discourse far from Whitehall is particularly notable.[29] If we turn to other writers, the same is true. For instance, from 1618 we have the anonymous *Coleorton Masque*, a text performed by, amongst others, the Earl of Essex, and there is also White's *Cupid's Banishment* for the queen's court.[30] However, further evidence for non-Whitehall courtly space can be found in accounts of the most famous Jacobean progress from London, which describe the king's 1617

---

[27] Jonson, *Lovers made Men*, p. 256, line 1. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[28] The conflated text is in Orgel, *Ben Jonson*, pp. 316-73. See also Randall, *Jonson's Gypsies Unmasked*, p. 67. In a related study, Butler points out that progressing courtiers often depicted themselves as Gypsies; see '"We are one mans all": Jonson's *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991), 253-73 (p. 260). For this text as a running masque, see Butler, 'Jonson's *News from the New World*', p. 162.

[29] However, see Knowles, 'Jonson's *Entertainment at Britain's Burse*', in *Re-presenting Ben Jonson*, ed. by Butler (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), pp. 114-51; Gabriel Heaton and Knowles, '"Entertainment Perfect": Ben Jonson and Corporate Hospitality', *The Review of English Studies*, 54:217, (2003) 587-600. At p. 593 Heaton and Knowles observe that '[t]he gradual recovery of Jonson's civic writings is reshaping our sense of his role as a court writer and his involvement in the occasional entertainments that filled the Jacobean period'. See also pp. 598-99.

[30] See *Court Masques*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 126-35. See also Philip J. Finkelpearl, 'The Fairies' Farewell: *The Masque at Coleorton* (1618)', *The Review of English Studies*, XLVI:183 (1995), 333-51.

journey to Scotland. This allows my chapter to end with an acknowledgment of the court's polycentrism and continuation of the royal progresses during the reign of James.[31]

As I noted in an earlier chapter, the king's journey to Scotland was such a large undertaking that some doubted the feasibility of it actually taking place. However, the official progress took place between March and September 1617 and has often been viewed as a political success. The progress has been ignored by social and cultural historians, and particularly, by literary scholars. Part of the reason for this is the lack of surviving textual evidence that has anything particularly new to tell us about the reign. It is certainly true that the study of such a progress has not fitted within the direction of critical discourse, at least partly because of the influence of David Bergeron's thesis in the early 1970s. Indeed, Bergeron ignored the actual fact that James progressed, and focussed on the lack of accompanying civic pageantry. However, three contemporary accounts of the visit do survive, and I wish to turn to these briefly in order to offer an alternative view of James's progress and, by implication, our own ideas about court space in the period.

The title of one of the works is perhaps typical of the problem: *A SPEACH DELIVERED TO THE KINGS most excellent MAIESTIE, At his Entrie into his Good-Towne of EDINBVRGH upon the XVI. Of May, ANNO DOMINI 1617.*[32] This text, then, records a speech to James rather than a full-blown welcome ceremony of entertainment

---

[31] See G. P. V. Akrigg, *Jacobean Pageant or the Court of King James I* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1962), pp. 259-63; William A. McNeill and Peter G. B. McNeill, 'The Scottish Progress of James VI, 1617', *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXV, 1:199 (1996), 38-51. Also of interest is Knowles's research on Jonson's journey to Scotland the following year: 'Jonson in Scotland: Jonson's Mid-Jacobean Crisis', in *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*, ed. by Takashi Kozuka and J. R. Mulryne (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 259-77.

[32] Edinburgh, 1617.

and pageantry. However, the speech still has much to tell us about the return of James to the city, as well as the implications of this for courtly space. For example, we are immediately reminded of James's removal from Scotland and the city in 1603, in terms of what might be termed a discourse of sadness and remembrance: 'HOW joyfull your Majesties returne (Gracious and dread Soueraigne) [...] This is that happie Day of our New-birth.'[33] The city, therefore, is not only re-energized by the return of the king, it is born-again as the sadness turns to happiness and celebration. In the same way, the text continues, 'by whose remouing from our Hemisphaere, wee were darkened, deepe sorrow and feare possessing our heartes (without enuying your Majesties happinesse and felicitie) our places of solace euer giuing a newe heat to the feuer of the languishing remembrance of our wonted happinesse.'[34] Here a sense of loss intertwines with the importance of place, and, particularly, the king's return to that space, as a civic world is made courtly. Oddly, though, this movement is actually expressed through pastoralism: 'The verie Hilles and Groues accustumed of before to be refreshed with the dewe of your majesties presence.'[35] However, the space of Scotland, whether pastoral or urban, is soon subordinated to monarchical presence, as the text names 'your maiesties Court, the marriage place of Wisedome and Godlinesse'.[36]

One further example is notable at the end of this short publication, as the body of the king is actually merged with the familiar Jacobean trope of an architectural discourse, as monarchical presence blends with the idea of a firm, structural hierarchy:

---

[33] *A SPEACH*, sig. A2r.

[34] *A SPEACH*, sig. A2v.

[35] *A SPEACH*, sig. A2v.

[36] *A SPEACH*, sig. A3v.

> [We] shall euer bee readie to sacrifice and consecrate our selues for maintainance of your Royall Person and Estate: Praying th'Eternall our God, that Peace may bee within your Majesties Walles, Prosperitie within your Majesties Palaces, Lenth of Dayes to your Sacred Person, One from your Majestie's Loynes neuer wanting to weigh the Scepter of these your Majesties Kingdomes, And that Mercie may bee to your Majestie and your Seede for euer.[37]

In this passage, the architecturalism of sacred majesty is expressed through the image of walls and magnificent palaces; but, at the same time, the king's own body undergoes a thorough description, as the register of building moves to the king's loins and subsequent offspring. Again, ideas of power are articulated through a discourse that embraces the physical presence of the sovereign as well as the architectural permanence needed to consolidate that royal body. Significantly, courtly definitions are accessed simultaneously, as the focus on the king's body reminds us the physicality of monarchical presence and the need for this in the 'kingly' or progressing understanding of elite space. Additionally, though, the sense of a solidified and permanent structure suggests the architectural permanence familiar to us from the idea of a court as geographically fixed and centred. Through the evocation of the king's politicized body, therefore, the contours of an emphasis on spatial assertion and definition are apparent.

Another text from the progress records two sermons preached before James during the movement through Scotland.[38] Although the nature of this text means that a courtly discourse is subordinated, as monarchical authority is praised for its godliness, there are traces of the idea of a travelling court arriving at various locations. Similarly, that the sermons were printed in London adds more weight to the idea of these progresses

---

[37] *A SPEACH*, sig. B2r.

[38] *TWO SERMONS PREACHED IN Scotland before the Kings MAIESTY* (London, 1618).

as continually newsworthy cultural events. The text stresses that James may have been in Scotland, but he still enjoyed a court palace, as the king received a 'Welcome, *giuen to his Maiesty in the Royall Chappell of the Palace of* Holy-roode-house, *at his Maiesties comming in*'.[39] Clearly, James may be far away from Whitehall or Hampton Court, but it is a marker of the permanence of his royal authority that wherever he goes the court accompanies him. Owing to this, the text articulates a sense of architectural permanence through the reporting of the existence of a royal palace. Similarly, the court as a collection of courtiers is also touched upon very briefly, when Buckingham is mentioned only a few lines later.[40] Even in a text that foregrounds religion, therefore, Jacobean political and religious theology intertwine in order to mention the importance of elite space, as well as the open-endedness of the signifier 'court'.

The remaining account of the Scottish progress, *Ta ton Mouson eisodia: THE MVSES WELCOME TO THE HIGH AND MIGHTIE PRINCE IAMES*, by John Adamson was not actually printed until the following year, though it did emerge from the Edinburgh presses rather than London.[41] Unlike the other two texts on the Scottish visit, this is a much more thorough affair, chronicling 'his Majesties happie Returne to his olde and natiue *Kingdome* of SCOTLAND, *after* 14 *yeeres absence* IN ANNO 1617'.[42] Likewise, that this is a progress text is made clear on the title page: '*Digested according to the order of his Majesties Progresse, By I. A.*' Clearly, this very large text was meant

---

[39] *TWO SERMONS*, sig. A2v. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

[40] See *TWO SERMONS*, sig. A2v.

[41] John Adamson, *Ta ton Mouson eisodia: THE MVSES WELCOME TO THE HIGH AND MIGHTIE PRINCE IAMES BY THE GRACE OF GOD KING OF GREAT BRITAINE FRANCE AND IRELAND.* (Edinburgh, 1618).

[42] Adamson, *THE MVSES WELCOME*, title page. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

to be viewed as a commemorative tome for the visit of the king; as such, the Edinburgh speech is reproduced (see above), as well as a poem on the king by William of Hawthornden. Interspersed with various Latin and Greek panegyrics are accounts of praise for the king. Although these documents have little to tell us about the court as a spatial concept, they do reveal the importance of the progress to the Scottish people, be they members of the elite or the wider public. Although much of the accompanying pageantry is now lost, it is clear that Jacobean progressing needs to be rethought in historical and critical work, and the same can be said for the later progress texts for Charles I. Indeed, if we remember recent critical discourse on the materiality of the early modern text, it is clear that the mere existence of this volume is a vital footnote to the spatial dynamics of Jacobean court culture. On one level, through its material existence, the text documents the king's return to his homeland on a royal progress. In another way, however, the work testifies to the maintenance of links and dialogues between two courtly worlds in Scotland and in England. It is important to remember that the two courts are geographically separate, yet symbolically, if not politically, unified through the king and his moveable courtly space.

Moreover, this chapter has demonstrated that various kinds of masques and entertainments gave voice to the complex nature of Jacobean court culture. These surviving texts continued to shape that world, helping to fashion an open-ended court space whilst circulating definitions through performance, manuscript or print. However, as the next chapter reveals, a very different courtly discourse resonated more exclusively *from* Whitehall Palace, suggesting further, diverse ideas about court space, as Jacobean elite culture pulled in competing directions. The privileged space of Whitehall, and, in

particular, the masques performed at the palace, are the subject of the next chapter in light of this complexity, as my study reads these 'traditional' masques alongside my work on court expansion. As I disclose, the Jacobean court did indeed solidify at Whitehall through masque performance whilst fragmenting and expanding simultaneously, a dualism that occurred because of James's possession of two kingdoms, the activity of Queen Anna, and, as this chapter has shown, the embrace of aristocratic 'alternative' masquing and the continuation of the royal progresses.

Chapter 5 Whitehall Masquing Culture and Jacobean Court Space

'This house is a Princely thing'[1] *(William Camden)*

Introduction

Despite the Jacobean court's polycentrism, there is substantial evidence for the increased (and contradictory) prioritization of Whitehall Palace in the early Stuart period. This 'fixing' of the court at Whitehall was aided by the presentation of masques, as the primary court palace became seen as a place of performance and was therefore aestheticized by a literary and dramatic focus. This more permanent court undermines the mystery of monarchy perpetuated in James's own discourse, as Whitehall becomes stable, less ambivalent, and more describable, as the continued use of masque performance allows an author's fictions to transform space metaphorically at the point of audience reception. Such a Jacobean prioritization is at odds with the simultaneous expansion of the court culture as discussed in the last chapters, as Whitehall masques, and particularly their accompanying architectural discourse, stress a different kind of court space, and Jacobean culture pulls in opposite directions; prioritizing architectural magnificence, whilst persevering simultaneously with the moveable definition of elite space favoured by Elizabeth I. Conversely, the way that courtly buildings are conveyed in the masque consolidates the idea of an expanding definition of 'court', in the period, as the word signifies variety to a great extent.

In this chapter, I demonstrate how Whitehall masque writers were able to present a particular spatial view of the court and the palace. Correspondingly, this section explores the accompanying use of an architectural motif to achieve this presentation of

---

[1] See William Camden, *Britain, or A chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adioyning, out of the depth of antiquitie beautified with mappes of the seuerall shires of England* (London, 1610), p. 432.

court space, with this read alongside instances of spatial transformation, particularly in Ben Jonson's *Masque of Blackness* from 1605. As will be shown, it is not coincidental that architecture and spatial alteration surface in masques associated with Anna of Denmark, because as chapter 3 revealed, the queen was a key figure in the expansion of the court's meaning. Yet, for monarchical authority, the accelerated use of this architectural discourse and the accompanying emphasis on describable aesthetics undoes some of the mystery of the alternative progressing culture, as 'divine space' is brought down to 'actual place'. Although my earlier chapters have established that Elizabethan and Jacobean progressing often incorporated architectural motifs, the conflicting prioritization of Whitehall Palace, and, after 1619, the new Banqueting House by Inigo Jones, meant that James's divine authority could be described and conceptualized, as quartos of masques described and relayed information about the Whitehall space to a wider audience through the fluidity of print.

Of course, the complexity of Jacobean court culture meant that this authority was literalized and rendered describable in alternative, multiple spaces, and I have verified previously that masques were performed in locations far removed from Whitehall. We have to remember that this was in many ways a useful manoeuvre, rather than a process of fragmentation, as a diverse courtly culture enriched itself and appropriated other spaces. Despite this, however, an open-ended, continually expanding court that was always in a process of defining itself suggests a lack of cohesion, as the court's meaning is pulled in competing directions and lacks clarification. With this in mind, this chapter concludes with an analysis of the neglected topic of Jacobean courtesy literature as I examine alternative ways of interrogating and publicizing the court in the period.

Significantly, this closing section reveals that elite space and courtly definitions were being discussed in a wider sphere than the usual idea of a masque allows. Rather, I prove that 'the court' was always being interpreted in multiple ways, through a diverse collection of textual materials.

Courts, political discourse, and monarchical mystery

In terms of political discourse on both the king's divine authority and the court realm, two passages can be compared that are helpfully contradictory for my purposes here. Firstly, as James Stuart stated in 1616:

> That which concernes the mysterie of the Kings power, is not lawfull to be disputed; for that is to wade into the weaknesse of Princes, and to take away the mysticall reuerence, that belongs vnto them that sit in the Throne of God.[2]

Secondly, in 1622 John Reynolds translated the work of Eustache de Refuge and the treatise includes the following comment on elite space: '[T]he *Court* is an emminent and conspicuous *Theatre*, exposd to the sight and eyes of the world.'[3] It is unsurprising that James stressed the 'mysterie' of a Renaissance political culture that was underpinned by semi-absolutist notions of kingship and government. Yet the King's own words, as quoted above, allow us to detect an unease, as James clearly realized that to pry into a king's mystical power was to ask certain questions about that status and accompanying elite cultural practices, perhaps even to point up faults in the rhetoric or the ideological

---

[2] King James VI and I, 'A Speech in the Starre-Chamber, The XX. Of Jvne. Anno 1616', in *King James VI and I, Political Writings,* ed. by Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 204-228 (p. 213).

[3] Eustache de Refuge, *A treatise of the court or Instructions for courtiers Digested into two books. Written in French by the noble, and learned iuris-consull Monsr Denys de Refuges, Councellor of Estate, and many tymes ambassador (in foraigne parts) for ye two last French kings his masters Done into English by Iohn Reynolds* (London, 1622), p. 3. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

maxims essential to the maintenance of monarchical rule. The quotation from Reynolds, on the other hand, demonstrates that early modern society often looked to the court as a place of theatricality and spectacle.

Certainly, in *Cynthia's Revels*, an earlier Elizabethan comedy by Jonson from 1601, the dramatist predicts the performative future of the court under the early Stuarts, when Crites remarks: 'I haue seene (most honour'd ARETE,) / The Strangest pageant, fashion'd like a court.'[4] Of course, this kind of description is common in the public theatre from the 1590s onwards, as we have seen in Marlowe's *Edward II*. If we contextualize Jonson's play in terms of late-Elizabethan court culture, it is clear that the court space assumed a theatrical veneer before James came to the throne. But, under the early Stuarts, the gradual aestheticization of Whitehall means that Jacobean masques allowed literary writers to fashion courtly worlds, as elite spectators were encouraged to interpret a set of performative acts in the masques.[5] As the quotation above indicates, James did not want his subjects to gaze too deeply into the mystification of kingship, yet the performance of masques encouraged courtiers to view Whitehall as a place of fiction. *A treatise of the court* by Reynolds makes it apparent that it was entirely possible, indeed appropriate, to image and depict the court in literary and social commentary as an all-too-

---

[4] Ben Jonson, *Cynthia's Revels*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by C.H. Herford, and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932), IV, III. 4. 3-4.

[5] Indeed, Jonson's 1624 masque, *Neptune's Triumph for the Return of Albion* was cancelled and never performed. However, as Jerzy Limon has made clear, Jonson 'consciously created a text that has been defined as a literary masque by including in the created world a description of a court performance that never took place. Thus his text pretends to have been staged [...] Jonson gives fictitious details concerning the time and place of the performance on the title page.' See *The Masque of Stuart Culture* (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990), p. 45. By this point, therefore, masque writers were literally creating masquing / courtly worlds out of thin air. See also Martin Butler, 'Courtly Negotiations', in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. by David Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 20-40, particularly pp. 33-36.

visible theatre that performed various roles for the cultural and political landscape of Jacobean England.

Because masque writers were able to transform the court space metaphorically through their entertainments, and so alter an audience's perception of what a court should or could be, they helped to confirm the alternative conception of the court as open-ended and undetermined, a series of definitions that elite culture recognized as available for appropriation, adoption, or refashioning. Because of this, even the supposedly insular Whitehall masques epitomize court extension in the Jacobean period. Theatricality is inherently fluid in that both dramatic persona and setting are changeable, and so to embrace theatricality in terms of a masquer's assumed persona, or, more importantly in this case, the changing perception of the 'stage' and accompanying dramatic environment, admits to the flexibility of the court space itself, and its additional social meaning. A fixed court or palace becomes the space for role-playing and performativity. By implication, therefore, this theatricalism brings a sense of variability to the architectural space, thus reminding us of the changeability witnessed elsewhere in this thesis in terms of more overtly moveable courtly spaces.

Another of Jonson's earlier plays for the Elizabethan theatre, *Every Man Out of his Humor* (1600), shows that theatrical discourse could express the idea of a variety of competing court worlds, when Puntarvolo remarks to Fastidius that it is possible to focus attention upon elite space, as another character is described in the following terms: '[H]e is exceedingly / valiant, an excellent scholler, and so exactly trauail'd, that / hee is able in discourse, to deliuer you a *modell* of any / princes court in the world.' [6] Here Puntarvolo articulates the point that many royal courts may be all too similar. There is a particular

[6] Jonson, *Every Man Out of his Humor*, in *Ben Jonson*, (1927), III, V. 2. 25-28. Emphasis mine.

emphasis in this quotation on the power of discourse to describe or 'deliuer' the variety of court worlds. As I argue throughout this chapter, 'discourse', (whether in a theatrical form in masque performance and text, or other varieties of cultural discourse in printed texts, such as courtesy literature), seems to have the potential to decipher the monarchical codes of court life, and is, therefore, able to 'translate' the king's discourse of divinity. Printed texts – and masque texts in particular – are able to 'deliuer' definitions of the court to the spectator or reader, monumentalizing a snapshot of the court space for many outside its elite circle of access and patronage. The publication of masque texts through quartos by writers like Jonson, therefore, publicized courtly space and so accelerated the Jacobean broadening of the definition of 'court' to a wider public.

Of course, literary and non-literary texts had always had the potential to contemplate and describe the court. As Thomas Churchyard put it in 1596, 'Court is not bound, to pleasure eury one: / Court is a king, and subject vnto none.'[7] This makes it apparent that the court should not be subjected to the will of anyone lacking royal status, nor fashioned by those without monarchical authority. However, the couplet can also be interpreted as a rhetorical strategy that undermines the value of royal authority in instances of elite spatial fashioning, as even the monarch may be implicated by the use of the word 'none', with the court as the supreme decipherer of status and symbolic access. Even though 'court' and 'king' are synonymous here, there is perhaps a very subtle suggestion that the word 'none' means that even the king can be excluded from a definition of a court. Although the pamphlet praises monarchical power at several points, it is clear that any discussion of the court and monarch may at least touch upon difficult

---

[7] Thomas Churchyard, *A Pleasant Discourse of Court and Wars: with a replication to them both, and a commendation of all those that truly serue Prince and countrie* (London, 1596), sig. B3r.

issues, as the topics are subjected to authorial interpretation. Conversely, the textual link between king and court may be read as implying that the two are inseparable. However, we can also apply David Scott Kastan's classic formula, and observe that the king – or in this case the court – should not be subjected to the gaze of an audience at the Renaissance public theatres (or elite performance spaces such as Whitehall), as this loosens monarchy's grip on power by 'subjecting' monarchy to interpretation.[8]

The writers of masque texts, as well as the authors of courtesy books that debate the court world, showed that the court could indeed be a 'subject'. Although Churchyard articulates the point that such an elite space could not be subjected, it is curious that, in a sense, this is exactly what his own work is doing, as he highlights the mysteries of the court through textual transmission. Likewise, if, according to Churchyard, the 'Court is a king', then the performance of a masque turns the king to a subject for his own court, thus subjecting the king to various narrative strategies as determined by the masque's creator. In the same way, modes of describing the undetermined space of the court continue to surface in contemporary accounts in the Jacobean period. If we overview the period, and so explore the court as an early modern spatial and social 'generalization', rather than thinking in a distinctively Elizabethan or Jacobean sense, we find the court's meaning to belong to a surprisingly indeterminate set of social spaces, as the Jacobean court settles at Whitehall, yet enjoys a contradictory polycentrism, thus underscoring the expansion of definitions of courtly space after 1603.

---

[8] See David Scott Kastan, 'Proud Majesty Made a Subject: Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 37, No. 4 (1986), 459-475. For an update of Kastan's work, see his *Shakespeare after Theory* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), pp. 109-27. See also my introduction, p. 1.

'Our court so strangely disguised': spatial transformation at the Banqueting House

Court masques obviously carried with them a sense of transformative power: the masquers are usually disguised, even, as we shall see, unrecognizable, and the court environment is literally altered through scenic staging and similar devices. If we think back to the latter stages of Elizabeth's reign and Marlowe's *Edward II* it should be clear that Gaveston's troublesome employment of spectacle and performance is partly articulated through the court masque. As was demonstrated, this in turn allowed the Frenchman to aestheticize the court environment through the use of lavish, sexualized exoticism and classicism. The court as a social and spatial hierarchical structure is thus altered and problematized: an unsettling development for one aristocratic faction in the play.[9] With this in mind, I explore the interrelations between theorized notions of social space and the Jacobean court masque at Whitehall Palace, because what has been ignored by critics, in court performances and texts such as Jonson's *Masque of Blackness* and the contemporary comments of masque spectators like Dudley Carleton, is the undeniable emphasis upon the social space of the court being somehow altered through the act of

---

[9] Some forty years later, in the 1630s, Queen Henrietta-Maria would be accused of a similar disquieting employment of performance at court when puritans disapproved of her fondness for coupling together lavish masquing and Neo-Platonism. On the Caroline masque and Neo-Platonism, see Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), p. 189; Karen Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Just as I have argued that the 'fixing' of the court occurs in Marlowe's *Edward II* through the increased visibility of aesthetic display with the arrival of Gaveston, the early Stuart court is even more fixed at Whitehall during the Caroline period, partly through the new queen's enjoyment of a lavish masquing culture. As David M. Bergeron has shown, the Caroline period witnessed greater decline in terms of progressing and civic display than the Jacobean period. See Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry: 1558-1642* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971), p. 105. In historical actuality and Marlowe's theatrical discourse, both narratives end with the execution of a king who has been removed from an architecturally and socially fixed court. Of course, the increase of visual spectacle also had much to do with the rise of Archbishop Laud, as Malcolm Smuts makes clear: 'Laudians argued that the soul must be shaped through sensual experiences to prepare it for the imprint of saving grace. They aimed not only to convert people to the message of the Gospels, but to instil in them a greater capacity for awe and reverence. In Charles's court the power of the king and the visual splendour surrounding him were treated as essential to this educative process.' See Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1987), p. 234.

masquing. As theatrical display transforms the spatial environment metaphorically, this shows that the Jacobean court's definition is always evolving and changing. This is true in *Blackness*, but in many of the masques a stress on architecturalism seems to foreground the importance of a monarchical palace, as the definition of a court as a fixed palace is seemingly underscored. It is apparent that this architectural discourse allows the Whitehall masques a degree of inter-textual communication with other entertainments, such as Samuel Daniel's Hampton Court masque from 1604 and the 1613 progress entertainments for Queen Anna. In this widened context, therefore, a stress on architecture and spatial alteration in the masques means that the Jacobean court continues to expand and consolidate a variety of court definitions simultaneously. We have to highlight moments when masques present architectural permanence and yet gesture towards an open-ended, complex court culture through their stress on the variable nature of courtly spaces.

Jonson's 'Masque of Blackness'

> He burnt that Idoll of the *Revels* too:
> Nay, let *White-Hall* with Revels have to doe,
> Though but in daunces, it shall know his power;
> There was a Judgement shew'n too in an houre.[10]

In his 'An Execration upon Vulcan', published in the 1640 second folio, Jonson makes reference to the fire that destroyed the Banqueting House in January 1619. This textual recollection also highlights the extent to which the palace at Whitehall had come to symbolize a degree of performativity and theatrical spectacle in the Jacobean consciousness, as this elite space is readily identified with dramatic occasion alongside the city's other theatrical venues. One objective that Jonson's poem achieves, then, is the

[10] Jonson, 'An Execration upon Vulcan', in *Ben Jonson*, (1947), VIII, pp. 202-212 (p. 210), lines 155-58.

placing of Whitehall within the performance context of the whole city and its theatrical industry.

This emphasis on performativity surfaces in an earlier contemporary account of masque performance at the Banqueting House. In an often-quoted letter, Carleton, a spectator at the performance of Jonson's *The Masque of Blackness,* performed on 6 January 1605 and featuring Queen Anna and some of the leading ladies of the court, offers his thoughts to Ralph Winwood in a passage that is marked for its criticism of the appearance of Queen Anna and the ladies:

> Their Apparell was rich, but too light and Curtizan-like for such great ones. Instead of Vizzards, their Faces, and Arms up to the Elbows, were painted black, which was Disguise sufficient, for they were hard to be known; *but it became them nothing so well as their red and white, and you cannot imagine a more ugly Sight, then a Troop of lean-cheek'd Moors.*[11]

This revealing commentary, unsurprisingly, has been usefully employed by several critics, including Hardin Aasand and Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, who are interested in the exploration of gender issues in a document closely linked to the Jacobean court. These critics place great emphasis upon the Amazonian-like self-assertion and (possible) courtly/cultural subversion played-out by Anna and the ladies, through their employment of both performative dress and spectacle.[12] The surviving text of the masque yields clear evidence of the appearance of the ladies at the performance, Jonson himself noting 'it was her majesty's will to have them blackamores / at first' in his preface to the actual

---

[11] Quoted in *Ben Jonson,* (1950), X, p. 448. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[12] This interpretation resembles the appearance of Tamora and the Goths in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* (1592), where social structures fail to maintain or even articulate traditional cultural 'truths' owing to this alien presence. See also Hardin Aasand, '"To Black an Ethiop, and Revive a Corse": Queen Anne and *The Masque of Blackness*', *Studies in English Literature,* 32, No. 1 (1992), 271-285; Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 1993), pp. 15-43.

theatrical text.[13] In the masque itself Anna and the accompanying eleven ladies are described in the following terms: 'twelve nymphs, Negroes, and the / daughters of Niger.'[14] The masque was not printed until a quarto appeared in 1608, and it is striking that *Blackness* was presented with another, later masque featuring the queen, *The Masque of Beauty*, as Jonson's pairing explicitly foregrounds an emphasis on these masques in relation to the queen.[15]

In terms of the queen consort, Lewalski has discussed Anna as being a female opposition to James's patriarchal government, and she links this to the masques, including those entertainments by Samuel Daniel, in addition to some by Jonson.[16] When *Blackness* is discussed, Lewalski examines the dismay expressed by Carleton, and aligns this horror with the Amazonian implications of the spectacle and dress.[17] More recently, Clare McManus has explored some of the highly theorized performative implications of the staging of *Blackness* at the Jacobean court, offering 'an evaluation of

---

[13] Jonson, *The Masque of Blackness,* in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques,* ed. by Stephen Orgel (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1969), pp. 47-60 (p. 48), lines 18-19. For an interesting discussion of the Jacobean masque and the politics of space and monarchical presence, see Kenneth Robert Olwig, *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World* (Wisconsin: Winconsin University Press, 2002). This slightly complex argument needs to be followed in its entirety.

[14] Jonson, *Blackness*, p. 49, lines 43-44.

[15] See *The characters of two royall masques The one of blacknesse, the other of beautie. personated by the most magnificent of queenes Anne Queene of great Britaine, &c. With her honorable ladyes, 1605. and 1608. at White-hall: and inuented by Ben: Ionson* (London, 1608).

[16] See Lewalski, *Writing Women*, pp. 15-43.

[17] See Lewalski, *Writing Women*, pp. 31-32. Likewise, Kathryn Schwarz has examined the early court careers of Daniel and Jonson and explored the Amazonian subtext of several masques, including *Blackness:* 'Queen Anne brings to court the marginalia of cultural anxiety: the masquers of *Blackness* recall the Amazons of New World mythology, who cross and recross the boundaries of race as well as those of gender performance.' See Schwarz, 'Amazonian Reflections in the Jacobean Queen's Masque', *Studies in English Literature,* 35, No. 2, (1995), 293-319 (pp. 301-302). Schwarz also states: 'At best, Amazons suggest the potency of Elizabethan nostalgia; at worst, they pose a direct challenge to the terms of male sovereignty itself.' p. 296.

the nature of female performance and cultural agency as it relates to the demands of the masque form, and of the controversial status of such performance within contemporary society.'[18] Once more, it seems, a critic concentrates upon female transgression rather than the effect of this event on the court space.

Nevertheless, in both *Blackness* and in Carleton's letters, we can trace textual recordings of the court undergoing spatial transformation, something revealed in the courtier's use of 'Disguise' in the quotation above. As has been demonstrated, the court could be used as a representational social space in many different ways. However, I would argue that here, in Carleton's letter, is a particularly resonant example of early modern anxiety at the undetermined court space. This can be seen in two comments made by Carleton. In the same letter to Winwood, our masque-spectator writes: 'The *Spanish* and *Venetian* Ambassadors were both present, *and sate by the King in state;* at which Monsieur *Beaumont* quarrells so extreamly, that he saith *the whole court is Spanish.*'[19] Here we can detect an anxiety about the actual space of the court itself, and this is certainly linked to the masque Carleton is commenting upon. The French

---

[18] Clare McManus, '"Defacing the Carcass": Anne of Denmark and Jonson's *The Masque of Blackness*', in *Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender, Politics and the Jonsonian Canon,* ed. by Julie Sanders, with Kate Chedgzoy and Susan Wiseman (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), pp. 93-113 (p. 94). McManus explores the quotation by Carleton at pp. 94-95. For an update of this approach, and a book-length study of this theoretical agenda, see McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court (1590-1619)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002). For discussion of Carleton's letter, see p. 1. The presence of this matter on the opening page to a book concerned with the politics of female masquing in the Jacobean era should testify to the critical importance that has been attached to Carleton's distaste, over the last ten years or more. For another relatively recent discussion of the masque and Queen Anna, see Marion Wynne-Davies, 'The Queen's Masque: Renaissance Women and the Seventeenth-Century Court Masque', in *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance,* ed. by S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), pp. 79-104. *Blackness* and Carleton's comments are discussed at p. 88. See also Sophie Tomlinson, *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 18-47. For the political idea of a separate queen's court, see N. R. R. Fisher, 'The Queenes Courte in Her Councell Chamber at Westminster', *The English Historical Review*, 108:427 (1993), 314-37.

[19] In *Ben Jonson*, X, p. 448. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

ambassador (Beaumont) expresses, through Carleton's report, the political tension inherent in these courtly spectacles. However, Beaumont also seems to have been testifying to the somewhat unfixed nature of the court space in the period: for him the Spaniards are so common at both the court and the masque performances that a process of assimilation is conjectured. Despite the Frenchman's disproportional comments, the choice of language is at least revealing of a contemporary dissatisfaction that is linked to Renaissance expectations, or idealizations, of the court in terms of numerous spatial and social categories. Somewhere here, beneath the surface of the words expressed, lurks an allusion to early modern anxiety about cultural difference, race, and the infectious nature of interaction with foreign elements. This element of fear may have been all the more apparent at court, a familiar space and institution that was at the very centre of both national pride and the early modern project to define and articulate the Jacobean nation-state. For Carleton, the court needs to be controlled and defined, not altered through a feminine participation that involved women who were part of the fabric of the court itself.

An even more significant concern, again expressed by Carleton, arises in a second letter by the courtier, written on 7 January 1605, to John Chamberlain, once more commenting on the performance of *Blackness* and the appearance of the ladies:

> The presentation of the maske at the first drawing of the trauers was very fayre, and theyr apparel rich, but too light and curtisan-like; Theyr black faces, and hands wch were painted and bare vp to the elbows, was a very lothsome sight, and I am sory that strangers should see owr court so strangely disguised. The Spanish and venetian Ambassadors were both there, and most of the French abowt the towne.[20]

[20] In *Ben Jonson*, X, p. 449. On this letter, see Aasand, '"To Black an Ethiop, and Revive a Corse"' p. 273. She observes that, for the eyewitness, 'Queen Anne's appearance in black makeup promotes a court fundamentally inverted by the queen, who is the feminine representative of the country's political hierarchy.'

Here Carleton again reveals his disgust at the dress and appearance of the court ladies and their female monarch. Tellingly, however, the masque-spectator also focuses his attention, with specific concern, upon the court itself, worrying that 'owr court' has become 'so strangely disguised.' This statement testifies to both the fluid nature of the court in terms of its cultural definition, as well as a degree of anxiety about the lack of a stable, definite understanding. Once again, early modern use of the word 'court' is accompanied by a puzzling contradiction. Worse still for the courtier, it may be that a court that is architecturally fixed and defined is being transformed before his eyes.[21] The comment is also evidence of the transformative power of the performance of a Jacobean masque, in that the writer makes an explicit link between the performance space and its features (the female actors and their dress), and the subsequent 'disguise' taken on by the court of James. The unspecific nature of the court, problematic in its own right, almost invites the space to be viewed as a site for any unsettling change.

Carleton's own use of the word 'court' is fascinating, and I interpret his usage as drawing on both the idea of the court as Whitehall, James's physical and literal court and the actual place of performance for the masque, and also the idea that the courtiers combine to form a court-world. In this instance of description, the ladies of the court *are* synecdochically the court, in the sense that female courtiers form a courtly space when together. What is problematic here is that the synecdoche is working in new directions,

---

[21] As Martin Butler has remarked, 'Carleton certainly felt that [the] show had polluted the court by intruding physical difference so forcefully into the evening's elegant compliments.' See Butler, '*The Masque of Blackness* and Stuart Court Culture', in *Early Modern English Drama: A Critical Companion*, ed. by Garrett A. Sullivan, JR., Patrick Cheney, and Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 152-63, at p. 159. See also McManus, 'Introduction: The Queen's Court', in *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*, ed. by McManus (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 1-17 for a similar discussion of the word 'court' in another Jacobean context for Queen Anna.

because, traditionally, it was only the persona of the monarch who stood in for the space of the court, rather than a collection of aristocratic women. The comments can also be read as an allusion to the different courts of James and Anna within the unifying and governing 'courtly' structure of symbolic Stuart power. By 'owr court', Carleton may refer to a specific feminine court, or collective of female courtiers, that he feels a patriarchal and protective attachment towards.

