

Summer 2018

Constructing an Early Modern Queen: Posturing, Mimicry, and the Rhetoric of Authority

Megan K. Mize
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_etds

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [European History Commons](#), [Rhetoric Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mize, Megan K.. "Constructing an Early Modern Queen: Posturing, Mimicry, and the Rhetoric of Authority" (2018). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), dissertation, English, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/967y-f524
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_etds/49

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the English at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

CONSTRUCTING AN EARLY MODERN QUEEN:
POSTURING, MIMICRY, AND THE RHETORIC OF AUTHORITY

by

Megan K. Mize
B.A. May 2004, The College of William and Mary
M.A. August 2006, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ENGLISH

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
August 2018

Approved by:

Imtiaz Habib (Director)

Lindal Buchanan (Member)

David Metzger (Member)

Leah Marcus (Member)

ABSTRACT

CONSTRUCTING AN EARLY MODERN QUEEN: POSTURING, MIMICRY, AND THE RHETORIC OF AUTHORITY

Megan K. Mize
Old Dominion University, 2018
Director: Dr. Imtiaz Habib

As the illegitimate daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, a woman executed for treason, Elizabeth Tudor stood at the center of discourses that often sought to contain or even destroy her. Early on, Elizabeth understood that constant re-invention, performance, and mimicry were key strategies for survival. When she finally ascended the throne in 1558, Elizabeth continued to use these rhetorical methods to retain her autonomy, as far as possible, garnering public support and the loyalty of her court. Although Elizabeth has long been acknowledged as a historical icon and has received considerable scholarly attention, particularly from feminist and feminist-leaning scholars, her status as a skilled rhetor and use of strategic imitation has only been briefly considered.

This project will examine Elizabeth as an iconic rhetor, one with the semblance of power and agency within the confines of gendered discourses. Analyzing her performance through the lens of mimicry and historical inaccessibility, as outlined in the theories of Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak, this project considers the following lines of inquiry: Tudor era debates regarding pedagogical strategies and their intersection with rhetorical theories; the influence of early instructors, both women and men, on Elizabeth's rhetorical strategy; and Elizabeth's emulative self-fashioning as it appears in her speeches, behavior, letters, and portraits. This project suggests that as a seminal figure at the start of the modern moment, Elizabeth's deft use of mimicry to establish and maintain her royal authority is significant within the rhetorical tradition.

Copyright, 2018, by Megan K. Mize, All Rights Reserved.

This dissertation is dedicated to my family, but in particular to Paul C. Mize, a loving grandfather who helped inspire my love of learning and would, no doubt, declare me “a mess.”

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The acknowledgements genre with its sincerity is one that I find difficult, not for the lack of genuine gratitude, but due to my natural tendency towards levity. As such, what follows is my attempt to express sincere appreciation to all those who have supported me on this journey offered in my own way. At moments like these, I wish there was some genre of writing that was committed to expressing emotion in evocative and creative ways. But as I cannot think of such a genre, I'll turn to the poetry of Philip Sidney: "But words came halting forth, wanting Invention's stay,/ Invention, Nature's child, fled step-dame Study's blows, / And others' feet still seem'd but strangers in my way.../ Biting my truant pen, beating myself for spite-- 'Fool,' said my Muse to me, 'look in thy heart and write.'" Appropriately, emulation is an underlying theme of these acknowledgements.

To begin, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Dr. Imtiaz Habib for his continuous support of my Ph.D study. His guidance helped me understand that literature is not something one does on a Sunday afternoon. I would also like to thank the rest of my dissertation committee, Dr. Leah Marcus, Dr. David Metzger, and Dr. Lindal Buchanan, for their time and insightful comments. Each of these scholars demonstrated thoughtful mentorship which I will always appreciate and seek to emulate.

Next, to all my friends, thank you. I am constantly in awe at my good fortune in terms of friendship and community. To my Dissertation Bootcamp community, your company and good humor as we have moved through this process has been invaluable. I have benefited from watching so many scholars generously share their experiences, research, and GIFs. A special thanks to Diane Cook, Carmen Christopher, Vince Rhodes, Angela Harrison, and Christy Gilroy

for blazing a trail and then showing the possibilities of life beyond the program. Daniel Hocutt, your good-natured spirit and diplomatic insight has often reminded me to lighten up and enjoy the work. April Cobos, your generosity of spirit is matched only by your playful nature; both infuse your work. Your handstands in dangerous places are a metaphor for academia, I am sure. Anthony Garcia, I will always be indebted for you for the conversations regarding the state of Literary Studies; what it was, is, and could be. That intensely invested discourse is what I hoped to engage in when I joined the doctoral program. Laura Buchholz, you are a model of mentorship that I will always strive to match, knowing that I will never have half the patience and wisdom you possess. Laura, Danielle Roach, Matt Beale, and Jamie Henthorn, you are all unparalleled scholars and friends. You will never know how much I have appreciated the laughter you have shared with me. Each of you challenge me to grow as an instructor and researcher, reminding me that we are really just students who refuse to stop learning. Thank you for letting me veer into your research lanes because I want to be more like you. Matt, you deserve an extra acknowledgement for re-reading game instructions to me so many times and not flipping the table when I asked, “So what are we doing?” There are many more colleagues within this program to whom I owe thanks. I could not have asked to be among more engaging and dedicated scholars.

Next, I owe Shelley Rodrigo a very large debt. I was on the receiving end of your “sledgehammer” mentorship, which is a gift that can never be repaid. You are both a mentor and a dear friend; thank you for taking on both roles. I know each can be exhausting. Aimee Tripolites, a country may be between us, but you are only a message away. Thank you for making sure the distance is so short. You kept me sane and prevented me from making some serious style errors. Jeff Penano, you are my oldest friend, which means you are my most patient

friend. You helped me keep things in perspective throughout this incredibly lengthy process, allowing me to laugh at the absurdity of academia while I waded through it. I like you, Jeff.

Always have, always will.

When it comes to family, words like “thank you” and “gratitude” fail here, but those are the words I have to use. Thank you, my oldest nephew, Alano Mize. You are one of my favorite humans and I am so proud of you. The Mize family could not have asked for a better representative to move forward into the future. To my brother, Shane Mize, thank you for being cool. It lets me look cool in connection. Nicole Mize, thank you for being my sister. I always thought it would be fun to have one. You showed me I was right. To my parents, David and Ginnie Mize, your unfaltering love and support have meant more than you will ever know. From each of you, I have derived my love of reading, history, and teaching. You always listen when I am excited about some obscure discovery, take my side when I face obstacles, and joyfully celebrate my accomplishments. I won the parental lottery. I love you both, very much.

Finally, perhaps surpassing all these, one individual in particular has produced a huge impact. Newt, thank you for holding my lap and arms in place as I wrote, head-butting me as you demanded pets, and teaching my spell-check “zzxxxxzzx.” You are a good kitty. Yes, you are.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	x
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	12
METHODOLOGY	24
CHAPTER DESCRIPTIONS	35
II. “SHEWETH THE IMAGE AND WAYS OF GOOD LIVING”: EARLY MODERN TACTICS FOR TRAINING A FEMALE PRINCE.....	40
IDENTIFYING IMITATION AS EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE AND RHETORICAL STRATEGY	46
“GRAMMARIANS, SPEECHIFIERS, AND GREEKLINGS”: THE TENUOUS POSITION OF THE HUMANIST SCHOLAR.....	51
VIVES AND MIMICRY AS PEDAGOGICAL, PERSONAL STRATEGY	57
CONCLUSION.....	75
III. “A CAUSE TO MAKE US LIVE WELL”: ELIZABETH TUDOR’S HOUSEHOLD CIRCLES AND KATHERINE PARR AS EARLY RHETORICAL MODELS.....	79
ELIZABETH’S EARLY HOUSEHOLD AND WOMEN INSTRUCTORS.....	85
THE INFLUENCE OF ROYAL WOMEN ON ELIZABETH’S EDUCATION	92
MIMICRY AND UNREADABILITY IN KATHERINE PARR’S LAMENTATION OF A CONFESSED SINNER	103
CONCLUSION.....	116
IV. “HOW UNCULTIVATED I AM IN LETTERS”: EDUCATION OF A TUDOR PRINCESS	120
MALE INSTRUCTORS WITHIN THE PRINCESS’S HOUSEHOLD.....	123
PROXIMATE MODEL FOR RESPONDING TO POLITICAL AND PERSONAL DANGER.....	127
ASCHAM, THE QUEEN’S SCHOOLMASTER	134
CONTINUED INFLUENCE OF INSTRUCTORS IN ELIZABETH’S COURT	151
V. “SHREWDNESS AND ELOQUENCE”: EVIDENCE OF THE IMPACT OF ELIZABETH TUDOR’S EDUCATION AND MIMICRY IN HER MONARCHIC CAREER.....	158
“ANSWER ANSWERLESS”: ELIZABETH’S VIEW OF MIMICRY.....	161
“SUCCEED HAPPILY THROUGH A DISCREET START”: EARLY PUBLIC PERFORMANCES OF MIMICRY	171

Chapter	Page
ASSIMILATING AND ADAPTING PREVIOUS PERFORMANCES OF ROYAL AUTHORITY	181
“WELL WORTH THE TROUBLE”: MIMICRY AND ELIZABETH’S MANIPULATIONS OF FOREIGN DIPLOMACY	200
ELIZABETH’S USE OF VISUAL MIMICRY TO PORTRAY ROYAL AUTHORITY	218
CONCLUSION.....	229
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND AFTERWORD.....	232
POTENTIAL FOR EXPANSION AND FUTURE AVENUES OF RESEARCH	235
MIMICRY IN THE PRESENT MOMENT	238
WORKS CITED	240
APPENDICES	
A. LICENSE FOR THE RAINBOW PORTRAIT	264
B. LICENSE FOR THE ARMADA PORTRAIT.....	266
VITA.....	267

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Rainbow Portrait	8
2. Rainbow Portrait – Upper Close-up.....	9
3. Rainbow Portrait – Lower Close-up	9
4. The Armada Portrait	16

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The early modern period was marked by personal authority vested in reigning aristocratic figures. While passage of this authority depended in part on legal structures of heredity, the exercise of authority required the ability to perform that authority within cultural expectations. Such behavior was heavily gendered, providing disparate scripts for individuals of either sex. Elizabeth Tudor offers a public example of a woman openly resisting a subordinate status. Yet her methods of resistance were complex, as she embraced several cultural discourses regarding female roles, while often re-scripting herself as a masculine entity. By assuming various gendered postures, Elizabeth validated her authority as a woman in the patriarchal role of monarch. Louise Montrose claims, “Queen Elizabeth was a cultural anomaly ... By the skillful deployment of images that were at once awesome and familiar, this perplexing creature tried to mollify her male subjects while enhancing her authority over them” (48). Elizabeth is a provocative example of self-fashioning on many levels, as she used multiple mediums to create a complex and often contradictory identity that strove to be all things to all people.

As the illegitimate daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, a woman executed for treason, Elizabeth Tudor constantly stood at the center of discourses that often sought to contain or even destroy her. As a child, Elizabeth occupied a strangely liminal space in her father’s court. Though accorded the status of a royally acknowledged offspring, her ambiguous position made Elizabeth the focus of several court intrigues, as in time she came to represent an alternate, and more Protestant, future for England. The conflux of shifting court alliances and the need to remain in favor with the monarch, whether it was her father, brother, or older sister, offered the

young Elizabeth hands-on training in terms of self-fashioning. Early on, Elizabeth understood that constant re-invention, performance, and the strategy of mimicry were key strategies for survival. When she finally ascended the throne, Elizabeth continued to use methods developed during her youth to retain her autonomy, as far as possible, garnering public support and the loyalty of her court. These were rhetorical strategies that illuminate Elizabeth as a rhetor. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar describes the role of the humanist rhetor thus:

The rhetor is seen (ideally) as the conscious and deliberating agent who ‘chooses’ and in choosing discloses the capacity for ‘prudence’ and who ‘invents’ discourse that displays an *ingenium* and who all along observes the norms of timeliness (*kairos*), appropriateness (*to prepon*), and *decorum* that testify to a mastery of *sensus communis* ... The agency of rhetoric is always reducible to the conscious and strategic thinking of the rhetor. The dialectic between text and context is ... always prefigured in the rhetor’s desires and designs. (48-49)

As a result of her education, early influences, and life experiences, Elizabeth was armed with an awareness of the value of imitation as a process for selecting conventional postures or drawing on precedent as a means of generating her own rhetorical performances. Her purposeful manipulation of such postures demonstrates the connection between her “desires” as rhetor and her “design.” As a rhetor, Elizabeth often carefully selected and then deployed postures that were useful in terms of their timeliness and propriety and suited her own purposes. Such strategic imitation allowed her to intervene in established discourses by seeming to conform to expectation, while creating the space for her to actually invent new strategies for establishing her unique form of authority. Gaonkar’s description allows us to view Elizabeth as a rhetor due to

her manipulation of cultural expectations, both through oration, writing, and public appearances, in response to the constantly evolving concerns of political life.

Evidence of Elizabeth's rhetorical prowess may be found at any point in her life; for instance, even as an adolescent Elizabeth employed careful strategies to negotiate her tenuous position. Notably, the changeable nature of Elizabeth's status during her childhood led to an uneven treatment of her formal education. As she was declared illegitimate, and therefore ineligible to rule, following Anne Boleyn's demise in 1536 her early education was not consistently aimed at preparing her for public service. As a result of Elizabeth's reinstatement to the line of succession, it was not until 1544 that a schoolmaster was officially appointed to direct the princess's training for rulership (Pollnitz 133).

Elizabeth's curriculum was likely modeled after the course of study proposed by Desiderius Erasmus in *Institutio Principis Christiani* (1516) for her half-sister, Mary. Erasmus states, "The main hope of getting a good prince hangs on his proper education" (Dowling 42). The curriculum Erasmus recommended included works of "moral philosophy" such as: Plutarch's *Apophthegms*, *Moralia* and the *Lives*; the works of Seneca; Aristotle's *Politics*; Cicero's *De Officiis*; and Plato's *Republic* (Erasmus 61-62). Notably, the curriculum emphasized translation and imitation as vital tools for learning.

At age eleven in 1544, at the very outset of her revised training, Elizabeth translated Marguerite de Navarre's *Miroir de l'ame pecheresse*, a religious meditation. Her original translation, titled *The Mirror of the Sinful Soul*, was later published for public circulation in 1548 by John Bale in *A Godly Medytacyon of the Christen Soul Concerning a Love towards God and Hys Christe*. In Elizabeth's introduction of the translations to Katherine Parr to whom she dedicates the text, it is possible to witness an early example of Elizabeth's strategy of

downplaying her own skill: “as well as the capacity of my simple wit and small learning could extend themselves” (E. Tudor, “Prefacing Her New Year’s Gift” 7). This modesty was both desirable and useful as a later political tool. This early strategy may have also worked to counteract the effects of Anne Boleyn’s disgrace. For instance, in 1545, when presenting her French, Italian, and Latin translations of Katherine Parr’s *Prayers or Meditations* to Henry VIII, Elizabeth stressed that she did not merely imitate her father’s virtues, but rather had inherited them (Pollnitz 136). Discernibly, the twelve-year-old Elizabeth was overtly aligning herself to her father and his “virtues,” distancing herself from the stain of the Boleyn connection.

Her position was especially precarious during the reign of Mary Tudor, her older, Catholic half-sister. The siblings had a tumultuous relationship, as Elizabeth represented not only Henry’s public repudiation of Mary’s mother, Catherine of Aragon, but also came to symbolize the potential for a Protestant England, freed from the influence of Mary’s Spanish husband and political ally, Phillip II (Starkey 121). As young Elizabeth carefully fashioned herself as a Protestant princess, her hesitation to publicly embrace Mary’s Catholic religion was discreet. Her reluctance was present in her theatrics during public appearances; though attending Mass on the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, September 8, 1553 to appease Mary, Elizabeth displayed her unwillingness to participate through sighing and feigned illness (Hibbert 41-43). Such efforts, though overtly moments of submission to her sister’s will, were rhetorical strategies which subtly implied that Elizabeth would offer an alternative model of rulership, at least in terms of religion. This perception may have garnered the princess supporters, possibly preventing Mary from openly moving against her (Starkey 149).

However, Elizabeth came very near to execution due to the suspicion of her involvement in Wyatt’s Revolt of 1554, a suspicion that likely had merit (Starkey 138). Sent to the Tower of

London, Elizabeth once again called upon her rhetorical prowess to survive. As the council interrogated the young woman, she responded with purposefully vague answers, thereby evading entrapment. As evidence of her involvement turned out to be sparse; Elizabeth was removed from London and kept under custody at Woodstock. At this low point, it appeared that Mary had her troublesome younger half-sister under control. In her initial negotiations for Elizabeth's release, Mary claimed that she wanted no more of Elizabeth's evasions: "By the argument and circumstances off her said letter . . . yt may well appere hir meaning and purpose to be farre otherwise than hir letters purporteth; Wherefore our plesure ys not to be hereafter anye moore molested with such hir disguise and colourable letters" (M. Tudor, "The Quene's Letter" 182). Mary's description of Elizabeth's strategy serves as independent testimony of Elizabeth's strategic posturing. Later Elizabeth's performance became more aggressive, pressing to approach the council or even the queen, rather than confining her protests to easily dismissed letters. As David Starkey notes, "Elizabeth, by magnificently overplaying a weak hand, bluffed her way to an almost total victory" (159). Eventually, through the pressure of her council and her husband, Mary was forced to accept Elizabeth back into her graces, a defeat Elizabeth pressed to her advantage as Mary's authority began to falter, demonstrating her growing success as a rhetor, though luck also certainly had a hand.

Upon Mary's demise due to illness, Elizabeth illustrated once more a strong grasp of rhetoric and self-invention as a political tool. In the months prior to Mary's death, Elizabeth and a small entourage prepared quietly for ascension, to ensure a rapid and smooth transition of power. As a result, when Elizabeth's moment arrived, her ascension appeared to be divinely ordained, as it lacked the confusion and turmoil of previous decades (Starkey 242). *The Quenes Maisties Passage through the Citie of London* (1559), available nine days after the event,

describes the five pageants that occurred during her procession into London, during which Elizabeth responded to the various skits in warm and informal ways. Pageants along the procession exhorted the queen to perform her royal duties in virtuous fashion, instructing Elizabeth as to her subjects' expectations. *The Queenes Maisties Passage* records her response to such presumption: "But after that her grace had understode the meaning therof, she thanked the citie, praised the fairness of the worke, and promised that she would doe her whole endeavour for the continuall preservation of concorde" (34). One may mark here a subtle shift from the somber, pious Protestant princess to the more effusive, popular image of Elizabeth as an approachable and vigorous ruler.