Another interrelated key point here is Carleton's use of the word 'disguise'. The masque observer alludes to an important element of Jacobean masquing. Obviously, the ladies, with their faces and bodies blackened with make-up, are in disguise, though clearly the spectators knew exactly who they were, and Jonson's text names them one by one. (lines 243-61) Indeed, as Wynne-Davies has shown, the element of disguise in courtly masquing can be traced back to the 'mommerie' tradition.[22] Francis Bacon, in 1625, comments on the court masque in his *Essays*: 'As for rich embroidery, it is lost and not discerned. Let the suits of the masquers be graceful and such as become the person when the vizards are off; not after examples of known attires; Turks, soldiers, mariners, and the like.'[23] McManus has argued for the positive effects on female agency inherent in

---

[22] See Wynne-Davies, 'The Queen's Masque', p. 89.

[23] Francis Bacon, *Essays or Counsels, Civil and Moral,* in *Francis Bacon,* ed. by Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 341-456; 'Of Masques and Triumphs', pp. 416-417 (p. 417). Bacon interestingly continues: 'Let anti-masques not be long; they have been commonly of fools, satyrs, baboons, wild men, antics, beasts, sprites, witches, Ethiops, pigmies, tarquets, nymphs, rustics, Cupids, statua's moving, and the like.' p. 417. On the element of disguise inherent in masques, and specifically female disguise in this context, Sir John Harington is insightful. In 1606 the courtier wrote a letter to Secretary Barlow, describing the performance of entertainments for the visit of King Christian IV of Denmark at Theobalds: 'I will now, in good sooth, declare to you, who will not blab, that the Gunpowder fright is got out of all our heads, and we are going on hereabouts as if the devil was contriving every man should blow up himself, by wild riot, excess, and devestation of time and temperance. *The great Ladies do go well-masked*, and indeed it be the only show of their modesty, to conceal their countenance; but, alack they meet with such countenance to uphold their strange doings, that I marvel not at ought that happens.' Here the repetition of issues relating to masking and disguise again links with Carleton's outburst through the shared use of the word 'strange.' The letter is printed in *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities,*

the 'blackening' of appearance for the performance, because 'the physical expression of costume and make-up destabilizes the restrictions placed upon [the female masquer].'[24] McManus then neatly aligns this argument with the concerns of Carleton, observing that his protests aim at 'the demeaning impact such a displeasure has on the status of the queen [...] It is extremely offensive that his queen cannot be recognized, that her body is de-faced.'[25]

However, modern critical work has failed to excavate the way the word 'court' is being used in relation to disguise here, as useful contextualizing information is given precedence over a detailed close-reading placed within a contextual framework.[26] Anna, as queen, has some claim to be representative of the court environment. If the court is indeed where the king 'is', then, by extension, a degree of this representative power is transferred to the body of the (masquing) queen, who just happens to be disguised as a Moor. This may be one of the points signified by the Carleton outburst, as Anna is meant to stand synecdochically for the whole court during the act of a particularly feminine performance, as opposed to the motionless, though not passive, observation of James. In this instance, then, to 'blacken' and disguise the queen is to also disguise, even disfigure

---

of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court, ed. by John Nichols, 4 vols (London: J. B. Nichols, 1828), I, p. 74. Emphasis mine.

[24] McManus, '"Defacing the Carcass"', p. 98.

[25] McManus, '"Defacing the Carcass"', p. 104.

[26] Orgel, *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, does touch upon this point very briefly in his introduction; see pp. 1-39 (pp. 4-5). Orgel comments on Carleton's critique that '[i]t is the relationship between the reality and the symbol, the impersonators and the impersonation, that is of crucial importance for the seventeenth-century spectator. Although, as Jonson tells us, the masquers appeared in blackface by the queen's own command, Carleton cannot forget that however much they are nymphs of the poet's fiction, they are also the queen and her ladies. Jonson would have to agree with the criticism, at least in principle: the first requirement of a masque was the creation of valid symbols for the court, parts that royalty could play without ceasing to be royal.' p. 5.

the court as a cultural space. Although monarch and court space were often aligned together in the period (whether the emphasis falls on the king or his consort) it is clear that this space could be interpreted differently, depending on which member of the royal household was in question.[27] Furthermore, the king, and the other aristocratic courtiers who may also stand for 'a court', have to watch this transformative event. The idea that the twelve ladies, as courtiers, form a courtly body, (one that is signified by, and represents, 'owr court'), only intensifies the above explanation. If the court is to be seen as a pieced-together space, with the courtiers acting as a whole 'court', then a masquing group of disguised female courtiers can also be taken as an instance of spatial transformation through performance. This becomes clearer still, if we turn to Jonson's text.

The printed account of *The Masque of Blackness* begins with the introductory message 'Personated at the court at Whitehall on the Twelfth-night, 1605.'[28] Obviously, the sense of grandeur and occasion at the performance of Jonson's first masque requires

---

[27] As McManus has shown, Anna was the head of what was, to some extent at least, her own 'court', and it was this collection of courtly ladies, and Anna in particular, that was patronizing the masquing culture of the main Whitehall court as a performance centre. McManus interprets the 1590 royal entry into Edinburgh, when the city celebrated the marriage of James to Anna. She observes that, as a royal consort rather than a regent, Anna had to be particularly passive in terms of performativity at the occasion. See McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*, p. 74. This shows how Carleton may have been particularly uncomfortable precisely because a consort, rather than a regent, is shaping the courtly space through performativity. Similarly, McManus notes that 'the tensions caused by Anna's active agency in commissioning and influencing the performance reveal much about her masquing career and the nature of female performance and cultural agency in the Jacobean court.' p. 3. For Anna's 'court', see the whole of McManus's book. Of particular importance is McManus's point that Anna 'moved between courts [...] [including] Stirling, Whitehall and the Queen's court at Greenwich.' p. 5. McManus stresses 'the relationship of the performing female body to the space of the stage and the political actuality of the court community', and also traces '[t]he historical, social and political context of [the] ephemeral moments of performance [...] [in order to] ascertain the extent to which Anna [...] can be considered to have formed a queen's court.' p. 5. Lastly, it is demonstrable that the gendered approach employed by McManus relates to aspects of my own study because the idea of Anna's own court 'has a wider context, that of the fractured Jacobean court in Scotland and England.' p. 5.

[28] Jonson, *Blackness*, p. 47.

a textual emphasis on an awareness of place and courtly spectacle. Similarly, Jonson's foregrounding of the royal location may also be seen as an added ingredient of respectability, highlighted in the 1616 folio in order to emphasize the elite nature of this form of literary production as opposed to the 'public' place of performance for much of Jonson's theatrical output. As critics have long recognized, then, the production and utilization of space is vital to debates about theatrical activity in many guises, from public theatres to masquing spaces. However, Jonson's preliminary line in the text cannot help but point out subtle complexities in attempts to voice the courtly environment, as Jonson's use of 'the court' as the place of presentation appears to highlight the singularity and exclusivity of Whitehall, perhaps as the Jacobean political and administrative culture began to literalize and fix the court space, whether for theatrical display or political negotiation with foreign dignitaries. Yet, 'the court *at* Whitehall' reminds us of the older, more fluid Elizabethan conceptualization of a moveable space that only settles in one place intermittently.

Jonson then adds a certain security as a reassuring sense of court description is invoked through the familiarity of masque performance for the implied privileged reader, the text reporting that '[t]he honor and splendor of these spectacles was such in the performance.'[29] This gives the reader a sense of past achievement, stressing, as it does, the settled, stately environment that the performances occupied as well as the unique singularity of the occasion. Yet, to this might be added Jonson's subsequent reference to the destruction of the masquing space by the audience, those who 'are privileged by

---

[29] Jonson, *Blackness*, p. 47, lines 1-2.

custom to deface their carcases'.[30] Reassuringly jovial and good natured this 'custom' may have been, (though Jonson seems to hint at a measure of personal dissatisfaction), part of this elite performative practice involved the physical deconstruction of a stage-space that had just presented what Carleton called 'owr court' before an audience at court. Then, following on from this, Jonson's textual remembrance of the masque performance smoothly turns attention to Ethiopia, 'the blackest nation of the world', as if to highlight the power of performance in accelerating the transformation of imaginary space.[31] 'Otherly' worlds, then, are performed and so accessed through theatrical discourse, and the imagination and attention of the courtly audience is directed towards a dual narrative awareness as the court spectators watch a symbolic, performative female court, whilst also witnessing the staging of a very foreign world at Whitehall, the palace being a physical manifestation of elite space that is meant to offer a fixed, concrete definition of the court. Rather, the performance adds ambiguity to elite space.

As Jonson's preface to the masque continues, he acknowledges the potentiality contained in theatrical discourse to present metaphorical transformation, as various spatial landscapes are produced, (or perhaps fabricated), with apparent ease for audience satisfaction:

> *First, for the scene, was drawn a Landtschap consisting of small / woods, and here and there a void place filled with huntings; which / falling, an artificial sea was seen to shoot forth, as if it flowed to / the land, raised with waves which seemed to move, and in some / places the billow to break, as imitating that orderly disorder / which is common in nature.*[32]

---

[30] Jonson, *Blackness*, p. 47, line 7. On the destruction of the masquing space, see McManus, '"Defacing the Carcass"'.

[31] Jonson, *Blackness*, p. 48, lines 15-16.

[32] Jonson, *Blackness*, p. 48, lines 20-25. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

Theatrical production, then, can create an (oxymoronic) imaginary 'reality'. or, to borrow Jonson's phrase, it can depict 'orderly disorder'. Of course, there is also an immense financial cost involved in the production of such a scene, and it is 'the court' that has sanctioned this expenditure. Carleton's outburst about the female masquers stands as an example of the disturbing potential for the masque space to distort a spatial mindset about normative courtly reality. In the case of Anna and the ladies, however, the female court actively participates in the spectacle, unravelling neat definitions of the court space along the way. Of course, as was shown in chapter 3, this would not be the first time that Queen Anna would complicate and problematize the court's definition. Tellingly, a sense of performative display sweeps through the terrain of the masque performance, something that the textual recording has reserved for subsequent readers. Jonson foregrounds the ease with which courtly realms may be referenced, and so momentarily staged, through theatricality. As Niger remarks, 'In search of this [land] have we three princedoms passed.'[33] In addition to this, through the attendance of masque performance, spectators are able to survey foreign lands and courts themselves. As Russell West has shown, '[t]he Jacobean court masque [...] was a multifaceted work of art in which perspective, as one element of the theatrical ensemble, appears to have been riddled by contradictions which made it a less than assured mode of asserting spatial control.'[34]

---

[33] Jonson, *Blackness*, p. 54, line 171.

[34] Russell West, 'Perplexive Perspectives: The Court and Contestation in the Jacobean Masque', *The Seventeenth Century*, 18, No. 1, (2003), 25-43 (p.25). West makes the important point that '[t]he theatrical space of the masque was profoundly unstable, and its messages of royal legitimacy equally fragile.' p. 36. See also West's earlier book: *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage: From Shakespeare to Webster* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 59-81. Both these connected studies have influenced my own work on the Jacobean masque, and West's groundbreaking book has been extremely helpful in enabling me to access the concept of space and its interrelations with Renaissance literature. However, West's studies do not attempt to unearth the complexity of court description in social and spatial terms, nor do they try to examine the idea of competing court definitions, whether moveable or static. On the other hand, it is

Taking this much further, however, I believe that this contradiction relates to the complexity of court definition in Jacobean England, a vital point for the following discussion of one of Jonson's theatrical competitors.

Daniel's 'Tethys' Festival'

Of course, it was not just the masque writer, be it Jonson or Daniel, who had the power to fashion new court worlds through the creation of the 'literary' masque. The entertainments were usually produced in partnership with Inigo Jones, and it is worth observing that Jones's career at court outlasted that of Jonson throughout the Caroline elite's continuation of early Stuart masquing culture. As Daniel said in the preface to the printed version of *Tethys' Festival* (1610):

> But in these things wherein the only life consists in show, the art / and invention of the architect gives the greatest grace, and is of most / importance, ours the least part and of least note in the time of the / performance thereof; and therefore have I interserted the description / of the artificial part, which only speaks Master Inigo Jones.[35]

Indeed, editors and critics have often acknowledged that whereas Jonson argued for the literary quality of the masque against Jones's insistence on spectacle, Daniel's views

---

clearly important to acknowledge that West's later article (2003) has similarly observed the monarch's theatrical 'subjection' in the moment of masque performance; though West's wider emphasis in terms of the second study's interest in the Renaissance concept of perspective is rather different. As West asks: 'If James was the principal spectator of the masques composed to celebrate him, and thus the explicit subject of their exposition of royal power, to what extent did he find himself caught in a role that was passive and powerless – 'subjected' to the mechanisms of theatrical representation?' p. 37. In his book, West makes it clear that he views the Jacobean court as a relatively stable space, remarking that '[t]he anchoring of the fictional world of the masque in the concrete context of the court [...] occurred .' in various masques. p. 72. However, West's chapter does examine, in great detail, the transformative powers of the masque performance in terms of spatial representation, and this clearly overlaps with my own interests in this chapter (see pp. 59-81).

[35] Samuel Daniel, *Tethys' Festival*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 54-65 (p. 55), lines 54-8. The masque was printed in quarto form in the same year as its performance, and demonstrates the occasional speed with which courtly entertainments reached a wider public and brought attention to Whitehall. On this masque, see John Pitcher, '"In these Figures Which they Seem": Samuel Daniel's *Tethys' Festival*', in *The Court Masque*, ed. by Lindley (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), pp. 33-46.

were much similar to those of the architect.[36] That this emphasis on physicality and aesthetic display can be traced in the textual recollection of Daniel's masque is revealing in that it demonstrates once more the sense of a transformation of social space on the Jacobean masquing stage.

In Daniel's text, as with so many masques, other kingdoms are made to represent or stand for aspects of the Stuart realm and, occasionally, the court at Whitehall. For instance, in *Tethys' Festival* Triton states:

> From that intelligence which moves the sphere
> Of circling waves (the might Tethys, queen
> Of nymphs and rivers, who will straight appear,
> And in a human character be seen)
> We have in charge to say, that even as seas
> And lands are graced by men of worth and might,
> So they return their favours, and in these
> Exalting of the good seem to delight.
> Which she, in glory lately visiting
> The sweet and pleasant shores of Cambria, found
> By an unusual and most forward spring
> Of comfort, wherewith all things did abound,
> For joy of the investiture at hand
> Of their new prince, whose rites, with acts renowned,
> Were here to be solemnized on this strand.[37]

Immediately it is noticeable that other spaces are being transported to the Banqueting House through the performance of the masque, and this reminds us of Daniel's earlier Hampton Court entertainment and the plurality of court worlds. Daniel's preference for highlighting the importance of Jones in the performance of the masque is evident from the long descriptive piece that begins this text, in which Daniel is at pains to stress

---

[36] See, for instance, Lindley, *Court Masques,* p. 231.

[37] Daniel, *Tethys' Festival*, p. 58, lines 150-164.

costume and design.[38] In terms of the quotation above (p. 150), however, it is noticeable that Daniel does place a degree of emphasis upon the other world that his masque helps the audience to access, and so suggests the expansion of court space. In the printed text, then, Daniel is keen to emphasize the transformation of the masquing space. Similarly, the reference to the creation of Henry as the Prince of Wales is revealing in that performance allows the 'idea' or cultural concept of the prince, on the stage and in historical actuality, to have a degree of ambivalence attached: Daniel's masque references the real world at Whitehall just as it explores other worlds through theatricality. Tellingly, toward the end of the text, Daniel allows reality to merge with the performance as the masquing scene joins with the elite space of the court:

> *Hereupon the Duke of York with his attendants departing to perform this service, the loud music sounds, and suddenly appears the Queen's majesty in a most pleasant and artificial grove, which was the third scene, and from thence they march up to the King, conducted by the Duke of York and the noblemen, in very stately manner.*[39]

In this instance at least, it appears that monarchical authority could be subjected at Whitehall, as members of the royal family become participants in the spectacle that underpins this courtly event, precisely because the masquing stage had blurred the boundary between theatre and reality.

Refashioning Whitehall: courtly and architectural permanence

> O *London*, blessed Mrs of this happy *Brittaine*, build new thy Gates, ther's *peace* entring at them [...] Let *White-Hall* (fit embleme for her purity) be her chiefe Pallace, and let it say, *Ades alma salus* [a helpful and nourishing dwelling or palace].[40]

---

[38] Daniel, *Tethys' Festival*, pp. 56-57, lines 85- 128.

[39] Daniel, *Tethys' Festival*, p. 64, lines 405-09. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[40] *The Peace-Maker: Or Great Brittaines Blessing* (London, 1619), sig. A4v, cited in Per Palme, *Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House* (London: Thamea and Hudson, 1957), p. 18. This translation relies on 'ades' being a mistranscription of 'aedes'.

As the above quotation makes clear, Whitehall Palace took on a new importance in the Jacobean reign, a fact that is reflected through masquing culture and a series of architectural projects, including, of course, the construction of Inigo Jones's Banqueting House after 1619. Between the performance of Jonson's *Masque of Blackness* and Daniel's *Tethys' Festival* something happened to the Whitehall masquing space that had nothing to do with the theatricalized fictions of poets. Rather, in 1606 the old Elizabethan Banqueting House was brought down and replaced with a newer version. As Butler points out, the wooden structure was substituted by James 'with a permanent stone hall more suitable for the ceremonies of the new dynasty'.[41] The 'permanence' of this structure is interesting, particularly when we think about the theatricalism attached to the venue, as the court as a place of performance is underscored through building. As the Venetian Ambassador, Zorzi Giustinian reported in January 1607, James wished for a 'ceremony' in order 'to consecrate the birth of the Great Hall which his predecessors had left him built merely in wood, but which he had converted into stone'.[42]

Thus, although the Jacobean court culture was characterized by its multiplicity and polycentrism, the Whitehall masques were not the only cultural force to centralize courtly and monarchical power at Whitehall. Rather, the building of architectural magnificence makes a grand statement about the permanence of the new Stuart regime,

---

[41] Butler, '*Blackness*', p. 154.

[42] Printed in *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, ed. by Horatio F. Brown (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904), Vol. XI, p. 86. For a thorough discussion of the various court theatres in the early modern period, see John Astington, *English Court Theatre: 1558-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). For a recent account of the aestheticizing influence of architecture, see Linda Levy Peck, *Consuming Splendour: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 188-229. For Jonson's interest in architectural theory as related to his own poetic art and the building of courtly structures, see Ian Donaldson, *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 66.

and is at odds with Elizabeth I's relative lack of interest in building in favour of the roaming court as conceptualized through her progresses. Despite this, as the last three chapters on Jacobean entertainments and progressing away from Whitehall demonstrated, both the physicality of the palace's courtly space and the additional complexity of royal and aristocratic culture ensures that we keep our concentration on the strange duality of this society. In many ways, the architectural emphasis of the Whitehall masques and the construction of the Banqueting House points to very different conclusions when compared to the progressing discussed elsewhere in this thesis. Yet, conversely, this confirms also the growing range of meanings attached to the court.

We have to maintain awareness of moveable space and the multifaceted nature of this world whilst realizing that the increased architectural emphasis foreshadows the later reign of Charles, a court culture that took architecturalism much further, particularly in the later Whitehall masques of the 1630s.[43] Although my work on both of the early Stuart monarchs fully embraces the polycentrism of these court cultures, there has to be an acknowledgment of a move in the Caroline period towards more centralization. However, whilst retaining an awareness of this multiplicity, I believe it is possible to trace the beginning of this centralization process back to the birth of the second Banqueting House after the performance of Jonson's *Blackness*. Notably, when we turn to many of the masques that were performed in the new theatrical space, there appears to be a marked acceleration of an architectural discourse that prioritizes a court as a fixed space. Crucially, though, this has to be read beside my earlier arguments about this

---

[43] In his forthcoming study, James Knowles makes reference to 'a centralising absolutism' in the early Stuart period. See *Politics and Political Culture in the Masque* (Forthcoming, 2007). For alternative evidence demonstrating James's desire to restrict access to London, see his poem, 'You women that doe London loue so well', in *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. by James Craigie (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood, 1958), 2 vols, 2: pp. 178-81. I am grateful to Jane Rickard for this reference.

expanding and moveable world, as this study continues to stress the duality of this culture: the paradoxical fact that Whitehall and a privileging of fixed space exists beside the definition of a court as a moveable space defined by the sovereign. As we have seen, aspects of Whitehall masquing actually give prominence to the genre's potential for creating and describing new worlds on the courtly stage. Yet, as I now demonstrate, other masques expressed an interest in architectural permanence as a variety of fixed courtly structures were staged before, and at, James's court. As will be shown, even these structures consolidated the multiple ways of defining a court, because to stage such architecture referenced simultaneously the static nature of Whitehall as a court and acknowledged polycentrism by demonstrating the potential for courtly worlds beyond Whitehall.

The 'truth of architecture': masques and the courtly structures of authority

As has been made clear, masque writers could transform a scene through their fictions. Equally, the performative court space could be altered by the stage designs of an architect like Jones. However, one fascinating development of this performative team of writer and architectural theorist was the expression through masquing of Jacobean culture's interest in the display of architecturalism through highly classicized royal buildings and palaces.[44] As the last chapters made evident, textualized debates about elite space were often expressed through architectural metaphors. However, in a Whitehall masque the writers did not have to balance courtly, royal space alongside elite, aristocratic and civil spaces. Therefore, we can trace in the masque the growing

[44] For a detailed discussion of Jonson's deep understanding of Vitruvian architectural theory and his use of this knowledge in the masques, see A. W. Johnson, *Ben Jonson: Poetry and Architecture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

importance of architectural discourse, as the masques give expression to the early Stuart fondness for building and the desire for a splendid new Whitehall Palace. The deployment of an architectural discourse in the masques (whether through the poet's literature or the architect's scenic design) lends a self-referentiality to the masquing culture, as 'the court' fashions and promotes itself through architectonics. Indeed, although the masques greatly accelerated this move during the Caroline period, the beginnings are clear from earlier in the period.

'Eternised in the House of Fame': Jonson's 'Masque of Queens'

On February 2, 1609 *The Masque of Queens* was performed at the Banqueting House, Whitehall Palace and was then printed in the same year. Like several of the masques analyzed in this thesis, it is revealing that the quarto form appeared so quickly, as a potentially wider audience was exposed to the masque. Similarly, the text continued the tradition of Jonson's earlier *Masque of Blackness* in that it was influenced by Queen Anna and her ladies. However, unlike the earlier performance, *Queens* had an interesting addition, in that the masque foregrounded an architectural space in the guise of Jones's presentation of the House of Fame. Also, in an unusual move for a masque, Jonson's prefatory comment about the performance location mentions both the real space of Whitehall and the fictional realm of the house: 'Celebrated from the House of Fame, by the queen of Great Britain with her ladies. At Whitehall, February 2, 1609.'[45] In fact, Jonson here prioritizes the fictional presentation of the House of Fame, and only records 'Whitehall', rather than 'Whitehall Palace' or 'the Banqueting House'. Owing to this, the fictional building is privileged in Jonons's literary discourse above James's own royal

[45] Jonson, *The Masque of Queens* in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, pp. 122-41 (p. 122).

structure. Once more, therefore, the writer of a courtly entertainment is able to somehow alter the courtly space by the manner of performative presentation or textual remembrance. Jonson is able to conjure up 'a spectacle of strangeness', particularly with the help of his colleague Jones.[46]

However, when Jonson moves to his description of what actually happened at the masque performance, his directions make it clear that the first scene actually featured the entrance of a group of witches at '*an ugly hell*'.[47] In his prefatory material Jonson had actually forecast the arrival of the House of Fame to the reader of his text, thus privileging this magnificent fictional building above the actual start of the text. Of course, the use of an onstage temple or palace-like structure is reminiscent of the Temple of Peace in the 1604 Hampton Court masque by Daniel, and so even a Whitehall masque reminds us of the broadening of the Jacobean court. Here though, Jonson gives prominence to an architectural structure as the most important royal palace of the Jacobean period. Indeed, the witches are vanquished by a change of scene when the House of Fame is revealed to the spectators:

> *In the heat of their dance on the sudden was heard a sound of loud music, as / if many instruments had made one blast; with which not only the hags / themselves but the hell into which they ran quite vanished, and the whole / face of the scene altered, scarce suffering the memory of such a thing. But in / the place of it appeared a glorious and magnificent building figuring the / House of Fame, in the top of which were discovered the twelve masquers / sitting upon a throne triumphal erected in form of a pyramid and circled / with all store of light.*[48]

---

[46] Jonson, *The Masque of Queens*, p. 123, line 17.

[47] Jonson, *The Masque of Queens*, p. 123, line 21. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[48] Jonson, *The Masque of Queens*, p. 134, lines 334-41. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

Not only are the witches made to disappear, the arrival of a formal structure of authority forces an actual spatial change, as the 'face of the scene altered' and the witches and hell mouth are forced into a sudden retreat. Equally, it is not just that the House of Fame is a 'glorious and magnificent building'; rather, the architectural presence is then defined absolutely as a space of monarchical, and therefore courtly, authority, as the twelve masquers / queens take the stage whilst on their thrones. Jonson is making the usual point of the masque writer that at a performative venue like the Banqueting House royal, elite space can be altered through his fictional presentation. The text makes a second observation, however, in that 'real' courtly space is able to reference itself through performance, as the masquing space presents the fictional House of Fame. In turn, the Stuart dynasty is automatically fused with architectural splendour, as magnificent courtly building is shown to offer a metaphoric conceptualization of royal authority.[49]

Crucially for this chapter, 'Heroic Virtue' subsequently points out the sense of the House of Fame as a structure of architectural permanence. The queens, we are told, 'had after death the claim / To live eternised in the House of Fame.'[50] A fixed courtly structure of royal authority protects the unique monarchical presence of queenly power, encasing the authority of the masquers through a classicized structure, and so housing their fame for eternity. Similarly, it is revealing that only a genuine courtly space such as Whitehall Palace is able to allow the House of Fame to materialize through masque performance. In this episode, therefore, court space always accompanies monarchical

---

[49] See Orgel, *The Jonsonian Masque* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965; 1981), p. 140: 'The House of Fame has many mansions, and one of them is evidently the palace at Whitehall, for Heroic Virtue is able to address King James directly in his own person.'

[50] Jonson, *The Masque of Queens*, p. 136, lines 388-89.

presence, though there is a hint of the fact that royal authority has a need for the demonstrativity of a formal structure to focus energies and dispel the witches / antimasquers and the accompanying darkness. Whereas in earlier Stuart entertainments courtly and civic spaces had to wrestle for theatrical and textual authority, at Whitehall the courtly space of the House of Fame is able to make other spatial realms – in this case, hell – literally disappear. Jonson's text might even be said to inadvertently give courtly space the upper hand over monarchical authority, as the pyramidical structure of the House of Fame is given prominence as the centre of this fictional court world and it is the building that allows the entry of the queens into James's own palace, just as it is Whitehall that gives prominence to the watching king.

However, Jonson's text avoids this awkward entanglement by allowing the fictional and real courtly worlds to merge, thus subordinating the house to the Stuart king:

> To you, most royal and most happy king,
> Of whom Fame's house in every part doth ring
> For every virtue, but can give no increase,
> Not through her loudest trumpet blaze your peace.[51]

The previous action in the masque has shown the two worlds to have intertwined through the masque performance. Here, however, Jonson reiterates this point by forcing the fictional courtly space to be dependent on James's authorizing presence. Like an Elizabethan progress, therefore, courtly space is shown to be forever dependent on the presence of the king or queen's royalism. Yet even then, there is a slight problem with the masque's foregrounding of a palace through a deliberate architecturalism: it is clear that the house was an important courtly structure before it appeared at James's own

---

[51] Jonson, *The Masque of Queens*, p. 137, lines 408-11.

space. Although the house's most vital queen is Bel-Anna, the theatricalized version of James's consort, the House of Fame might be said to have possessed an inherent courtliness in the pre-text of Jonson's narrative, as Anna once more complicates courtly definition. Towards the close of the masque Jonson depicts the house through a heightened classicism, as if to add a sense of its own importance:

> *And here we cannot but take the opportunity to make some / more particular description of their scene [...] which was the House of Fame. / The structure and ornament of which (as is professed before) was entirely / Master Jones his invention and design. First, for the lower columns, he / chose the statues of the most excellent poets, as Homer, Virgil, Lucan, etc., / as being the substantial supporters of Fame. For the upper, Achilles, / Aeneas, Caesar, and those great heroes which these poets had celebrate. / All which stood as in massy gold. Between the pillars, underneath, were / figured land battles, sea fights, triumphs, loves, sacrifices, and all magnifi- / cent subjects of honor, in brass, and heightened with silver.*[52]

Whereas in *Blackness* the female Moors were 'improved' by the bleaching sunrays of King James, in this text the courtly space of the House of Fame has inherent worth through its own possession of a classical aesthetic. In fact, at no stage does the text suggest that James has classicized the building or the scene.

Continued architecturalism in the Whitehall masque

In 1610 the Banqueting House made space for the entertainments to celebrate Prince Henry's installation as the Prince of Wales, and Jonson's theatrical speeches for the event survive in *Prince Henry's Barriers*. Notably, although the architectural motif in the royal masque was to be taken further by Jonson and others, the theme does spill over from the previous year and the performance of *Queens*. As the Lady of the Lake exclaims:

---

[52] Jonson, *The Masque of Queens*, p. 138, lines 448-57.

> Only the house of chivalry (howe'er
> The inner parts and store be full, yet here
> In that which gentry should sustain) decayed
> Or rather ruined seems, her buildings laid
> Flat with the earth that were the pride of time,
> And did the barbarous Memphian heaps outclimb;
> Those obelisks and columns broke and down
> That struck the stars.[53]

Of course, Jonson's point here is that, as the narrative of the entertainment unfolds, the militaristic Protestantism of Henry will revive the fortunes of the house of chivalry, and Henry's interventionist outlook toward Catholic forces on the continent has been much documented by scholars.[54] In the quotation, however, the gentry are castigated by the Lady of the Lake, as courtiers are shown to have a certain responsibility for different types of elite space. Similarly, as the masque unfolds, only royal authority can right this wrong, obviously through the emergence of the new Prince of Wales. In the fictive past, however, Jonson suggests that the decline of a courtly aristocratic culture can be represented in spatial and architectural terms, as the columns have fallen down.

This continues throughout the speech, as the Lady equates the metaphorical building with monarchical splendour in the masque's past:

> O, when this edifice stood great and high,
> That in the carcase hath such majesty,
> Whose very skeleton boasts so much worth,
> What grace, what glories did it then send forth?
> When to the structure went more noble names
> Than the Ephesian temple lost in flames;
> When every stone was laid by virtuous hands,

---

[53] Jonson, *The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers* in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, pp. 142-58 (p. 143), lines 32-9.

[54] See Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986); Robin Headlam Wells, "'Manhood and Chevalrie': *Coriolanus*, Prince Henry, and the Chivalric Revival", *Review of English Studies*, 51:203 (2000), 395-422. On the masque, see Jean E. Graham, 'The Performing Heir in Jonson's Jacobean Masques', *Studies in English Literature*, 41:2 (2001), 381-98; West, 'Perplexive Perspectives'.

> And standing so (O that it yet not stands!),
> More truth of architecture there was blazed
> Than lived in all the ignorant Goths have razed.[55]

Here the building or 'edifice' has been used to house courtly authority and the accompanying chivalric culture. But the house's former glory in which 'noble names' gathered has been replaced and forgotten, the architectural structure declining, owing to the rejection of chivalry by the courtiers. If a collection of courtiers can be viewed as helping to fashion a court world, then their subsequent neglect can only be expressed through the withering of architectural magnificence. As previously stated, the courtly arrival of the Prince helps to put things right, but once more the actions of associates of the court, whether monarchical or aristocratic members of the elite, are intertwined with the matter of court space, and again, this is articulated via the masquing culture's embrace of an architectural discourse. Lastly, towards the end of Jonson's text, the masque pays homage to the all-knowing presence of James, the founder of the Stuart dynasty that Henry stands to inherit: 'Decayed (as all things subject are to fade), / He hath new built.'[56]

This foregrounding of a temple-like structure of royal authority, and the complex relationship between architectural and royal / courtly space, continues in the masque Jonson prepared for the court the very next year, 1611's *Oberon*. In this entertainment a landscape of wild pastoralism greets the spectators, as a non-courtly world is portrayed:

> *The first face of the scene appeared all obscure, and nothing perceived but a / dark rock with trees beyond it and all wildness that could be presented; till / at one corner of the cliff, above the horizon, the moon*

---

[55] Jonson, *The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers*, p. 144, lines 46-55.

[56] Jonson, *The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers*, p. 155, lines 342-43.

> *began to show, and / rising, a satyr was seen by her light to put forth his head and call.*[57]

This sight is soon changed by the arrival of Prince Oberon (Henry) and, crucially, the accompanying, key signifier of royal authority, a princely palace: '*There the whole scene opened, and within was discovered the frontispiece / of a bright and glorious palace whose gates and walls were transparent.*'[58] The masque prefigures the appearance of the fairy prince and his royal authority with the spatial presentation of his palace, as an architectural structure once more goes hand in hand with royal authority in the Jacobean masque. Oberon's royal status is given heightened meaning by the spatial marker of that authority, the presentation of an architectural palace. Similarly, in the entertainment, it is the palace that strikes the watching satyrs as its grandeur is magnified through Jonson's rhetoric: 'Look! Does not his palace show / Like another sky of lights?'[59] That courtly space is so utterly divine certainly flatters Whitehall Palace and the Banqueting House. Whether Oberon's slight dependence on the building is flattering to James is another issue entirely. Architectural discourse, therefore, can be used to show monarchical power in all its glory. On the other hand, this same discourse might voice subtle comments about the nature of the court and its place in the Stuart structural hierarchy, meaning that the court is publicized through performance and print and that elite space continues to diversify.

---

[57] Jonson, *Oberon, The Fairy Prince: A Masque of Prince Henry's*, in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, pp. 159-73 (p. 159), lines 1-4. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[58] Jonson, *Oberon, The Fairy Prince: A Masque of Prince Henry's*, p. 163, lines 97-8. Italics are reproduced from the edited text. For Jones's picture of the palace, see Roy Strong, *Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), p. 221.

[59] Jonson, *Oberon, The Fairy Prince: A Masque of Prince Henry's*, p. 163, lines 101-02.

This architecturalism at Whitehall is not only limited to the Jonsonian masque, however. Indeed, on February 15th, 1613 George Chapman's *Memorable Masque* was performed at Whitehall (in the hall, rather than the Banqueting House) as one of three masques commissioned to celebrate the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to Frederick, Elector Palatine.[60] This masque is particularly interesting in terms of spatial descriptions of elite realms because, in addition to the obvious reference to courtly space, the text has the unusual feature of a procession that incorporates aspects of London's separate civic space. After a lengthy description of those on the procession, Chapman observes that '*all these so marching to the court at Whitehall, the King, bride, and bridegroom, with all the lords of the most honoured / Privy Council and our chief nobility, stood in the gallery before the / tilt-yard to behold their arrival.*'[61] Even if this is more of a courtly space than civic realm, owing to the royal procession, it is still unusual for a masque to go beyond the performance space of the theatrical hall. This passage stands as another site of masquing 'here and now', as the highly formalized elite ceremony is partly contextualized within the larger framework of space beyond Whitehall. Unsurprisingly, the masque then goes into detail about the masquing space proper, giving the minutiae of a particularly classicized courtly landscape.

Similarly, later in 1613, another masque by Thomas Campion was performed at the Banqueting House to celebrate the controversial marriage of the king's favourite, the Earl of Somerset, with Frances Howard. Although this performance, in keeping with

---

[60] George Chapman, *The Memorable Masque*, in *Court Masques*, pp. 74-91. The other masques were Thomas Campion's *The Lords' Masque* and Frances Beaumont's *The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn*. For more on the wedding and the masques, see David Norbrook, '*The Masque of Truth:* Court Entertainments and International Protestant Politics in the Early Stuart Period', *The Seventeenth Century*, 1:2 (1986), 81-110; Kevin Curran, 'James I and Fictional Authority at the Palatine Wedding Celebrations', *Renaissance Studies*, 20:1 (2006), 51-67.

[61] Chapman, *The Memorable Masque*, p. 77, lines 120-23. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

Chapman's masque, did not feature a monumentalized temple such as those seen in *Queens* and *Oberon*, the classicized landscape at court continues from the *Memorable Masque*, as a genuine architectural setting (Whitehall) is aestheticized through the deployment of classical description:

> The place wherein the Maske was presented, / being the Banqueting house at White Hall, the upper / part, where the State is placed, was Theatred with Pillars, Scaf- / folds, and all things answerable to the sides of the Roome. At the / lower end of the Hall, before the Sceane, was made an Arch Try- / umphall, passing beautifull, which enclosed the whole Workes.[62]

Here the courtly space of Whitehall is made grander still by the beautifying of the scene through the classical landscape and the sense of aestheticization. The masquing space is seen to be 'Theatred' with the pillars and scaffolds, thus linking the architectural discourse with the intrinsic theatricality of the court, as masquing and performativity share the same sense of demonstrativity that foregrounds Whitehall as a place of courtly splendour.[63]

Architectural references in masques, therefore, have at least two purposes: their use by the poet demonstrates the masque's potentiality for the unveiling of alternative

---

[62] Campion, *The Somerset Masque*, in *The Works of Thomas Campion: Complete Songs, Masques, and Treatises with a Selection of the Latin Verse*, ed. by Walter R. Davis (London: Faber and Faber, 1969), pp. 263-84, at p. 268. No line numbers appear in this text. See also Lindley, 'Embarrassing Ben: The Masques for Frances Howard, *English Literary Renaissance*, 14 (1986), 343-59; Butler and Lindley, 'Restoring Astraea: Jonson's Masque for the Fall of Somerset', *English Literary History*, 61 (1994), 807-27; Knowles, 'Crack Kisses Not Staves: Sexual Politics and Court Masques in 1613-14', in *The Crisis of 1614 and The Addled Parliament: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, ed. by S. Clucas and R. Davies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 148-67.

[63] The crossover between courtly space, architecture and the self-referentiality of descriptions of the masquing scene can be scene much later in the period. For example, from 1624 we have a text for Jonson's unperformed *Neptune's Triumph for the Return of Albion*, in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, pp. 409-24. In the masque, the Cook exclaims, 'Sir, this is my room and region too, the Banqueting House! / And in matter of feast and solemnity nothing is to be presented / here but with my acquaintance and allowance to it.' p. 410, lines 13-15.

court worlds, whilst, at the same time, because of the courtly nature of the performance venue there is an inherent self-referentiality in any expression of courtly space through the verbalization of architecture. In terms of this chapter's wider concern with the duality of court signification in the Jacobean period, it is clear that this employment of architecture foregrounds the fixed version of courtly authority, and so sits uneasily with the accompanying polycentrism of that same courtly culture. The expansion of the court, therefore, brings a lack of unity and centrality.

'A prospective of Whitehall': architectural fixity

Masquing activity continued at the second Banqueting House until its destruction by fire in 1619. Reports of this calamity survive in a number of accounts. For instance, Thomas Wallis wrote to a Dr Ward: 'You have heard of the dismal accident at Whitehall, the burning of the banqueting house [...] I heard it this day reported, that the city hath offered his majesty to rebuilt it, and that his Majesty in lieu thereof will give unto the city the liberties of White and Black Friars, and Great St. Bartholomews.'[64] Similarly, on 23rd January, 1619 Chamberlain wrote that '[t]here is a speech of setting up the banqueting house again very speedily, and some will under take for seven or nine thousand pound (I know not whether) to make it more fair and beautiful than before.'[65] What is notable about these accounts is not so much grief for the loss of the old Banqueting House, but the sense of urgency to resurrect the structure anew. Indeed, G. E. Bentley has commented that '[t]he interest of King James in this new structure, which

---

[64] Quoted in *The Court of King James the First*, 2 vols, ed. by Godfrey Goodman (London: Richard Bentley, 1839), II, pp. 175-76. See also pp. 186-89.

[65] *The Chamberlain Letters: A Selection of the Letters of John Chamberlain Concerning Life in England from 1597 to 1626*, ed. by Elizabeth McClure (London: Putnam, 1965), p. 149.

promised so much as a setting for his magnificence and for the prestige of his reign, was evidently unflagging.'[66]

Roy Strong has speculated that James's rebuilding of the Banqueting House can be linked with something much grander: the restructuring of the entire palace of Whitehall long before the project's renaissance under Charles. Certainly, Strong has commented suggestively that the future Caroline ceiling by Peter Paul Rubens was actually a Jacobean idea dating from 1621.[67] More interesting still is Strong's idea that the Jacobean plans for a new palace were to relate to the idea of Solomon's Temple, thus historicizing the Stuarts and grounding James's presentation of himself as Solomon in an architectural, fixed structure. Crucially, therefore, these possibilities show the desire of James and his leading courtiers to further centralize the idea of what 'a court' could be, as a definitive architectural structure. Strong offers further evidence for this courtly formation from the letters of Rubens, who, in 1619 wrote 'that he had been asked to decorate the hall in *the new palace*.'[68]

In fact, I believe that this suggestion re-energizes the study of elite, courtly formation, as the Stuarts may have begun to privilege architectural permanence as a way of understanding the conundrum known as 'the court' in all its early modern guises.

---

[66] G.E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 8 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), VI, p. 261. See also Per Palme, *Triumph of Peace*, p. 3, which comments on James's setting up of a commission for the Banqueting House, as well as the resulting expense of the project. See also pp. 17-18. See p. 23 for related renovations to St Pauls.

[67] Roy Strong, *Britannia Triumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens and Whitehall Palace* (London: Thomas and Hudson, 1980), p. 10. See also Johnson, *Ben Jonson*, Appendix II, 'Jonson, Jones, and the Temple of Solomon', pp. 239-42.

[68] Strong, *Britannia Triumphans*, p. 61. Strong's emphasis. Strong remarks that 'we must cease thinking that the Whitehall Banqueting House [...] could ever have been conceived in total isolation. It was built with absolutely no concessions to the rambling old Tudor palace, as two facades facing outwards and inwards to the *Cour d'honneur*. There were no ends to it.' p. 61. Similarly, Strong explains that he believes the House was only the start of a whole new Jacobean palace. See pp. 62-3.

Indeed, James's potential concern for these ideas can be fortified when we think about his other architectural interests. As J. Newman makes clear:

> James's expenditure on palaces soared above the essentially care-and-maintenance level at which Queen Elizabeth I had kept it [...] [On his] own London palace, Whitehall, the seat of his power, he lavished nearly £50,000 by 1615.[69]

Similarly, we need only look at the 1620 portrait of James by Paul van Somer to witness the king's accelerated (and possibly belated) embrace of a more fixed courtly structure towards the end of the reign. Whereas Elizabeth had been pictured standing (perhaps progressing) over the entire country in the 1592 Ditchley portrait, James was painted with the as yet unfinished Banqueting House in the background, thus making clear 'the importance attached to the building by the Crown, as a symbol of the new ideals of the Stuart Court'.[70] Of course, this portrait relates to the fixed court definition in that an architectural structure is given a colossal status by being depicted alongside the king. By implication, however, this allows us to glimpse the new importance attached to this building. The paradox of court space is present once more, as an additional argument can be made for the definition of the court that requires James's authorising presence, as

---

[69] J. Newman, 'Inigo Jones and the Politics of Architecture', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (London: Macmillan, 1994), pp. 229-55, (p. 231). See also p. 235; John Charlton, *The Banqueting House, Whitehall* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1964), p. 17: 'In all the work [the Banqueting House] took nearly three years and cost £15,618 14s'.

[70] John Harris, Orgel and Strong, *The King's Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court* (London: Arts Council for Great Britain, 1973), p. 121. On the portrait, see also Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries* (California: Stanford University Press, 1983), pp. 40-41. The painting is reproduced at p. 41. At p. 40 Goldberg points out that the building's presence 'reinforces the monarch's absolutist stance.' Although revisionism might argue with Goldberg's new historicist insistence on James's supposed absolutism (when semi-absolutism might be more appropriate), the point is still important as it demonstrates an awareness of the complex interactions between the body of the monarch and courtly space in the period. Unfortunately, Goldberg's study appeared long before the recent explosion of interest in Renaissance culture and spatial theory, and so he does not explore the connections between early modern absolutism and spatial assertion in any detail. See also Palme, *Triumph of Peace*, p. 31.

he is, after all, the main focus of interest in the portrait. One point that is clear, however, is that the notion of Jacobean polycentrism is downplayed in the portrait, perhaps even negated entirely, as early Stuart political culture is expressed through an architectural emphasis. We can see how such artwork directs James's monarchical image in one direction, whereas, in reality, the complexity of the court culture was maintained. Yet, the portrait does foreshadow the view of courtly authority put forward by Charles I in the later reign, as we shall see in the next chapter.

The painting's depiction of the House, along with Jones's initial commission for the actual building, stand as evidence for the growing prioritization of a fixed architectural space as signifier of courtly and royal authority after 1619. Certainly, looking back to some of the masques in the preceding years, it becomes apparent that masquing discourse had already pre-empted this cultural move through the employment of an architectural discourse. Correspondingly, Strong's hints about the potentiality of a whole new palace add weight to this theory, as does the continued use of an architectural discourse in many of the remaining early Stuart masques. For instance, on January 19, 1623, Jonson's masque *Time Vindicated to Himself and to his Honours* was performed at Whitehall. The masque featured a model of the new Banqueting House as a background to the spectacle.[71] As Sir John Astley's letter informs us, 'the first that was discovered

---

[71] See Harris, Orgel and Strong, *The King's Arcadia*, p. 133-34, where it is noted that this model would have been a deliberately unfinished representation of the classical structure. See also Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1991), pp. 111-67 (p. 111). Fumerton's entire chapter on 'Consuming the Void' is highly suggestive in terms of sensitivities towards place in many of the masques. Whereas I have attempted to highlight an architectural, courtly self-referentiality, Fumerton's work on 'placing' in masques is highly informative. Lastly, see John Harris and Gordon Higgott, *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (New York: Zwemmer, 1989), p. 33, where Harris comments on the existence of Jones's drawing for a lost masque on *Cupid's Palace*. The masque's title adds intriguing evidence to the growth of architecturalism in the form. See p. 33. The earlier sketch of Oberon's palace is reproduced at p. 47. See

was a prospective of Whitehall, with the Banquetting house'.[72]

It seems that multiple aspects of the court culture were beginning to foreground the idea of a courtly palace. Although many of the courtiers may not have understood the classical implications of Jones's assumption of Vitruvianism, it is clear that the basic idea of architectural display was taking hold of the Jacobean court towards the end of the reign. As we shall see in the final two sections of the thesis on the Caroline court, this cultural manoeuvre continued into the next reign with an accelerated, decisive eagerness. Likewise, it will be shown that this has profound implications for political discourse as the early seventeenth century unfolded. Recalling the importance of the open-ended nature of Jacobean court space, it is apparent that this is still highly visible, and, at the close of this chapter, I conclude by exploring a text that says much about both courtly space, and, more importantly, some of the ways in which this spatial dynamic can inform our readings of the masque and Jacobean court culture. This last section on a neglected courtesy manual in many ways offers alternative ideas about court space that are not involved with architectural discourses. However, the variety of court description continues to consolidate the polycentrism of the court, even whilst architectural theory was gaining prominence.[73]

Conclusion: *The Court of the most Illustrious and most magnificent Iames*

In his *Basilicon Doron* King James offered Prince Henry the following advice on the 'acquisition' of nobles as a useful feature for a court's successful social complex:

---

also pp. 108-09 on the Banqueting House. Lastly, see pp. 116-17 for a reproduction of Jones's design of the House for the 1623 masque.

[72] Printed in *The Progresses of King James the First*, III, pp. 784-85 (p. 785).

[73] This growing interest is evidenced by the publication of Henry Wotton's *The Elements of Architecture* (London, 1624).

> But consider that vertue followeth oftest noble blood: the worthinesse of their antecessors craueth a reuerent regard to be had vnto them, as Peeres and Fathers of your land: the more frequently that your Court can bee garnished with them, thinke it the more your honour.[74]

In this passage, James admits that trustworthy aristocrats are essential to a workable court. Yet this seems to imply that James would favour a court definition in which the courtiers form part of the court itself, not just the king's physical presence. Certainly, *Basilicon Doron* acknowledges the court's need for aristocrats to help fashion and maintain an elite space, as a hint of pragmatism undercuts the mysticism of the king and his court perpetuated elsewhere in James's own political discourse, including, of course the grand monarchical tone of *Basilicon Doron* itself. Certainly, this point allows us to link the fixed, Whitehall court to an area of early Stuart political culture that some historians are beginning to see as a flawed aspect of monarchical government, in which the reigns of James and Charles may be seen to have failed to offer responsive projects in terms of what Alastair Bellany terms 'self-legitimation' because 'the Stuart kings undercut their own moral and political authority [...] [and] we cannot write about delegitimation, or crisis in authority, without treating it in the context of legitimation, or the cultural construction of authority'.[75]

Important evidence for the demystification of elite space in the Jacobean period can be traced when we move beyond the literary production of the masque writers towards courtly advice literature, a key genre for understanding the cultural practices of the early Stuart court. Of particular significance here is a work that has been virtually

---

[74] James Stuart, *Basilicon Doron,* in *King James VI and I, Political Writings*, p. 29.

[75] Alastair Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 22. Bellany is actually summarizing the work of the historian William Hunt, see pp. 21-22. See also Butler, 'Early Stuart Culture: Compliment or Criticism?', *The Historical Journal*, 32:2 (1989), 425-35.

ignored in literary and historical analysis of the Jacobean period by 'A. D. B.' from 1619 entitled *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES.* Although this text is actually an advice manual to courtiers, the title obviously focuses upon the court of the contemporary monarch, rather than highlighting the work's actual emphasis on courtesy and the behaviour of a courtier, although, etymologically speaking, behaviour and location are clearly linked together. The title's exclusive emphasis on the monarch appears to be another example of the fixing of Jacobean elite space, as the court is clearly associated with monarchical authority, rather than viewed as a site for a fluid negotiation of elite practices and rules by courtiers, a project that is actually at the centre of the manual's strategy. Yet the title page still hints at the earlier, less rigid definitions of the undefined court, in that the subheading reads: 'With divers rvles, most pvre precepts, and selected definitions liuely delineated.'[76] This focus, unspecific as it is on one particular definition, is instead neglected in the actual work, as the writer views the court as the place of the performance of courtliness for the ideal courtier, before the king, thus allowing this person to join 'the Societie of Courtiers'.[77] Significantly, the court is viewed in this work as primarily a space for self-fashioning and self-improvement on the part of the courtier, rather than as a place that is given meaning and exclusively fashioned by royal authority: 'Let the Courtier then which rightly and honestly desires, to decke and

---

[76] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES, the first: KING Of Great-Britaine, France, and Ireland: &c. WITH DIVERS RULES, MOST PURE PRECEPTS, AND SELECTED DEFINITIONS liuely delineated* (London, 1619). The text has not been completely ignored, however. See Dale B. J. Randall, *Jonson's Gypsies Unmasked: Background and Theme of 'The Gypsies Metamorphos'd'* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1975), p. 94, note 74; Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (New York and London: Routledge, 1990), p. 178.

[77] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* p.22.

adorne the forme and fashion of his life in the Court, and to make his Prince his friend and sauourer.'[78]

However, resonances of different approaches to the court can be traced in this work, as we note the writer's stress on a fixed court setting. Indeed, it seems that the confusion and complexity at the heart of early modern court description results in another problem for King James: similarly to the masques at the Banqueting House, architectural elite space is shown, in *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* to be a site that can be altered through courtly performance, or, in this case, the act of writing about the court, courtiers and the king. Courtesy books, such as the earlier *Book of the Courtier* by Baldassarre Castiglione, (translated by Thomas Hoby for an Elizabethan audience in 1561), and George Pettie's translation of Steeven M. Guazzo's *The Ciuile Conuersation* (1581), might be seen as a peculiarly Elizabethan trend. Yet the existence of later works, such as *The Court of James*, and the more well-known 1622 *Compleat Gentleman*, by Henry Peacham, serve as surviving textual evidence for the continued importance of the courtesy manuals.

If we group courtesy manuals together with the masques, then both types of narrative (or textual negotiations with the courtly culture) can be seen as a sub-genre of 'discourse on the court' that examines elite space. Thus, it is possible to view these related works as, in the words of James, unfortunately 'disput[ing]' the 'Kings power' and 'mysticall reuerence'. For instance, early in *The Court of James*, in the 'Epistle to the Reader', the author points out that an earthly court is an unstable and uncertain environment, as religious discourse subconsciously destabilizes and undermines the

---

[78] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* p. 27.

political discourses and courtesy codes associated with James's court. As the writer informs the courtly reader:

> *And this, to thee alone (ingenuous Courtier) doe I heartily desire: vntill thou shalt be translated from this transitory and momentary Court, into that celestiall Palace eternally blessed and blissefull, without all sighes and sorrowes, toile and turmoile, even the mansions of the heauenly Ierusalem.*[79]

Again, an element of mysticism and divinity has been taken from the Jacobean court and reassigned to a place where mystery and the unexplored reign supreme.[80] The English court, it is implied, is an emblem of a greater, celestial realm.

The Court of James even makes a direct link between the court as the place of performance and the possibility for unsettling change that reminds us of the redefinition of elite space through theatrical activity suggested by the masque performances. As the reader is told:

> Courtiers then may learne by these exemplified reasons, drawn out of these famous Kingdomes, as out of the most spacious and specious *Theatre* of the whole world, how alternate and variable the vicissitudes and alterations of things are in a Court.[81]

---

[79] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* sig. A3r. Italics are reproduced from the original text. Later on in the work, the writer refers to 'the Heauenly Court, and Kingdome of Iesus Christ.' p. 22. That one must disregard the earthly court in order to enter the spiritual court in the afterlife is made perfectly clear: 'What if the Courtier also, after this fraile and *transitory* Court, seriously desiring and aspiring, vnto the Celestiall Court, should in pious seruencie, breake out into these holy and heauenly words.' Emphasis mine. p. 24.

[80] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* does dwell on the mystery of kingship, thus highlighting the court as the realm of divine mysticism and political secrecy: 'Princes haue their secrets, which who so ere dares or desires to peepe or pry into shall hardly be free from danger, and giue most palpable and apparant signes of his grosse imprudence. In this case therefore let the Courtier be very cautelous & circumspect, that he diue not too deepe into this dangerous gulfe, but that he keepe neerer the shore, and that he wisely conceale much more than he shall dare to reueale, and that he depresse and keepe in what he should not expresse; yea, let this be the period of all, that silence is a safe & sure reward to him which imbraceth the same.' p. 121.

[81] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* p. 13.

If the courtly performance of masques is to be associated with a degree of metaphorical transformation in terms of elite space, it is interesting to note the emphasis placed on the necessary changes, according to this writer, for the successful courtier, a social climber who has to learn the art of rhetorical performance and *sprezzatura*:

> For Courtiers [sic] had neede to apply and confirme themselues, to all occasions, and to the conditions of them with whome they liue; to bee subtill and craftie both in their *Genius* and disposition, and more mutable and variable than *Proteus* himselfe.[82]

Similarly, another performative function of the court space is linked to the changing of reality and appearance in a disapproving manner that alerts the modern reader to the potential negativity that may have been associated with masque performance:

> [T]he Court is the flatterers stage or *Theatre* wherein hee still doth practise, to adapt and fit himselfe to all affayes excelling *Polypus* farre, yea and the *Cameleon* in change of coullours & mutability of conditions.[83]

Clearly, the writer of the manual is actually discussing the idea of the court as a stage for courtiers' flattery and Machiavellian 'practice', a feature of the early Stuart court that public dramatists such as Thomas Middleton and John Webster were happy to transmit at the London theatres. Yet the explicit link that the writer makes to '*Theatre*' is particularly revealing. The idea of the court as the place of performance is surely implied in this quotation, as early Stuart Whitehall is viewed, with great emphasis, as an explicit space for dramatic activity. In the Jacobean period, this can only mean court theatre and,

---

[82] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* p. 76 (wrongly paginated as p. 66). Later in the work, the writer continues: 'Wherefore let the Courtier be of *Polypus* mind, to take vpon him diuers conditions and disposations, seuerall shapes, and shewes as time and place shall require, yet neuer digressing from equitie and honestie.' pp. 142-43.

[83] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* p. 77.

particularly, the masques of Jonson, Jones and others. Similarly, the negativity associated with the flatterer on his courtly stage-space makes a clear reference to the idea of theatricality as malleable. As we have seen, this is exactly what Carleton feared about 'owr court' and the spatial transformation implicit in the activity of early Stuart masquing culture.

The courtly manual, then, reveals itself to be problematic to Stuart authority because even in a work that praises the Jacobean court, making the lives of courtiers and elite space the subject of a writer's focus subjects the court to possibly harmful processes of scrutiny and enquiry. Thus, the writer cannot avoid the mention of dubious courts and kings, as he pries into, as James said, the 'mysterie of the Kings power':

> But whosoeuer [...] doth honestly and discreetly desire to prouide for, and to forecast his owne well fare and future felicitie. Him I admonish, that he be inquisitive [sic] and carefull, to seeke out the Court of a most potent Prince or Monarch, rather than of an infirme, weake, and less puissant King or kingdome.[84]

The conduct book demonstrates how the Jacobean court can be visualized without the king's authorizing presence, court business continuing in the absence of monarchical authority, as '[t]he Courtier being aduanced and extolled to some great and egregious height of honour, and dignitie, and in the absence of his Prince being (as it were) president or principall Agent, in an intricate employment, and affaires of great

---

[84] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* pp. 24-25. The work also includes 'A Briefe memoriall of that most memorable Queene Elizabeth', pp. 44-45. In this digression, the author finds space for praise of the previous monarch, but also suggests she has taken her place at the heavenly court, mentioned above. Elizabeth appears to be continuing her court-centred progresses even now: 'Thou art now blessedly ascended, from this momentary and temporary Court, into a heauenly Palace.' pp. 44-45. We see here how 'court discourse', in this case the courtly manual, unravels the mythical splendour of the Jacobean court by praising both the former head of the English court, as well as the court of heaven.

consequence' is able to carry out various courtly tasks.[85] This relates to the expansion of the court during James's reign, including the use of aristocratic entertainments, and the role of Queen Anna for much of the reign, as a court need not be so centred on monarchical presence. Although the quotation appears to make only a small point, concerned as it is with administrative or ceremonial duties, it does suggest a gradual cultural shift: a delegitimation of authority in terms of kingly attendance, access to the court, and the acquisition of power can be traced through an examination of courtly discourse in the early Stuart period.[86] However, as the next chapter on the Caroline period demonstrates, although Charles's court retained a sense of this polycentric expansion

---

[85] A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES,* p. 128.

[86] Another Jacobean text, Nicholas Breton's *The Court and Country* (sig. A4r) reveals an interesting modification of the early Stuart court, when the Courtier tells the Countryman: 'Oh, the gallant life of the Court, where so many are the choices of contentment, as if on earth it were the paradise of the world, the majesty of the Soueraigne, the wisdome of the Conseell, the honour of the Lords, the beauty of the Ladies, the care of the Officers, the courtesy of the Gentleman.' In this example, monarchical power is a contributor to the definition and life of the court, but the space also seems to be participating in a mutually beneficial performance that cultivates a courtly life. Indeed, the Courtier's speech to the Countryman allows us to glimpse one early modern conception (or summary of interrelated conceptions) of the court, in that the passage neatly lists various components. Certainly, the Courtier's implied closeness to what is, in this instance, a fictional monarchy, permits the speaker to praise the court as 'the paradise of the world.' Crucially, however, the monarch's 'majesty' seems to be reliant on other aspects of court life, as praising the court allows the opportunity for praising the king or queen to surface. Seen from this vantage point, panegyric for the ruler is reliant on discourse first permitting approval for the spatial world that frames and nurtures monarchy, an aspect of the political culture that is merely one component of the wider complex. As the passage makes clear, other equally important apparatus include the wisdom of those with access to the king or queen, the honour of the aristocracy and ruling class, and the presence of the court's ladies; a point that clearly connects this passage with the idea of a female collective in courtly formation, as portrayed in Jonson's *Masque of Blackness.* Lastly, 'the care of the Officers' and 'the courtesy of the Gentleman' add the importance of decorum and administrative procedure to the constructive components of the courtly milieu. Yet again, though, this only strengthens the sense of mutual dependency between the king or queen and other aspects of the environment. See Nicholas Breton, *The Court and Country, OR A briefe Discourse Dialogue-wise set downe betweene a Courtier and a Country-man: Contayning the manner and condition of their liues, with many Delectable and Pithy Sayings worthy obseruation. Also, necessary Notes for a COURTIER. VVritten by N.B. Gent.* (London, 1618). Breton's dialogue also allows the Countryman to offer an interesting view on the physical sight of the monarch, arguing that although the countrymen do not meet with the king on a daily basis, (as the courtiers do), they are still touched by the reaches of sacral monarchy: '[T]hough we see not our Soueraigne every day, yet we prey for him euery hower; and holding our selues unworthy of his presence, are glad when we may get a sight of his Majesty.' Sig. B1r. This might be taken a stage further, however, in that continued admittance to the monarch at court may allow the courtier too much access to the sovereign, and so the court as the fixed place of the king's performance *permits* familiarity.

alongside a growing architecturalism, the later reign increasingly fixed a definition of the court space at Whitehall Palace.

Chapter 6 'Pieces of Architecture of a Palace Royal': Absolutist Court Space and Caroline Entertainments

Introduction

Charles I did not possess adequate funding for the building of a new royal palace, but, as I demonstrate in this chapter, the king used the court masque to articulate his absolutist vision of architectural structures, as Whitehall masquing culture increased during the reign. As critics like Stephen Orgel, Martin Butler, and Kevin Sharpe have long noted, the Caroline masque surpasses the Jacobean forerunner in terms of a centralized aesthetic and accompanying spectacle.[1] In this later period, monarchical theatrical activity increased also, as England's King, as well as the Queen Consort, now performed on the masquing stage. With this in mind, this section excavates a neglected architectural discourse in the surviving Caroline masques, and argues that the sense of physicality offered by the Caroline writers underscores the early Stuart interest in a 'fixed' courtly space at Whitehall. As I demonstrate in this chapter, the architectural discourse of the

---

[1] On the Caroline court masque, see Roy Strong and Stephen Orgel, eds., *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols (California: California University Press, 1973); Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: California University Press, 1975); Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981); Jennifer Chibnall, '"To that Secure Fix'd State": The Function of the Caroline Masque Form', in *The Court Masque*, ed. by David Lindley (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), pp. 78-93; David Norbrook, 'The Reformation of the Masque', in *The Court Masque*, pp. 94-110; Martin Butler, 'Politics and the Masque: *The Triumph of Peace*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 2:2 (1987), 117-41; Butler, 'Reform or Reverance? The Politics of the Caroline Masque', in *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts*, ed. by J. R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 118-56; Butler, 'The Invention of Britain and the Early Stuart Masque', in *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, ed. by Malcolm Smuts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 65-85; Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 179-264; Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Karen Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); James Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture in the Masque* (forthcoming 2007), Chapter 5, 'Dwarf Posts from Hell: Towards a Sociology of the Masque'. On Caroline entertainments such as civic entries and progresses, see David M. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry: 1558-1642* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971), pp. 105-21.

Jacobean masque is not only continued; it is advanced significantly in the Caroline period, particularly as Inigo Jones is allowed a more dominant role in theatrical production. However, in the concluding section of this chapter, I show that there was a continuing remembrance of Elizabethanism in Caroline court culture, as the royal progress and accompanying entertainments are not abandoned, but rather neglected. We can account for this resonance of a progressing culture because, as my previous chapters have highlighted, James I did actually undertake a number of important progresses, and so it is unsurprising that these continued under Charles, to some extent at least. Furthermore, the expansion of the court under James meant that Charles had inherited a polycentric and complex elite world. Even if Charles had wished to abandon progresses entirely, this was not possible in early Stuart England.

Nevertheless, an investigation of the surviving textual evidence for a Caroline progressing culture adds further weight to the idea of an early Stuart embrace of the masquing scene at Whitehall, at the expense of a degree of communication with the popular voice and the aristocratic elite away from London, as 'popular' entertainment and display is subordinated to elite masquing. Like James, Charles continued to progress, but even more so than his father, the pageantry associated with this form of monarchical spectacle is missing. Similarly, whereas James may have progressed as often as Elizabeth, during Charles's reign the progress is relatively neglected as a form of royal assertion. Owing to the slight continuation of progressing, together with the idea of a separate court for the queen (Henrietta-Maria), Caroline court culture retained a sense of the Jacobean elite's polycentrism.[2] Yet, at the same time, the Stuart prioritization of a

---

[2] See Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1987), particularly p. 133; Britland, *Drama*, p. 17; Caroline

fixed courtly structure at Whitehall Palace is greatly accelerated and embraced during Charles's reign. Unfortunately for Charles, a king may be removed from a static space, as he was to find out in the 1640s. Notably, although Charles's move with his court to Oxford in 1642 was a pragmatic, almost voluntary relocation, the king was excluded permanently, of course, with his 1649 execution. Throughout Charles's reign, therefore, at least two types of court cultures existed together, as a progressing court struggled to compete with Charles's fixing of authority at Whitehall.

'Troy wall'd so high': Caroline court aesthetics and Whitehall masquing culture

In his influential study, David Howarth stresses the importance of London to both James and Charles, and, by implication, points up the architectural splendor that they wished to be associated with in terms of palaces as 'images of rule':

> The Stuarts felt London was a direct reflection on their own magnificence. The palaces of Greenwich and Whitehall were central to image-making in a very obvious way: foreign ambassadors had to be impressed as they waited for an audience with the king.[3]

Of course, the Banqueting House was the only part of the old Tudor palace to be added by the Stuarts on a significant scale. Indeed, according to Howarth, the Banqueting House by Inigo Jones should clearly be remembered as a Jacobean achievement, rather than a Caroline advancement:

> James certainly prided himself on what he took to be authoritative statements on a whole host of issues which were genuinely of concern to him if not, as he fondly deluded himself, to the Jacobean literati [...] A whole series of proclamations on building show his close personal involvement both in the sentiments they express, the philosophy they

---

Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: Perspectives on the Role of Consort Queens in *Ancien Régime* Courts', in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. by Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 92-110.

[3] David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Social and Political Analysis of English Renaissance Art* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), p. 28.

> declare and the ambitions they set out. Furthermore James I was intensely proud of his achievement as a builder.[4]

Thus, argues Howarth, we need to be aware that much of what I have been calling the aestheticization of Whitehall took place during the Jacobean era, rather than the Caroline period. Howarth goes on to argue that, whereas the 1619 Banqueting House by Jones stands as evidence of James's interest in the high arts and, particularly, architecture, the lack of similar enterprises under Charles is a sharp reminder to those who see Charles's court as a golden age of aesthetic display, because 'Charles I lacked confidence and to have built on a princely scale demanded it.'[5] However, contemporary evidence, such as Edmund Waller's poem 'Upon His MAJESTIES repairing of PAULS' offers a rather different opinion:

> Not ought which *Shebas* wondering Queen beheld
> Amongst the works of *Solomon* excell'd,
> His ships and building; emblems of a heart
> Large both in magnanimity and art.[6]

In this passage and throughout his poem, Waller attaches much emphasis on Charles's interest in restoring the cathedral to former glories. For the purposes of this study, it is perhaps more important to think about how Charles I utilized the fine buildings already available to him, including, in particular, the Banqueting House and the whole of Whitehall Palace. Although Howarth is correct in stressing that the Jacobean era is at the centre of Jones's classical project, the Caroline period prioritized this new elite space

---

[4] Howarth, *Images*, p. 33.

[5] Howarth, *Images*, p. 45.

[6] Edmund Waller, 'Upon His MAJESTIES repairing of PAULS', in *Poems* (London, 1645), pp. 3-5 (p. 5). Italics are reproduced from the original text. On this poem's relation to the Caroline masque, see David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 75-76.

more than ever before, at least in terms of masque performance. Likewise, it was during Charles's reign that the Rubens ceiling was unveiled, a work of art that surely adds to the sense of an increased readiness for monarchical absolutism in the later 1620s and throughout the 1630s on the part of Charles.[7] For instance, as Parry reminds us,

> [i]t was through painting that [Charles] made the most comprehensive statement about the character of Stuart power ideally understood, when he commissioned Rubens to paint a sequence of canvases for the Banqueting House ceiling in 1629-30 [...] The Whitehall ceiling [...] serves as an indication of the move towards absolute government that would accelerate during the 1630s. The deified James is shown to be approved by Heaven: he possesses in himself all the essential wisdom and knowledge required for good government; there is no need of any human aid or counsel. The Rubens paintings aim to sanction the unmoderated exercise of power by wise and benevolent Stuarts.[8]

There is a related point of crucial importance. As Howarth admits, just because Charles did not commission a building like the Banqueting House, this does not mean that the monarch was unaware of the importance of elite space and building on a grand scale:

> [T]here appears to be a major difficulty in assuming that Charles was a king for pictures not palaces. This is found in a corpus of some seventy drawings by Jones' assistant John Webb. These are now taken to represent two separate schemes from the 1630s for a palace which was to have been located either in St James's Park or along the Thames [...] Some believe that the drawings allow us to conclude that James and Charles intended the

---

[7] On the Rubens ceiling and the interior decoration of the Banqueting House, see Per Palme, *Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1957), pp. 225-88; Oliver Millar, *Rubens: The Whitehall Ceiling* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958); John Charlton, *The Banqueting House, Whitehall* (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1964); Roy Strong, *Britannia Triumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens and Whitehall Palace* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), particularly p. 59. See also D. J. Gordon, *The Renaissance Imagination: Essays and Lectures by D. J. Gordon*, ed. by Stephen Orgel (London and Los Angeles: California University Press, 1975), pp. 24-50. For more general discussions of architecturalism in the period, see Linda Levy Peck, *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 188-229; J. Newman, 'Inigo Jones and the Politics of Architecture', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (London: Macmillan, 1994), pp. 229-55.

[8] Graham Parry, *The Seventeenth Century: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1603-1700* (London and New York: Longman, 1989), pp. 28-29

> Banqueting House to be part of a classical enfilade of buildings; a flagship waiting for its squadron of classically dressed buildings floating along the river.[9]

Likewise, James Knowles has noted the 'absolutist re-edification projects pursued by Charles I (e.g. St Pauls, the planned Whitehall Palace).'[10] It is understandable that such potential ventures would have allowed Charles to 'mine' such buildings (through persuasive political discourse) for their prioritization of classical and courtly aesthetics, in order to stress the confidence of early Stuart absolutism, or semi-absolutism at least. This is certainly what appears to be happening in Waller's poem on the rebuilding of St Pauls:

> *Laomedon* that had the gods in pay,
> *Neptune*, with him that rules the sacred day,
> Could no such structure raise, Troy wall'd so high,
> Th'Atrides might as well have forc'd the sky.[11]

In this passage, therefore, Charles's ability to raise or refurnish classicized structures of authority is a vital aspect of his divine monarchy, as Waller's use of couplets brings attention to the aesthetic construction of his own poem and so mirrors Charles's embrace of architectural structure.