Despite her accession to the throne in December 1558, Elizabeth remained at the center of competing discourses. Her challenges were not erased; rather, they increased, as she now represented the nation as a whole. At this moment, several examples of Elizabeth's rhetorical prowess exist, particularly in her early addresses to her Parliament, in which she rapidly outlined the framework through which she intended to rule. During a speech to Parliament in 1559, she responded to calls for her marriage, stating, "And in the end this shall be for me sufficient: that a marble stone shall declare that queen, having reigned such a time, lived and died a virgin" (E. Tudor, "First Speech Before Parliament" 58). As an unmarried woman in a traditionally masculine position, without stable and powerful allies, with an ambiguous religious stance, and with a constricted cash flow, Elizabeth was under constant pressure to conform to expectations, yet for political reasons, often could not comply. For instance, her council and public opinion remained conflicted throughout her lifetime in terms of a suitable marriage partner for the queen. Marrying a foreign prince was an unpopular option, further complicated by competing needs for political allies with flexible views on religion. Likewise, Elizabeth could not easily marry an

Englishman, as few had the pedigree one would expect for a royal partner; furthermore, intra-familial jealousies also troubled such options. Finally, there is Elizabeth's own stated aversion to marriage, although to what degree she truly dismissed the possibility is debatable. Nonetheless, she had witnessed first-hand the loss of power experienced by women who wed. Elizabeth was forced to navigate these conflicting concerns, using mimicry and evasion, constantly offering the possibility but not the reality of marriage as a way of ensuring alliances.

These tensions continually informed Elizabeth's re-invention of her public figure. Within her lifetime, Elizabeth's rhetorical skills were acknowledged, both in her oration and writing. For instance, in *The Arte of English Poesie*, George Puttenham claims: "first in degree is the Queene our soueraigne Lady, whose learned, delicate, noble Muse, easily surmounteth all the rest that haue written before her time or sence" (77). She had to be at once mother and wife to the country, as well as the ever elusive but desirable maiden (if not physically desirable as she aged, at least politically desirable), with all the virtues virginity imported to a woman at the time. Likewise, Elizabeth also had to convince her subjects of her authority, an almost exclusively masculine concept at the time. Her careful manipulation of those discourses that troubled her authoritative position is a key element in the character of her rulership that must be examined, as she turned those concepts that would seek to hinder her agency in the political forum to her advantage.

Through the constant combination of images (such as official public portraits, one of which depicts her wearing a dress decorated by eyes, ears, and mouths, a strong metaphor for a rhetor, Fig. 1), speeches (to Parliament, to universities, ambassadors, and at court), and writing (letters, translations, and poetry), Elizabeth carved a space for her authority. In her conscious crafting of her public persona, she mimicked expected behavior in order to act in unconventional

ways, drawing on her rhetorical training under the guidance of Roger Ascham. She was the product of a unique pedagogical situation, becoming a remarkable icon of humanist training and an alternative model of rulership that was very conscious of public opinion as political power.



Figure 1. *Rainbow Portrait*. The full length portrait of the 60 year old queen.



Figure 2. *Rainbow Portrait – Upper Close-up*. Shows a close up of Elizabeth’s right hand holding a rainbow, with the inscription “Non Sine Sole Iris” (*There is no rainbow without the sun*).



Figure 3. *Rainbow Portrait – Lower Close-up*. Highlights the ears, eyes, and mouths on the dress, as well as the serpent eating a ruby heart on the sleeve.

Although Elizabeth has long been acknowledged as a historical icon and has received considerable scholarly attention, particularly from feminist and feminist-leaning scholars (Marcus, Glenn, Bell, and Doran, for instance), her status as a skilled rhetor has often been obscured or only briefly considered. Work is needed to focus on the rhetorical contributions of women during the early modern period, a pattern that extends even to the most visible of public figures, Elizabeth Tudor. Furthermore, though the fields of literary and rhetorical study have taken great strides to be more inclusive, they often continue the well-intended but hazardous trend of discussing women's works as a separate canon. Rather, it is necessary to focus on the intertextual nature of Elizabeth's work, examining those who trained her, works that informed her rhetorical strategies, and the recorded responses of those subject to her rule. This type of approach responds to Karen Newman's call for "a different kind of textual intercourse, a promiscuous conversation of many texts" (144).

Such lines of inquiry should produce several significant results. First, by exploring the intersections between early modern pedagogy, rhetoric, and self-fashioning, such work would be able to trace the evolution of Elizabeth's self-construction from being an early means of survival as the submissive daughter to the Protestant princess, to becoming a necessary tool for agency in rulership. Secondly, a project that pinpoints Elizabeth's rhetorical strategies, such as imitation, evasion, and ambiguity, as well as the context within which she employed these tactics, would comprehensively track the complex discourses which led to her powerfully iconic postures and successful bid for authority. Past and current studies tend to overlook the role of imitation within Elizabeth's rhetorical strategies. A new study is needed address this lack and drive attention towards Elizabeth's early training, her later sophisticated and purposeful crafting of her public

persona via written and visual modes, and the cyclical exchange of information between Elizabeth and her subjects.

Using contemporary critical terminology such as “mimicry” and “ambiguity” in order to revisit the past is not without peril, yet this transhistorical strategy has merit, as scholars have long assumed modern thinking is heavily dependent on and derived from the early modern period. For instance, in *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*, Gunther Kress and Theo Van Leeuwen argue for a general “grammar” of Western reading and viewing practices that evolved over the centuries: “this generalization has some validity as it points to a communicational situation with a long history that has evolved over the past five centuries or so” (4). The comment of Kress and Van Leeuwen make it possible to see that the discursive phenomena of the later modern moment can be said to be approximately coherent in terms of the language of the early modern moment. Modern critical concepts can redress the naturalized narratives and terminology that have erased Elizabeth as a rhetor by reframing the lens through which the queen is viewed. Elizabeth needs to be situated in an interventionist junction for the rhetorical history of sixteenth century England, as that history is incomplete if it cannot account for struggles of the early modern woman at the center of competing discourses. Situating Elizabeth within the web of active discourses during her lifetime demonstrates a key moment in pedagogical debates regarding women in authoritative positions, which often center explicitly on issues pertaining to oration and performance and highlight the impact of a figure produced by such tensions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Within early modern studies, many scholars seek to recover female experiences excluded from traditional histories, highlighting the intertextual nature of discourses across the spectrum of culture. Researchers have expanded their understanding of previously stable concepts, recognizing that traditional definitions often discard utterances that do not neatly conform to patriarchal norms. A scholarly reliance on traditional, and often exclusionary, terminology constructs a false sense of cultural unity and naturalizes political values. In conformation, as it were, scholars are using more expansive definitions for terms such as “author,” “text,” and “rhetoric.”

The idea of performance is often foregrounded when examining women's subjectivity and agency within the patriarchal discourses of the early modern era. Scholars such as Joan Kelly-Gadol, Catherine Belsey, and Jane Donawerth, to name a few, work to identify not only the ways in which representations of women have reinforced hierarchies of power along gender lines, but also opportunities for resistance and agency for women of the time. In the Foreword to *Fashioning Femininity*, Catherine Stimpson states, “This [gender] hierarchy, however, was unstable, as is every sexual identity, every gender identity ... We fashion them with a language, at a moment, in a milieu. We then call them immutable, as grievous an error as conflating the fabric of a sock with the foot it covers ... Women, moreover, resisted their subordinate roles” (xii). These critics therefore undermine the humanist historiography that celebrates the Renaissance as a bright cultural moment for all, pointing to the ways in which women were used in binaries to define men as ideal figures of authority.

In doing so, scholars challenge entrenched notions of universal experiences which naturalize hierarchies in terms of subject position and textual value. Belsey claims, “People make history under determinate conditions. One of these conditions is subjectivity itself, and this is in turn an effect of discourse. To be a subject is to be able to speak, to give meaning. But the range of meanings it is possible to give at a particular historical moment is determined outside the subject” (x). She stresses the situated nature of the subject’s experience; women could resist the dominant discourse, but only through the available cultural symbols. Many studies centered on women as subjects have examined their roles within the domestic sphere, as well as the few public arenas open to women (Belsey 150). However, in *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*, Sharon Crowley defines a rhetor as “anyone who composes discourse that is intended to affect community thinking or events” (437). This expansive definition allows scholars to consider women in a wider variety of contexts, re-imagining rhetorical work.

Recent revisionist efforts to recover early modern women relegated to the margins are fraught with tension, as scholars from multiple critical backgrounds and fields often cannot agree on which female figures are worthy of examination. As a result, a divide occurs, with some researchers striving to highlight the common woman’s experience, and others focusing on “exceptional” women. For instance, Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald critique work that examines women that deviate from the historical norm, stating, “much recent work in women’s rhetorics tends to valorize exceptional women writers” (xix). Categorizing authoritative women as “exceptional” points to the constricted access to authority, but also reinforces the concept that women in general were deficient by traditional norms.