Charles's plans for Whitehall allow us to trace the court's gradual settling in London, as this project would have contrasted in the extreme with Elizabeth's preference for travel rather than building. Although it is true that the building of a grand palace to rival those of the French and Spanish courts would clearly have been an absolutist manoeuvre, this move towards a fixed court strengthened the definition of court space as an architectural location. As we shall see, historians have undervalued the extent to which

---

[9] Howarth, *Images*, p. 47.

[10] See Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture*.

[11] Waller, 'Upon His MAJESTIES repairing of PAULS', p. 5.

Charles progressed. However, Charles's court was not defined exclusively according to the early modern notion of the court being wherever the monarch resides, though Caroline culture did retain this meaning. As Parry has pointed out, the stress on a London-based court culture may have harmed Charles presentation before his people, because his 'aesthetic tastes [...] did much to alienate stolid Protestants, who suspected that the course of the Reformation was being subverted. It is not at all surprising that after the execution of Charles in 1649, Parliament ordered the sale of the royal collections, and that much of the proceeds was used to pay military expenses.'[12] Although Parry notes the failure of the aesthetic Caroline project, he does acknowledge its potential: '[Charles's] grandest scheme, for a completely rebuilt Whitehall to fulfill [his] dream of a palace that would rival the Louvre, never got beyond the drawing-board.'[13]

However, other projects in the aestheticization of Caroline court culture enjoyed a great deal of success, and the masques between 1631 and 1640 helped to articulate Charles's absolutism through an architectural discourse that often referenced and even foregrounded the elite courtly space of Whitehall Palace. For, as John Peacock has persuasively argued, '[t]he most magnificent images of the king were to be seen in the court masques. As a medium for representing royalty the masque was unique, in that it did not need to fabricate a simulacrum of the monarch: the King appeared in person.'[14] In the same way, argues Peacock, it is hardly surprising that Caroline masquing culture

---

[12] Parry, *The Seventeenth Century*, p. 53.

[13] Parry, *The Seventeenth Century*, p. 54. Nigel Smith has argued for a greater critical awareness of a Republican / Cromwellian understanding of the power of fine art. See 'Purified Form and the Court Pureed', unpublished conference lecture, *English Court Culture, 1642-60*, Hampton Court Palace, June 2006. I am grateful to Professor Smith for allowing me to read a copy of this unpublished work.

[14] John Peacock, 'The Visual Image of Charles I', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 230.

was chosen to articulate much of Charles's political discourse because 'in the spectacular transformations of the masque, designed by Jones to look like baroque paintings come to life, the King could figure as gloriously as any continental sovereign, with the added advantage of figuring authentically as himself.'[15] Similarly, one way that Charles could encourage a vision of himself that embraced Continental absolutism was the foregrounding of a distinct aesthetic discourse in the masques, one which acknowledged the importance of a rhetoric of architecturalism.[16]

Of course, there is something intrinsically elitist about the establishment of a Whitehall masquing culture; even if we put aside the complications of spatial theory, in terms of public / private, inner and outer, space. For instance, whereas progressing at least allowed the outside world a glimpse of a monarch and his or her accompanying court culture, the early Stuart masque continually reinstated the line between the elite and the popular masses. As Peacock has shown,

> [t]he apotheoses of the masque were witnessed by an elite. Although the texts were often printed, and so made more accessible, the performances were for 'spectators of quality', courtiers and privileged outsiders. Those excluded, such as citizens and the common people, often cropped up

---

[15] Peacock, 'The Visual Image', p. 231. See also an influential essay by Butler, who comments that '[m]asques had political functions that went beyond that of flattery of the monarch.' Butler, "Politics and the Masque: *Salmacida Spolia*", in *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 59-74 (p. 61). See also Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 180. Lastly, John Astington locates this debate usefully within the confines of fine art in the period. See his *English Court Theatre, 1558-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 215.

[16] Although the foregrounding of architecturalism in the masques is a key point of my discussion, previous scholars have at least noticed this fact, though the full importance of this development has not been recognized before. See Veevers, *Images*, p. 112, where the Romanized buildings in the masques are noted. See also p. 136-37. At p. 141 Veevers links the building in *The Temple of Love* to the queen's own Catholicism. Lastly, see the recent work of John Peacock: 'The Image of Charles I as a Roman Emperor', in *The 1630s*, pp. 50-73. Alongside a discussion of Caroline court portraiture, Peacock goes into much detail about the presence of architecturalism in the Caroline masque. However, unlike my own emphasis, Peacock is interested in the period's use of Charles's imperialism and Romanized grandeur, rather than the deployment of these tropes for the articulation of absolutist courtly space.

> irrepressibly as comic characters in the antimasque, encouraging the courtly elite to see the majority of their compatriots as part of a bumptious social subplot.[17]

It might be conjectured that the publication of masque texts from the start of the early Stuart fascination with the form may have had more to do with the need for writers like Jonson to push their texts forward into the literary culture, as well as into the print culture of early modern London. Jonson, we know, was particularly keen to make a case through print for the court masque as an artistic and literary form of considerable worth. For instance, he had his first two court masques (*The Masque of Blackness* and *The Masque of Beauty*) printed together in quarto format in the earlier Jacobean period, and his masques feature prominently in the 1616 folio of his works, before Jonson began to print his masques as quartos once more in the 1620s.[18] Correspondingly, the sense of elite culture was heightened by the performances of the monarch in the Caroline masque, as now the privileged spectators were able to see monarchical theatricality in a very real sense.

Likewise, as theatre historians and literary critics have long observed, the Caroline masque coupled the performance of monarchy together with a more aesthetic and demonstrative court performance, in that the masques of the 1630s distanced themselves from Jonson and his obsession with literary taste and textuality, and, instead,

---

[17] Peacock, 'The Visual Image', p. 232. Butler goes further and points out that Caroline masques may have occasionally missed their intended audience as well. See his '*Salmacida Spolia*', p. 72.

[18] See Jonson, *The characters of two royall masques The one of blacknesse, the other of beautie. personated by the most magnificent of queenes Anne Queene of great Britaine, &c. With her honorable ladyes, 1605. and 1608. at White-hall: and inuented by Ben: Ionson* (London, 1608). For the later folio, see *The workes of Beniamin Ionson* (London, 1616). Indeed, the heightened status of Jonson in the folio's title, where he is now '*Beniamin*' as opposed to '*Ben*' in the 1608 quarto suggests the considerable rise in status that Jonson attached to himself. That the masque texts feature in a folio presented in this way tells us much about Jonson's wish to highlight their literary quality. On the last point above about the return to quartos, see James Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture*, chapter 4.

focused increasingly on the theatrical 'show' that Jones staged for the court.[19] Of course, the performances of Charles and his queen would have only added to this sense of display and aesthetic spectacle. As Peacock has argued, 'during the 1630s, when Jones was in the ascendant, he made sure that the masques became more and more pictorial in character, a tendency which accorded with Charles's love of the visual arts and his use of them to make statements of his political objectives and ideals.'[20] Similarly, it would seem that the Caroline embrace of court aesthetics through the use of a masquing culture included a generic shift that meant that the masque itself became more aesthetically-charged than ever before. A balanced and aestheticized court space required an eloquent, aesthetic masque to articulate monarchical and classical grandeur.

Charles's court was driven by a determined aestheticism, with the king at the centre of the court culture and the masque. As Sharpe points out, 'we may be certain that the king's participation was completely to refashion the masque.'[21] Indeed, according to Sharpe, the participation of Charles in the Caroline masques of the 1630s did not figure the monarch as mere actor. Rather, we should perhaps think of Charles as a guiding hand behind his own idealized courtly vision:

> Jones's prominence [...] cannot be isolated from [...] the influence of the king and queen. The prologue to *Chloridia* hints that there had been more than two inventors of the masque; and that the king and queen had been closely involved in the production. It may well be that throughout the

---

[19] On this theme, see, for instance, Knowles, '"Can ye not tell a man from a marmoset?": Apes and Others on the Early Modern Stage', in *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures*, ed. by Erica Fudge (Illinois: Illinois University Press, 2002), pp. 138-63 (p. 148).

[20] Peacock, 'The Visual Image', p. 230

[21] Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 183. Similarly: 'In some ways the succession of Charles I presented Jonson with a solution to the problem he had faced for years: how to make the monarch the centre of the masque and the effective force of the transformation which was the masque's purpose.' See p. 184.

> 1630s the decisive voices in the direction of the court entertainments were those of the Charles I and Henrietta Maria themselves. In the case of the queen, who presented over half of the entertainments, there is little direct evidence [...] [Evidence] suggests strongly that Jones's chief collaborator after 1631 was Charles I himself and that the masques of the 1630s reflect the ideas of both men.[22]

When my own argument traces an architectural discourse in the masques of the period, it is clear that this feature has much to do with the influence of the king and his fondness for a theory of architectural absolutism. Crucially, if Charles could not create a new Whitehall Palace, he could at least use *the idea* of a fixed architectural setting to articulate his own political discourse of royal magnificence.[23] Although critical work has occasionally highlighted the Caroline masque's use of architectural motifs, it is my belief

---

[22] Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 186, p. 188. However, Sharpe's slight simplification does not quite do justice to this court culture's continued polycentrism, in that the 'authorship' of a masque might be said to include courtiers and those involved in the rehearsals. Also, Sharpe's conceptualization of early modern authorship does not take into account recent critical work on the open-endedness of early modern ideas of authorship and the materiality of the printed text.

[23] Astington observes that 'Charles would gladly have transformed Whitehall in the general fashion of the elegant new Banqueting House, had he had the money to do so.' See *English Court Theatre*, p. 34. Similarly, Sharpe notes that Charles may not have been able to alter the physical structure of Whitehall to any great extent, but he did manage to change the court's attitudes and ideology. See Sharpe, 'The Image of Virtue: The Court and Household of Charles I, 1625-1642', in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. by David Starkey (London: Longman, 1987), pp. 226-260 (p. 230). See also Charles Carlton, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (London: Ark, 1983), p. 124. Carlton comments also on Charles's preference for Whitehall above his other palaces: '[D]uring the 1630s the king spent little time at Windsor. He was even more negligent of Nonsuch.' See p. 127. Charles's neglect of Nonsuch is particularly ironic when it is remembered that this royal palace was the subject of one of the most detailed drawings of Elizabeth's moveable court on her progresses. The engraving is by George Hoefnagel from c. 1582 and is at the Folger Shakespeare Library. See the cover art to Mary Hill Cole's *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999). To summarize, therefore, it seems that Charles's prioritization of Whitehall Palace occurred in many different, interconnected ways: he cut down on progressing and pageantry (though this continued sporadically); he stayed at Whitehall far more than previous monarchs; neglected other palaces, and, crucially, staged lavish masques that articulated an absolutist, centralizing discourse through the employment of architectonics in these masques, both verbally and pictorially. See Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 209-74. At p. 213 Sharpe discusses Charles's plan for a new Whitehall Palace, and at p. 322 he discusses the new St Pauls venture. See also John Harris and Gordon Higgott, *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (New York: The Drawing Center, 1989), pp. 238-39; Maija Jansson, 'The Impeachment of Inigo Jones and the Pulling Down of St Gregory's by St Pauls', *Renaissance Studies*, 17:4 (2003), 716-46. On this last point, see Waller's poem 'Upon His MAJESTIES repairing of PAULS'. For some contemporary views on Caroline court culture, see *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631-1638: Catholicism and the Politics of the Personal Rule*, ed. by Michael C. Questier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

that this is far more important than has been realized. As I demonstrate, the Caroline masques at Whitehall utilize architecture in terms of scenic display and literary discourse and this formal expression allows us to trace Charles's prioritization of a fixed courtly structure at the expense of both Elizabethan peripateticism and the Jacobean court's polycentric nature.

'A prospect of the kings pallace of *Whitehall*': masques and Caroline architectural discourse

The Caroline masques that survive from the Whitehall stage-space from 1631 onwards display even greater confidence than the Jacobean texts, as the genre asserted monarchical idealism more than ever before.[24] Fittingly, the first two texts that we have are from Jonson, the writer who, along with Jones, dominated the Jacobean masquing stage. The first 1631 masque was the king's *Love's Triumph through Callipolis*, performed on January 9th. *Chloridia* was performed on February 22nd and might be termed the queen's companion masque. However, whereas Jones's masquing career would go from strength to strength under Charles, Jonson evidently enjoyed less success on the stage of the Caroline court theatre. As Karen Britland points out, '*Chloridia* [. . .] gave rise to Ben Jonson's notorious and definitive rupture with Inigo Jones, ostensibly because Jones objected to his name appearing second on the title page of the printed text.'[25] Likewise, if it is accepted that the Caroline masque increasingly embraces

---

[24] No Caroline masques from Whitehall survive from the beginning of Charles's reign, hence the link between Caroline masquing culture and the personal rule in modern criticism. For instance, See Sharpe, *The Personal Rule* alongside his earlier *Criticism and Compliment*.

[25] Britland, *Drama*, p. 74. However, see also Julie Sanders, 'Jonson's Caroline Coteries', in *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*, ed. by Takashi Kozuka and J. R. Mulryne (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 279-93.

performativity, then one casualty of the aestheticization of the Caroline court may be said to be Jonson himself. Of course, this was not so apparent in 1631.

Jonson's *Love's Triumph* and *Chloridia* are, in many ways, products of the new courtly aesthetic at Whitehall. In both masques it is telling that textuality has given way to performativity, as both are far shorter than the Jacobean forerunners in terms of these being textual recollections of a performative event. There was clearly more theatrical and visual splendour than literary discourse in the new court masques of 1631. As David Lindley remarks, *Chloridia* displays 'the new direction and new thematic preoccupations of the masques of the period, with their celebration and idealization of the royal marriage.'[26] In the earlier text, we have the first architectural references in a Caroline masque, as Evphemvs comments on '*the streetes of* [...] Callipolis' and Amphitrite refers to '*The Temple of all* Beauty'.[27] Although these are only minor instances of an architectural discourse, it is significant that straight away the Caroline masque picks up where the Jacobean court left off in the mid 1620s, because as was demonstrated in the last chapter, numerous Jacobean masques were accentuating architectural structures in courtly productions. Notably, far more of this material was about to surface throughout the 1630s.

Moreover, the title page of the second masque (*Chloridia*) is interesting in terms of court space. Whereas Jonson's Jacobean masques had tended to highlight the performance space of the drama 'at the court of Whitehall', thus signifying the older

---

[26] Jonson, *Chloridia*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 259. The text is reproduced at pp. 147-54. See also Britland, *Drama*, p. 74.

[27] Jonson, *Love's Triumph through Callipolis*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), VII. The masque is reproduced at pp. 731-43. Quotations above are from p. 737, line 71; p. 739, line 116. Italics are reproduced from the edited text. On this masque, see Britland, *Drama*, pp. 66-70.

Elizabethan sense of a court accompanying monarchical presence, it is clear that, by 1631, Whitehall Palace was *the* court by definition in the public consciousness, as the title page can presume that 'at court' signifies the Whitehall masquing space. In fact, there is no longer a need to state the obvious. As the reader is informed: 'Rites to Chloris and Her Nymphs, / Personated in a Masque at Court / By the Queen's Majesty and her Ladies / At Shrove-Tide, 1631.'[28]

When we turn attention beyond the prefatory material to the second masquing text itself it is clear that a sense of physicality dominates the scene as the spectacle of a staged environment is foregrounded:

> *The Curtain being drawn up, the scene is discovered, consisting of / pleasant hills planted with young trees and all the lower banks adorned / with flowers. And from some hollow parts of those hills fountains come / gliding down, which, in the far-off landscape, seemed all to be converted / to a river.*[29]

It is obvious from the very beginning of Jonson's text, therefore, that the new Caroline masque will prioritize the scene created by Jones, as a sense of landscape and the environment shapes the masquing space. This can only have added to the very real sense of the performance of the masque transforming court space before the audience. It may even be conjectured that the pastoral landscape resonates with a distinct Elizabethanism, as the culture of progressing into the wilds of the country is fondly remembered through the masque's ability to permit (fictional) access to non-courtly worlds beyond Whitehall. Rather than travelling to the countryside as Elizabeth had done, Charles and Henrietta-Maria have pastoralism recreated within the closed-off space of Whitehall. If Charles will

---

[28] Jonson, *Chloridia*, p. 147.

[29] Jonson, *Chloridia*, p. 147, lines 15-19. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

not take his court on tour, then the sites and landscapes must come to Whitehall through the transformative power of masque performance.

Tellingly, Jonson's text goes on to prioritize visuality and spectacle even in the printed remembrance of the event: '*When the spectators had enough fed their eyes with the delights of the / scene, in a part of the air a bright cloud begins to break forth.*'[30] Not only is the new masque recreating fictionalized spaces before the courtly audience, as the Jacobean masques had done; now the entertainment's potential for creating such places is highlighted, and even comes to dominate Jonson's text. If, behind the scenes Jonson was losing his battle with Jones and so failing to articulate the literary possibilities of the masque form, then all he could do was to verbalize Jones's scene for the printed text. At least in textual transmission, Jones's pictorial focus was dependent on Jonson's literary discourse.

In terms of the masque's representation of distant space and the 'here and now' of the performance area of the Banqueting House, Jonson's masque actually makes a point of foregrounding Whitehall's elitist nature and the growing sense of the isolation of courtly space in the Caroline period, and this jars with the embrace of pastoralism and community mentioned above. As Postilion remarks in the masque: 'All is turned triumph there. Had / hell-gates been kept with half that strictness as the entry here has / been tonight, Pluto would have had but a cold court, and / Proserpine a thin presence, though both have a vast territory.'[31] This reminds us of the exclusivity of the court masque as opposed to the embrace of popular display in a royal progress. As Lindley observes, these

---

[30] Jonson, *Chloridia*, p. 147, lines 22-23.

[31] Jonson, *Chloridia*, p. 150, lines 117-20.

lines refer to the fact that 'Charles had tightened up on admission to the masques'. though it might also be added that it is clear that this must have been a well-known point, in order for Jonson to joke about the topic.[32] At the Caroline court, then, the closing-off of the fixed space at Whitehall is a moment of pride and is referenced knowingly by the masque writer for audience enjoyment.

The exclusivity of the Banqueting House allows Jonson's text to depict a feature of the Caroline masques that would frequently reappear throughout the period, as we have another glimpse of an architectural discourse. Crucially, this presentation is personified for the audience's pleasure. As we shall see in the conclusion on Royalist nostalgia for Whitehall in the 1640s, this tactic is adopted frequently as the place itself is made to speak in several texts. In the masque, the sense of elitism and a 'knowing', cultivated audience is brought out by Architecture's point that here is 'Architecture, who will raise thee high.'[33] The classical and aesthetic embrace of building as a cultural form is then linked to the importance of high art at Charles's court by the personification of Sculpture, who remarks 'And Sculpture, that can keep thee from to die [sic].'[34] Of course, sculpture and architecture share a common sense of fixing a theme in place for eternity, as high art is coupled together with the embrace of a permanent structure that consolidates Stuart power. In the masque, the use of an architectural discourse helps to monumentalize Charles's authority, thus adding to the idea of a court as a permanent structure of royal power. Also, Jonson's use of Architecture as a speaking character means that Jones's visual emphasis (architecture and scenic display) is appropriated by a

---

[32] Lindley, *Court Masques*, p. 260.

[33] Jonson, *Chloridia*, p. 154, line 225.

[34] Jonson, *Chloridia*, p. 154, line 226.

literary discourse, as it is only through the employment of personification (a literary rather than a visual device) that Jones's ideas are able to speak through the text, in the world beyond the actual visual performance that night; the world of textual transmission through print.

'His sumptuous palace': Caroline masques and architectural persistence

Aurelian Townshend's 1632 *Albion's Triumph* also foregrounds the importance of architecture at the Caroline court. This text makes direct reference to architectural discourse in terms of courtly space, and, like Jonson's earlier Jacobean masque, *Time Vindicated to Himself and to his Honours*, even features a scenic representation of Whitehall Palace. It is this text, rather than Jonson's two 1631 masques, that explicitly references the king's own interest in classical architecture and the building of stately palaces, as early Stuart absolutism is linked to a sense of aesthetic achievement in building. Of course, this discourse is then articulated by another form of elite and aestheticized court entertainment, in terms of the performance of the high art of the masque itself, as the Caroline court aesthetic continues to be self-perpetuating and cyclical in motion, as well as, like the Jacobean court, overwhelmingly self-referential. By prioritizing a fixed court at Whitehall, Charles may have begun to unravel the polycentric identity of the previous courtly culture, but this utilization of a closed-off elite space was anything but stifling to aesthetic creation in a variety of types of high art.

Like Jonson's text, Townshend's title page begins with the phrase 'Personated in masque at court'.[35] Similarly, Townshend's work displays a lack of urgency in terms of

---

[35] Aurelian Townshend, *Albion's Triumph*, in Orgel and Strong, *Theatre*, II, pp. 452-77 (p. 454). On this masque, see Sharpe, *Criticism and Complement*, pp. 224-27; Jansson, 'The Impeachment', pp. 730-31; Peacock, 'The Image', particularly pp. 59-69.

revealing Whitehall as the performance space of the masque. Again, we can confidently conjecture that, by 1632, 'at Court' signifies Charles's favourite royal palace. Unlike Jonson's text, however, this recording of a masque begins with an authorial intervention, as Townshend makes the courtly contexts of the performance explicitly clear:

> The King and Queen's majesty having signified their / pleasure to have a new masque this new year, Master Inigo / Jones and I were employed in the invention. And we agreed / the subject of it should be a triumph in Albipolis, the / chief city of Albion.[36]

Thus, it is apparent that Charles and Henrietta-Maria had a substantial influence on the preparation of the masque. Similarly, unlike Jonson, Townshend appears more than happy to allow Jones both credit and a noticeable degree of control and influence, thus underscoring the performativity of this text, and so locating it as, at least in part, a work of theatrical aesthetics. Also, the reference to the city as early Stuart London is clear enough. Nevertheless, this emphasis on a city lends the courtly form a sense of an urbanized landscape, as Whitehall (as the performance space) is clearly referenced, and so fixed, within London's metropolitan sphere. As was demonstrated in my second chapter, early Stuart courtly space often entered into a complex interplay with civic spaces. In this instance, however, although Townshend displays the breaking down of boundaries between courtly and civic identities, the physical location of Whitehall as the performance space underwrites courtly authority over the city space. By implication, therefore, the Caroline court, like the earlier Jacobean space, continues to expand, but this time that expansion is played out at Whitehall itself.

This theme continues when the text turns to the familiar and generic 'description of the scene'. The following report of the masquing space accentuates the urban setting

---

[36] Townshend, *Albion's Triumph*, p. 454, lines 1-5.

by adding an architectural discourse that includes both classicism and an atmosphere of courtly grandeur in terms of the art of building. Like Jonson's *Chloridia*, landscape and setting are foregrounded. This time, however, the text resonates with Charles's interest in absolutist political discourse, and this is expressed through architecturalism and the accompanying classical aesthetics:

> *The first thing that presented itself to the eye was the ornament that / went about the scene, in the midst of which was placed a great arm of / the King's, with angels holding an imperial crown, from which hung a / drapery of crimson velvet fringed with gold, tacked in several knots, / that on each side, with many folds, was wound about a pilaster; in the / frieze, were festoons of several fruits in their natural colours, on / which, in gracious postures lay children sleeping; at each end was a / double shield with a gorgon's head, and at the foot of the pilasters, on / each side, stood two women, the one young, in a watchet robe looking / upwards, and on her head a pair of compasses of gold, the points / standing towards heaven, the other more ancient, and of a venerable / aspect, apparelled in tawny, looking downwards, in the one hand a / long ruler, and in the other a great pair of iron compasses, one point / whereof stood on the ground, and the other touched part of the ruler. / Above their heads were fixed compartments of a new composition, / and in that over the first was written* THEORICA, *and over the / second* PRACTICA, *showing that by these two all works of / architecture and ingining have their perfection. The curtain being / suddenly drawn up, the first scene appeared, which represented a / Roman atrium, with high columns of white marble, and / ornaments of architecture of a composed manner of great projecture, / enriched with carving, and between every return of these columns / stood statues of gold on round pedestals, and beyond these were other / pieces of architecture of a palace royal.*[37]

In this lengthy quotation it is apparent that, because of the conventions of the masque genre, Whitehall is being referenced here. Furthermore, close analysis of the quotation in its entirety makes it clear that this masque presented a unique convergence of some of the key aspects of Charles's influence at Whitehall. We have references to highly stylized art, in terms of architecture and an accompanying classicism, the importance of a royal palace

---

[37] Townshend, *Albion's Triumph*, p. 454, lines 23-46. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

as a permanent architectural structure, together with the foregrounding of classical learning, as well as an emphasis on the majesty of the sovereign's divinely-appointed will. The first line reminds us of the new performativity and visuality of the Caroline court masque, as wonders are 'presented' to 'the eye' and Jones's role is made clear. In the same way, architectural perfection is stressed, as is the emphasis on the 'white Marble' that constructs the presentation. The description of the scene makes it quite clear what has been witnessed, as Whitehall is referenced explicitly through the 'pieces of architecture of a palace royal', as a Romanization helps to articulate Charles's grand plans for the Stuart dynasty and, by implication, the Whitehall architectural structure. Through 'ornaments of architecture of a composed manner of great projecture' the masque voices Charles's absolutist plans through the implied permanence of large-scale building, as his royal identity is to be stressed through his overall scheme of projection to the courtly elite. This scheme involves architecture (Whitehall itself), as well as the embrace of high art and a classical aesthetic, including the masques and their own, fictional architectural discourse. However, for Charles, this does not propagate knowledge to the non-courtly public at large, as only the elite are reached through performance.[38]

Later in Townshend's text we see the link between Charles's court at Whitehall and the social space of theatre performance, as the masquing scene transforms once more. Once the palace has been suitably referenced, so too can its role as the theatre of the early Stuart kings be made explicit. Townshend foregrounds this point with the necessary accompanying Romanism: '*The scene is turned into an amphitheatre with people sitting*

[38] However, see the forthcoming work of Knowles on the circulation of masque texts beyond the court, in *Politics and Political Culture*, chapter 5.

in it; a / patrician and a plebeian come forth.'[39] The scene is followed by a dialogue between Platonicus and Publius and it is at this point that Charles is also referred to in the masque. As Publius explains: 'Albanactus Caesar from his sumptuous palace / through the high streets of Albipolis rid triumphing, on / a chariot.'[40] Again, in the Caroline masques monarchical presence and authority are underscored by an accompanying reliance on architectural discourse, as the king is linked explicitly with a fixed courtly setting. However, the concept of progressing through Albipolis / London (really a triumphal procession) is also alluded to in the quotation, as the king rides through the city on a chariot. In this masque, even the neo-medievalism of (Elizabethan) progressing culture has to be Romanized, as early Stuart authority acquires an aesthetic eloquence. Similarly, the passage is also slightly unfortunate in terms of monarchical panegyric, in that progressing is exactly the kind of assertive (but also communal) cultural activity that Charles is neglecting.

However, it is the ending of this masque that truly underscores the importance of a fixed courtly space to Caroline masquing culture:

> *The King and the masquers dance the main masque, afterward taking / his seat by the Queen. / The scene is varied into a landscipt in which was a prospect of the / King's palace of Whitehall and part of the City of London, seen afar / off.*[41]

---

[39] Townshend, *Albion's Triumph*, p. 455, lines 133-34. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[40] Townshend, *Albion's Triumph*, p. 455, lines 175-77.

[41] Townshend, *Albion's Triumph*, p. 457, lines 336-40. Italics are reproduced from the edited text. See also Jerzy Limon, *The Masque of Stuart Culture* (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990), p. 84. Limon comments on the earlier part of the masque and links this to the above quotation: '[T]his [palace] represented a part of Whitehall, which would draw an architectural link between ancient Rome and the England of the 1630s. The function of the forum, then, is to link the ancient past to the royal palace, thereby stressing the classical roots and heritage of Charles's kingship.'

It is within this setting that the masque comes to a close, and the text is at pains to stress the harmonious ending of the work and the accompanying fictional scene. Yet this moment of self-referencing for the Whitehall court shows Caroline political discourse working besides a foregrounding of architectural splendour. It seems that, by 1632, 'the court' can be presented as an architecturally fixed, and so closed-off, elite space, even though, in reality, progresses were to take place after this date. Indeed, it is telling that it is Jones's scenic device (the literal 'model' of Whitehall Palace) that speaks for the imagined glory of the Caroline court, as physical setting is given prominence over literary craft. An aestheticized, 'structural' court is articulated through visual display and spectacle.

Equally, aspects of this theme continued into the masque of the very next month, as Townshend's *Tempe Restored* also gives voice to the importance of display in the masque. Although the Jacobean masque had always made much of splendid courtly display, it is evident that the Caroline court wished to accelerate this process immediately. As the description of the scene makes clear, '[t]he rest of the / border was filled up with several fancies, which lest I should be too long / in the description of the frame, I will go to the picture itself; and indeed / these shows are nothing else but pictures with light and motion.'[42] Despite the assertion that such shows might be dismissed, the description still points to a need to 'go to the picture itself', as visual sight negates any

---

[42] Townshend, *Tempe Restored*, in *Court Masques*, pp. 155-65 (p. 156), lines 40-43. See also p. 261, where Lindley glosses these lines as Jones's answer to Jonson's 'An Expostulation with Inigo Jones'. On this masque, see Britland's fascinating discussion, in *Drama*, pp. 90-110. See also Knowles, '"Can ye not tell a man from a marmoset"', particularly pp. 145-56; Axel Ståhler, 'Inigo Jones's *Tempe Restored* and Alessandro Piccolomini's *Della Institution morale*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 16:2 (2003), 180-210. See particularly p. 197 on Circe's Palace, as well as Chibnall, 'The Function', p. 83. Lastly, see Sophie Tomlinson, 'Theatrical Vibrancy on the Caroline Court Stage: *Tempe Restored* and *The Shepherds' Paradise*', in *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*, ed. by Clare McManus (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 186-203.

desire for a verbal description of a mere 'frame'. Although that 'picture' will have to be described through the printed word, the stress on the visual underscores the masquing scene – and so Charles's court – as a brilliant, aestheticized object. The masque thus offers an interpretation of the definition of a court as a place of display, as the complexity of the early modern usage of the word is made clear once more. Here the masque appears to approve of the idea of the court as a collection of courtiers in one place (in this case Whitehall Palace). Again, then, the inherent mysticism of progressing is ignored in the Caroline period:

> *For the apparitions of such as came down in the air, and the choruses / standing beneath, arrived to the number of fifty persons, all richly attired, / showing the magnificence of the court of England.*[43]

Whitehall is now, more than ever, a rarified, elite space, defined by those who frequent its buildings just as much as the presence of the king. Likewise, the emphasis on the 'fifty persons' demonstrates that courtly authority could still mean far more than the king's authorizing presence. Furthermore, the passage is suggestive of a process of aestheticization, as the courtiers are 'richly attired' at court. Here, therefore, the court and the collection of courtiers are viewed as sharing a complimentary togetherness.

---

[43] Townshed, *Tempe Restored*, p. 160, lines 194-96. Italics are reproduced from the edited text. On the demonstrativity and visuality of this masque, see Knowles, '"Can ye not tell a man from a marmoset"', p. 148: '[The masque] respresents a defining moment in the Caroline reformation of the masque and in the politics of representation of the performing queen [...] *Tempe* establishes the new Caroline aesthetic [...] against the Jonsonian insistence of the priority of the word.'

'To see the masque come by': 'The Triumph of Peace' and progressing masquers?

In another of the Caroline masques, James Shirley's 1634 *Triumph of Peace*, we can see how the form's employment of architectural discourse and the accompanying prominence given to aesthetic display continues as the 1630s unfold.[44] The text informs us that,

> [t]his Masque was presented in the Banqueting House at Whitehall before / the King and Queen's Majesties and a great assembly of Lords and Ladies / and other persons of quality, whose aspect, sitting on the degrees prepared / for that purpose, gave a great grace to this spectacle, especially being all / richly attired.[45]

It is clear that, for Shirley at least, part of the artistic splendour depends upon the presence of monarchical magnificence. Equally important, however, are the accompanying courtiers, a collective of spectators being necessary for court fashioning as well as masque performance. Likewise, the rich attire means that the audience is, in turn, aestheticized, as the spectators become one with the court through the transformative power of the masque. Of course, the emphasis on 'persons of quality' reminds us once more that Caroline masquing culture was underscored by a relentless elitism, marking the court space as off-limits to the general public in early modern England.

Architectural references are again coupled together with monarchical splendour and masquing culture in Shirley's text:

> *A curtain being suddenly drawn up, the Scene was discovered, repre- / senting a large street with sumptuous palaces, lodges, porticos, and / other noble pieces of architecture, with pleasant trees and grounds. / This, going far from the eye, opens itself into a spacious place adorned / with public and private buildings seen afar off, representing the Forum / or*

---

[44] See James Shirley, *The Triumph of Peace*, ed. by Clifford Leech in *A Book of Masques in Honour of Allardyce Nicoll*, ed. by T.J.B Spencer and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967; repr. 1980), pp. 275-313.

[45] Shirley, *Triumph*, p. 285, lines 124-28.

> *Piazza of Peace. Over all was a clear sky with transparent clouds / which enlightened all the Scene.*[46]

Here, then, a Caroline masque continues to foreground the importance of architecture and places Charles's court in an overtly urban setting. However, this locale is underscored by architectural courtliness as a series of palaces is portrayed. The traditional pastoral setting of the Elizabethan progress entertainment is supplanted by Jones's continental neo-classicism. If Charles's finances and absolutist project could not stretch to a series of classical 'sumptuous palaces', at least the transformative qualities of Caroline masquing culture enabled the monarch to envisage a courtly structure of beauty.

Certainly, the closure of the masque reiterates the artistic performativity of Shirley's text and Jones's scenic construction. Through masque performance, Whitehall is aestheticized more than ever:

> *And thus concluded this Masque, which was, for the variety of the / shows, and richness of the habits, the most magnificent that hath been / brought to Court in our time.*[47]

The aestheticization of Caroline culture continues to take shape, therefore, as the masques become more and more 'magnificent' and costly.[48] The text hints at the way in which the

---

[46] Shirley, *Triumph*, p. 286, lines 160-66. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[47] Shirley, *Triumph*, p. 304, lines 782-84. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[48] For a seventeenth-century account of the preparation for the masque, the procession, and the actual performance, see Bulstrode Whitelocke, *MEMORIALS OF THE ENGLISH AFFAIRS: OR, AN Historical Account OF What passed from the beginning of the Reign of King CHARLES the First, to King CHARLES the Second His Happy RESTAURATION.* (London, 1682), pp. 18-21. At p. 19, Whitelocke hints that the occasion still maintained a degree of exclusivity: 'The Gallery behind the State, at the end of the Banquetting-house, was reserved for the Gentlemen of the *Inns of Court*, who should come thither to see their Masque, that there they might sit together, and none else to be admitted with them into that place.' For the importance of those attending the masque, apart from the king and queen, see pp. 20-21: 'In the mean time the Banquetting-house at *White-hall* was so crowded with fair Ladies, glittering with their rich Cloths and richer Jewels, and with Lords and Gentlemen of great quality, that there was scarce room for the King and Queen to enter in.' Indeed, this is certainly not an instance of the court being defined by monarchical presence, as access to courtly space is made problematic by the aesthetic display of the female courtiers and other ladies. For another contemporary view of this performance, see the anonymous poem 'Now did

court culture may have viewed a presentation of a masque as a series of theatrical entertainments, as the emphasis on 'the variety of the shows' pluralizes the recollection of the scene. This aspect of performance within performance adds further weight to the theatricalization of the court space of Whitehall. In the same way, we must not forget the unusualness of this text's performance history, in that the masque was performed on two separate occasions, on 3rd February (through parts of the city, ending at Whitehall) and at the merchant Taylors' Hall on 13th February, with the Lord Mayor present.[49] Here we can see how the expansion of an increasing courtly aesthetic is accompanied by a growing theatrical repertoire.