Some feminist scholars explicitly refuse to address Elizabeth Tudor, dismissing her as an outlier. In her study of early modern women writers, Tina Krontiris states, “In my group of

authors I have not included the two queens of the period (Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart) because they do not seem to be typical of other women at that point of English culture” (24). Likewise, Karen Newman states her work is aligned more with cultural materialism in its “focus on gender, and more particularly its turn away from monarchs” (xv). This is a puzzling exclusion, considering that she seeks to study, “the relationship of gender to power and the state ... [and how] femininity [was] fashioned and deployed in early modern England” (Newman xvii). Yet without acknowledging or examining the woman at the apex of this society, and the ways in which she fashioned herself and then influenced concepts regarding “femininity,” how can one speak effectively about how this fashioning could or did work for other women? This move also strips Elizabeth of her female status, making her a liminal, androgynous figure. Janel Mueller claims that Elizabeth “most often styles herself prince and her rule or throne princely in what, at this period, sustains its gender-neutral sense: the derivation of prince from Latin *princeps*, a noun of so-called common—or indifferently masculine or feminine—gender” (“Virtue and Virtuality” 42). Though superficially gender neutral, the term had exclusively male referents in English history to that point. This strategy has led some scholars to view Elizabeth as a somewhat androgynous figure, even though she often foregrounded her feminine posturing in portraits, writing, and public appearances, while also transcending femininity at will.

Defining womanhood by a universal and shared experience runs the risk of being reductive. If one examines Elizabeth Tudor’s experience as a female authority figure within the public sphere, it becomes apparent that even behavior that diverges from the supposed norm can prove fruitful for highlighting the multiplicity of discourses that bear on gender across varied social levels. In “On Authority in the Study of Writing” (1994), Peter Mortensen and Gesa Kirsch highlight the difficulty in identifying women’s authoritative strategies, due to the tradition

of perceiving authority as inherently masculine. At the same time, they challenge the scholarly focus on the discursive practices of women who lacked political power, claiming, “The material authority that women rulers held makes them interesting subjects of rhetorical study because men have traditionally held most positions of authority, and acts of asserting authority are often marked as masculine, regardless of the actor’s gender” (Mortensen and Kirsch 325).

The lens of early modern posturing has been applied in part to Elizabeth, as scholars observe her complex relationship to gendered expectations. Many scholars point to Elizabeth’s pattern of posturing as both masculine and feminine, depending on the context. Glenn claims, “Her self-fashioning refused the popular concept of woman as conduit for male rule, legitimacy, or power. The rhetorical situation ... demanded that ... she quell the tensions arising from her ‘unmastered’ womanhood and fashion for herself the authority associated with males: a self-mastered (wo)man, answerable only to God” (163). In order to do so, Elizabeth had to make the patriarchal framework for her. Likewise, Belsey comments on Elizabeth’s frequent rejection of femininity, claiming that to assume an independent role is “to personate masculine virtue” (181). While such work establishes a useful foundation, it often overlooks the imitative and often collaborative nature of Elizabeth’s self-fashioning, as well as the tendency to emphasize her female status. Though Elizabeth strove for autonomy, she also consistently relied on council, and submitted to social pressures at key moments. This submission also had tactical advantages, allowing the weight of consequence to fall on her council’s shoulders, rather than simply her own. Moreover, Belsey’s claim that Elizabeth strikes masculine postures is not inaccurate, but it obscures the overwhelming evidence of Elizabeth’s own foregrounding of her feminine behavior, as can clearly be seen in the *Armada Portrait* (Fig. 2).



Figure 4. *The Armada Portrait*. Painted in 1588 to commemorate the defeat of the Spanish Armada, this portrait demonstrates the tendency to portray the queen in overtly feminine costumes, while the traditionally masculine objects of authority, such as the crown, are not emphasized. Her hand rests gently on the globe, a non-aggressive gesture that still signals dominance. Likewise, the battle occurs in the background, separate from the queen, but a part of her image. Elizabeth, in her finery, remains foremost a feminine figure, but claims responsibility for military victory.

Although Elizabeth had well-known tutors, very few scholars have explored the actual program of study and texts used to train her. Interest in this area is emerging, as Aysha Pollnitz's work "Christian Women or Sovereign Queens? The Schooling of Mary and Elizabeth" illustrates. Pollnitz examines the extent to which Mary and Elizabeth shared a curriculum, as well as the implications that the Tudor women received a "masculine" education. As humanism influenced pedagogical theory for centuries, it is worthwhile to observe how humanist theories of pedagogy were adapted to address the issue of preparing women for potential queenship. More importantly, by shedding light on Elizabeth's early educational development, we are better able

to discuss the evolution of her rhetorical strategies and public performance as queen, an aspect of the topic that Pollnitz does not address at length.

Within the last two decades, several scholars have engaged in the recovery of women's rhetorical work. Key examples include: Andrea Lunsford's *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition* (1995); Cheryl Glenn's *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (1997); and Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald's *Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s)* (2001). Lunsford's *Reclaiming Rhetorica* consists of critical essays by several feminist scholars, each theorizing about the rhetorical strategies of women over time, from Aspasia to Julia Kristeva. The anthology's stated purpose is to present "a glimmer of possibilities, an array of glances- an enthymeme" (Lunsford ix). In *Rhetoric Retold*, Glenn explores the work of historical women rhetors, highlighting the ways in which each uses rhetoric within a particular historical situation. In their work, Ritchie and Ronald signal the value of such efforts as "gathering women's rhetorics together in order to remember that the rhetorical tradition indeed includes women" (xv). By offering access to often overlooked work, these collections challenge androcentric history, as well as offer alternative approaches to rhetorical theory. Notably, a scholarly volume of Elizabeth I's writing was not compiled until 2000, when Leah Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose published *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*.

Traditionally, very little work has explicitly addressed Elizabeth as a rhetor in a comprehensive manner. Scholars such as Christine Beemer and Cheryl Glenn exemplify the growing effort to elucidate Elizabeth's rhetorical strategies. In her dissertation, "*Usurping Authority in the Midst of Men*": *Mirrors of Female Ruling Rhetoric in the Sixteenth Century*, Beemer examines the "mirror of princes" tradition, arguing, "Ruling women of the early modern period found little literal reflection ... Without a mirror of female rule, reigning women turned to

one another, as contemporary mirrors, to guide them in the discovery of their rhetorical selves” (34). While Beemer is no doubt correct that female rulers looked to one another as models, her assumption that shared gender alone inherently links rhetorical strategies is reductive. Such an implication fails to account for the influence of male monarchs’ rhetorical strategies on women. Elizabeth certainly looked to her male predecessors also as models to draw on.

It is vital to consider the cultural history of male rule, as it necessarily influenced female strategies. For instance, in “Virtue and Virtuality: Gender in the Self-Representations of Queen Elizabeth I,” Mueller describes Elizabeth’s “princely” posturing, suggesting that the term “prince” was somewhat gender neutral due to its Latin origins (42). Though superficially gender neutral, in English history to that point the term had exclusively male referents. Elizabeth was not only looking to her female predecessors, as Beemer’s work might lead us to believe. Rather, she also drew on the rich history of male rule, assimilating their strategies and language for her own purposes.

Placing Elizabeth’s efforts also within the context of male-dominated rhetorical history illustrates the synergistic nature of rhetorical strategies. In *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity through the Renaissance*, Cheryl Glenn acknowledges the ways in which Elizabeth assimilated traditionally masculine strategies. Glenn claims:

To distinguish herself from all the English kings who had gone before, as well as from all other women in the realm, she appeared an androgyne, the perfect trope for an imperialistic, nationalistic state. Elizabeth thereby transformed the feminized margins of political power into a masculinized body of actual strength. (159)

In other words, Elizabeth worked not only within feminine frameworks provided by other women, but within the discourse of authority that was typically masculine. Glenn’s useful work

does join the trend within scholarship to discuss Elizabeth as an androgynous figure. Yet, in many instances, Elizabeth explicitly emphasized her status as a woman. Furthermore, Glenn's single chapter on Elizabeth focuses on her orations, providing a starting point for viewing Elizabeth as a rhetor, but not exploring other avenues of rhetorical performances, such as her tendency to deploy emulation as part of her self-fashioning in portraiture, poetry, and public progresses.

Elizabeth's iconic performance continued to influence culture for generations. Researchers such as Kevin Sharpe and Leah Marcus have explored the enduring impact Elizabeth's posturing may have had, pointing to an ensuing nostalgia during the reign of James I. Sharpe considers the ways in which discourses regarding other women may have changed as a result of Elizabeth's reign, touching briefly upon texts regarding women's place within the family (107). For instance, he suggests Elizabeth's performance of authority likely had a long-term impact on perceptions of gender and gendered relations, as texts following her reign sometimes asserted women were less emotional and physically driven than their male counterparts (107). Leah Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose state, "Already in the early to mid-seventeenth century, Queen Elizabeth I had become such a powerful cultural symbol that her writings were freely adapted and transformed to meet emerging crises and occasion" (xiv). Curtis Perry describes the "residual" nature of Elizabeth's reign, claiming that different audiences within Jacobean culture, such as the king, his courtiers, and the citizenry, repurposed her legacy to suit their own ends (154).