Owing to this fact, Shirley's work reminds us of the Jacobean 'running masque' (see chapter four), as well as Jonson's *Masque of the Metamorphosed Gypsies* and the way in which masques could actually negotiate in and around the space between the polarized points of progress entertainments and Whitehall masques. Similarly, as Sharpe has pointed out, Shirley's show 'was not a court masque in the strict sense [...] The entertainment commenced with the procession from Holborn to Whitehall of the masquers and antimasquers.'[50] Sharpe has even gone as far as to say that '[t]he whole occasion was more evocative of an Elizabethan progress than a Caroline masque.'[51] Such

---

heaven's charioteer', cited in M. B. Pickel, *Charles I as Patron of Poetry and Drama* (London: Frederick Muller, 1936), p. 147. I am grateful to James Knowles for this reference.

[49] See Leech's introduction to the masque, in *A Book of Masques*, pp. 277-80 (p. 278).

[50] Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 191. See also p. 215: 'Though the idea for *The Triumph of Peace* originated within the court, the entertainment, quite unusually, began far from the royal palace of Whitehall and indeed was addressed to an audience beyond the confines of the court.' See also Butler, '*Triumph of Peace*', p. 127: '*The Triumph of Peace* is that unique object, a Caroline masque that reached both a courtly and a plebeian audience.' Yet, as much of this thesis points out, courtly, elite, monarchical, and civic spaces are interchangeable in the early modern period.

[51] Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 215. See also pp. 220-21.

evidence, therefore, reminds us that Caroline court culture retains aspects of the polycentric nature of the Jacobean period, as courtly worlds could still interact with spaces beyond the confines of Whitehall, despite the assertion of architectural discourse in the period.

Thus, even the Caroline court maintained an element of Elizabethanism, as the masque resembled aspects of a progress and involved a demonstrative spectacle for the 'common people' of London. Also, unlike other entertainments from the 1630s, the masquers are not figures of monarchical or courtly authority. However, Sharpe's emphasis does miss a crucial point, in that what makes this, generically speaking, a Caroline text is the way that Whitehall looms in the background. After all, although the urban procession travels through parts of the city, the key strategic goal is the arrival *at* the Banqueting House. Only there can the glories of the masque text unfold properly for the king and his court. Although Sharpe does comment that the text 'illustrates the flexibility of the masque as a form', he undermines this important point by stating that it 'was not a court masque'.[52] Sharpe underplays this flexibility by failing to take account of the earlier running masques as well as the three performances of Jonson's *Gypsies*. Rather, the masque could be far more open-ended in terms of generic expectations. Importantly, however, this masque is not typical, given its utilization, by the Inns of Court, of spaces beyond Whitehall. Like the 'running masque', then, Shirley's show operates in an undefined textual, theatrical and generic world that helps to blur the boundaries around which ideas of 'the court' and 'court culture' are shaped. In this sense,

---

[52] Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 222. The contradiction then folds back on itself as Sharpe comments that '[t]here was not one, but many stages for the Caroline court.' p. 259.

therefore, the text asks more interesting questions about architecture (the physical landscape of court and city), probing the nature and definition of urban and courtly spaces in the masque, just as the early civic entertainments had done at the beginning of the Jacobean period.

The forthcoming work of James Knowles will highlight the neglected importance of the procession, as well as the appropriation of royal space by the Inns of Court commissioners.[53] The text points to the retention of at least a small aspect of the Jacobean court's polycentric identity and nature, as those outside the court are participating in masque creation.[54] Once more, even in the centralized court environment favored by Charles, there is an inherent open-endedness about the early modern court, as even the masque (or at least this unusual variation) is not necessarily as Whitehall-bound as has been supposed. Furthermore, the pre-performance commissioning of this masque is particularly interesting, as the entertainment is the only Whitehall-based Caroline masque to be presented to the court by the Inns of Court.[55] Finally, as the observer Whitelocke makes clear, the blurring of generic boundaries could be noted by contemporaries, as he

---

[53] See Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture*, chapter 5.

[54] Butler gestures towards this instance of polycentrism in terms of the masque's composition when he suggests that '[t]he committee of lawyers that devised the masque embraced every possible strand of opinion.' See '*Triumph of Peace*', p. 126.

[55] Of the ten surviving Caroline masques to be performed at Whitehall, four may be said to be the king's masques, four were the queen's, and the last (*Salmacida Spolia*) was a joint collaboration. Owing to this, Shirley's masque is the only surviving example of a Caroline masque to be fashioned for the royal couple and the court. The fascinating context here involves William Prynne's 1632 publication of his *Histriomastix*, in which he ranted at the concept of theatre and offended the court with his famous comment about female performance. See Leech's introduction to the masque, in *A Book of Masques*, p. 277. On the same page, Leech points out that because Prynne belonged to the Inns of Court, the Inns offered Shirley's masque as a conciliatory gesture. Prynne, of course, was famously mutilated by order of Starchamber on two separate occasions, the first being for this offence. See Sharpe, *Personal Rule*; Knowles, *Politics and Political Culture*, chapter 5. Knowles's chapter will offer investigations into the large print run of the text and this fact's problematization of the former critical theory that believed the masque to be articulating a Whitehall-based exclusivity. Orgel's earlier work may be seen as typical of this approach.

reports that '[t]he King and Queen stood at a window looking strait-forward into the Street, to see the Masque come by.'[56] Modern critical discourse is only just beginning to open a space for discussion of such a comment, as what are meant to be 'static' Whitehall masquers pass or 'come by' and so reference simultaneously a progressing culture. At the same time, moreover, the king and queen watch this from a courtly space whilst looking out directly onto an urban landscape. In short, even when a Caroline masque, such as Shirley's, does not push forward and promote an exclusive architectural discourse, this centralizing topic, as well as the generalized theme of courtly and elite space, usually lingers between the lines of the text and the spaces of the performance.

'The prospect of Windsor Castle': inter-architecturalism

Coelum Britannicum by Thomas Carew (1634) also employs an architectural frame of reference. However, in this masque the spectators witnessed a ruined courtly aesthetic:

> *The curtain was watchet and a pale yellow in panes, which flying up/ on the sudden, discovered the scene, representing old arches, old palaces, / decayed walls, parts of temples, theatres, basilicas, and* thermae, *with / confused heaps of broken columns, bases, cornices, and statues, lying as / underground, and altogether resembling the ruins of some great city of the / ancient Romans or civilized Britons.*[57]

In this scene, the Banqueting House is greeted with a nightmarish vision of Whitehall's court culture, with its emphasis on display and high art fallen into neglect and ruin. However, as is usual in the early Stuart masque, the performative qualities of the event are enough to restore order. Later in the masque, classicized perfection appears once again, as the scene is made reassuringly tranquil and content:

---

[56] Whitelocke, *MEMORIALS*, p. 21.

[57] Thomas Carew, *Coelum Britannicum*, in *Court Masques*, pp. 166-93 (p. 167), lines 25-30. Italics are reproduced from the edited text. On this masque, see Sharpe, *Criticism and Complement*, particularly pp. 232-43.

> *The masquers dance their main dance; which done, the scene again is / varied into a new and pleasant prospect, clean differing from all the other; / the nearest part showing a delicious garden with several walks and / parterres set round with low trees, and on the sides against these walks / were fountains and grots, and in the furthest part a palace, from whence / went high walks upon arches, and above them open terraces planted with / cypress trees, and all this together was composed of such ornaments as / might express a princely villa.*[58]

In this masque, the restoration of order requires an accompanying sense of the reinstatement of aesthetic beauty in the landscape, so as to appear as a '*princely villa*'. Likewise, harmony is symbolized by the glimpse of a royal palace. However, the influence of Caroline court culture can also be detected in terms of an absence of monarchical presence, as the palace can only be viewed '*in the furthest part*', a sure sign of the sense of distance that separates Charles and his palace in London from the rest of his people.

This theme continues in the masque when harmony is truly restored, as another of Charles's palaces is referenced by Carew: '*And / in the lower part was seen afar off the prospect of Windsor Castle, the / famous seat of the most honourable Order of the Garter.*'[59] Again, the prominence given to an architectural setting and a royal palace means that there is a sense of distance in Caroline court culture. This depicted elite space may not be Charles's favoured Whitehall Palace, but the masque does voice Charles's architectural project by signifying royal authority through the display of a magnificent and regal building. Just as the early Stuart masque was often marked by a certain inter-textuality between the works, there is clearly a kind of inter-architectural reference here, as the masque performance articulates the prominence of one monarchical space through

---

[58] Carew, *Coelum Britannicum*, p. 190, lines 952-59. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[59] Carew, *Coelum Britannicum*, p. 191, lines 1012-14. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

self-presentation in the performance-space of another. In many ways, then, the masque adds to Charles's discourse of architectural absolutism, as Windsor and Whitehall are demonstrated to be one and the same. Both buildings display Charles's vision of himself and the Stuart dynasty, and the masques present, from a fictionalized perspective, a mental picture of monarchical authority through their accompanying architectural discourse.

'That sacred temple': the structuralism of love and monarchy

Such themes can be excavated from the queen's masque of 1635, *The Temple of Love* by William Davenant and Inigo Jones. Although this text is quite typical of the Whitehall-bound Caroline masquing culture, a clear link is made with masques like *The Triumph of Peace*, in that the masque enjoyed multiple performances at the Banqueting House, on February 10th, 11th, 12th, and, according to Orgel and Strong, possibly the 14th also.[60] In the text, the prominence given to architecture and scenic display is clear from the explanation of the performance at the beginning of the masque. As we are told, the show was '[p]resented by the Queen's majesty and her ladies at Whitehall on Shrove Tuesday, 1635. By Inigo Jones, Surveyor of his majesty's works, and William Davenant, her majesty's servant.'[61] Clearly, then, Jones's ousting of Jonson has been profitable, as it is now Jones whose name comes first. But the text also makes it clear that Jones, as 'Surveyor of his majesty's works' is a particularly important person, as the role of architectural authority is given much significance. Literary qualities, on the other hand,

---

[60] See Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, p. 599. The scholars print the masque in II (pp. 598-617). On this masque, see Britland, *Drama*, pp. 131-67; Knowles, '"The Faction of the Flesh": Orientalism and the Caroline Masque', in *The 1630s*, pp. 111-37. I have found one point by Knowles (p. 128) to be particularly helpful: '[T]he surface of the masque is precisely designed to both aestheticize and abstract rather than deal in direct political statement.' See again p. 128 for the Caroline court's polycentrism . Lastly, see p. 136, note 70, where Knowles doubts the fourth performance of the masque.

[61] Jones and Davenant, *The Temple*, p. 600.

are downplayed significantly, as Davenant is merely the queen's 'servant'. In the new theatrical and textual economy of Caroline culture, part of this cultural work has been designated to the demonstrativity of Jones's display and his architectural prowess, though I admit that 'Surveyor' makes it very clear that Jones is a servant to the crown.

What is apparent from this masque is the manner in which, by this point in early Stuart culture, important moments are still being expressed through an architectural discourse. Indeed, whereas in the earlier Jacobean period architecture was, though highly important, only one way in which to express regal magnificence, by 1635 it seems as though it is the only discourse that is pure enough to be trusted with the articulation of the wonder of Charles and his court. This is obvious from the very beginning of the text, when, in 'the argument' of the masque, the central narrative of the show is expressed by the evocation of a permanent, structural building: 'the Temple of Chaste Love should be re-established in this / island; which temple, being long sought for by certain / magicians, enemies to chaste love, intending to use it to their / intemperate ends, was by Divine Poesy hidden in mists and / clouds.'[62] Of course, it is rather unsurprising that the masque will go on to depict the resurrection of this architectural structure through the action of the performance, but, if we remember that this masque was acted on at least three occasions, on consecutive nights, it is highly tempting to suggest that the queen, Jones, and Davenant are at pains to convey to Charles and the court their own deployment of his architectural discourse of absolutism, as, on three nights in a row it was made clear to everyone present that the metaphorical re-establishment of chaste love can only happen through the necessary establishment of a grand structure. In fact, by the third night the point must have been all too familiar to the courtiers.

---

[62] Jones and Davenant, *The Temple*, p. 600, lines 6-10.

In a related point, architecture's power to articulate monarchical grandeur on a huge, inter-continental scale is made clear when the masque points out that '[t]he fame of this Temple of Love / being quickly spread over all the eastern world inflamed a / company of noble Persian youths, borderers on India, to / travel in quest of it.'[63] The lure of a classically-inflected architectural structure of Stuart magnificence is so tempting, therefore, that men will travel far to view it and bring with them a foreignness that underscores the multiculturalism of this European court. Only with the accompanying presence 'of the / glorious Indian queen' can the travelers 'enter and enjoy the / privileges of that sacred temple.'[64] In theory at least, the Caroline court retains an aspect of Elizabethan portability, in that the presence of a monarch or consort is required to authorize elite space. In this later period, however, a degree of authority is handed on to the architectural space itself. As the text proclaims: 'For Indamora with her beauty's light / The truer temple shall restore to sight, / The false shall be obscured in endless night.'[65] Again, then, we have here an instance of the complex relationship between the spatial interplay of a royal body and an architectural setting. Although it is the presence of Indamora who alone can redeploy the powers of the temple, the text admits to the fact that the intrinsic magnificence of the temple is needed also to reaffirm and consolidate the arrival of 'beauty's light'.

As the masque comes to a close, the bodies of the king and queen are linked explicitly to the permanence offered by the appearance of the temple:

---

[63] Jones and Davenant, *The Temple*, p. 600, lines 13-16.

[64] Jones and Davenant, *The Temple*, p. 600, lines 25-26, 28-29.

[65] Jones and Davenant, *The Temple*, p. 601 lines 131-33.

> *The masquers, having a while reposed, danced their second dance, / which ended, and the Queen being seated under the state by the King, / the scene was changed into the true Temple of Chaste Love; this / temple instead of columns had terms of young satyrs bearing up the / returns of architrave, frieze and cornice, all enriched with / goldsmiths' work; the further part of the temple running far from the / eye was designed of another kind of architecture, with pilasters, / niches and statues, and in the midst a stately gate adorned with / columns and their ornaments, and a frontispiece on the top, all which / seemed to be of burnished gold.*[66]

Here we have an attempt by the masque's creators to fuse together the physicality of flesh with the concrete world of an architectural structure, as the satyrs replace the columns. However, although this point underscores the presence of the king and queen at the start of the quotation the importance of the building is quickly prioritized by the masque's foregrounding of a distinctly classical description of the scene. This process of Romanization consolidates the physicality of the courtly building, but the cost is the king's, who is severely downgraded in the quotation's emphasis on architectural discourse, as the sense of the artificiality of the court aesthetic replaces the natural pastoral emphasis inherent in Elizabethan court culture.

'Britannia Triumphans': the standardization of architectural discourse

In 1638 Jones and Davenant collaborated once more on the king's masque, *Britannia Triumphans*. The performance venue was a temporary masquing room, as it had been decided to protect the Rubens ceiling at the Banqueting House from the smoke given off during masque performance.[67] Of course, although this constituted a redeployment of creative energies to an alternative venue, it must be remembered that the principal theatrical location was still very much the king's palace at Whitehall. However, it is

---

[66] Jones and Davenant, *The Temple*, pp. 598-629 (p. 604), lines 456-65. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

[67] See Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, II (p. 661).

telling that, in the prefatory material to the masque, the author felt the need to explain the switch of theatrical venue:

> There being now past three years of intermission that the / King and Queen's majesties have not made masques with / shows and *intermedii*, by reason the room where formerly / they were presented having the ceiling since richly adorned / with pieces of painting of great value figuring the acts of / King James of happy memory, and other enrichments; lest / this might suffer by the smoke of many lights, his majesty / commanded the surveyor of his works that a new temporary / room of timber, both for strength and capacity of / spectators, should be suddenly built for that use; which / being performed in two months, the scenes for this masque / were prepared.[68]

What this passage does is to once more prioritize architectural space (the performance venue) over the literary craft of the masque. Likewise, the importance of the Banqueting House, and the need to protect it, points up the aesthetically-charged nature of 1630s Whitehall, as the protection of Rubens' work is given prominence. In a sense, therefore, the beginning of this masque might be said to summarize Caroline courtly culture: here we have the importance of architecture, accompanying masquing, the use and protection of high art, and the king's personal preference for 'command[ing]' the court. Of course, the mention of King James then legitimates this court culture by placing it, and so contextualizing Charles's project, within the far-reaching scheme of Stuart royal authority, going back to at least 1603. In doing so, Charles's ideas are thus consolidated through the use of recent monarchical history, as the early Stuarts are shown to assert their authority through architectural and theatrical display. Although this appears to consolidate the fixed definition of the court as a building of status, we can trace also the

---

[68] Jones and Davenant, *Britannia Triumphans*, in *Inigo Jones*, II, 660-703 (p. 662), lines 6-17. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

emphasis on the presence of the sovereign, something that is reinforced by the remembrance of James.

When the masque is underway, Jones and Davenant waste little time in conveying the familiar trope of architectural splendor. Although the early part of the masque does not reveal a monarchical palace, the Caroline court is, by implication, contextualized through the deployment of a London scene. Of course, the London that is presented is one of urban splendor and architectural permanence:

> *A curtain flying up discovered the first scene, wherein were English / houses of the old and the newer forms intermixed with trees, and afar off a / prospect of the city of London and the river Thames; which, being a / principal part, might be taken for all of Great Britain.*[69]

The passage makes a point of inferring that architectural structures are usually built to last, hence the survival of the older houses. At the same time, however, the potentiality of architecture to renew and refresh the existing urban landscape is evoked clearly by 'the newer forms'. That this is Charles's capital, and so a successful and peaceful realm, is then made clear by the co-existence of the pastoral scene as instanced by the description of the 'intermixed [...] trees' and the Thames. Interestingly, the Stuart prioritization of London is made explicit by the idea that the capital 'might be taken for all of Great Britain'. Indeed, from this passage at least, it is easy to understand Charles's failure to embrace a progressing culture, as, it is implied, all that is required is a microcosmic focus on London as his seat of government. An accompanying synecdoche is clearly present also, as London stands for the entire realm. As the performance of this masque at the

---

[69] Jones and Davenant, *Britannia Triumphans*, p. 662, lines 59-62. Italics are reproduced from the edited text.

royal palace testifies, in reality there was an even greater emphasis on Whitehall as the centre of Caroline London.

In the remaining parts of the masque, we have Jones's emphasis on the theatrical backdrop of an architectural setting, in that he presented to the court a second House of Fame. However, unlike the earlier (Jonsonian) period, the masque-text itself does not articulate the setting through verbal device or description. Rather, it is apparent that the employment of architectural discourse was so common by 1638 that there is no need for the text to voice this feature. The masque has become the ultimate example of scenic display, and only the spoken or descriptive words are preserved through the printed text. It is clear that, by this point, architectural magnificence is a 'given' to the Caroline court. That the printed text fails to voice the grandeur of the House of Fame to the general reader is further evidence of the Caroline court's withdrawal into itself as the 1630s progress. Unlike the (textually) popular *Triumph of Peace*, this masque only offers an architectural discourse through performance: those not present at court have few textual pointers to the splendor of this fixed courtly space. Importantly, however, evidence of further architectural discourse is perceptible in the last Caroline masque.

In this work, Jones and Davenant's *Salmacida Spolia*, from 1640, we are told, towards the end, that: '*[t]he second dance ended, and their Majesties being seated under the state, / the scene was changed into magnificent buildings composed of several / selected pieces of architecture.*'[70] This is the last full 'description of the scene' to take place during the reign of Charles at Whitehall Palace. Crucially, the Caroline masquing

---

[70] Jones and Davenant, *Salmacida Spolia*, in Lindley, *Court Masques*, pp. 200-13 (p. 211), lines 408-10. Italics are reproduced from the edited text. On this masque and brief discussion of architecture, see Roy Strong, *Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), p. 241. See also Butler, '*Salmacida Spolia*'; Britland, *Drama*, pp. 168-91.

culture signs off with an architectural discourse that is, by 1640, so familiar as to be a generic marker of the form. The sense of architectural permanence is underscored by the seating of the king and queen 'under the state' as if they too are permanent and unmoveable 'selected pieces'. However, whereas this is meant to imply monarchical permanence at Whitehall, this draws attention also to the neglect of progressing, owing to the architectural prioritization.[71] Of course, just a few years later the royal couple would have to flee London for Hampton Court as the civil wars began in 1642. Charles could, then, be removed from Whitehall, as happened explicitly with his execution in 1649 outside the Banqueting House. Yet, by way of closing this chapter, I want to further this section's discussion of architecture and courtly space by demonstrating how this discourse intrudes on textual recollections of Caroline court culture when Whitehall was left behind on a voluntary basis during the royal progresses. As we shall see, the court's travels during Charles's reign resonated with the progressing culture of previous monarchs. However, in the later reign architectural fixity continued to prove influential in the fashioning of a courtly space.

'And afterward to his pallace of *Westminster,* there to solace himself': progresses and entertainments

As Clifford Geertz and Mary Hill Cole have made clear, there were a variety of distinct cultural advantages about the presentation of monarchy through the spectacle of progressing.[72] It is thanks to this work that modern historians and literary critics have an

---

[71] Architectural discourse in the courtly culture was clearly influential in wider circles. For instance, see Peck, *Consuming Splendor*, p. 204.

[72] See Clifford Geertz, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', in *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*, 3rd edn (New York: Basic Books, 1983; 2000), p. 125; Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen*.

important understanding of the form and nature of Elizabeth's progressing culture. However, the progresses of Charles, like those of his father James, have often been ignored by modern scholarship because of the continued assumption that Charles did not really progress at all. Yet, scholars are now beginning to examine the range of materials that have survived as evidence of a distinct Caroline progressing culture, though no large-scale study has appeared yet. Once we remember that the Caroline court did progress, it is similarly vital that we fully understand a key difference with the Elizabethan era: Charles may have gone on progress, but his court culture was not defined by an itinerant conception of elite space.

In terms of the aestheticization of a fixed court at Whitehall Palace, it is tempting to conclude that Charles defined his court against the progresses, rather than through them. Because Charles did progress occasionally, we have a situation at odds with the idea of Charles embracing an architectural, fixed court. However, this tension demonstrates that, even in the Caroline period, the definition of the court as a moveable and polycentric space did continue. Notably, though, we can trace a continuation of architectural discourse in the texts that document Charles's journeys, signifying the increasing prioritization of the fixed definition of courtly authority, even when the king travels. One way into this conundrum is to think of the neglect of progressing culture by Charles, rather than an Elizabethan embrace of a moveable courtly space. Thus, when Joad Raymond refutes the earlier work of Judith Richards, the facts are still apparent, in that

> [i]t is an overstatement to suggest that, notwithstanding his awareness of popular expectations, 'between 1625 and 1640 Charles systematically distanced himself from his subjects'. Nevertheless, Charles's inclination to privacy, his aloofness, affected his appearance in the popular eye. He

> generally shied away from the festive celebrations, entries and pageants, with which Elizabeth had courted her subjects.[73]

Importantly for the purposes of this study, Raymond goes on to extend this point about Charles to the wider reaches of Caroline political culture, speculating that '[p]erhaps Charles sought to enhance the mystery and majesty of kingship by distance and inaccessibility. If so, his efforts failed. For the 1630s, he might be described as an *impersonal* monarch.'[74] Despite this, that Charles progressed at all means that these travels were still a part of the formation and fashioning of a distinct Caroline court culture, in that a travelling courtly space was having at least a little influence on the perception and understanding of Charles, the royal family, his courtiers, and his palaces, particularly Whitehall. Indeed, the reality of the early modern court as an open-ended elite space was still apparent and so actually undermined Charles's centralizing manoeuvres. In this section, therefore, I explore the surviving texts from the Caroline progresses, in order to assess what these cultural documents tell us about the definition and the fashioning of Caroline courtly space that continues to foreground architectural permanence.

---

[73] Joad Raymond, 'Popular Representations of Charles I', in *The Royal Image*, pp.47-73 (p. 51). See also Judith Richards, '"His Nowe Majestie" and the English Monarchy: The Kingship of Charles I before 1640', *Past and Present*, 113 (1986), 70-96. Raymond is quoting from Richards, p. 78. On Caroline progresses specifically, see pp. 83-86.

[74] Raymond, 'Popular Representations', p. 53. The emphasis is Raymond's. Bergeron makes clear in his study of early modern progresses and processions, that 'while Charles made several progress tours, there is [...] no entertainment which truly compares with the estate pageants of the Elizabethan period. Furthermore, there is but one royal entry – in Edinburgh in 1633 – which actually qualifies as a civic pageant.' See *English Civic Pageantry*, p. 105. See also Sharpe, 'The Image of Virtue', particularly p. 229, pp. 243-44. In a later study, Sharpe points out that 'Charles I has often been criticized for concentrating on court masque and neglecting the more public politics of festival in royal entry or procession which Queen Elizabeth had used to good effect. Whilst it is true that the Stuart monarchy became less peripatetic, Charles I did participate in public festivals and entries – abroad and at home – the texts of which await study as representations of the prince and king.' See Sharpe, 'The Royal Image: An Afterword', in *The Royal Image*, pp. 288-309 (p. 296).

That Charles's first conception of his newly formed court in 1625 was thought of as at least partly a moveable space is obvious from one of the first proclamations of his reign. As the surviving text states:

> HIS Maiesty hauing taken a resolution that Himselfe and His Royall Consort the Queene and their Courts shall very shortly remoue first to His Castle of *Windsor*, and after to his Honour of *Hampton-Court*, and there to settle: and foreseeing that the vicinity of those places to the Cities of London and Westminster, and the Suburbs thereof, and the Borough of *Southwarke* & Towne of *Lambeth*, which long haue been, and yet are so grievously infected with the Plague, is apt to draw an intercourse betweene those Cities and places & the Court, which may bring extreame perill to the sacred Persons of their Royall Maiesties, vnlesse it be very carefully avoyded.[75]

Here we can see the idea of the Queen Consort's individual court as separate from that of Charles. This reminds us of the court fashioned by Queen Anna in the Jacobean reign. Likewise, it is apparent that these courts are moveable in that they can 'remoue' to Windsor Castle and Hampton Court, and there seems to be a hint of the understanding of the court as the place where the monarch resides.

However, this idea is complicated when we realise that the monarch has left Whitehall and London only because of the necessity of the plague epidemic. Equally, something unusual is happening here, as the Caroline court *has* to travel, as a moveable spatiality does not define this elite space. Rather, this court has no choice but to move from London. The implication is that the court has to settle on Hampton Court and Windsor Castle, as if these locations are second choices for Charles and Henrietta-Maria. Certainly, although the text makes it clear that the court will settle at Hampton Court for a considerable amount of time, it is implied that this is out of necessity, rather than

---

[75] *A Proclamation for the avoyding of all intercourse betweene His Maiesties Royall Court, and the Cities of London and Westminster, and places adioyning.* (Oxford, October 1625). On such proclamations, see Richards, '"His Nowe Majestie"', p. 77.

choice. Also, there is a distinctly Caroline conceptualization of a court as a space that simply has to settle somewhere, rather than embracing the Elizabethan (and even Jacobean) itinerant idea of court fashioning and sustainability; a move that could have been a realistic alternative. Similarly, if we remember the architectural cross-referencing of the Caroline masques, it is noticeable that the three elite spaces on display here – Whitehall, Hampton Court and Windsor Castle – are all royal spaces. Whereas Elizabeth had been happy to stay with leading aristocratic figures, the Caroline court travels exclusively within the tightly controlled circle of monarchical space. In this sense, the court is always 'with' Charles because he never really leaves these architectural courtly structures behind.

1633 and the Scottish progress

Of course, the 1625 proclamation does make it clear that Charles's court could, and did, move around the south of England, and even further north. This is confirmed in a 1633 proclamation issued by the crown. In this document the title alone is evidence enough of this important point: *A Proclamation for the well ordering of His Maiesties Court and Traine, as well in His present Iourney intended towards His Kingdome of Scotland, and returne from thence, as in all other His Maiesties Iourneys and Progresses hereafter.*[76] This title reminds us strikingly of the Elizabethan court's tendency to progress, as 'court' clearly signifies a moveable monarchical realm and 'traine' reminds of the progressing collection of courtiers and servants moving with the monarch and his advisers. The document actually forecasts Charles's most significant progress as he visited his northern

---

[76] *A Proclamation for the well ordering of His Maiesties Court and Traine, as well in His present Iourney intended towards His Kingdome of Scotland, and returne from thence, as in all other His Maiesties Iouirneys and Progresses hereafter.* (London, May 1633).

kingdom for a delayed coronation ceremony, and the stress on future '*Iourneys*' and progresses makes it clear that the idea of a moveable courtly space will be utilized in the future. Through an examination of this proclamation's mere title it becomes increasingly difficult to make a case for the idea of Charles as a Whitehall-bound recluse. However, it is also noticeable that the title for the announcement of a Caroline progressing culture does something that similar Elizabethan texts rarely, if ever, attempt: a stress is placed on the fact that Charles will 'returne from thence' and come home to Whitehall Palace and the court's London base. Even when the Caroline court travels, there is a centrality about the London setting that haunts the title of this progress text. Likewise, we should note the stress on the royal palace that closes this proclamation: 'Giuen at *the* court at Whitehall, the fifth day of May, in the ninth yeere of the Reigne of our Souereigne Lord Charles'.[77]

Likewise, various texts survive that chronicle the entertainments that greeted Charles in Scotland.[78] In *THE ENTERTAINMENT OF THE HIGH AND MIGHTY*

---

[77] *A Proclamation for the well ordering of His Maiesties Court and Traine.* Emphasis mine.

[78] On the journey to Scotland, Charles was entertained by William Cavendish, Earl of Newcastle by a Jonsonian entertainment now known as *The Kings Entertainment at Welbeck.* For the edited text, see *Ben Jonson*, VII, pp. 787-803. Owing to the extensive recent work on this entertainment that has been undertaken by James Knowles, I have omitted the work from my discussion. The article is important to this study, as Knowles traces a distinct Elizabethanism in the text, showing how Jonson and Newcastle were influenced by the 1575 Kenilworth entertainments for the progressing Elizabeth. I would like to thank the author, as well as his editors (Jayne Archer and Sarah Knight) for kindly allowing me to read this paper prior to publication. See Knowles, '"In the Purest Times of Peerless Queen Elizabeth": Nostalgia, Politics, and Jonson's use of the 1575 Kenilworth Entertainments', in *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I* (Forthcoming through Oxford University Press, 2007). Further evidence for the survival of an important Caroline progressing culture can be traced by the very title of a manuscript poem from the 1630s, as 'The Progresse' deals with the relationship between Charles and the queen. See *Early Stuart Libels: An Edition of Poetry from Manuscript Sources*, Special Edition of *Early Modern Literary Studies*, ed. by Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae, http://www.earlystuartlibels.net/htdocs/index.html. In 1634 Charles once more visited the estates of Newcastle, though this time the entertainment was provided at Bolsover Castle for the king and his accompanying queen, and, again, Jonson wrote the entertainment. A critical note aimed towards Charles is easily detected, as Jonson's text attacks the continued architecturalism of the Caroline court by mocking its surveyor, Jones. Indeed, although this might be seen as Jonson's late abandonment of architecture as he wishes to stress literary qualities more than ever, this was actually a subtle reminder that Charles's continuation of an architectural absolutism was actually becoming far from ideal. See *Loves Welcome at*

MONARCH CHARLES, William Drummond seized this opportunity for textual praise of Charles, and emphasized the Elizabethanism at the centre of this Caroline progress.[79] However, although the form and, in part, the subject matter might recall Elizabethan progressing culture, the text also highlights the urban setting of Edinburgh. In many ways the work is reminiscent of earlier royal, triumphal entries and their accompanying texts, from the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, as the works highlight a sense of civic duty and underscore the civic setting. As Drummond states at the very beginning of the text:

> WITHOVT the Gate which is towards the West, where the streete ascendeth to *Horoites* Hospital, did an Arch arise of height [...] of breadth [...] square with the battlements and inmost side of the towne-wall, the face looking to the Castle, represented a Citie situated on a rock, which with pointed Clifts, Shrubs, Trees, Herbs, and Verdure, did appeare in perspectiue upon the battlements.[80]

In this quotation the urban setting and employment of an arch echoes the civic triumphal processions that were typical of the early modern period. However, the emphasis on the city landscape, as well as the ancient castle and accompanying battlements reminds us of the architectural emphasis of the Caroline masques at Whitehall. In the same way, the urban setting means that the landscape of London (and, by implication, Whitehall Palace) is not as far away from Charles as might be thought on a northern progress. Furthermore,

---

Bolsover, in *Ben Jonson*, VII, pp. 805-814. See particularly pp. 809-10, lines 38-76, for Jonson's disparaging caricature of Jones as 'Coronell Vitruvius'. On Bolsover, see Timothy Raylor, '"Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue": William Cavendish, Ben Jonson, and the Decorative Scheme of Bolsover Castle', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 52:2 (1999), 402-39. On the two texts, see James Fitzmaurice, 'William Camden and Two Entertainments by Ben Jonson', *Ben Jonson Journal*, 5 (1998), 63-80; Sanders, 'Jonson's Caroline Coteries', pp. 285-86.

[79] William Drummond, *THE ENTERTAINMENT OF THE HIGH AND MIGHTY MONARCH CHARLES King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, Into his auncient and royall City of EDINBVRGH, the fifteenth of Iune, 1633* (Edinburgh, 1633). Title page.

[80] Drummond, *THE ENTERTAINMENT*, p. 1.

the text demonstrates that Charles's mere presence threatens to alter the landscape of the entertainment:

> If nature could suffer Rockes to move, and abandon their naturall places, this Towne founded on the strength of Rockes (now by all cheering rayes of your Majesties presence, taking not onely motion, but life) had with her Castle, Temples, and Houses moved towards you, and be sought you to acknowledge her yours.[81]

Again, Caroline court culture shows a marked interest in architectural discourse when compared to the Elizabethan progress texts. Also, the emphasis on the powerful healing rays that exude from the sovereign perhaps remind us of the tradition of Stuart masquing culture, particularly if we recall Jonson's *Masque of Blackness* from the third chapter, in which the rays given from James prompt a transformation of the appearance of the female masquers. Of course, the text's stress on the transformative power of Charles's presence does touch upon Elizabethan courtliness in a rather subtle way, as a non-courtly environment is re-animated by the appearance of Charles. The movement of the architectural buildings towards Charles reaffirms his ability to make the inanimate animate. Yet, on the other hand, it is interesting to see that his prioritization of an architectural absolutism means that permanent structures can be subjected to his will, and so appropriated.

In another surviving text from the entry into Edinburgh, a *PANEGYRICK TO THE HIGH AND MIGHTY MONARCH CHARLES*, by Walter Forbes, the inclusion of

---

[81] Drummond, *THE ENTERTAINMENT*, pp. 3-4.

the sun metaphor in terms of divine kingship is made clear once more.[82] Likewise, neo-classicism is coupled together with an awareness of progressing conventions:

> When bright *Apollo* circling in his Carre,
> Doth drive away the day-denuncing Starre,
> His pow'rfull rayes diffuse in mortall myndes
> A sweete desire of day, which straight vnbindes
> Sleep-fettered-fences, and his chearefull light
> Doth waste all vapours closde in cloudie night.[83]

Here the reference to a 'Carre' alludes to progressing and the royal entry into a city. Simultaneously, there is the classical context of the 'Carre' in terms of a continued Romanization of Caroline court culture through the deployment of a rigorous neo-classicism. However, the emphasis on the king's rays forces the reader yet again to revisit Whitehall's masques, as this metaphor carries such a strong remembrance of early Stuart political discourse, as demonstrated earlier in terms of Jonson's *Blackness*. Indeed, if Charles / Apollo brings day with him, then the implication is that Scotland has been left in the dark by the Stuart move to London. This stresses the sense of dislocation for the northern kingdom in early Stuart progressing culture, something that I noted in the earlier section on James's visit to his former home. In the above quotation, the unifying sense evoked by the rhyming couplet in the last two lines may add a sense of harmony and resolution, but the fact remains that, very soon, Charles will leave this space and travel back to England and Whitehall Palace.

Later in the text, an urban, architectural emphasis is added to the acknowledgement of monarchical rays of transformation: 'Great *Ioves* Vice-gerent looke

---

[82] Walter Forbes, *PANEGYRICK TO THE HIGH AND MIGHTY MONARCH CHARLES By the grace of GOD, King of Great BRITAINE, FRANCE, and IRELAND, Defender of the Faith. &c.* (Edinburgh, 1633). Title page.

[83] Forbes, *PANEGYRICK*, sig. A2r.

with kynd aspect / On my *Emporium* EDINBVRGH, direct / No oblique Rayes, accept in loue Her Showes.'[84] The personification of the Scottish city means that we are back in familiar Caroline territory, as panegyric to Charles takes the form of an animated architectural building or, as in this case, a civic space. As the space speaks to Charles a few lines before: 'Long did I wish to see thy sacred Face, / My Townes and Temples with thy presence grace.'[85] Personified Scottish space, therefore, is certainly pleased to welcome Charles, particularly so that the city can proclaim its allegiance though the demonstrativity of splendid architecture. Again, though, the problem with Caroline progressing is that it very rarely happens, as the quotation's use of 'long[ing]' makes clear.

The text closes with another resonance of architectural discourse from the Whitehall masques, in praise of Charles. Progress entertainments are a much rarer species in the Caroline period. Thus, when they are fashioned, writers had no choice but to mine masque texts for an understanding of the king's preferred rhetoric of magnificence:

> And After-age shall *Obeliskes* vpreare,
> In which thy Woorth and Vertues shall appeare,
> High *Phanes* and *Temples* shall by Thy Name bee calld
> And Thou amongst th'immortall Gods *enstalld*
> Shall see the Offrings and the yearely Vowes,
> Posteritie unto thy Fame allowes.
> Religious rites and games for Thee *erected*,
> Shall show on Earth how high Thou wast respected.[86]

This passage is crucial for an understanding of the articulation of political and monarchical discourse in the Caroline period. As we have seen, there is a wealth of

---

[84] Forbes, *PANEGYRICK*, sig. A3r.

[85] Forbes, *PANEGYRICK*, sig. A3r.

[86] Forbes, *PANEGYRICK*, sig. A4v. Emphasis mine.

evidence suggesting that Charles wished to monumentalize his authority through an adoption of European-inflected absolutism. As I have shown, this absolutism is articulated through a variety of cultural forms, most notably the court masque, particularly when the royal entertainments adopt the now-familiar architectural discourse of permanence and solidity. In the above passage, this architectural emphasis was so centralizing that, even when on a royal progress, panegyric aimed at Charles still adopts this permanence, even though a progress, more than any other form, should have at its centre a sense of fluidity and malleability. Charles's architectural discourse, then, imposes rigidity when it is not appropriate. Thus, above we have a catalogue of fixed physicality, such as obelisks and temples that will install Charles's magnificence into the earth, as the erection of these features does homage to his authority. What was really needed, however, was the consolidation of this power through a communal negotiation of several discourses; a more regular dialogue with such visited spaces. Read this way the quotation appears to articulate a discourse of colonization, as the court and Charles visit the space, merely leaving markers as symbols of appropriation before departing. In the Caroline period, it seems that even progress and procession texts voice monarchical magnificence through a discourse of permanence and splendour.

'Your palace at Westminster waits in expectation'

On a later progress in the 1630s, Charles and his queen were entertained at Richmond, having left Oxford. Interestingly, it says much about Caroline court culture that the surviving printing of this progressing entertainment actually refers to the performance as a masque, despite the fact that the royal audience was far from Whitehall. As the title page reads: *THE KING AND QVEENES Entertainement at RICHMOND. AFTER THEIR*

DEPARTVRE from OXFORD: In a Masque, presented by the most Illustrious PRINCE, PRINCE CHARLES.[87] It might be conjectured, then, that in the later period progressing culture is appropriated into the officially-sanctioned monarchical practice of masquing at Whitehall, particularly when the entertainment is presented by a royal prince. Of course, as has been discussed throughout this study, masques could certainly be staged far away from Whitehall, as Milton's Ludlow masque (*Comus*) testifies. What is apparent from the title page of the Richmond text, however, is that a false genre is being applied: this is a progress entertainment, not a masque text, and there is a sense in which the royal command is able to transform a visited place into a masquing space, as the text makes evident in terms of the production of the printed copy: '*Yet here it is; and as o'th'world some thought / That it by Atomes of it selfe was wrought: / So this concurring with your high commands / Came to be thus compacted, as it stands.*'[88] In a clear remembrance of the Elizabethan progressing texts, a visiting royal court quite literally refashions the visited space, but in the later period there is far more of a reliance on the Stuart discourse of masquing culture. Whereas the Edinburgh entertainments achieved this aim by referencing grand architecture such as castles and civic arches, the later text does not even attempt this. Rather, the goal is achieved in 1636 by referencing Whitehall generically: this is a masque text, after all. It is not that it is implied that a masquing culture cannot exist away from Whitehall. It is evident that by this point in the early

---

[87] Anonymous, *THE KING AND QVEENES Entertainement at RICHMOND. AFTER THEIR DEPARTVRE from OXFORD: In a Masque, presented by the most Illustrious PRINCE, PRINCE CHARLES* (Oxford, Sep. 1636). Title page. For another Caroline masque / entertainment away from Whitehall, see Davenant's *The Triumphs of the Prince d'Amour* (1635). On these entertainments, see Butler, 'Entertaining the Palatine Prince: Plays on Foreign Affairs 1635-1637', in *English Literary Renaissance* 13:3, (1983), 319-44.

[88] *THE KING AND QVEENES Entertainement at RICHMOND*, sig. A2r. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

Stuart period there is a degree of geographical interplay when the idea of a masque references Whitehall, as we witnessed in chapter 4 with the appearance of the Master of the Revels in Buckingham's 'running masque'.

As the period before the outbreak of civil war comes to a close, a short pamphlet remembers the entertainment given to Charles as he progressed into York in 1641. In many ways, *THE KINGS Noble entertainment AT YORK*, by Nathaniel Rigby, offers a short but accurate overview of the progress and accompanying theatrical culture in the 1630s.[89] This is true because at various moments in the text the moveable nature of Charles's court is made obvious, whilst, at the same time, the text stresses the removal *from* London as slightly unusual. Equally, although the printed text recalls the earlier Elizabethan form in terms of genre, there is a distinct lack of Elizabethan pastoralism in this surviving entertainment, as the text evokes the sense of a civic space that is reminiscent of the London entry texts of the Renaissance period. This last point is particularly noticeable in the subtitle of the work as the theme of royal entertainment gives ways to a celebration of York's civic culture: '*WITH The Lord Maior of YORK his worthy Speech to the King. AS also the manner how the Aldermen, Sheriffes, Citizens, and sundry other Gentlemen congratulated his Maiesty to York'*. On this title page we can view the foregrounding of yet another fixed architerctural structure in a Caroline theatrical text from a royal occasion. As Rigby makes clear: '*Likewise how triumphantly hee* [Charles] *was entertained with many rich Presents, and how they conducted his*

---

[89] Nathaniel Rigby, *THE KINGS Noble entertainment AT YORK* WITH *The Lord Maior of YORK his worthy Speech to the King. AS also the manner how the Aldermen, Sheriffes, Citizens, and sundry other Gentlemen congratulated his Maiesty to York.* (London, March 1641). Title page.

Maiesty to his Castle.'[90] Again, therefore, there is a certain civic resonance here that combines with a courtly discourse articulated through a subtle but familiar employment of architectural language.

If progress texts might be thought to possess a distinct sense of the portability of elite space, this is not at all apparent in this text, as pastoralism, formally a signifier of Elizabethan progressing culture, is abandoned. Instead, the beginning of the text goes to great lengths to stress the 'here and now' of Caroline political culture, as the troubles of the kingdom are articulated through what was supposed to be a celebratory monarchical form:

> THE Kings Most Excellent Maiestie, being variously discontented, partly at the seditious and preposterous Distraction in this Kingdome, partly at the Rebellious insurrection in *Ireland*, and the barbarous continuation of the same, none, or very little means of redresse being used, and partly (which I conceive was the principall cause that induced him) at the dangerous imputation of high affaires reflected on his Maiestie, was deeply wounded hereupon with griefe and vexation: all which loaded his Princely minde with such a ponderous burden, of sorrow, that he resolved himselfe to live absented from his Parliament. And in this remote distance from them, receiving divers times Messages from both Houses, highly touching his Maiesty; it did rather redouble and ingeminate his former griefe, then lessen or extenuate it.[91]

Here we have a fundamental shift in the intrinsic idea of a royal progress. In the Elizabethan period, the progresses and entertainments helped to articulate a particularly idealized vision of the queen, and so shaped Elizabethan political culture. By 1641, however, it is obvious that the idea of progressing has changed: here Charles travels because of the political climate and it is that political culture that shapes the progress. In

---

[90] Rigby, *THE KINGS*, Title page. Italics are reproduced from the original text.

[91] Rigby, *THE KINGS*, sig. A2r-A2v.

Caroline England, progresses are shaped, whereas the form had previously been used to fashion aspects of the courtly culture. Yet it is in keeping with the generic blur of a Caroline progress text that Rigby suddenly inserts a degree of Elizabethanism as the peripatetic courtly space is embraced:

> Wherefore being at New-Market, hee recreated himselfe oftentimes, and did seeme respectively to entertain some mirth and alacrity [sic] in his former deiected minde [...] Whereupon hee left New-market, and went next to Cambridge: from thence to Huntington, and there continuing a while, hee afterwards confirmed his resolution to set forward for Yorke.[92]

In this quotation there is at least a hint of the idea of a moveable courtly space accompanying the king's monarchical authority, wherever he may be. However, this is not common in the Caroline period, and, similarly, the *absence* of the familiar architectural discourse is just as notable.

Indeed, the embrace of a moving courtly space is often accompanied in the Caroline period with an acknowledgment from the writer that Charles wants, and needs, to return to his southern realm. Again, this is expressed through an architectural register: 'Your Palace at Westminster waits in expectation of your presence, it longs to enjoy your sacred self, it expands its gates, as if it expects your returne each minut: let it not seeme desolate, but rather honour it with your presence, that so it may become a Paradise.'[93] What can be traced in such texts, therefore, is not so much a Caroline interest in architecture, as an obsession with the expression of this interest in both literary and non-literary textual production. Again, a London palace is personified as a being that waits for its master to return and so refashion the elite space into a paradise-like utopia. Equally, there are traces of the moveable courtly space here, in that the king's presence alone will

---

[92] Rigby, *THE KINGS*, sig. A2v.

[93] Rigby, *THE KINGS*, *sig.* A3v.

bring such revelations. Yet we cannot forget the continuation of Caroline architectural language through the foregrounding of the palace and the literary personification that this space undergoes. In fact, this passage has an ideal microcosmic emphasis that can be taken as standard for the Caroline court's retention and neglect of a progressing culture: traces of Elizabethanism resonate with the idea of a moveable space defined by monarchical presence, whilst, at the same time, the importance of architectural permanence is emphasized through the muddled and somewhat confused textual and political discourse. Similarly, it must be remembered that one accompanying feature of the architectural personification cited above is the acknowledgment that the palace is still 'alive' even without Charles's presence, as an architectural structure has been supernaturalized by its allocated sense of importance in the wider courtly culture.

In conclusion, these themes continue in the last Caroline progress to and from Scotland in 1641. In fact, there appears to have been something of a textual explosion from the printing presses, both north and south of the border as Charles returned for the first time since 1633.[94] Yet this heightened sense of textuality has more to do with the political climate than progressing culture. In many of these works architecturalism continues to be stressed, whilst, additionally, there is a degree of generic confusion in

---

[94] For this study, I have been able to trace the following textual accounts of the 1641 trip to Scotland. Texts are anonymous unless otherwise stated: *The Kings Majesties Speech, in the Parliament at Edinburgh the Seventeenth day of August, 1641* (Edinburgh, 1641); A. G. Cler., *The Speech which was to have been delivered to the Kings Majestie, at his coming to HOLY-RUD-HOUSE the 14 of August, in the name of the citie of EDINBURGH* (Edinburgh, 1641); *A RELATION Of the Kings Entertainment into Scotland, on Fryday, the 13. of August. 1641* (London, 1641); *KING CHARLES his welcome home, OR A CONGRATVLATION of all his loving Subiects in thankefulnesse to God for his Maiesties safe and happie returne from Scotland, 1641* (London, 1641); J. H., *KING CHARLES HIS ENTERTAINMENT AND LONDONS LOYALTIE.* (London, 1641); *Englands Comfort, and Londons Ioy* (London, 1641); John Cragge, *ENGLANDS Congratulatorie Entertainment, OF HIS MAIESTIE Out of Scotland, and his welcome to London.* (London, 1641); *THE SVBIECTS HAPPINESSE, AND The Citizens Joy.* (London, 1641); *FIVE MOST NOBLE SPEECHES Spoken to his Majestie returning out of SCOTLAND INTO ENGLAND* (London, 1641); Lawrence Price, *GREAT BRITAINES time of Triumph.* (London, 1641); *OVATIO CAROLINA. THE TRIVMPH OF KING CHARLES* (London, 1641).

terms of the wider progressing / masquing culture. Yet the crisis point of 1641 resonates through this material, as an early Stuart court once more partakes in a discourse of separation through the progressing texts whilst also foregrounding the celebrations of Charles's return to London and the supposed safety of the permanent English palaces. However, it is the tense political climate that dominates these works as the country nears the outbreak of civil war, coupled with the ongoing problems north of the border.

Furthermore, these texts are not so much progress texts as an announcement of the redundancy of progressing as a cultural form in this later period. Whereas Elizabeth had shaped political discourse through her embracement of processions and the like, Charles could now only travel in order to diffuse or tackle complex political discourses away from his court. Likewise, a glimpse at the titles of the texts produced from London highlights the joy of London at Charles's return from Scotland. If this was a progress, therefore, it was one of necessity rather than choice on the part of the monarch and this says everything about Charles's understanding of early modern progressing: these events have to take place, but they are not embraced. Rather, as we have seen, the king's absolutist fascination with architectural permanence obviously finds better expression in the Whitehall masques, as a closed-off spatial realm articulates the importance of such structures through a deliberate self-referentiality. In the following conclusion to this thesis, I now turn attention to textual accounts of Charles's preference for the architectural definition of a fixed court with emphasis on how this is remembered in the 1640s once Charles has left Whitehall for Oxford.

Conclusion

'Majesty had wont to sit inthron'd within those glorious Walls': Whitehall, Monarchical Absence and Royalist Nostalgia

Though for a time we see White-hall
With Cobweb-hangings on the wall,
In stead of gold and silver brave,
Which formerly 'twas wont to have,
With rich perfume in every room,
Delightful to that Princely Train,
Which again shall be, when the time you see,
That the King enjoys his own again.[1] *(Martin Parker)*

Introduction

In the above quotation from the royalist Martin Parker's broadside ballad on Charles I's absence from Whitehall in the 1640s, it is made clear that the Caroline court of 1625-42 has given way to a less decadent and aesthetically structured space, leaving us to wonder if the word 'court' is appropriate at all. That the poem dates from the late 1640s is significant as Parker remembers the past glories of 'the court' and demonstrates the palace's fall into neglect. Crucially, the quotation reminds us of the need to view a court in a variety of ways. For this writer, a fixed architectural palace is most certainly a type of court. On the other hand, another form of 'court' has had to abandon Whitehall and

---

[1] Martin Parker, 'Upon defacing of *White-hall'*, (late 1640s), in S.N., *THE LOYAL GARLAND, Containing choice Songs and Sonnets of our late unhappy Revolutions*, 4th edn, (London, 167[3?]), sigs. A3r-A3v. See also *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse, 1509-1659*, ed. by H. R. Woodhuysen (London: Penguin, 1992), pp. 163-65. For biographical information on Parker, see p. 891 where he is referred to as 'the best-known ballad-writer of the age.' This note asserts also his undoubted royalist values. See also Joad Raymond's entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* for the post-1640 tone of Parker's 'sentimental pro-royalist politics [...] in his writings.' Similarly, Raymond notes that 'Parker became an important figure in popular literary culture, a symbol of traditional royalist allegiance. The position was firmly consolidated by his most famous ballad, 'When the king enjoys his own again.'' See Joad Raymond, 'Parker, Martin (*fl.* 1624–1647)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21326, accessed 30 March 2007].

London for the Oxford colleges. Correspondingly, whereas the quotation focuses on an architectural discourse ('in every room'), the poem also brings out the potentiality of a court as a moving space, as 'that Princely Train' signifies the court as more than a mere place, and perhaps alludes to an early modern progressing culture. Importantly, then, the extract allows a variety of definitions of the early modern court to be accessed simultaneously, as, once more, the meaning of a court can be viewed as open-ended, perhaps even problematized.

Additionally, of much importance is the poem's status as a royalist assertion of community and togetherness, as the text bolsters this with a reflection on the ultimate royalist structure in the period, Whitehall Palace. Significantly, the poem's title, 'Upon defacing of *White-hall*', makes it clear that the palace has fallen into decay, owing to the king's absence. Of particular concern, though, is the point that to remove the king and his courtiers is to 'deface' this architectural structure, as a key component has been removed. Yet, it is not at all obvious which of the features missing from the palace are the most decisive for a continuation of a 'healthy' courtly space. For instance, although the quotation closes with a nostalgic refrain and the assertion of the king's need to reclaim the palace and so 'enjoy his own again', it is unclear if the palace's greatest loss has been monarchical presence, or the aestheticized elite culture that Charles and his courtiers had fostered at the palace, through the embrace of high art. For example, we can note the emphasis in the extract on the 'gold and silver brave' and 'the rich perfume'. We detect also the way in which the assertion of royalism and the accompanying sense of community is partly dependent upon the palace itself, as Whitehall not only articulates the cause of monarchy in the 1640s, but actually represents it. In the poem, therefore,

Whitehall is able to be a substitute the king, despite its emptiness and loss. Part of this conclusion's focus, therefore, will be the continuation in the 1640s of an absolutist conceptualization of courtly space that always figures architectural permanence and solidity as crucial and of the utmost importance. Yet, at the same time, we need to examine carefully the implications of this move because, as Marlowe's King Edward found, one problem of foregrounding the court as a fixed and permanent centre of aesthetic grandeur is that this privileging of an architectural structure downgrades the importance of monarchical presence. Indeed, a king might be removed from a permanent and fixed court. In these concluding pages, therefore, I excavate the extent to which the Caroline court had become a fixed location at Whitehall as the royalist writers in the 1640s look back to Charles's palace, and through their well-meaning praise, actually reveal a fault line in the king's political discourse, as an architectural court has a magnificence with or without the monarch.

The last chapter examined Charles's gradual fixing of courtly authority at Whitehall Palace, as monarchical power steadily moved away from the progresses of the earlier Elizabethan regime and turned to the various guises of the Banqueting House. Now I explore the implications of this for elite space, particularly when we remember that Charles's court had left Whitehall in 1642, owing to the outbreak of civil war and Puritan control of London. Through my analysis of a number of key royalist literary texts from the 1640s, it becomes apparent that the vacated palace was remembered as a centralizing, almost living, architectural presence, as royalism voiced a discourse of nostalgia so as to define a courtly space as permanent and unmoveable, as is made clear by Parker's decision to use the refrain 'That the King enjoys his own again' throughout

his poem. Likewise, as the text nears it conclusion, Parker asserts the need for monarchy to return to Whitehall: 'Untill I see some peaceful Dove, / Bring home the Branch I dearly love'.[2] The emphasis on restoration in the couplet is a vital reminder, therefore, that monarchical absence from the palace lasted for the best part of two decades. As we shall see, a problem with the architectural approach to courtly space is that this discourse continues to resonate with elitism and monarchical splendour without the presence of the sovereign. This consolidates the definitional understanding of courtly space as a static configuration of architectural permanence, but suggests also that such constructions need not be fortified by monarchical authority. As I demonstrate, by the 1640s it is apparent that 'the court' was taking on a structural importance to a greater extent than before, despite the continued polycentrism of the Stuart culture, as fluidity is downplayed by a fixed, absolutist understanding of courtly space.

'As Empresse swaid O're all the British palaces': privileging Whitehall

Whereas the Elizabethan, and even Jacobean progresses allowed royal authority to appropriate other spaces as the court travelled the country (including, for instance, the elite spaces of aristocratic homes, as well as the City of London, whilst the monarch was on procession), the settling of the court as a fixed realm at Whitehall excluded power from the popular gaze. It is even possible, as I have shown, to trace a growing architectural discourse in the masques of this later period, which can only have added to the perception of Charles's 'court' as a fixed and closed-off palace, its physicality lending it permanence in terms of social space. Furthermore, although the following account of the beginning of Charles's reign is not reliable, it does suggest Charles's lack of appetite for public spectacle. As Anthony Weldon tells us:

---

[2] Parker, 'Upon defacing of *White-hall*', sig. A3v.

> This King was not Crowned with that solemnity, all other Kings have formerly been, by riding through the City in all state, although the same Triumphes were provided for him, as sumptuous as for any other; this, some have taken as an ill omen.[3]

As was shown in the last chapter, Charles moved away from the royal progress as a means of communicating with the 'popular voice', as well as aristocratic communities in the country.[4] This theme emerges more obviously still when we analyze accounts that look back to the 1630s and Charles's favourite palace. Indeed, this conclusion argues for the problematization of a royalist strategy of praise offered to Whitehall Palace in the 1640s, as political and literary energies are focussed on the privileging of Charles's most important palace rather than his monarchical presence. Of course, as chapter 6 demonstrated, this was a process that began much earlier in Charles's reign, as the cultural vigour for architecturalism was channelled into the Caroline masque. However, I now show the impact this had on literary discourse, as writers problematize Charles's cultural presentation even as they attempt to offer praise.

---

[3] Anthony Weldon, *THE COURT AND CHARACTER OF King James. Written and taken by Sir A:W: being an eye, and eare witnesse. Published by authority.* (London, 1650), p. 191. See also Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* ((Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987); Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981); Thomas N. Corns, 'Duke, Prince and King', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. by Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 1-25.

[4] See Corns, 'Duke, Prince and King', p. 22, where he points out that 'the distinctions from the Jacobean royal image were clear enough, inscribed in court ritual and custom as surely as in cultural discourses. At or near the start of the Personal Rule, Charles and his court had effected a considerable transformation within those ideological domains they could control. But ideological apparatuses outside the court could not so easily be mastered, a distressing plurality of alternative images remained available.' See also p. xv, pp. 15-16. Graham Parry, writes that 'Charles [...] dream[t] of a palace as vast as the Escorial or the Louvre.' See *The Seventeenth Century: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1603-1700* (London and New York: Longman, 1989), p. 29.

'Sink into the centre': poeticizing Whitehall

In Henry Glapthorne's *White-Hall. A Poem*, from 1643, the importance of Charles's principal residence is unsurprisingly highlighted, bearing in mind that the monarch had fled the capital for Oxford the year before.[5] The royalist nostalgia present in the text is perhaps to be expected in that its writer is known to have had much sympathy for Charles's cause, though Julie Sanders has pointed out that he had written 'elegies on the fourth earl of Bedford and the earl of Manchester, both of whom were opposed to court policies'.[6] Similarly, architectural discourse informs the poem, rather than the concept of a progressing courtly space. This is clear from the beginning of the text, when the appropriation of a late-medieval space is supplemented with architectural classicism:

> WHat Earthquake's this? that with such fury shakes
> My lofty Turrets from their Base? and makes
> My marble pillars totter, as they meant
> To sink into the Centre?[7]

Crucially, it is the palace itself that speaks in this poem, as Glapthorne uses the evocation of Whitehall as a speaking subject to articulate its own architectural magnificence. The use of the word 'Centre', of course, evokes the idea of the palace as a fixed entity that pulls power towards itself in London. However, the poem can be read alongside the later

---

[5] Henry Glapthorne, *White-Hall. A Poem. Written 1642. WITH ELEGIES ON The Right Honourable FRANCIS Earl of BEDFORD. And HENRY Earle of Manchester, Lord Privy Seale: both deceased during this present Session of Parliament. WITH An Anniversarie on the timeless death of Mrs. Anne Kirk, wife to the truly Noble Geo. Kirk, Gentleman of the Robes of his Majesties Bed Chamber, drowned unfortunately passing London Bridge, Iuly 6. 1641.* (London, 1643). On the Oxford court, see Jerome De Groot, 'Royalism, Politics and Culture in Civil War Oxford' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Newcastle, 2000); 'Space, Patronage, Procedure: the Court at Oxford 1642-46', *English Historical Review*, 117:474 (2002), 1204-27.

[6] See the entry by Julie Sanders in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. She points out that *White-Hall* can be dated 4 March 1642, though published in 1643. Julie Sanders, 'Glapthorne, Henry (*bap.* 1610)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10796, accessed 30 March 2007].

[7] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. A2r.

text by Parker examined at the start of this section, as both poems demonstrate the idea of courtly magnificence without the king's enigmatic presence. In Parker's text Whitehall is figured as an incomplete space owing to the absence of not only the king, but also the courtiers who form collectively a kind of court. The quotation above from Glapthorne is similar in that it does not focus wholly on monarchical presence or absence, but rather on the architectural permanence of Whitehall. Indeed, although both texts are meant to privilege the king and the royalist cause, they actually add a great deal of complexity to the definition of Charles's court in all its guises.

As the text moves on it foregrounds Whitehall as a site of monarchical authority and ownership in which its position as *the* residence of Charles is demonstrated explicitly:

> When like loud thunder violent, or the North,
> Its sudden tempest hideously breaks forth,
> As't has on me, who have for many yeares
> Out-shin'd the state and lustre of my Peeres.
> Great Hampton Court, faire Greenwhich, Richmond, and
> The pleasant None-such; that I seem'd to stand
> Equall with *Lo'uure*, or that work of all
> So much admir'd, Spaines costly Scurial.[8]

In some ways, these lines possibly gesture towards progressing, as it is at least made clear that the monarch enjoyed access to a variety of physical locations that symbolized his or her authority. It is also apparent that the monarch would have to travel between these elite spaces. However, these are monarchical realms, exclusive to the king or queen and travel between them does not constitute a royal progress in the manner that Elizabeth's visits to aristocratic houses had done in the sixteenth century. The quotation's last two lines are of particular interest, as they hint at Charles's grand designs to have the entire palace

[8] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. A2v. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

redesigned by Jones. Although nothing came of this idea, it is important to remember that Whitehall would then have been able to rival some of the great continental structures had the scheme been realized, in that Charles wished for his own centre of architectural absolutism. As the last chapter has demonstrated, although Charles did not have the funds for this grand project, he was able to map this discourse upon the theatrical structure of the masque in the 1630s. The continued architecturalism of Glapthorne's poem shows the partial success of this approach, as political and literary discourse attempts to stress the divinity of architectural absolutism even into the 1640s. This suggestion in the poem hints also at the architectural absolutism of France or Spain, as personal monarchy is shadowed by magnificent architecture and the divinity of kings in continental political discourse is linked to a need for firm and grand foundations in the processes of court fashioning.

Later in Glapthorne's poem, it is made explicitly clear that Whitehall has been Charles's one true court:

> Who since that prince of Prelates, *Woolsey*, laid
> My firme foundations, have as Empresse swaid
> O're all the British palaces, and beene
> The constant Residence o'th' King and Queene,
> That with their presence royall, did adorne
> My well-built Fabrick.[9]

If Charles had many courts, it is implied that Whitehall Palace was at the very centre of his reign. Indeed, the poem proceeds to chart the glories of the palace from the time of Henry VIII taking over the property from Cardinal Wolsey. When the good times associated with Charles's reign have been chronicled sufficiently, the poem turns attention to the absence of Charles and his entourage since the 1642 move to the Oxford

[9] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. A2v. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

colleges. Certainly, it is highly revealing that the poet takes as one of his central points Charles's absence, as this would seem to suggest that public discourse locates the king firmly at his chief London residence, rather than on an Elizabethan-style tour of the country. Importantly, we can trace the remembrance of the union of the king and queen at Whitehall. It is strange, however, that 'their presence royall' is objectified as something which 'adorn[s]' the palace as a space, as if monarchical presence is a suitable addition rather than intrinsic definer of a courtly realm. In short, the permanent and fixed architecturalism of Caroline court culture has actually given a voice – and so a distinctive and peculiar prominence – to Whitehall itself.

Thus, the poem's speaker remarks that, earlier in the period, when the king became involved in disputes with the Scots, Charles was brought 'home my much lov'd King', and Whitehall's personified state yearns for its monarch.[10] It is not that Charles's monarchical presence is not honoured in the poem, but that Whitehall is shown to be a living, functioning being with or without a sovereign, though we have to keep in mind also the idea articulated by Parker that monarchical withdrawal results in the 'defacing' of the palace. At the very least, Glapthorne's suggestion is hugely problematic for any early modern definition of the court as a space always occupied by the monarch. Charles's architecturalist tendencies, as demonstrated in the last chapter's discussion of 1630s masquing culture, can be unsettling for conceptualizations of the court, as the 'kingly' definition the court, where the monarch's presence is crucial is at odds with architectural fixity. As we have seen throughout this study, architecturalism can be traced as a distinctive early Stuart trope of magnificence very early in the reign of James. Yet it

[10] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. B3v.

is during the sovereignty of Charles that this theme collapses under its own weight, as a political discourse that was meant to solidify monarchical permanence and absolutism actually manages to make it possible to imagine a courtly space without a king. This world is now far removed from the peripateticism of the Elizabethan progresses.

In the same way, the historical departure of the monarch from Whitehall is recorded as '*Charls* his absence', whilst this same removal of royalty from the palace is evoked in architectural terms:

> Where are those beauties now from whose each eye,
> Flew winged flames of love and majesty,
> That trope [sic] of Ladies, who so oft did gild
> My stately roomes with their own looks, which sold
> All my Dimensions with rays pure and bright
> As was in Paradise, the worlds first light?
> Vanish'd like a shadowes, they no more appeare,
> The sun being set; death now inhabits here,
> And a continued dulnesse, now instead
> Of those soft measures which so oft were led
> Over my spacious floores there does intrude,
> In meager selfe, that nothing solitude [sic]:
> In stead of Musick, such as by the Spheares,
> And tunefull Orbs is breathd to inchant all Eares:
> Vpon my Turetts nightly there does howle,
> The most prodigious and portentous Owle:
> Nothing but feare and terrour in me dwels,
> Such as is resident in those dark cels,
> Where nought but death raigns.[11]

Here we are reminded of the absence of the female courtiers, presumably those who would have accompanied the queen throughout her days at the royal palace. At the same time, however, the objectification of these women as courtly 'beauties' adds to the aestheticization of the court in the Caroline era, whilst, simultaneously, implying that Whitehall is able to aestheticize its visitors through its own 'gloss' of grandeur. This theme clearly continues as the quotation moves on, with the women figured as a 'trope of

[11] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sigs. B3v-B4r.

Ladies' whose presence adds an aesthetic frame of reference to the architecturalism of the 'stately roomes' and '[d]imensions'. Undeniably, although the remembrance of the female courtiers adds to the understanding of the Caroline's court's continuation of polycentrism, it is clear that this downplays the definition of a court according to princely presence.

When the removal of the monarch from his primary residence is emphasized in terms of '[t]he sun being set' and the 'continued dulnesse' it is made clear that this relates also to the absence of the courtiers, in that these changes have greatly altered the 'stately roomes', 'spacious floores' and '[t]urrets', because 'death raigns' in place of Charles at the courtly space of Whitehall Palace, a place that now 'languish[es] like a faire young bride.'[12] Yet, some of this cultural and political work is undone by the previous emphasis on the absence of the ladies, a theme that is reiterated through the personification of the palace as a yearning bride. However, the most important point from this lengthy quotation is surely the continuation of architecture as a pervading influence that frames and underpins the discussion. It is a speaking building that is uttering this discourse of loss and remembrance and this voice is describing Gothic terrors, as the turrets reverberate with medievalism and the resonance of aristocratic chivalric culture. The use of couplets adds to the sense of structure in poetic and architectural craft and the enforced relocation of courtly and elite space that has been brought on by the civil war assumes the status of a gothic nightmare, as architecture is linked to the monarchical experience of change. Of course, this architectural emphasis moves the reader even further away from the possible alternative, an approach that would have foregrounded Charles as the centre of all courtly meaning. On the contrary, Glapthorne's poem reminds us of the

[12] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. B4r.

personification of buildings and architecture, a cultural move that stretches back to the beginning of the Stuart dynasty in England and that reached its zenith in the Caroline masquing culture of the 1630s. Yet this evocation of Whitehall Palace is not what Charles had in mind earlier in the reign.

'A pallace without a presence': a prose configuration

A similar obsession with an architectural physicality haunts a prose pamphlet from 1642, a text that once more mourns for the departed king. *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D Through the Lodgings at WHITE-HALL* deplores the monarch's enforced relocation to Oxford and raises specific points about the king's fondness for Whitehall, and, by implication, the understanding of courtly space in the Caroline period.[13] For instance, the text grants its reader access to the remembered discourse of aestheticality at the Caroline court in the 1640s, as well as the continuation of the era's preferment for an architectural discourse. Firstly, it seems that this text does separate the idea of a palace from a court. Indeed, as the full title reveals, for the author, J.B., Whitehall is very much a 'PALLACE', whereas the 'COVRT' has left with the king for Oxford. However, although at first glance this consolidates the belief that Charles only settled at Whitehall, but did still progress, the text reveals a subsequent anxiety, in that it is made explicit that the king's continued absence from Whitehall is both rare and extremely problematic for the author. Not only does the title express anxiety ('the Miseries of the PALLACE'), but the prose that

---

[13] J.B, *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D Through the Lodgings at WHITE-HALL, Deploring the absence of the COVRT, And the Miseries of the PALLACE.* (London, 1642). The copy of this pamphlet from the Thomason Tracts carries the annotation 'Octob: 4th'. I am grateful to Dr Gabriel Heaton for this reference. The work has been attributed to James Barlow, though the *Dictionary of National Biography* does not have an entry for this (possible) writer.

follows builds upon this by expressing discomfort through a discourse that evokes a sense of an architecturally fixed, physical structure:

> A Pallace without a presence! A *White-Hall* clad in sable vestments! A Court without a Court! These are miseries, and miseries, which the silken ages of this peacefull Island have not beene acquainted with, That the Feild should be turn'd to Court, and the Court into a desert! Majesty had wont to sit inthron'd within those glorious Walls, darting their splendour with more awfull brightnesse then the great Luminaries in the Firmament.[14]

It is clear that the palace is in the curious position of having to exist without a royal presence. In fact, royalist nostalgia is symbolically short-circuited here as the author struggles to articulate this unique situation. Put simply, royalist vocabulary lacks the verbal skill to give this a suitable articulation; such is the unusualness of the king's disappearance from his key palace. However, once more we are able to trace the complex interactions between 'court' and 'palace' in the early modern period, as J.B implies that Whitehall *is* still a palace without a king, albeit a rather poor example after 1642. In a related point, the double meaning of the word 'court' is clearly evoked as the text mentions the concept of 'a court without a court', signifying that the spatial court has been deserted by the court that follows the king. Whitehall, then, lacks monarchical presence as well as the group of courtiers who usually occupy its architectural spaces. This implies a surface contradiction which gestures towards tautology, as processes of signification disintegrate beneath the burden of the duality of 'court' as both fixed and moveable spatial realm. Heightened rhetoric is used therefore in an attempt to give voice to these woes, as the figure of antanaclasis echoes the changing face of the court and its dual meaning.