The scholarly work surrounding Elizabeth as performer-rhetor is often compartmentalized by interests particular to various disciplines. Marcus, Mueller, and Rose describe the traditionally "piecemeal" approach to studying Elizabeth:

Biographers describe her impressive education ... but seldom offer more than cursory attention to the content of her writings. Historians analyze her speeches and letters but usually as documents of policy ... Literary scholars and cultural historians focus on specific poems, letters, and speeches of widely acknowledged eloquence ... in order to analyze the strategic gendering of Elizabeth's self-representation. (xi)

A more vigorous approach must examine her performance comprehensively. Exploring the emerging debates regarding education, rhetoric, gender, and authority that shaped her identity more effectively captures the complex negotiations she engaged in throughout her reign. Such discourses shaped her training as a royal, constrained her via gender constructs, and provided her with a wide range of meanings to use in validating her authority. Belsey claims that work exploring the intersections of multiple discourses attempts to "construct a history of the meaning which delimits at a specific moment what it is possible to say, to understand, and consequently be" (x). Elizabeth was not separate from the culture that produced her, nor merely an exceptional product of a unique familial situation. Examining the network of texts produced by Elizabeth and her subjects provides richer insight into her royal performance. As Sharpe states, "A history of the changing relationship between royal authorship and royal authority promises to add to our understanding of the integrity of discourse to power, of the rhetorical nature of monarchy itself in early modern England" (24).

It is this "rhetorical nature of the monarchy" that requires more extensive analysis. Elizabeth Tudor literally embodied this rhetorical nature in her persistent, fluid, and often imitative performance as an early modern queen. Trained by several scholars and in communication with leading humanists, Elizabeth was exposed to traditional and emerging theories regarding performance and rhetoric, concepts that were overtly tied to the act of ruling.

As the apex of society, Elizabeth's posturing was always on display; she was discussed, considered, and potentially imitated. It is vital to understand the specific strategies she deployed, considering the long-reaching impact of her iconic figure. Acknowledging Elizabeth as a skilled rhetor, one aware of her strategies, situates her within rhetorical history, creates a fuller picture of the intersections present in early modern discourses regarding performance and authority.

The duality of her position, as a woman in a public patriarchal role, invites the use of postcolonial theory's interest in strategies of resistance in connection with rhetorical theory's interest in communicative and persuasive practices. It is not enough to simply acknowledge that Elizabeth manipulates expectations; rather we must understand the specific methodology of such tactics and the motivations she had for choosing these forms of manipulation. The concepts of mimicry and unreadability, often associated with the work of Jacques Lacan, Homi Bhabha, and Gayatri Spivak to name a few, articulates methods of opposition and agency for figures in marginalized positions. While these concepts are most commonly explored in connection to colonized subjects resisting imperial pressures, such strategies are not confined to those in obviously powerless positions. They can apply profitably to seemingly powerful monarchic figures such as Elizabeth whose "power" is severely constricted by the historical expectations of her gender and sex to make her life a complex dance between compliance and defiance, conformity and independence.

Admittedly, the use of postcolonial theory, typically reserved for marginalized groups with little access to agency, in order to analyze the rhetorical performance of a monarch may initially seem antithetical to the goals of such theories. Spivak has been criticized for using a Rani, examining a woman in a privileged position of authority to represent "marginalization" within the historical archives (Morris 7). However, for Spivak, marginalization is not purely

class-based as she observes the ways in which gender also leads to erasure from the historical narrative. Spivak claims, “The Rani emerges only when she is needed in the space of imperial production” (270). In other words, the Rani can only be reconstructed through the imperialist gaze, and hence is inaccessible, regardless of her privileged position. However, this inaccessibility does not mean scholars should not attempt to at least trace the process by which this construction occurred; to do nothing would be the same as participating in the historical erasure.

Rajiv Krishna Menon addresses the application of subaltern theory to women from all ranks of society, stating, “social expectations of women allow for the presence of subaltern women in all classes ... gendered subalternity is particularly complex, as often, the restraints of gender transcend class, allowing for subalternity to be free from socioeconomics” (1). Like the Rani, Elizabeth occupied several liminal positions, resulting in a far more tenuous hold on power than her male counterparts. Though her sex certainly situated her within a traditionally marginalized group, other factors further complicated her authoritative stance. One such factor was her ambiguous stance on religion; she was seen as a Protestant ruler, though she retained many of the Catholic rituals, such as the use of candles, music, and the crucifix. However, Elizabeth’s Protestant leanings alienated her from the larger European political system. In 1570, Pope Pius V excommunicated her, describing her in “*Regnans in Excelsis*” as “Elizabeth, the pretended queen of England and the servant of crime” (para. 2). The papal bull threatened English Catholics with a similar fate should they continue to serve as faithful subjects of the supposedly heretical queen (para. 6). Furthermore, her complicated family history left Elizabeth daughter of an executed traitor, with fluctuating legitimacy, giving her opponents strong grounds for undermining her claim to the throne, in favor of the Catholic Mary Stuart.

The result of such pressures was a constant anxiety regarding Elizabeth's ability to retain her authority, an anxiety shared by her subjects. Notably, Elizabeth used her public performances as the means to assert her authority, rather than to make policy aggressively. It must be noted that she was not free to be extravagant in expenditure, even to create the appearance of regal authority. When compared to her male counterparts, Elizabeth's household was fairly spartan, her wealth inherited, and her costs transferred to her noble subjects whenever possible. David Starkey claims, "Balancing the books was to be her life-long preoccupation as Queen ... Part of her problem, no doubt, was the difficulty caused for everyone on fixed incomes in this period by the rapid rate of inflation" (221). Therefore, her self-posturing had to make much of little, crafting the perception that she was a powerful monarch. More famously, Elizabeth's life-long unmarried status permitted her a level of autonomy, yet also placed in her in a precarious position in terms of alliances and dynastic continuity. Elizabeth's self-posturing is a continuous narrative of survival through daily performances, intended to convince her subjects that her position was secure and that she was worthy to rule.

The traditional scholarly narrative that elevates Elizabeth as the autonomous and splendid Gloriana ignores the bleak narrative in which her marginalization as a woman and religious outsider is highlighted, rather than removed. Regarding her refusal to conform to societal expectations regarding marriage, Susan Doran claims, "By this action, or rather nonaction, she appeared to be betraying her dynasty, her religion, and her realm, especially as she also refused to designate a successor" ("Gender, Power, and Politics" 30). Yet marriage presented its own, insurmountable obstacles to the queen, as it would limit her authority, nor could her council agree upon an appropriate candidate. Elizabeth was forced to maintain a delicate balancing act throughout her reign on a number of fronts. To view Elizabeth only as a monarch with privilege

would be historically and analytically irresponsible, as it overlooks her tenuous hold on power which motivated the continuous performance of authority.

Thus, a postcolonial concept such as “mimicry” may be adapted to a new purpose to demonstrate how strategies of resistance associated with colonial marginalization can create a space for authority for a female ruler working within and against the norms of her society. These theories reframe work produced by Elizabeth, highlighting her refashioning of gendered conventions to suit her needs. As a result, she can be seen to adhere to the norm while retaining the ability to shift her stance when the need arose. By re-purposing postcolonial theories regarding mimicry and the unreadability of historical figures and applying them to a female in a position of traditionally masculine authority, a new model of rulership emerges.

METHODOLOGY

In order to examine Elizabeth’s strategic use of imitation, this project first examines the debates regarding the education of royal women in the sixteenth century, which first in England began during the construction of a curriculum for Mary Tudor, in which an emphasis on imitation, modelling, and lived experience emerged as pedagogical strategy. This project argues that such pedagogical methods emerge from the instructors’ own dual positions, as those of inferior social status tasked with instructing those in authority. Then the project examines the fragmentary evidence regarding Elizabeth Tudor’s lived experience of a humanist curriculum, through her early domestic instructors, who were women, and her formal instructors. In order to demonstrate her embrace of creative imitation, the project will then examine verbal and visual artifacts from Elizabeth’s reign, emphasizing her pattern of drawing on culturally established

postures or imitating her royal predecessors in order to introduce her own construction of monarchic authority. Through this approach, this study will respond to historian Kevin Sharpe's call for "an approach to Early Modern history that would ask both how a diversity of languages and cultural texts provided ideological contexts (hence meaning) to individual moments and occurrences; and (by corollary) how specific episodes made immediate those texts and shaped the reading of them by and for contemporaries" (19).

This project conducts a close study of the politics of Elizabeth's early education and the lasting effect on her public career, strengthening the current understanding of how Elizabeth constructed herself as an early modern queen. In particular, studies on Elizabeth have paid little attention to either the prevalence of imitation within Elizabeth's early education and formative experiences or the ways in which she deployed imitation within her royal posturing. Early modern pedagogical texts emerged from the complicated social positions of the instructors tasked with creating new curricula for unique, socially superior students. As a result of their experiences, as well as their tendency to embrace Classical educational practices, such instructors implicitly demonstrated usefulness of productive imitation, or what this project will call "mimicry," as a rhetorical strategy.

"Imitation" is traditionally defined as an act in which a rhetor uses recognizable characteristics of established rhetorical performances, in terms of style or content (Corbett 243). However, imitation is a contested term even within rhetorical studies. Stephen Halliwell describes the complicated status of imitation, stating, "The semantic field of 'imitation' in modern English ... has become too narrow and predominately pejorative--typically implying a limited aim of copying, superficial replication, or counterfeiting ... we are not dealing here with a wholly unified concept, still less with a term that possesses a 'single, literal meaning,' but rather with a

rich locus of aesthetic issues relating to the status, significance, and effects of several types of artistic representation” (152). In *The Garden of Eloquence* (1593), Henry Peacham offers an early modern definition of imitation, reflecting the tensions connected to imitative performances:

Mimesis is an imitation of speech whereby the Orator counterfeits not only what one said, but also his utterance, pronunciation, and gesture, imitating everything as it was, which is always well performed, and naturally represented in an apt and skillful actor This form of imitation is commonly abused by flattering jesters and common parasites, who for the pleasure of those whom they flatter, do both deprave and deride other men's sayings and doings. Also this figure may be much blemished, either by excess or defect, which maketh the imitation unlike unto that it ought to be. (190)

Peacham’s definition indicates the contemporary perception that imitation can fall along a spectrum of performance, from the exaggerated and clownish to the skillful and appropriate, “that it ought to be.”

Rhetorical imitation can be separated into several categories. Thomas Green offers a useful typology, identifying four types of imitation: reproductive (the rhetor faithfully replicates the original source), eclectic (the rhetor draws upon and mixes multiple models), heuristic (the rhetor distances herself from the original source), and dialectical (the rhetor criticizes the original source) (38-45). This project traces the ways in which early modern pedagogues and their royal pupil engaged with all such types of imitation. As such, on occasion, this project uses terms such as “imitation” and “mimicry” interchangeably. When it does so, the project is typically alluding to the variety of imitation which is more active and productive than the act of mere copying. Other terms intended to function largely synonymously include: purposeful dissembling, sly civility, posturing, and assimilation. These terms reflect the typical rhetorical moves that creative

imitation, deemed “mimicry,” encompasses, including strategic use of humility, etiquette, delay, forgetfulness, and nostalgia.

Traditionally, imitation is valued for its ability to train rhetors by providing established rhetorical examples. Novice rhetors learned rhetorical precepts, such as style and arrangement, through imitation exercises. Corbett describes this process of educational imitation in sixteenth century England in particular, stating, “Imitative exercises involved two steps: Analysis and Genesis. Analysis was the stage in which students, under the guidance of the teacher, made a close study of the model to observe how its excellences followed the precepts of art. Genesis was the stage in which students attempted to produce something or to do something similar to the model that had been analyzed” (245). It can be challenging to distinguish the threshold between imitation and original composition drawn from precedent. Corbett states, “It is sometimes difficult to tell whether a particular exercise in the Tudor schools should be classified as part of the genesis stage of imitation or as part of the practice stage of original composition. The criterion for distinguishing imitation from practice should be the length of the tether with the model, but since the length of the tether is a relative matter, it will not always be possible to firmly categorize the exercise as imitation or practice” (245). Furthermore, given that there is a wealth of Elizabethan rhetoric that uses imitation for more than acknowledging generic contributions, sometimes highlighting that emulation and other times obscuring the fact that imitation is occurring, the “length of the tether with the model” becomes an ineffective standard for categorization. Rather this project focuses on the creative potential offered by imitation, as pedagogues believed imitation led the rhetor to develop original content.

Daniel Bender describes imitation-driven pedagogy as a tripartite process, in which students learn to create original rhetoric by “following, transforming, [and] overthrowing”

established models (345). This project is interested in particular in the ways in which imitation, an act of reproduction, can lead to transformation and overthrowing of established precedents. “Mimicry” is meant to distinguish that active moment of change from simple emulation or “following,” or as Geoffrey Hartman describes it, “*Mimesis* becomes *poesis*, imitation becomes making, by giving form and pressure to a presumed reality...” (23). Notably, this transformative strategy via imitation becomes habit as a result of repeatedly engaging in imitation-driven pedagogy. As such, it can be difficult to determine the purposefulness of a rhetor’s use of mimicry, given that it is both a learned behavior as well as a potent rhetorical device. Corbett stresses the duality of imitation, in which it can be habitual and purposeful, stating, “For it is that internalization of structures that unlocks our powers and sets us free to be creative, original, and ultimately effective. Imitate that you may be different” (250). In this formulation, Corbett articulates a useful purpose for imitation, in which similarity permits divergence.

As such the term “mimicry” describes a pattern of behavior that is a distinctly early modern version of rhetorical imitation, which results from a heavy emphasis on imitation within educational practice. The project draws on existing rhetorical terminology to describe early modern identity construction efforts that relied on imitation so that a rhetor might overcome some aspect of her identity that would otherwise prevent her from engaging in public discourse. The kinds of common rhetorical choices that can constitute early modern mimicry include the use of humility *topos* (a strategy in which a rhetor feigns ignorance or claims to have less ability than she actually possesses), the use of ambiguity and delay, and the attempt to reframe personal *ethos*, or character, by adapting culturally accepted precedents and postures. One of the project’s particular contributions is a new and useful analytical framework which is produced by connecting the concept of mimicry to existing rhetorical frameworks. As a cultural studies

project aimed at tracing a network of influence regarding Elizabeth I's royal identity construction, the choice of the term "mimicry" signals the intersection of Homi Bhabha's formulation of mimicry, in which imitation plays a significant role.

This rhetorical analytic needs to be complemented by cultural materialism and interventionist theories of psychoanalytic and feminist postcolonial scholarship such as those by Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak, in order to identify the ways in which Elizabeth's use of creative imitation and unreadability enabled her to assert her authority as a woman in the quintessential patriarchal position. The use of postcolonial feminism as a theoretical lens for observing Elizabeth's rhetoric necessitates a series of interconnected strategies, as this theoretical field addresses many historical discourses that led to the marginalization of figures based on race, class, or gender.

It is appropriate and productive for this work to analyze Elizabeth's performance through the lens of mimicry and historical inaccessibility, as outlined in the theories of Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak. Bhabha's modification of Jacques Lacan's formulation regarding camouflage as an act of resistance, applied to colonized subjects, suggests that mimicry produces a "menace" to the system that is being imitated (86). He claims, "the *ambivalence* of mimicry (almost the same, *but not quite*) does not merely 'rupture' the discourse but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a 'partial' presence ... The menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (86). Some may argue that in Bhabha's terms it is unclear that mimicry is by design or habit. One response is that mimicry is both. This critical paradigm allows us to see Elizabeth, as Other, working within the system that would separate her from agency, to create an ambivalent space in which she might challenge and even alter that system to some degree. The female

subject that understands the postures available to her may assume those that offer elements of authority, postures accepted by the culture as “appropriate.” For instance, chastity has a cultural history which affords the female subject a certain freedom; this is clear in the elevation of the Virgin Mary as at once pure from carnal sin and powerful as a maternal figure, yet another accepted female role. Likewise, the female subject that grasps the opportunities to maneuver within those roles may wear the trappings of such postures in order to assimilate their cultural cache. Thus, she appears to conform, camouflaging herself through expected behavior. Yet just as her free will is “dubious,” her conformity is as well. By appearing to perform the desired role, the female subject then has the space to work within the system to mold it to her own ends. Hence the ideas of performativity and rhetoric become key elements in the strategy of resistance. Notably, her mimicry actually helped consolidate the system insofar as stable monarchy was desirable. By mimicking conformity to the traditional monarchic discourses on issues of marriage, motherhood, chastity, and the masculine tradition of authority, bearing down on her, Elizabeth is able to re-fashion and assimilate them for her own unique purposes.

As Bhabha suggests, mimicry surpasses blending in to survive, stating, “[mimicry is] a discourse at the crossroads of what is known and permissible and that which though known must be kept concealed; a discourse uttered between the lines and as such both against the rules and within them” (7). As such, mimicry permits the user to infiltrate roles and spaces previously inaccessible to them in order to influence change. Likewise, Elizabeth’s mimicry is most apparent when she alters the postures she occupies. This transformation, which makes emulation a rhetorical act with the intent to persuade, is the definitive element that marks her strategy as mimicry, rather than simply a passive mirroring of expectations or established behaviors to survive. Her performances insistently redefined reality, bringing into the discourse a hybrid

understanding of what a prince might be, persuading her subjects that a woman could exercise royal power effectively.

Consideration of the long-term possibilities that result from such performances serves as a rebuttal to the criticisms of mimicry. Risa Applegarth supports a final extension of this theory of mimicry through her formulation of genre as a *topos*, or commonplace. She suggests authors may draw upon and adapt established genre as a means of establishing *ethos*. Most significantly, Applegarth claims that every entry into a genre opens up new possibilities for the genre: a hybrid, third space. She states, “*Ethos* strategies are ... shaped by genres, which are theorized as locations and environments in order to capture a fundamental dynamic between strategy and social norm” (41). This theory echoes Bhabha’s claim that mimicry is productive, as an author may produce new opportunities by manipulating a conventional framework, usurping conventions to new ends. Likewise, as a public rhetor, Elizabeth did not dismantle the patriarchal discourse within which she operated, instead manipulating various conventional postures as *topoi*. Her fluid performances, which combined altering gendered concepts to create a new version of a monarch which was both feminine and masculine at once, offered new possibilities for other rhetors to draw on and transform.

When engaging in mimicry, the rhetor identifies the posture that productively aligns with her aims, which requires an analysis of the audience in order to understand exactly which sorts of postures are viable for use. A successful performance of mimicry must not appear to undermine that posture, or else the value of the pose fails. In other words, mimicry is marked by a need to pass as the model that is being adapted without moving too far from the values attached to it. Furthermore, when mimicking, the rhetor is intervening in a tradition in order to use the *ethos* of convention to her own end, often subtly changing the parameters of that posture. In other

words, whereas imitation replicates the past, mimicry often uses the past to affect change in the present and future.