---

[14] J.B., *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D*, sig. A2r. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

Yet it is revealing that the early modern notion of the court as a space that is always with the king is still present in this passage, though the point is noticeably subtle and not at all obvious. J.B retains this aspect of Elizabethanism by implying that the court is still accompanying the king, even on the battlefield that is by implication 'tur'd to Court'. The political implications of this point (potentially useful to Charles's cause in terms of the foregrounding of a distinct monarchical space) are actually undone by J.B's next textual move, as he reverts to Caroline architecturalism by figuring Whitehall as a fixed space that has been abandoned, or transformed into 'a desert.' Crucially, J.B then groups together many key points about the confusion of courtly space in the period by observing that 'Majesty had wont to sit inthron'd within those glorious Walls, darting their splendour with [...] awfull brightnesse.' Charles may have wished to govern with a centralizing absolutism that would resonate from a new Whitehall Palace, but the civil war has forced him to abandon such a project at this moment in time. Likewise, although the text implies that architecturalism could have fixed Charles's royal magnificence in place with a marked determination and absolutist will, it is ironic that it is the use of a political discourse that has actually prioritized the aesthetic of 'those glorious walls' far too readily, turning Whitehall from an inanimate object that merely houses the king and his courtiers to a speaking organism capable of voicing political concerns. To this end, the work succeeds, yet often does so by deploying a contradictory architecturalism that places a royal palace extremely high in the Caroline hierarchy of place, space and presence.

However faintly, therefore, the concept of a moveable courtly space or collective of courtiers is evoked in a royalist prose work that actually stresses the architectural

setting of the 'fixed' Whitehall court. This deliberate heightening of the physicality of Whitehall continues throughout, as J.B starts the second paragraph pointedly 'at the entrance into the Court', before describing how the implied reader might 'walke into the Presence Chamber', or 'be minded to survey the Lodgings and withdrawing rooms', and 'the Lodgings of the severall Lords and Gentlemen' are nearby to the 'Chappell'.[15] Certainly, then, it seems that for royalists writing in the 1640s, the king's absence from Whitehall for any length of time was indeed a rarity and the anxiety that this reveals is manifested in an architectural discourse that stresses the physicality of the palace as a defining characteristic of elite, and particularly monarchical, space. Yet, the underlining tensions that pervade so often in the early modern period when the word 'court' is used are still present in the 1640s, and even this architectural language at least hints at the idea of a moveable (and so progressing) courtly space. Similarly, in 1642, Charles's court had to be a transferable and fluid space, because of the outbreak of civil war. In a related point, I now consider why it was that, when writers looked back at the 1630s from the vantage point of the 1640s, they often did so by thinking of Whitehall as a fixed space. Indeed, I suggest that the architectural discourse that has been examined above was often consolidated by a marked aestheticization that resonates into the 1640s.

'Beautify each corner of my court': aestheticizing Caroline architectural space

> This island [...] seems to me to be a spectacle worthy of the interest of every gentleman [...] not only for the splendour of the outward culture, which seems to be extreme, as of a people rich and happy in the lap of peace, but also for the incredible quality of excellent pictures, statues and ancient inscriptions which are to be found in this court [...] I confess I have never seen anything in the world more rare.[16]

---

[15] J.B., *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D*, sigs. A2r-A3r.

[16] Peter Paul Rubens to Pierre Dupuy, August 8, 1629. Quoted in Smuts, *Court Culture*, p. 187.

It is important to clarify what is meant by the idea of the aestheticization of the Caroline court. In an earlier chapter I argued that, in Marlowe's *Edward II*, the king and Gaveston unwittingly fix the court in one place, thus demystifying sacral kingship as the court becomes a fixed space that the monarch can be removed from. The barons, in turn, appropriate this fixed courtly realm. Where Marlowe's king falters, I have suggested, is the employment of lavish court spectacle at his palace, including the embrace of masquing culture. This allows the court to be seen as an aesthetic centre, as the court as the place of entertainment supplants the idea of the court as the moveable space of divine kingship.

Similarly, as Parry has shown, the Caroline interest in high art meant that the social space of Whitehall became transformed, in terms of the aesthetics of the court culture. For, as Parry argues, 'by the 1630s Whitehall could be considered among the most sophisticated courts in Europe.'[17] If we take note of this work, it is clearly possible to envisage how such a court culture lent itself to a sense of permanence, as 'the court' became Whitehall more than ever, because, as Smuts points out, 'the court's aesthetic culture lent support to an ambitious effort to transcend the limits that historical tradition had imposed upon the state and to establish government on the foundation of rational principles.'[18]

In terms of the 'aesthetic turn' of Caroline court culture, the importance of masques should always be supplemented by an awareness of other forms of elite culture,

---

[17] Parry, *The Seventeenth Century*, p. 49. Parry looks at the highly significant career of Van Dyck, a figure who, along with Rubens and Jones perhaps best exemplifies the emerging sense of a distinct Caroline aesthetic in the 1630s. See pp. 50-51. For more on these themes, see the groundbreaking work of Smuts, particularly his *Court Culture*. Smuts successfully situates Caroline court culture within its political and artistic context. See p. 130.

[18] Smuts, *Court Culture,* p. 171.

including the collection and display of great works of art, as well as the new Caroline interest in classical architecture that is displayed most obviously in the career of Jones. For instance, masquing was often linked to other types of courtly display in the early modern consciousness. This was something that the Caroline court inherited from the Jacobean period, as the following quotation from Thomas Gainsford in 1620 makes clear. In his work of nationalistic description, Gainsford implies that masquing is associated with the rebuilding of the Banqueting House after fire destroyed the previous incarnation. The quotation helps us to understand how masquing was linked to architectural discourse and building projects (in this instance the work of Jones), as well as the importance of building to early Stuart kingship and Renaissance ideas of the physical display of (semi-) absolutist kingship:

> And it did please him [James] to add some glorious repairing, or rather magnificent quadrant, to his palace at White-hall, being the principall place of entertainment, and the eye to ouerlooke such a city, as is not in the world, it would come neere our example indeede. For the Kings house in *Ierusalem* was thirteene yeere a building, and no one thing addes more honour to a nation, then regardable edifices, and eminent workes of Maiesty, being the very fruit of peace, and (as it were) the birth-right of prosperity, whether it bring forth sumptuous structures or adorning monuments [...] If you looke on his palaces, where are so many, and so good, belonging to any Kingdome in the world? If you will behold his court; I hope for state, good order, expences, entertainment, and continuall attendancy, other places come farre short?[19]

Here the court at Whitehall is explicitly viewed as the place of entertainment, owing to James's embrace of masquing culture as a cultural form for the elite. Similarly, the early Stuarts are linked to theatre and entertainment owing to their association with the

---

[19] Thomas Gainsford, *The glory of England, or A true description of many excellent prerogatiues and remarkable blessings, whereby shee triumpheth ouer all the nations in the world VVith a iustifiable comparison betweene her selfe, and the eminent kingdomes of the earth, plainely manifesting the defects of them all in regard of her sufficiencie, and fullnesse of happinesse. Nevvly revised with no lesse profitable then delightsome augmentation. By T.G.* (London, 1620), pp. 246-47. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

Banqueting House in public discourse. However, the usual early modern confusion over courtly space can once more be detected, as the plural 'palaces' signifies monarchical spaces beyond Whitehall. Yet there is only one 'court' and this is associated with 'expences' and 'entertainment' as Whitehall is seen as the primary outlet for aesthetic grandeur for both reigns in early Stuart England.

This theatrical and privileged culture is inherited by Charles who then proceeds to take matters to the next level, by actually performing in masques, as well as witnessing more of them, partially due to the influence of his French queen. Similarly, Charles displayed a love for the arts and an interest in architecture, as is demonstrated by his patronage of Anthony Van Dyck, Peter Paul Rubens and Jones. The role played by the queen consort in shaping Caroline masquing culture is neatly tied together in a parliamentary newsbook which highlights the importance of this entertainment culture to the regime. This text looked back to the 1630s and early 40s with more than a little scorn:

> It is, there, thought also by some of His Majesties servants (as our *Mercurie* verily beleeveth) that the Queen will not have so many Masks at Christmas and Shrovetide this yeare as she was wont to have other yeares hereof [sic] because *Inigo Iones* cannot conveniently make such Heavens and Paradises at *Oxford* as he did at *White-hall*; and because the Poets are dead, beggared or run away, who were wont in their Maskes to make Gods and Godesses of them, and shamefully to flatter them with Attributes neither fitting to be ascribed or accepted of; and some are of opinion, that this is one of the innumerable vanities which hath made them and us become so miserable at this day.[20]

As this demonstrates, material for the satire of the Caroline court, with its associations with masquing culture and accompanying aesthetics, was readily available. That Whitehall is foregrounded only adds to the public perception of the palace in the popular mind with the early Stuart court. Importantly, the fact that Jones is mentioned, rather than

---

[20] *Mercurius Rusticus* (October 1643), p. 10. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

masque writers such as Ben Jonson or Aurelian Townshend, displays the extent to which the masques were now associated with architectural display at Whitehall, rather than poetic skill and literary accomplishment. Finally, of course, the author cannot resist the chance to point an accusing finger at Whitehall masquing culture for the troubles of the 1640s. In the period of civil war, therefore, it is clear that both Whitehall Palace and masquing culture are linked significantly to decadence and aesthetic display in the homogenizing complex diversity of opinions. Owing to this, Charles's royal authority is projected upon a fixed and static understanding of 'court' that downplays the importance of monarchical presence. The mentioning of Jones and Whitehall demonstrates that Caroline architectural discourse has become so absolute and wide-reaching that it can even be used accusatorily to apportion blame to the royal regime. Even when at Oxford, the queen, and, by implication, the king and his court, are linked with a permanent palace and its aestheticism.

The association of Whitehall with a splendid and aesthetically dominant court culture is reflected in the printed texts examined above in terms of their shared concern for the deserted London court in the 1640s. In Glapthorne's poem the glories of the palace are remembered in terms that reverberate with both an architectural discourse and a sense of accompanying aestheticization:

> Then did I flourish, then my spacious rooms
> Were hung with Arras, nay with Persian looms.
> Then did my walls drest in rich colours vie
> With Roman Pallaces for Imag'ry:
> Mosaick paintings (though I'm now forlorne)
> Did then my costly gilded roofs adorne.
> Statues of Parian Marble such as might
> The amorous Pigmalion invite
> To laugh at his dull workmanship, did grace

My walks and gardens.[21]

Here architectural classicism merges with a sense of grandeur and architectural permanence, despite the poem acknowledging that events have taken a drastic turn for the worse in 1642, and that this court was not as enduring as was imagined. Likewise, the classicism and Romanization of the architectural landscape adds Whitehall to an inventory of magnificence and prestige. However, what is most notable about this passage is the continuation of the motif of a speaking palace. Again, then, the personified building is meant to articulate a sense of communal and nostalgic royalism for the king and his court up to 1642. However, in reality the dual stress on architectural discourse and classicism means that it is the spatial structure of Whitehall that is foregrounded, rather than the absence of monarchical and courtly presence.

Later in the same text, the Caroline court's Jacobean heritage is recalled in terms of this growing aestheticization of court life:

> This King of more then Kingdoms, all mens hearts;
> Monarch of letters, Emperour of arts:
> When he his happy peacefull reigne begunne,
> What plenteous streames of joy and blisse did runne
> Through all my veines! what a full throngd resort
> Did beautifie each corner of my Court![22]

This passage clearly links the aestheticism of the court to the reign of James I. However, Whitehall is personified now as the palace articulates its collection of woes. Yet the result of this manoeuvre is to contextualize Charles's reign alongside that of his father. By implication, therefore, kings are shown to possess only a tenant-like status as Whitehall is able to articulate its own discourse in remembrance of royalty.

---

[21] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. A4v.

[22] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. B2r.

In a related point, the next section of the poem is especially interesting for the purposes of my study because the focus on Whitehall as a permanent architectural structure not only continues to evoke a highly aestheticized courtly space, but also turns a specific attention on the palace as the place of entertainment and masquing culture throughout the early Stuart period:

> The Muses then did flourish, and upon
> My pleasant mounts planted at their Helicon.
> Then that great wonder of the knowing age,
> Whose very name merits the amplest page
> In Fames faire book, admired *Iohnson* stood
> Up to the chin in the Pierian flood,
> Quaffing crownd bowles of Nectar, with his bayes
> Growing about his temples; chanting layes,
> Such as were fit for such a sacred Eare
> **As** his majestick Masters was; to heare,
> Whom he so oft pleasd with (those mighty tasks
> Of wit and judgement) his well laboured Masks.[23]

In this passage it is clear that theatrical culture is contextualized within a larger frame of reference of aestheticism and cultural assertion. Similarly, the mention of a famous Renaissance poet-dramatist like Jonson adds to the sense of a mutual respect between the public theatre and Whitehall, as if both realms have something in common. Without doubt, the Jonsonian reference highlights the regime's masquing culture whilst, at the same time, the palace is figured as a theatrical venue of importance alongside other spaces for drama. Additionally, the architectural frame of reference continues with the idea of a theatre being articulated by the speaking building of the palace. As the text states:

> Then those two thunderbolts of lively wit,
> *Beamont* and *Fletcher* gloriously did sit
> Ruling the Theater, and with their cleane

---

[23] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. B2v. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

Conceptions beautifying the Comick Scene.[24]

Although playwrights continue to be mentioned, their importance is downgraded below the concept of a 'Theater', just as Charles's presence or absence is negated by the employment of the trope of a speaking building. Also, as James's embrace of aesthetics has allowed the court to be 'beautifie[d]', so too does public drama, in that high art changes 'the Comick Scene' at the theatre, as both Whitehall and public playing spaces are linked aesthetically through drama.

Later in the poem the architectural splendour of Jones's new Banqueting House is shown to be part of the Jacobean legacy to the Caroline court, as one visually pleasing structure replaces another:

> That I did rather then appeare to be
> The worlds best furnishd learnedst Academy,
> Then the Kings pallace: who when fatall fire
> In its malicious fury did conspire
> To ruine part of my faire buildings; He
> Great *Iames* renewed with State and Majesty,
> Like to himselfe, that goodly Fabrick, which
> Is for materials, as invention rich;
> On polished marble pillars, which shall stand
> To speak his fame, while this renowned Land,
> Free from the invasion of all forraigne harmes,
> Is walld about with Oceans watry armes.
> For which faire ornament I must bestow
> My gratitude [sic] on worth *Inigo*,
> Whose skill in Fabrick did direct each part
> Of that excelling frame with powerfull art.
> Yet should I silent be, the very stones,
> So quaintly laid, will speak the praise of *Iones*.[25]

In this passage 'the Kings pallace' is 'renewed' by King James. Indeed, the comment

---

[24] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. B2v. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

[25] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sigs. B2r-B3v. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

that the first Stuart king used 'himselfe' in this regard clearly aligns sacral majesty with architectural splendour. Yet the poet does not give all of the praise to monarchy, and Jones as the chief architect is thanked in a passage of some significance, as this shows the importance of Jones's highly classical (and so aestheticized) Banqueting House to early Stuart discourse of magisterial projection and representation. Jones's 'skill in Fabrick' and 'powerfull art' have left a legacy of classicism for the next king, Charles I. Again, then, the speaking building voices monarchical magnificence, but only as an aside to the assertion of architectural permanence through Jones's classicism.

Evocatively, Charles's assumption of royal power is viewed as both consolidating and strengthening the architecture of Whitehall Palace:

> Brave *Charles* succeeded. Then my joyes renewd,
> As Eagles their old feathers being mewd.
> I with his vigorous presence warmd, grew yong,
> My witherd frame appearing farre more strong
> Then at its first foundations; mirth and sports
> Like fayries tripping through my happy Courts.[26]

What is most noticeable here is the way that the poem reinforces the happiness and safety of the fabric of the building with the presence of a king. For instance, we learn that the death of James has 'witherd' the palace's frame, whilst the arrival of Charles as king means that 'joyes' are 'renewd' and that a new monarchical 'presence' invigorates the building with a youthfulness and vitality. Not only are the foundations of Whitehall renewed, Charles's arrival as king allows the structure to be more solid than ever before. Of course, the king strengthened these ties by remaining at Whitehall and failing to progress on a regular, large scale, but it is important to observe that entertainment, and possibly court drama, performs a role here, as part of the process of architectural

[26] Glapthorne, *White-Hall*, sig. B3r. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

invigoration is linked to a renewed sense of aestheticization, or 'mirth and sports'. A clear link is established in Caroline discourse between architecture, dramatic entertainment and successful kingship.

This bond is also apparent if we turn back to the prose work about Whitehall, J.B.'s *A Deep Sigh*. This text's employment of an architectural tone to support a monarchical (Caroline) discourse of authority was demonstrated earlier in this conclusion. However, the pamphlet also remembers the aestheticality of Caroline masquing culture by fictionally revisiting the Cockpit that Charles had installed for the entertainment of his royal court:

> In the Cockpit and Revelling Roomes, where at a Play or Masque the darkest night was converted to the brightest Day that ever shin'd, by the luster of Torches, the sparkling of rich Jewells, and the variety of those incomparable and excellent Faces, from whence the other derived their brightnesse, where beauty sat inthron'd in full glory, that had not *Phaeton* fir'd the World, there had wanted a Comparative whereunto to parallel the refulgencie of their bright-shining splendor.[27]

Here the court is most definitely the place of performance. What is perhaps most striking about this passage is the way in which the aestheticization that masquing culture brings alters those within the court, as courtiers now possess 'excellent Faces', as performance aestheticizes members of the court.

However, it is at this point that we are reminded that the text is not only remembering the former glories of the Caroline court, but also wishing for the return of the king and his courtiers. Therefore, the king's absence has meant that Whitehall has fallen into decay, and this is reflected in the decline of masquing culture:

> Now you may goe in without a Ticket or the danger of a broken-pate, you may enter at the Kings side, walke round about the Theaters, view the

[27] J.B., *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D*, sig. A3v. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

> Pullies, the Engines, conveyances, or contrivances of every several Scaene And not an Usher o'th Revells, or Engineere to envy or finde fault with your discovery, although they receive no gratitude for the sight of them.[28]

The disappearance of theatrical entertainment is viewed as an aspect of court life that has been lost with the king and his court away from the palace, as the text continues to make it clear that theatrical activity was only one part of a wider sense of court splendour at the aesthetically-charged Caroline court. With the king gone, so too is theatre and a variety of other delights:

> There is no presse at the Wine-sellor Dores and Windowes, no gaping noise amongst the angry Cookes in the Kitchings, no wayting for the opening of the Posterne-dore to take water at the Stayres, no racket nor balling in the Tenis Court, no throng nor rumbling of Coaches before the Court Gates, but all in a dumbe silence, as the Pallace stood not neere a well peopled City, but as if it were the decay'd buildings of ruin'd *Troy*, where scarce a passenger is known to tread once in twenty yeares.[29]

Here the removal of monarchical splendour is felt at every level of Whitehall life, as the palace stands empty. This loss is then translated into yet another architectural discourse, as classical Troy is evoked through a rhetoric of aesthetic decay, neglect and loss. Indeed, the theme began earlier, when J.B. mentioned the loss of the inhabitants of the Guard Chamber, in that 'now they are all vanisht, nothing left but the bare Walls, and a cold Harth'.[30] It seems that when writers in the 1640s looked back to the glory of Charles's Whitehall they often expressed their sense of awe, as well as an accompanying sense of loss, within an enclosed verbal orientation that included either architectural magnificence, or neglect and ruin, although the prose work does attempt to solidify

---

[28] J.B., *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D*, sig. A3v.

[29] J.B., *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D*, sig. A3v. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

[30] J.B., *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D*, sig. A2v.

Charles's regal importance by working alongside an architectural discourse rather than beneath it.

In the same work, it is made explicitly clear that the use of an architectural discourse (utilized, in this case, to express monarchical absence) is to be viewed as part of the aestheticization of Caroline court culture. Here architecture, already linked with kingly splendour and theatrical entertainment, is associated with the display that covered the actual walls of Whitehall:

> If you be minded to survey the Lodgings and withdrawing rooms, you shall finde those rich and costly hangings of *Persian Arras* and *Turky*-worke, (like the Bishops) for their pride taken downe, And some (like the Bishops) thrown in the *Tower*, and the rest clapt close Prisoners in the Wardrop, unlesse it were those that (like the Bishop) made escape to *Yorke*, before the wars began, The very walls as if they were sensible of this calamatie, doe weepe downe their plaister in griefe that their Ornaments should suffer so hard a fortune.[31]

In this quotation, the 'costly hangings' accentuate the sense of Whitehall as a centre for artistic grandeur. Furthermore, it is revealing that the uses of the aesthetic features of the Whitehall space are then extended and so go beyond political comment on monarchical and courtly absence. Here other aspects of 1640s political culture (the mention of the Bishops, for instance) are expressed through the remembrance of the court's former glory. Crucially, the discourse of physicality that underpins this work's description of the palace allows the writer to envisage a metaphorical world in which the actual walls of Whitehall are able to participate in royalist grief, such has been the importance of Whitehall to the political environment of the early Stuart years. Indeed, this importance is stressed through the memory of Whitehall as an aesthetic centre of monarchical and

---

[31] J.B., *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D*, sigs. A2v-A3r. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

courtly display and extravagance, a position the palace fulfilled so spectacularly in the 1630s and early 40s. This important point is clarified as the pamphlet draws to a close:

> Thus you see poore *White-Hall* is miserably deserted of all its darlings, from Majesty to mockery, forsaken and left in the most solitary condition that ever any Princes Court of so great eminence and Hospitality in the whole World was. Now I should proceede to give you the reasons of this great alteration, And perhaps had this beene printed at *Yorke* I might have done it, But as the case is I forbeare, I would be loth to have the House pul'd downe where it is printed, and besides I have no stomack or affection to be torne to peeces in *Cheap-side*, and though my braines be muddy I would not have them wash't in the kennell, And as therefore as silence is the true signe of mourning, I will grieve inwardly for this distraction, and leave prating of it.[32]

Here the narrator continues to evoke royalist absence from Whitehall, but adds something of a personal touch in terms of the preparation of the printed text. In fact, architectural discourse is so thoroughly inscribed in this text that even the place of publication might be 'pul'd downe', as all buildings are shown to be less permanent than might be hoped, despite the narrator's stress on the unique nature of architectural discourse as a descriptive tool.

In conclusion, however, my attention turns to a key royalist assertion of elite space being defined by the presence of the monarch, so as to demonstrate the survival of this discourse of monarchical and courtly definition beside the prominence of architectural fixity in the later period of Charles's reign. Importantly, however, I suggest that, even in the opening of this text, architectural metaphors problematically limit the success of the prioritization of moveable courtly space, at least in the Caroline period.

---

[32] J.B., *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D*, sig. A4v. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

'Courts make not Kings, but Kings the Court': *Coopers Hill* and conclusions

The reverberation of this clash of discourses of moveability and permanence can be traced in John Denham's textual account of royalism's relationship with the land in his *Coopers Hill*, a text surviving in numerous forms and first dating from 1640-41.[33] This work begins confidently with what appears to be a straightforward statement of allegiance to the king-centred, moveable definition of courtly space:

> Sure there are Poets which did never dream
> Upon *Parnassuss*, nor did tast the stream
> Of *Helicon*, we therefore may suppose
> Those made not made Poets, but the Poets those.
> And as Courts make not Kings, but Kings the
> Court,
> So where the Muses and their train resort,
> *Parnassus* stands: if I can be to thee
> A Poet, thou *Parnassus* art to me.[34]

Clearly, then, just as the poet is a kind of authorizing presence, so monarchical attendance defines courtly space, and the king fashions the court through his divine being. Similarly, the mysticism attached to moveable space is then accentuated by the reference to the Muses and 'their train'. Despite this, however, there are moments near the opening of *Coopers Hill* that appear to contradict these instances of assertion for moveable space, as the poem is suggestive of alternative, architectural spaces as having another type of importance.

---

[33] See John Denham, *Coopers Hill*, in *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse*, pp. 152-63. Owing to the complex manuscript and print publication history of the text I have used a modern edited work. For the various editions and textual variations, see pp. 771-72. The version used derives mostly from 1653-54. On the poem, see Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England: 1640-1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 320-26; David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 71-79.

[34] Denham, *Coopers Hill*, lines 1-8. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text. However, in the 1655 edition, (known by scholars as the 'B' text), there is far less certainty in these lines, as the work begins 'IF there be Poets' rather than 'Sure there are Poets'. Of course, beginning the poem with this tentative line has reverberations for the rest of the quotation's assertion of monarchical authority, and, by implication, what it articulates about courtly space. See Denham, *Coopers Hill* (London, 1655), sig. B1r.

The reader first glimpses this with the implied fixity of '*Parnassus* stands', but the poem then sets up a contrasting duality by falling back upon the implied portability of 'in my flight', 'untrac't ways', 'aery paths', and 'boundless in my Fancy':

> Nor wonder, if (advantag'd in my flight,
> By taking wing from thy auspicious height)
> Through untrac't ways, and aery paths I fly,
> More boundless in my Fancy than my eie:
> My eye, which swift as thought contracts the space
> That lies between, and first salutes the place
> Crown'd with that sacred pile, so vast, so high,
> That whether 'tis a part of Earth, or sky,
> Uncertain seems, and may be thought a proud
> Aspiring mountain, or descending cloud,
> *Pauls*, the late theme of such a Muse whose flight
> Has bravely reach't and soar'd above thy height.[35]

In turn, though, this moment of fluidity is countered with Denham's insistence on 'thy auspicious height' and the 'contract[ed] [...] space' which hints at the firmness of an architectural structure. This poetic movement towards spatial fixity is then underscored absolutely by the reference to Charles's restoration of St Pauls and Edmund Waller's earlier poem by the mentioning of a need to 'salute [...] the place / Crown'd with that sacred pile, so vast, so high.' The metaphorical intertwining of Charles's regal authority and the way this 'Crown[s]' St Pauls is clear, and the poem suggests also that the Cathedral itself then crowns London with its splendid authority. Rather than prioritizing a moveable conception of Charles's courtly power, then, Denham falls back upon the Caroline stress on fixity and absolutist and structural firmness. However, just as this thesis has demonstrated the ease with which definitions of court space interchange throughout the early modern period, we can see in Denham's poem that this is still the case, as fixity and movement somehow join together through the 'Uncertain [...] /

---

[35] Denham, *Coopers Hill*, lines 9-20. Emphasis is reproduced from the original text.

Aspriring mountain, or descending cloud.' Here the fixity of the mountain is underscored by its aspirations for greatness (like St Pauls), whilst, at the same time, upwardly-reaching mobility is implied by that same 'Aspiring Mountain'. Likewise, this is countered by the mountain's merger with the 'descending' (and so moveable) 'cloud'. Lastly, this contradiction continues with the suggestion that the implied poetic fluidity of Waller's text ('flight', 'bravely reach't', 'soar'd above thy height',) actually counters the fixity of '*Pauls*' that Waller's same poem commemorates.

After this dynamic opening to the poem, *Coopers Hill* is less energetic in its contradictory merger of different types of space, but traces resonate throughout the text, particularly with the affirmation that 'thee the best of Poets sings, / Preserv'd from ruine by the best of Kings.'[36] Here the stress on restorative architecture is articulated through Denham's own poetic structure, a suggestive moment in the poem that appears to be at odds with the pronouncement of kingly and moveable spatial authority that began the poem. Despite this, *Coopers Hill* does return to this definition of courtly space, when, towards the end of the work, monarchical power is energized by the authority of fixed structures in order to gather the strength to move:

> But if with Bays and Dams they strive to force
> His channel to a new, or narrow course;
> No longer then within his banks he dwells,
> First to a Torrent, then a Deluge swells:
> Stronger, and fiercer by restraint he roars,
> And knows no bound, but makes his power his shores.[37]

In the closing moments, therefore, Denham suggests that the kingly, fixed authority presented at St Pauls is a firm foundation for the implied necessary reversal of

---

[36] Denham, *Coopers Hill*, lines 23-4.

[37] Denham, *Coopers Hill*, lines 353-58.

moveability and spatial freedom. This duality is expressed most eloquently, nonetheless, several lines earlier, when the poem relates, 'The Happier stile of King and Subject bear: / Happy, when both to the same Center move, / When Kings give liberty, and Subjects love.'[38] In this highly political passage, we can see the traditional royalist binary between monarchy and subject. Beyond this, however, there appears to be the suggestion of a twofold emphasis on a fixed centre and the journey that takes king and subject to that place. In Denham's poem, therefore, both architectural and portable spaces clash, yet sometimes co-exist.

This thesis has demonstrated this dualism throughout various moments of early modern culture, as chapters have revealed the complex ways in which definitions of the court overlap and interact throughout the early modern period. As I have shown in the introduction, although there were various ways of defining a court, English Renaissance society was particularly preoccupied with two competing types of 'court', with stress placed on either a moveable space defined by the monarch's presence, or a fixed architectural palace. A detailed recontextualization of Marlowe's *Edward II* then made it apparent that dramatists were able to utilize this tension for the entertainment of the London audiences. In chapter 1, the Elizabethan progresses were analyzed as a form that allowed monarchy to govern the court's meaning, with this elite space usually defined as being with the king or queen. Four chapters on the Jacobean court then documented the expansion of 'court' as a signifier of elite space during the reign of James I. The first section viewed the importance of the king's status as ruler of two realms and multiple courts alongside resulting moments of spatial contact between a continued progressing culture, James's control of Whitehall, and entertainments for the king's welcome into the

[38] Denham, *Coopers Hill*, lines 332-34.

civic realm of London. The second Jacobean chapter then evaluated the cultural action associated with the presence in England of the consort, Queen Anna, and her embrace of architecture and the progressing tradition. The significance of a wider masquing culture beyond the restrictions of Whitehall Palace was the primary focus for the third Jacobean section, as I inspected the implications of this for elite space. In conjunction with the development of the court during this period, the last Jacobean chapter analyzed a contradictory fixing of courtly space at Whitehall, a manoeuvre closely associated with the emergence of the court masque at the principal royal palace.

Chapter 6 then advanced to the reign of Charles I and demonstrated how the open-ended nature of court space did survive into the later period but was increasingly under threat from the partial neglect of royal progresses and an increased interest in aesthetics and architectural discourse, as evidenced in a variety of theatrical texts and, particularly, the Caroline court masque. Finally, this conclusion has revealed that, when royalist writers in the 1640s looked back to Charles's court at Whitehall, they inadvertently highlighted a key problem with the king's political discourse as their praising of his principal palace meant that a sense of awe had passed from monarchical presence to an architectural realm. As we now know, Charles was then permanently removed from that space in 1649 as different Republican and Protectorate court cultures began to emerge. By this point in Caroline society, therefore, the dominating definition of the court was that of a permanent structure rather than kingly attendance.

Bibliography

Primary Texts

Adamson, John, *Ta ton Mouson eisodia: THE MVSES WELCOME TO THE HIGHAND MIGHTIE PRINCE IAMES BY THE GRACE OF GOD KING OF GREAT BRITAINE FRANCE AND IRELAND* (Edinburgh, 1618)

Ashton, Robert, ed., *James I by his Contemporaries: An Account of his Career and Character as seen by Some of his Contemporaries* (London: Hutchinson, 1969)

A. D. B., *THE COURT OF THE MOST ILLVstrious and most Magnificent JAMES, the first: KING Of Great-Britaine, France, and Ireland: &c. WITH DIVERS RULES, MOST PURE PRECEPTS, AND SELECTED DEFINITIONS liuely delineated* (London, 1619).

J.B, *A DEEP SIGH BREATH'D Through the Lodgings at WHITE-HALL, Deploring the absence of the COVRT, And the Miseries of the PALLACE* (London, 1642).

Bacon, Francis, *Essays or Counsels, Civil and Moral*, in *Francis Bacon,* ed. by Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 341-456

Breton, Nicholas, *The Court and Country, OR A briefe Discourse Dialogue-wise set downe betweene a Courtier and a Country-man: Contayning the manner and condition of their liues, with many Delectable and Pithy Sayings worthy obseruation. Also, necessary Notes for a COURTIER. VVritten by N.B. Gent.* (London, 1618)

Calendar of State Papers Venetian, ed. by Horatio F. Brown (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904), XI

Camden, William, *Britain, or A chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adioyning, out of the depth of antiquitie beautified with mappes of the seuerall shires of England* (London, 1610)

Campion, Thomas, *The Somerset Masque*, in *The Works of Thomas Campion: Complete Songs, Masques, and Treatises with a Selection of the Latin Verse*, ed. by Walter R. Davis (London: Faber and Faber, 1969), 263-84

—— *The Caversham Entertainment*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by David Lindley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 92-101

Carew, Thomas, *Coelum Britannicum*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by Lindley, 166-93

Chamberlain, John, *The Chamberlain Letters: A Selection of the Letters of John Chamberlain Concerning Life in England from 1597 to 1626*, ed. by Elizabeth McClure Thomson (London: Putnam, 1965)

Chapman, George, *The Memorable Masque*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by Lindley, 74-91

KING CHARLES his welcome home, OR A CONGRATVLATION of all his loving Subiects in thankefulnesse to God for his Maiesties safe and happie returne from Scotland, 1641 (London, 1641)

CHESTERS TRIVMPH IN HONOR OF HER PRINCE (London, 1610)

Churchyard, Thomas, *A DISCOVRSE OF The Queenes Maiesties entertainement in Suffolk and Norffolk: With a description of many things then presently seene* (London, 1578)

—— *A Pleasant Discourse of Court and Wars: with a replication to them both, and a commendation of all those that truly serue Prince and countrie* (London, 1596)

Cler, A. G., *The Speech which was to have been delivered to the Kings Majestie, at his coming to HOLY-RUD-HOUSE the 14 of August, in the name of the citie of EDINBURGH* (Edinburgh, 1641)

'The Cowdray Entertainment', ed. by Jean Wilson, in *Entertainments for Elizabeth I* (Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 1980), 86-95

Cragge, John, *ENGLANDS Congratulatorie Entertainment, OF HIS MAIESTIE Out of Scotland, and his welcome to London* (London, 1641)

Daniel, Samuel, 'A Panegyric Congratulatory', in *The Progresses of King James the First*, ed. by Nichols, I, 121-134

—— *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, ed. by Joan Rees, in *A Book of Masques in Honour of Allardyce Nicoll*, ed. by T.J.B. Spencer and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967; repr. 1980), 17-42

—— *Tethys' Festival*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by Lindley, 54-65

Dekker, Thomas, *THE MAGNIFICENT, Entertainment: Giuen to King Iames, Queene Anne his wife, and Henry Frederick the Prince, vpon the day of his Maiesties Triumphant Passage (from the Tower) through his Honourable Citie (and Chamber) of London, being the 15. of March. 1603.* (London, 1604), in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. by Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 229-309

De Refuge, Eustache, *A treatise of the court or Instructions for courtiers Digested into two books. Written in French by the noble, and learned iuris-consull Monsr Denys de Refuges, Councellor of Estate, and many tymes ambassador (in foraigne parts) for ye two last French kings his masters Done into English by Iohn Reynolds* (London, 1622)

Denham, John, *Coopers Hill*, in *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse, 1509-1659*, ed. by H. R. Woodhuysen (London: Penguin, 1992), 152-63

—— *Coopers Hill* (London, 1655)

Drummond, William, *THE ENTERTAINMENT OF THE HIGH AND MIGHTY MONARCH CHARLES King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, Into his auncient and royall City of EDINBVRGH, the fifteenth of Iune, 1633* (Edinburgh, 1633)

Dugdale, Gilbert, *THE Time Triumpant Declaring in briefe, the ariual of our Souraigne liedge, King IAMES into England His Coronation at Westminster: Together with his late royal progresse, from the Towre of London through the Cittie, to Highnes mannor of Whitehall.* (London, 1604)

Englands Comfort, and Londons Ioy (London, 1641)

The Essex House Masque of 1621: Viscount Doncaster and the Jacobean Masque, ed. by Timothy Raylor (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2000)

FIVE MOST NOBLE SPEECHES Spoken to his Majestie returning out of SCOTLAND INTO ENGLAND (London, 1641)

Foakes, R.A., and R.T. Rickert, eds., *Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961)

Forbes, Walter, *PANEGYRICK TO THE HIGH AND MIGHTY MONARCH CHARLES By the grace of GOD, King of Great BRITAINE, FRANCE, and IRELAND, Defender of the Faith. &c.* (Edinburgh, 1633)

Ford, John, *HONOR TRIVMPHANT. OR The Peeres Challenge, by Armes defensible, at Tilt, Turney, and Barriers. . . . ALSO The Monarches meeting: OR The King of Denmarkes welcome into England.* (London, 1606)

Gainsford, Thomas, *The glory of England, or A true description of many excellent prerogatiues and remarkable blessings, whereby shee triumpheth ouer all the nations in the world VVith a iustifiable comparison betweene her selfe, and the eminent kingdomes of the earth, plainely manifesting the defects of them all in regard of her sufficiencie, and fullnesse of happinesse. Nevvly revised with no lesse profitable then delightsome augmentation. ... By T.G.* (London, 1620)

Gascoigne, George, *The princelye pleasures at the courte at Kenelworth,* in *The whole workes of George Gascoigne Esquire* (London, 1587)

Glapthorne, Henry, *White-Hall. A Poem. Written 1642. WITH ELEGIES ON The Right Honourable FRANCIS Earl of BEDFORD. And HENRY Earle of Manchester, Lord Privy Seale: both deceased during this present Session of Parliament. WITH An Anniversarie on the timeless death of Mrs. Anne Kirk, wife to the truly Noble Geo. Kirk, Gentleman of the Robes of his Majesties Bed Chamber, drowned unfortunately passing London Bridge, Iuly 6. 1641* (London, 1643)

Goodman, Godfrey, ed., *The Court of King James the First*, 2 vols (London: Richard Bentley, 1839)

J. H., *KING CHARLES HIS ENTERTAINMENT AND LONDONS LOYALTIE.* (London, 1641)

Harrison, Stephen, *THE ARCHES OF TRIVMPH Erected in honor of the High and mighty prince James the first of that name King of England and the Sixt of Scotland at his Maiesties Entrance and passage through his Honorable Citty chamber of London vpon the 15th day of march 1603* (London, 1604)

Harrison, William, *The Description of England*, ed. by Georges Edelen (New York: Cornell University Press, 1968)

Hubert, Francis, *The Historie of Edward the Second*, in *The Poems of Francis Hubert*, ed. by Bernard Mellor (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1961), 1-169

Jones, Inigo, and William Davenant, *The Temple of Love*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. by Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, 2 vols (California: California University Press, 1973), II, 598-617

—— *Britannia Triumphans*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. by Orgel and Strong, II, 660-703

—— *Salmacida Spolia*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by Lindley, 200-13

Jonson, Ben, *Every Man Out of his Humor*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52), III

—— *Cynthia's Revels*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by Herford and Simpson, IV

—— *B. JON: HIS PART OF King James his Royall and Magnificent Entertainment through his Honorable Cittie of London, Thurseday the 15. of March. 1603.* in *Ben Jonson*, VII, 81- 109

—— *An Entertainment of King James and Queene Anne at Theobalds*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by Herford and Simpson, VII, 151-58

—— *The Masque of Blackness*, in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, ed. by Stephen Orgel (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1960), 47-60

—— *The characters of two royall masques The one of blacknesse, the other of beautie. personated by the most magnificent of queenes Anne Queene of great Britaine, &c. With her honorable ladyes, 1605. and 1608. at White-hall: and inuented by Ben: Ionson* (London, 1608)

—— *The Masque of Queenes*, in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, ed. by Orgel, 122-41

—— *The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers*, in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, ed. by Orgel, 142-58

—— *Oberon, The Fairy Prince: A Masque of Prince Henry's*, in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, ed. by Orgel, 159-73

—— *The workes of Beniamin Ionson* (London, 1616).

—— *Lovers made Men*, in *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, ed. by Orgel, 256-62

—— *Love's Triumph through Callipolis*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by Herford and Simpson, VII, 731-43

—— *Chloridia*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by Lindley, 147-54

—— *The Kings Entertainment at Welbeck*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by Herford and Simpson, VII, 787-803

—— *Loves Welcome at Bolsover* in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by Herford and Simpson, VII, 805-814

—— 'An Execration Upon Vulcan', in *Ben Jonson*, ed. by Herford and Simpson,VIII, 202-12

THE KING AND QVEENES Entertainement at RICHMOND. AFTER THEIR DEPARTVRE from OXFORD: In a Masque, presented by the most Illustrious PRINCE, PRINCE CHARLES (Oxford, Sep. 1636)

The Kings Majesties Speech, in the Parliament at Edinburgh the Seventeenth day of August, 1641 (Edinburgh, 1641)

Laneham, Robert, *A LETTER: Whearin part of the entertainment vntoo the Queenz Maiesty at Killinwoorth Castl in Warwik sheer in this soomerz progress 1575 is signified / from a freend officer attendant in coourt vntoo hiz freend a citizen and merchaunt of London* (London, 1575)

—— *A LETTER*, ed. by R.J.P. Kuin (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983)

LONDONS LOVE TO THE ROYAL PRINCE HENRIE (London, 1610)

THE MAGNIFICENT, Princely and most Royall Entertainments giuen to the High and Mightie Prince, and Princesse, FREDERICK, Count Pallatine, Pallgraue of the Rhyne: and ELIZABETH, sole Daughter to the High and Mightie King of England, Iames, our Soueraigne Lord (London, 1613)

Marlowe, Christopher, *Edward the Second*, ed. by Charles R. Forker (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994)

Marston, John, *The Entertainment of the Dowager-Countess of Darby*, in *The Poems of John Marston*, ed. by Arnold Davenport (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1961) 191-207

Mercurius Rusticus, (October 1643)

Millington, Thomas, *The True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Maiesie from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; till his receiuing at London: with all the most speciall Occurrences* (London, 1603)

Naile, Robert, *A RELATION OF THE ROYALL MAGNIFICENT, AND sumptuous Entertainement, giuen to the High, and Mighty Princesse, Queene ANNE, at the renowned Citie of Bristoll, by the Mayor, Sheriffes, and Aldermen thereof; in the Moneth of Iune last past, 1613* (London, 1613)

Nichols, John, ed., *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court,* 4 vols (London: J. B. Nichols, 1828)

The Order and Solemnitie of the Creation of the High and mightie Prince HENRIE (London, 1610)

OVATIO CAROLINA. THE TRIVMPH OF KING CHARLES (London, 1641)

Parker, Martin, 'Upon defacing of *White-hall'*, in S.N., *THE LOYAL GARLAND, Containing choice Songs and Sonnets of our late unhappy Revolutions*, 4th edn, (London, 167[3?]), sigs. A3r-A3v

The Peace-Maker: Or Great Brittaines Blessing (London, 1619), in Per Palme, *Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1957)

Price, Lawrence, *GREAT BRITAINES time of Triumph* (London, 1641)

A Proclamation for the avoyding of all intercourse betweene His Maiesties Royall Court, and the Cities of London and Westminster, and places adioyning (Oxford, October 1625)

A Proclamation for the well ordering of His Maiesties Court and Traine, as well in His present Iourney intended towards His Kingdome of Scotland, and returne from thence, as in all other His Maiesties Iouirneys and Progresses hereafter (London, May 1633)

'The Progresse', in *Early Stuart Libels: A Edition of Poetry from Manuscript Sources*, Special Edition of *Early Modern Literary Studies*, ed. by Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae, http://www.earlystuartlibels.net/htdocs/index.html.

THE Queenes Maiesties Entertianement AT WOODSTOCK (London, 1585)

A RELATION Of the Kings Entertainment into Scotland, on Fryday, the 13. of August. 1641 (London, 1641)

Rigby, Nathaniel, *THE KINGS Noble entertainment AT YORK* WITH *The Lord Maior of YORK his worthy Speech to the King. AS also the manner how the Aldermen,*

Sheriffes, Citizens, and sundry other Gentlemen congratulated his Maiesty to York. (London, March 1641)

Robarts, Henry *THE Most royall and Honourable entertainment, of the famous and renowned King, CHRISTIERN the fourth, King of Denmake* (London, 1606)

'The Running Masque', ed. by James Knowles, in *English Manuscript Studies*, 9 (2000), 79-135

—— *Englands Farewell to Christian the fourth, famous King of Denmarke: with a relation of such shewes & seuerall pastimes presented to his Maiestie, as well at Court* (London, 1606)

Savile, John, 'A Salutatorie Poem to the Majestie of King James', in *The Progresses of King James the First*, I, 140-44

TWO SERMONS PREACHED IN Scotland before the Kings MAIESTY (London, 1618)

Shakespeare, William, *Richard II*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition,* ed. by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1997), 943-1014

—— *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, 1225-1291

—— *As You Like It* in *The Norton* Shakespeare, 1591-1657

—— *Henry VIII*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, 3111-3193

Shirley, James, *The Triumph of Peace*, ed. by Leech, in *A Book of Masques*, ed. by Spencer and Wells, 275-313

A SPEACH DELIVERED TO THE KINGS most excellent MAIESTIE, At his Entrie into his Good-Towne of EDINBVRGH upon the XVI. Of May, ANNO DOMINI 1617 (Edinburgh, 1617)

Stuart, James, *Basilicon Doron,* in *King James VI and I, Political Writings*, ed. by Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

—— 'A Speech in the Starre-Chamber, The XX. Of Jvne. Anno 1616', in *King James VI and I, Political Writings*

—— 'You women that doe London loue so well', in *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. by James Craigie, 2 vols (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood, 1958), II, 178-81

THE SVBIECTS HAPPINESSE, AND The Citizens Joy (London, 1641)

Taylor, John, *Heauens Blessing, And Earths Ioy. OR A true relation, of the supposed Sea-fights & Fire-workes, as were accomplished, before the Royall Celebration, of the al-beloved Marriage, of the two peerlesse Paragons of Christendome, FREDERICKE & ELIZABETH* (London, 1613)

——*THE MAGNIFIcent marriage of the two great Princes, Fredericke Count-palatine, & c and the Lady Elizabeth, daughter to the imperiall maiesties of King Iames, and Queene Anne to the comfort of all great Britaine* (London, 1613)

Townshend, Aurelian, *Albion's Triumph*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. by Orgel and Strong, II, 452-77

—— *Tempe Restored*, in *Court Masques*, ed. by Lindley, 155-65

Waller, Edmund, 'Upon His MAJESTIES repairing of PAULS', in *Poems* (London, 1645), 3-5

Weldon, Anthony, *The Court and Character of King James. Written and taken by Sir A:W: being an eye, and eare witnesse* (London, 1650)

White, Robert, *Cupid's Banishment*, in *Renaissance Drama by Women: Texts and Documents*, ed. by S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wyne-Davies (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 76-90

Whitelocke, Bulstrode, *MEMORIALS OF THE ENGLISH AFFAIRS: OR, AN Historical Account OF What passed from the beginning of the Reign of King CHARLES the First, to King CHARLES the Second His Happy RESTAURATION* (London, 1682)

Wilson, Arthur, *The History of Great Britain, being the Life and Reign of King James the First* (London, 1653)

Wotton, Henry, *The Elements of Architecture* (London, 1624)

Secondary Texts

Aasand, Hardin, '"To Black an Ethiop, and Revive a Corse": Queen Anne and *The Masque of Blackness*', *Studies in English Literature*, 32, No. 1 (1992), 271-285

Akrigg, G. P. V., *Jacobean Pageant or the Court of King James I* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1962)

Archer, Jayne, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight, eds., *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming 2007)

—— and Knight, 'Introduction', in *The Progresses*, ed. by Archer, Goldring and Knight

Archer, John, 'Marlowe and the Observation of Men', in *Christopher Marlowe*. ed. by Wilson, pp. 191-214

Astington, John, *English Court Theatre: 1558-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Atherton, Ian, and Julie Sanders, eds., *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 92-110

Barroll, Leeds, 'The Court of the First Stuart Queen', in *The Mental World*, ed. by Peck, pp. 191-208

Bellany, Alastair, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Bellany, Alastair, and Andrew McRae, eds., *Early Stuart Libels: An Edition of Poetry from Manuscript Sources*, Special Edition of *Early Modern Literary Studies*, <URL: http://www.earlystuartlibels.net/htdocs/index.html.

Belsey, Catherine, 'Desire's Excess and the English Renaissance Theatre: *Edward II, Troilus and Cressida, Othello*', in *Erotic Politics,* ed. by Zimmerman, pp. 84-102

Bentley. G. E., *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 8 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), VI

Bergeron, M. David, *English Civic Pageantry: 1558-1642* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971)

—— *English Civic Pageantry: 1558-1642*, rev. edn (Arizona: Mrts, 2003)

—— ed., *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater* (Georgia: Georgia University Press, 1985)

—— *Practicing Renaissance Scholarship: Plays and Pageants, Patrons and Politics* (Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press, 2000)

—— 'The "I" of the Beholder: Thomas Churchyard and the 1578 Norwich Pageant', in *The Progresses*

Bevington, David, and James Shapiro, '"What are kings, when regiment is gone?" The Decay of Ceremony in *Edward II*', in *"A Poet and a filthy Play-maker"* ed. by Friedenreich, Gill, and Kuriyama, pp. 263-78

—— and Peter Holbrook, eds., *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Britland, Karen, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta-Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

Burlinson, Christopher, 'Edmund Spenser and Early Modern Spatial Production' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2002)

Burnett, Mark Thornton, '*Edward II* and Elizabethan Politics', in *Marlowe, History and Sexuality*, ed. by Whitfield White, pp. 91-107

Burt, Richard A., '"Licensed by Authority": Ben Jonson and the Politics of Early Stuart Theater', *English Literary History*, 54:3 (1987), 529-60

Butler, Martin, 'Entertaining the Palatine Prince: Plays on Foreign Affairs 1635-1637', in *English Literary Renaissance* 13:3, (1983), 319-44

—— 'Politics and the Masque: *The Triumph of Peace*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 2:2 (1987), 117-41

—— 'Early Stuart Culture: Compliment or Criticism?', *The Historical Journal*, 32:2 (1989), 425-35

—— 'Politics and the Masque: *Salmacida Spolia*', in *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. by Healy and Sawday, pp. 59-74

—— '"We are one mans all": Jonson's *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991), 253-73

—— 'Jonson's *News from the New World*, the "Running Masque", and the season of 1619-20', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, (1993), pp. 153-78

—— 'Reform or Reverance? The Politics of the Caroline Masque', in *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts*, ed. by Mulryne and Shewring, pp. 118-56

—— '"Servant, but not Slave": Ben Jonson at the Jacobean Court', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 90 (1995), 65-93

—— 'The Invention of Britain and the Early Stuart Masque', in *The Stuart Court and* Europe, ed. by Smuts, pp. 65-85

—— 'Courtly Negotiations', in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. by Bevington and Holbrook, pp. 20-40

—— ed. *Re-presenting Ben Jonson*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999)

——'Private and Occasional Drama', in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, ed. by Braunmuller and Hattaway, pp. 131-63

—— '*The Masque of Blackness* and Stuart Court Culture', in *Early Modern English Drama*, ed. by Sullivan, Cheney and Hadfield, pp. 152-63

——and David Lindley, 'Restoring Astraea: Jonson's Masque for the Fall of Somerset', *English Literary History*, 61 (1994), 807-27

Braunmuller, A. R., and Michael Hattaway, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, 2nd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Carlton, Charles, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (London: Ark, 1983)

Cartelli, Thomas '*Queer Edward II*: Postmodern Sexualities and the Early Modern Subject', in *Marlowe, History and Sexuality*, ed. by Whitfield White, pp. 213-23

—— 'King Edward's Body', in *Christopher Marlowe,* ed. by Wilson, pp. 174-90

Cerasano S.P., and Marion Wynne-Davies, eds., *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992)

Chambers, E. K., *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945; repr 1961), IV

Charlton, John, *The Banqueting House, Whitehall* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1964)

Chibnall, Jennifer, '"To that Secure Fix'd State": The Function of the Caroline Masque Form', in *The Court Masque*, ed. by Lindley, pp. 78-93

Clucas, S., and R. Davies, eds., *The Crisis of 1614 and The Addled Parliament: Literary and Historical Perspectives* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003)

Cole, Emily, *The State Apartment in the Jacobean Country House* (forthcoming unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sussex)

Cole Hill, Mary, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Amherst: Massachusetts University Press, 1999)

——'Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses' in *The Progresses*, ed. by Archer, Goldring and Knight

Corns, Thomas N., ed., *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

—— 'Duke, Prince and King', in *The Royal Image*, ed. by Corns, pp. 1-25

Croft, Pauline, 'Robert Cecil and the Early Jacobean Court', in *The Mental World*, ed. by Peck, pp. 134-47

—— ed., *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002)

Cuddy, Neil, 'The Revival of the Entourage: The Bedchamber of James I. 1603-1625', in *The English Court*, ed. by Starkey, pp. 173-225

Curran, Kevin, 'James I and Fictional Authority at the Palatine Wedding Celebrations', *Renaissance Studies*, 20:1 (2006), 51-67

Cust, Richard 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 112 (1986), 60-90

Deats, Sara Munson, *Sex, Gender, and Desire in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Associated University Press, 1997)

De Groot, Jerome, 'Royalism, Politics and Culture in Civil War Oxford' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Newcastle, 2000)

—— 'Space, Patronage, Procedure: the Court at Oxford 1642-46', *English Historical Review* 117:474 (2002), 1204-27

DiGangi, Mario, 'Marlowe, Queer Studies, and Renaissance Homoeroticism', in *Marlowe, History and Sexuality*, ed. by Whitfield White, pp. 195-212

Dillon, Janette, *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Donaldson, Ian, *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

Downie, J. A. and J. T. Parnell, eds., *Constructing Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Dutton, Richard, *Jacobean Civic Pageants* (Staffordshire: Keele University Press, 1995)

—— *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England: Buggeswords* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000)

Finkelpearl, Philip J., 'The Fairies' Farewell: *The Masque at Coleorton* (1618)', *The Review of English Studies*, XLVI:183 (1995), 333-51

Fisher, N. R. R., 'The Queenes Courte in Her Councell Chamber at Westminster', *The English Historical Review*, 108:427 (1993), 314-37

Fitzmaurice, James, 'William Camden and Two Entertainments by Ben Jonson', *Ben Jonson Journal*, 5 (1998), 63-80

Friedenreich, Kenneth, Roma Gill, and Constance B. Kuriyama, eds., *"A Poet and a filthy Play-maker": New Essays on Christopher Marlowe* (New York: AMS Press, 1988)

Fudge, Erica, ed., *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures* (Illinois: Illinois University Press, 2002)

Fumerton, Patricia, *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1991)

Geertz, Clifford, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', in *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*, 3rd edn (New York: Basic Books, 1983; 2000)

Goldberg, Jonathan, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries* (California: Stanford University Press, 1983)

—— *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1992)

Goldring, Elizabeth, 'Portraiture, Patronage, and the Progresses: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth Festivities of 1575', in *The Progresses*, ed. by Archer, Goldring and Knight

Gordon, D. J., *The Renaissance Imagination: Essays and Lectures by D. J. Gordon*, ed. by Stephen Orgel (London and Los Angeles: California University Press, 1975)

Graham, Jean E., 'The Performing Heir in Jonson's Jacobean Masques', *Studies in English Literature*, 41:2 (2001), 381-98

Grande, Toni Y., *Marlovian Tragedy: The Play of Dilation* (London: Associated University Press, 1999)

Grantley, Darryll, and Peter Roberts, eds., *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996)

Hadfield, Andrew, *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Matter of Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Hamilton, Donna B., *Anthony Munday and the Catholics: 1560-1633* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005)

Harp, Richard, and Stanley Stuart, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Harraway, Clare, *Re-citing Marlowe: Approaches to the Drama* (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2000)

John Harris, Orgel and Strong, *The King's Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court* (London: Arts Council for Great Britain, 1973)

—— and Gordon Higgott, *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings* (New York: Zwemmer, 1989)

Harrison, Philip, and Mark Brayshay, 'Post-horse Routes, Royal Progresses and Government Communications in the Reign of James I', *Journal of Transport History*, 18:2 (1997), 116-33

Harrison, William, *The Description of England*, ed. by Georges Edelen (New York: Cornell University Press, 1968)

Hattaway, Michael, *Elizabethan Popular Theatre: Plays in Performance* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982)

—— ed., *A Companion To English Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000)

Healy, Thomas, and Jonathan Sawday, eds., *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Heaton, Gabriel, 'Elizabethan Entertainments in Manuscript: The Harefield Festivities (1602) and the Dynamics of Exchange', in *The Progresses*, ed. by Archer, Goldring and Knight

—— 'The Queen and the Hermit: The "Tale of Hemetes" (1575)', (Forthcoming 2007)

—— and Knowles, '"Entertainment Perfect": Ben Jonson and Corporate Hospitality', *The Review of English Studies*, 54:217, (2003), 587-600

Helgerson, Richard, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1992)

Hibbard, Caroline, 'Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: Perspectives on the Role of Consort Queens in *Ancien Régime* Courts', in *The 1630s*, ed. by Atherton and Sanders, pp. 92-110

Hiscock, Andrew *The Uses of this World: Thinking Space in Shakespeare, Marlowe, Cary and Jonson* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2004)

Howarth, David, *Images of Rule: Social and Political Analysis of English Renaissance Art* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997)

Jansson, Maija, 'The Impeachment of Inigo Jones and the Pulling Down of St Gregory's by St Pauls', *Renaissance Studies*, 17:4 (2003), 716-46

Johnson, A. W., *Ben Jonson: Poetry and Architecture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994)

Kastan, David, Scott., 'Proud Majesty Made a Subject: Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37:4 (1986), 459-475

—— *Shakespeare after Theory* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999)

——and Peter Stallybrass, eds., *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama* (New York and London: Routledge, 1991)

Knowles, James, 'Marston, Skipwith and *The Entertainment at Ashby*', *English Manuscript Studies*, 3 (1992), 137-92

—— 'The Spectacle of the Realm: Civic Consciousness, Rhetoric and Ritual in Early Modern London', in *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts*, ed. by Mulryne and Shewring, pp. 157-89

—— '"Infinite Riches in a Little Room": Marlowe and the Aesthetics of the Closet', in *Renaissance Configurations*, ed. by McMullan, pp. 2-29

—— 'Jonson's *Entertainment at Britain's Burse*', in *Re-presenting Ben Jonson*, ed. by Butler, pp. 114-51

—— '"The "Running Masque" Recovered: A Masque for the Marquess of Buckingham (c. 1619-20)', *English Manuscript Studies*, 9 (2000), 79-135

—— '"Tied / to Rules of Flattery?": Court Drama and the Masque', in *A Companion To English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Hattaway, pp. 525-44

—— '"To Raise a House of Better Frame": Jonson's Cecilian Entertainments', in *Patronage, Culture and Power*, ed. by Croft, pp 181-95

—— '"Can ye not tell a man from a marmoset?": Apes and Others on the Early Modern Stage', in *Renaissance Beasts*, ed. by Fudge, pp. 138-63

—— '"To Enlight the Darksome Night, Pale Cinthia Doth Arise": Anna of Denmark, Elizabeth I and the Images of Royalty', in *Women and Culture*, ed. by McManus, pp. 21-48

—— 'Crack Kisses Not Staves: Sexual Politics and Court Masques in 1613-14', in *The Crisis of 1614*, ed. by Clucas and Davies, pp. 148-67

—— '"The Faction of the Flesh": Orientalism and the Caroline Masque', in *The 1630s*, ed. by Atherton and Sanders, pp. 111-37

—— 'Jonson in Scotland: Jonson's Mid-Jacobean Crisis', in *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson*, ed. by Kozuka and Mulryne, pp. 259-77

—— '"In the Purest Times of Peerless Queen Elizabeth": Nostalgia, Politics, and Jonson's use of the 1575 Kenilworth Entertainments', in *The Progresses*, ed. by Archer, Goldring and Knight

—— *Politics and Political Culture in the Masque* (Forthcoming 2007)

Knowles, Ronald, 'The Political Contexts of Deposition and Election in *Edward II*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England,* 14 (2001), 105-21

Kozuka, Takashi, and J. R. Mulryne, eds., *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

Leahy, William, *Elizabethan Triumphal Processions* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005)

Leech, Clifford, 'Introduction to *The Triumph of Peace*', in *A Book of Masques*, ed. by Spencer and Wells, pp. 277-80

Lees-Jeffries, Hester, 'Location as Metaphor in Queen Elizabeth's Coronation Entry (1559)', in *The Progresses*, ed. by Archer, Goldring and Knight

Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space*, trans. by Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991)

Leslie, Michael, '"Something Nasty in the Wilderness": Entertaining Queen Elizabeth on Her Progresses', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England,* 10 (1998), 47-72

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer, *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 1993)

Limon, Jerzy, *The Masque of Stuart Culture* (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1990)

Lindley, David, ed., *The Court Masque* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984)

——'Embarrassing Ben: The Masques for Frances Howard, *English Literary Renaissance*, 14 (1986), 343-59

—— ed., *Court Masques*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

Marcus, Leah S., 'Jonson and the Court', in *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson*, ed. by Harp and Stuart, pp. 30-42

McAdam, Ian, *The Irony of Identity: Self and Imagination in the Drama of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Associated University Press, 1999)

McCloskey, Susan, 'The Worlds of *Edward II*', *Renaissance Drama,* n.s. 16 (1985), 35-48

McDermott, Kristen, 'Jonson's Gossips and Stuart Family Drama', *Early Theatre*, 9:1 (2006), 61-83

McGee, C.E., 'Mysteries, Musters, and Masque: The Import(s) of Elizabethan Civic Entertainments', in *The Progresses*, ed. by Archer, Goldring and Knight

McManus, Clare, '"Defacing the Carcass": Anne of Denmark and Jonson's *The Masque of Blackness*', in *Refashioning Ben Jonson*, ed. by Sanders. Chedgzoy and Wiseman, pp. 93-113

—— *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court, 1590-1619* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002)

—— ed., *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)

—— 'Introduction: The Queen's Court', *Women and Culture*, ed. by McManus, pp. 1-17

McMullan, Gordon, ed., *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/Bodies/Spaces, 1580-1690* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998)

McNeill, William A. and Peter G. B. McNeill, 'The Scottish Progress of James VI, 1617', *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXV, 1:199 (1996), 38-51

McRae, Andrew, '"On the Famous Voyage": Ben Jonson and Civic Space', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 4.2 (1998) <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/04-2/mcraonth.htm>

—— *Renaissance Drama* (London: Arnold, 2003)

Millar, Oliver, *Rubens: The Whitehall Ceiling* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958)

Mullaney, Steven, 'Civic Rites, City Sites: The Place of the Stage', in *Staging the* Renaissance, ed., by Kastan and Stallybrass, pp. 17-26

Mulryne, J. R. and Margaret Shewring, eds., *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

Newman, J., 'Inigo Jones and the Politics of Architecture', in *Culture and Politics*, ed. by Sharpe and Lake, pp. 229-55

Norbrook, David, 'The Reformation of the Masque', in *The Court Masque*, ed. by Lindley, pp. 94-110

—— '*The Masque of Truth:* Court Entertainments and International Protestant Politics in the Early Stuart Period', *The Seventeenth Century*, 1:2 (1986), 81-110

—— *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Normand, Lawrence, '"What passions call you these?": *Edward II* and James VI', in *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*, ed. by Grantley and Roberts, pp. 172-97

—— '*Edward II,* Derek Jarman, and the State of England', in *Constructing Christopher Marlowe,* ed. by Downie and Parnell, pp. 177-93

Olwig, Kenneth Robert, *Landscape, Nature, and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World* (Wisconsin: Wisconsin University Press, 2002)

Orgel, Stephen, *The Jonsonian Masque* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965; 1981)

——*The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: California University Press, 1975)

Palme, Per, *Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1957)

Parry, Graham, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981)

—— *The Seventeenth Century: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1603-1700* (London and New York: Longman, 1989)

Paster, Gail Kern, 'The Idea of London in Masque and Pageant', in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. by Bergeron, pp. 48-64

Peacock, John, *The Stage Designs of Inigo Jones: The European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

—— 'The Visual Image of Charles I', in *The Royal Image*, ed. by Corns, pp. 176-239

Peck, Linda Levy, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 1990)

—— ed., *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

—— *Consuming Splendour: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Perry, Curtis, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

—— 'Court and Coterie Culture', in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Hattaway, pp. 106-18

—— *Literature and Favoritism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

Pickel, M. B., *Charles I as Patron of Poetry and Drama* (London: Frederick Muller. 1936)

Pitcher, John, '"In these Figures Which they Seem": Samuel Daniel's *Tethys' Festival*', in *The Court Masque*, ed. by Lindley, pp. 33-46

Questier, Michael C., ed., *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631-1638: Catholicism and the Politics of the Personal Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Randall, Dale B. J., *Jonson's Gypsies Unmasked: Background and Theme of 'The Gypsies Metamorphos'd'* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1975)

Raylor, Timothy, *The Essex House Masque of 1621: Viscount Doncaster and the Jacobean Masque* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2000)

—— '"Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue": William Cavendish, Ben Jonson, and the Decorative Scheme of Bolsover Castle', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 52:2 (1999), 402-39

Raymond, Joad, 'Popular Representations of Charles I', in *The Royal Image*, ed. by Corns, pp.47-73

—— 'Parker, Martin', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21326]

Richards, Judith, M., '"His Nowe Majestie" and the English Monarchy: The Kingship of Charles I before 1640', *Past and Present*, 113 (1986), 70-96

—— 'The English Accession of James VI: "National" Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England', *English Historical Review*, 472 (2002), 513-35

Sanders, Julie, ed., with Kate Chedgzoy and Susan Wiseman, *Refashioning Ben Jonson: Gender, Politics and the Jonsonian Canon* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998)

——'Glapthorne, Henry', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10796]

——'Jonson's Caroline Coteries', in *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson*, ed. by Kozuka and Mulryne, pp. 279-93

Sanford, Rhonda Lemke, *Maps and Memory in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)

Schwarz, Kathryn, 'Amazonian Reflections in the Jacobean Queen's Masque', *Studies in English Literature,* 35, No. 2, (1995), 293-319

Sharpe, Kevin, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

—— 'The Image of Virtue: The Court and Household of Charles I, 1625-1642', in *The English Court*, ed. by Starkey, pp. 226-60

—— *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992)

—— 'The Royal Image: An Afterword' in *The Royal Image*, ed. by Corns, pp. 288-309

—— and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London: Macmillan, 1994)

Shepherd, Simon, *Marlowe and the Politics of Elizabethan Theatre* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1986)

Smith, Bruce R., *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991)

Smith, Nigel, *Literature and Revolution in England: 1640-1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994)

—— 'Purified Form and the Court Pureed', unpublished conference lecture, *English Court Culture, 1642-60*, Hampton Court Palace, June 2006

Smuts, Malcolm, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987)

—— 'Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change at the Court of James I', in *The Mental World*, ed. by Peck, pp. 99-112

—— ed., *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Soja, Edward W., *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989)

Stähler, Axel, 'Inigo Jones's *Tempe Restored* and Alessandro Piccolomini's *Della Institution morale*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 16:2 (2003), 180-210

Starkey, David, ed., *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London: Longman, 1987)

Strong, Roy, *Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973)

—— *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977)

—— *Britannia Triumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens and Whitehall Palace* (London: Thomas and Hudson, 1980)

—— *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Thomas and Hudson, 1986)

—— and Stephen Orgel, eds., *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols (California: California University Press, 1973)

Sullivan, Garrett A. JR., Patrick Cheney and Andrew Hadfield, eds., *Early Modern English Drama: A Critical Companion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Summers, Claude J., 'Sex, Politics, and Self-Realization in *Edward II*', in *"A Poet and a filthy Play-maker"*, ed. by Friedenreich, Gill, and Kuriyama, pp. 221-40

Thurley, Simon, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993)

Thurn, David H., 'Sovereignty, Disorder, and Fetishism in Marlowe's *Edward II*', *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 21, (1990), 115-41

Tomlinson, Sophie, 'Theatrical Vibrancy on the Caroline Court Stage: *Tempe Restored* and *The Shepherds' Paradise*', in *Women and Culture*, ed. by McManus, pp. 186-203

—— *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Twyning, John, *London Dispossessed: Literature and Social Space in the Early Modern City* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998)

Veevers, Erica, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta-Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Wells, Robin Headlam, '"Manhood and Chevalrie": *Coriolanus*, Prince Henry, and the Chivalric Revival', *Review of English Studies*, 51:203 (2000), 395-422

West, Russell, *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage: From Shakespeare to Webster* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)

—— 'Perplexive Perspectives: The Court and Contestation in the Jacobean Masque', *The Seventeenth Century*, 18, No. 1, (2003), 25-43

Whigham, Frank, *Ambition and Privilege: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory* (Berkeley: California University Press, 1984)

—— *Seizures of the Will in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Whitfield White, Paul, ed., *Marlowe, History and Sexuality: New Critical Essays on Christopher Marlowe* (New York: Ams Press, 1998)

Wilson, Jean, ed., *Entertainments for Elizabeth I* (Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 1980)

Wilson, Richard, ed., *Christopher Marlowe* (London and New York: Longman, 1999)

Wormald, Jenny, 'James VI and I: Two Kings or One?', *History*, 68:19 (1983), 187-209

Wright, Nancy E., '"Rival Traditions": Civic and Courtly Ceremonies in Jacobean London', in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. by Bevington and Holbrook, pp. 197-217

Wynne-Davies, Marion, 'The Queen's Masque: Renaissance Women and the Seventeenth-Century Court Masque', in *Gloriana's Face*, ed. by Cerasano and Wynne-Davies, pp. 79-104

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

Young, Michael, *James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality* (London: Macmillan, 2000)

Zimmerman, Susan, ed., *Erotic Politics: Desire on the Renaissance Stage* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992)

——'Introduction. Erotic Politics: The Dynamics of Desire on the English Renaissance Stage', in *Erotic Politics*, ed. by Zimmerman, pp. 1-11