To extricate Elizabeth's rhetorical efforts from multiple agenda-driven discourses, both past and present, Gayatri Spivak's notion of historical "cracks" provides a useful lens. In "The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives" Spivak addresses the issue of privileging archival evidence, pointing to the subjective process of selecting artifacts to preserve within historical archives. Notably, Spivak examines the enigmatic figure of the Rani of Sirmur, an Indian woman whom British officials placed in charge of Sirmur after deposing her husband. Spivak describes the fate of the Rani's legacy, stating, "Caught in the cracks between the production of the archives and indigenous patriarchy, today distanced by the waves of hegemonic 'feminism,' there is no 'real Rani' to be found" (271). The lived experience of this woman is lost as interceding entities and institutions preserved, filtered, and interpreted this figure for a variety of purposes. As a result, scholars can only describe the figure produced by discursive strictures which governed the production of artifacts. While it may initially appear antithetical to view women in authority positions as "caught in the cracks," Spivak's focus on the intersection of patriarchy and archival history suggests a useful heuristic.

Spivak's work provides several paradigms that prove fruitful for constructing a heuristic through which to approach Elizabeth's self-fashioning, identifying agendas that produced the Elizabeth of scholarly understanding. Spivak's historical "cracks" exist between those cultural forces, such as the patriarchal discourse of authority, and processes, such as historicizing and archiving, that over time attempt to preserve a particular version of figures like Elizabeth. For this project, this paradigm of rupture makes visible historical processes, illuminating the ways in which the narrative of history performs as well as marking the ways in which such narratives

conceal figures overwritten by discourses that bear down on them. Furthermore, in *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* Spivak describes “the dubious place of the free will of the sexed subject as female” (298). The concept of “dubiousness” is significant in connection to Elizabeth’s self-fashioning. Superficially this uncertainty is a disadvantage, preventing the female subject from having “free will.” In other words, the female subject cannot act without already being overwritten or circumscribed by the patriarchal discourse. Within the framework of rhetorical strategy, however, the “dubious” nature of the female subject’s will allow us to understand the processes of rhetorical self-fashioning that Elizabeth manipulates. The Elizabeth of traditional history is deliberately “dubious” as a result of her mimicking rhetorical strategy. This is to convert circumstance into a willed method whose validity is masked by the former.

Furthermore, this study draws on Judith Butler’s rejection of the universal, and therefore exclusionary, category of “women,” in order to suggest that while Elizabeth may not represent a broader experience for women of the early modern period, her performance has a wide-reaching impact regarding the discussion of women’s roles in society, within both the domestic and public sphere. In order to avoid essentialism when discussing Elizabeth’s manipulation of gendered conventions, this study borrows Karen Newman’s strategy of discussing the discourse of “femininity” acknowledging, as she does, that it is a historically specific discourse (xix). The instincts of the feminine discourse in the early modern moment are such that not even the queen, or most especially the queen, can ignore, though as a skillful rhetor, she can mold it to her advantage.

To avoid the compartmentalization of studies of Elizabeth described by Marcus, Mueller, and Rose, the project explores through an intertextual approach the means by which Elizabeth

Tudor developed her representation as a woman in the patriarchal role of a monarch. To do so, the work first traces a network of influence through Elizabeth's early instructors and her later "formal" instructors, all of whom engaged in and at times overtly discussed mimicry as strategy, though they did not name it as such. To establish the value of focusing on self-fashioning as rhetorical strategy, this project draws on identity theories, such as those offered by Judith Butler and Stephen Greenblatt, that emphasize performance and self-fashioning. Though mimicry participates in self-fashioning, this study will explore its unique nature as a deliberate adaptation of conventional postures to achieve new, and sometimes culturally challenging, ends. Placing Butler's discussion regarding performance as a daily practice that requires constant attention in proximity to Greenblatt's claim that the early modern individuals were highly aware of themselves as performers, the project also examines Elizabeth's meticulous crafting of her public persona, from her vast array of costuming, both in court functions and portraiture, deployment of personal metaphors in several mediums, and adept manipulation of royal rhetorical precedents in her orations.

Following Cheryl Glenn's example, the study places Elizabeth's speeches and writing in conversation with both male and female-authored texts, illustrating that men and women both considered and engaged with the patriarchal discourse, often through a rich process of cross-fertilization. Such an approach also serves the function of avoiding feminist tokenism; Elizabeth's rhetorical work is valuable not simply because of her gender. This study will identify such effects in the work of Juan Luis Vives and Roger Ascham, in the religious writing of Catherine Parr's *The Lamentation of a Sinner*, and in the political speeches of both Henry VIII and Elizabeth. In these analyses, the project will focus particularly on posturing and ambiguity, highlighting the ways in which a network of individuals influenced and anticipated Elizabeth's

ambivalent behavior as a means of establishing effective rulership. Such an approach follows the models set by scholars such as Catherine Belsey who justify the inclusion of non-literary texts as, “not in any sense background material, but [as] primary locations of ... meanings and contests for meaning” (10).

Under the umbrella of postcolonial feminism, with its varied concerns regarding gender, history, and the power of language to naturalize marginalization, the project approaches the subject through a series of strategies, including: comparative analysis via close reading and genre awareness, and rhetorical analysis. Furthermore, it avoids constructing “women” as a universal, homogenous group, focusing instead on the construction of “femininity” within discourses of gender and authority. Finally, it highlights the value of identifying the specific strategy of mimicry within Elizabeth’s self-fashioning, as well as the impact of such efforts. By viewing Elizabeth as a rhetor, produced by an early modern humanist education, we recover a significant and highly visible model of rhetorical strategy for an individual occupying a role traditionally closed to marginalized groups.

CHAPTER DESCRIPTIONS

The project will pursue this trajectory of inquiry: early Tudor era debates regarding pedagogical strategies and their intersection with rhetorical theories; the influence of Elizabeth’s early female instructors and royal models on her nascent experience of imitation and mimicry; the impact of Elizabeth’s formal education under the tutelage of scholars such as Roger Ascham who specifically focused on the value of imitation; and Elizabeth’s self-fashioning through mimicry as it appears in her actions, speeches, letters, and portraits. By examining debates prior

to her ascension, formative rhetorical models and experiences, and Elizabeth's activity during her reign, the work attempts to gain a fuller understanding of how Elizabeth's performance both tested and potentially altered the discussion of gender and authority during the early modern moment. This trajectory of the study will be laid out through this introductory chapter, four chapters and an afterword, tracing forces that shaped Elizabeth as a rhetor. The chapters are as follows.

Chapter 2

Examining Elizabeth's education illuminates the background that informs her later rhetorical performances. In order to do so, the chapter begins by exploring the forces that may have influenced the development of the curriculum Elizabeth inherited, as a result of early pedagogical debates during the reign of Henry VIII. The chapter analyzes gendered concerns that arose within pedagogical texts, with an emphasis on the "mirrors for princes" tradition. Of particular interest will be Juan Luis Vives's *The Education of a Christian Woman* (1523). By identifying the typical conventions of the "mirrors" genre and the ways in which the authors confront and accommodate a female-prince, the chapter demonstrates how discourses of authority and gender problematize pedagogical strategies.

Furthermore, by examining how scholars such as Vives negotiated their own complicated status as social inferiors tasked with designing instruction for royal, female offspring, this chapter will also explore performance, identifying mimicry as an emerging rhetorical strategy that underpins such scholars' behavior and is embedded in their pedagogical strategy. The chapter sets up later comparisons in Elizabeth's public performances to rhetorical tastes. Moreover, it examines intersections and conflicts between recommended rhetorical strategies for those in authority, typically assumed to be male, and those in subordinate positions, often

women. Placing these debates regarding rhetorical methods appropriate for women rulers in conversation with Elizabeth's early education, this chapter identifies early origins of her rhetorical strategies.

Chapter 3

This chapter examines influential female role models who were a part of Elizabeth's formative years. First the chapter explores those women who served in Elizabeth's childhood household, focusing on the ways in which they instructed her. It then analyzes fragmentary evidence of early demonstrations of mimicry, both by Elizabeth's governess, Kat Ashley, and Elizabeth herself during depositions. Then, the chapter considers the influence other royal women, such as Anne Boleyn and Mary Tudor, had on Elizabeth's early exposure to royal identity construction and public rhetorical performances. The chapter concludes by analyzing Katherine Parr's *Lamentation of a Confessed Sinner*, highlighting evidence that Parr used mimicry. Within this text, Parr provides a model of Tudor queenship which manipulates conventional postures in order to perform as a rhetor in the public sphere.

Chapter 4

This chapter focuses on Elizabeth's formal instructors, such as Jean Belmain and Giovanni Battista Castiglione, examining ways in which their tutelage likely instructed Elizabeth to use mimicry as a rhetorical strategy in response to politically delicate situations. In particular, this chapter studies Roger Ascham's *The Scholemaster* as a retrospective account of Elizabeth's schooling. Within the text, Ascham demonstrates his own propensity for mimicry, a behavior likely not lost on his pupil. Moreover, he advocates for strategic imitation, both as a traditional tool for learning Latin language and style and as a means of constructing one's identity in public spaces. The chapter concludes by considering the longevity of such scholars' influences upon

Elizabeth at her court, as they continued to serve in close proximity to the queen as advisors and confidants.

Chapter 5

This portion of the project examines Elizabeth's use of mimicry as it appears in her behavior, political speeches, letters, and portraits as queen. By placing these various artifacts in conversation with another, this chapter will again draw on Sharpe's methodology, by refusing, "to be deaf to the rhetoricity of all political locutions and performances" (15). The first part of the chapter examines evidence of Elizabeth's awareness, while monarch, of mimicry as a rhetorical strategy. Then, the chapter identifies early examples of strategic emulation in Elizabeth's public life and political career. Next, the chapter will explore examples of Elizabeth drawing on rhetorical performance and maneuvers made by her Tudor predecessors, focusing in particular on speeches from the Tudor monarchs. It then considers Elizabeth's posturing in terms of foreign relations, demonstrating her pervasive use of mimicry particularly in uncertain or new political situations. Finally, this chapter analyzes Elizabeth's appropriation and adaptation of established early modern iconography and Tudor imagery as a means of furthering her construction of her version of royal authority. Drawing on Roy Strong's method of placing images within their "ideological history" this chapter will analyze images by considering the composition of the figures within, as well as the placement of objects, perspective, setting, and gendering of costuming (Sharpe 27). This chapter argues that Elizabeth also used mimicry visually to strengthen her royal *ethos*, employing several early modern feminine postures, such as modesty, chastity, and erudition, in conjunction with traditionally masculine symbols.

Conclusions and Afterword

The afterword closes the project by considering the aspects of mimicry as a rhetorical strategy as it appeared in the sixteenth century, offering a different perspective on Elizabeth's role in rhetorical and literary history, and reaffirming the assertion that her careful self-fashioning, via mimicry, functioned as a rhetorical strategy to create space for her unique model of royal authority. Then this section suggests future avenues of scholarship that might result from the material covered in this project. Finally, the afterword considers mimicry's status as a rhetorical strategy today.

CHAPTER II

“SHEWETH THE IMAGE AND WAYS OF GOOD LIVING”: EARLY MODERN TACTICS
FOR TRAINING A FEMALE PRINCE

During a state visit to Oxford University, on September 5, 1566, Elizabeth Tudor addressed her scholarly audience, asking them to forgive her supposedly rough Latin. She stated:

Those who do bad things hate the light, and therefore, because I am aware that I myself am about to manage badly my opportunity in your presence, I think that a time of shadows will be fittest for me ... For a long time, truly, a great doubt has held me: Should I be silent or should I speak? If indeed I should speak, I would make evident to you how uncultivated I am in letters; however, if I remain silent my incapacity may appear to be contempt. (E. Tudor, “Latin Oration” 89-90)

This feigned humility and hesitance to speak, known in rhetorical studies as the humility *topos*, are marks of Elizabeth’s rich education, even as she erases it. As a significant early modern figure, Elizabeth Tudor created and projected a unique public identity, drawing on available models of behavior, such as those offered by her immediate family as well as those tasked with instructing her, to construct a royal persona that was at once female and authoritative, a seemingly antithetical possibility at the time. It is Elizabeth’s very act of seeming to denigrate herself that permits her to lecture the leading male scholars in her country.

Early in the sixteenth century, Catherine of Aragon, daughter of the formidable Isabella of Castile and first wife to Henry VIII, facilitated the discussion of royal female education in England, as she recognized the need for an improved curriculum for her own daughter, Mary

Tudor. Catherine's motivation was not originally intended to yield widespread changes. Rather, she sought a new model of education to train Mary for her royal obligations. As the alliance with Spain via marriage was an attempt to shore up the uncertain political standing of the Tudor dynasty, Catherine viewed Mary's education as a necessary tool for perpetuating that dynasty in the absence of a male heir. Juan Luis Vives's introduction to *De Ratione* reveals the intimate degree to which Catherine was involved in shaping her daughter's education, as he states, "And since thou hast chosen as her teacher, a man above all learned and honest, as was fit, I was content to point out details, as with a finger" (137). Such a pedagogical curriculum would in fact be very new to England.

Prior to Catherine, the closest example of an educated, authoritative woman was Margaret Beaufort, Henry VII's mother. Describing Margaret, Watson states, "she took no initiative in specifically women's education; her efforts were directed to swell the onward current of men's education" (2-3). While she was learned and self-taught, she did little to advance other women's learning. However, Margaret established a tradition in which a female member of the royal family supported education at large, as in 1497 she generated professorships at Cambridge and Oxford; Erasmus held the Cambridge position for some time (Watson 2). In 1505, Margaret founded Christ's College, then in 1508, established St. John's College, Cambridge. While Margaret did not advance the cause of women in formal education, she did establish a precedence in which English royal women were actively involved in the oversight of educational programs (Watson 2).

Thus, Margaret's actions established a precedence in England for a woman to express interest in educational institutions and their programs of study. For Catherine, a more immediate example was available in the form of her mother, Isabella of Castile, who insisted that all of her

children be educated in a similar fashion. *Jardin de nobles donzellas* [*Garden of Noble Maidens*] (1468) by Martin de Córdoba, or Fray Martin, offers a striking example of an educational treatise for a royal woman, as he wrote the text specifically to inform Isabella's own education prior to her ascension. As he outlines his purpose for writing, Fray Martin indicates the value placed on the education of a royal woman, stating, "So that ... you may not fail by defect of moral wisdom before appropriate learning makes you worthy to reign" (de Cordoba 36). Without instruction in "appropriate learning", an autonomous queen risks failing to be suitable for her role, and hence unable to retain it. Isabella clearly placed a high value on education, as she patronized several academic institutions and scholars. She instructed her own children including Catherine, in the palace school she established. Isabella also secured influential scholars, including foreign instructors to supplement the education of her four daughters (Watson 8). Reared in an environment which celebrated intellectual endeavor, Catherine turned to a fellow Spaniard when selecting a humanist scholar to apply emerging concepts to her daughter's curriculum.

Before the early Tudor era, very few texts in English history were dedicated specifically to women and education. Foster Watson mentions three such manuals: *Ancrene Wisse* (*Guide for Anchoresses*) (circa 1250), followed by *How the Good Wiif Taughte Hir Doughtir* (circa 1430), and *The Myroure of Oure Ladye* (fifteenth century) (3). Two of these texts, such as *Ancrene Wisse* and *The Myroure of Oure Ladye*, were intended for cloistered women, in part instructing them on matters related to daily behavior and devotional activities. Notably, the "mirror" metaphor for learning that is echoed in many early pedagogical texts and conduct manuals, is present in *The Myroure of Oure Ladye*, as its opening prologue explains the purpose of the text, stating, "se [the Virgin Mary] therin as in a myroure, and so be styred the more deuoutly to prayse her, & to knowe where ye fayle in her praysinges, and to amende: tyll ye may come there

ye may se her face to face wythouten eny myrroure” (4). In other words, the devoted woman should strive to emulate Mary to the point that she internalizes the virginal model, no longer requiring a metaphorical mirror to show her the way to behave. Other texts, such as *How the Good Wif Taughte Hir Doughtir*, a Middle English conduct poem addressing lower class women who were not cloistered, contain lessons on courteous behavior as well as advice on domestic issues. These early conduct manuals stress chastity, obedience, and discretion as feminine virtues. At the start of the sixteenth century, Richard Hyrde, writing a preface to Margaret Roper’s translation of Erasmus’s *Precatio Dominica in Sept em Portiones Distributa* (1524), describes the prevailing attitudes regarding women and education:

Alleging for their opinion that the frail kind of women, being inclined of their own courage unto vice, and mutable at every newelty [novelty], if they should have skill in many things that be written in the Latin and Greek tongue, compiled and made with great craft and eloquence, where the matter is haply sometime more sweet unto the ear than wholesome for the mind, it would of likelihood both inflame their stomachs a great deal the more to that vice, that men say they be too much given unto of their own nature already (161-162)

While medieval ideas regarding women’s education and the potential danger of instructing them in rhetoric persist in the early modern texts, the Tudor texts offered new considerations for the purpose of female education, including training a princess for a public role.

The first Tudor texts that attempt to establish a curriculum for women continued to reinforce traditional gender roles through education; even relatively progressive educators argued for knowledge as a means of preserving female chastity. Key figures in the early discussion of such curricula include Desiderius Erasmus, Thomas More, and Juan Luis Vives. These scholars

shared mutual admiration of one another's concepts, often drawing on and critiquing their proposed models. The emerging consideration for women and education may not entirely have been prompted by the presence of potential royal female heirs. Barbara Correll rejects purely regio-centric theories regarding Tudor pedagogy, such as those offered by Stephen Greenblatt and Louis Montrose, as these debates began long before a woman held the throne. Correll states:

We see ... signs of a kind of psycho-political crisis of masculine identity and authority among members of a rising intellectual bourgeoisie who sought to negotiate positions of authority in a power structure still largely determined by the hereditary nobility and the institution of the Church ... Here we cannot speak of the provocation of a female monarch. (241-242)

The early modern pedagogical debates, which often used the female figure to construct male identities, emerged from the intersection of changing social and political structures, which in turn affected perceptions regarding gender identity. While some humanist manuals argued for women's education, this advocacy was often framed by entrenched notions of gender roles, thereby limiting the purpose for such education. Nonetheless, this discussion marked a significant shift in thought regarding women's education; it acknowledged that there could be a formalized system for training women outside the institution of the Catholic Church.

Considering the early modern perception of rhetoric as a practical art, it is perhaps unsurprising that as humanist scholars considered new, more effective curricula for training women, initially to serve in the domestic sphere, they often conflated education in general with rhetorical training. Rhetoric could be taught in a scaffolded fashion, training women to read, write, and when occasion called for it, as it might for a noble woman, to speak well. Rhetoric also taught women to understand context and audience, informing the ways in which they would

perform their duties as a daughter, wife, and mother most effectively. Such treatises often assumed that the female's role was significant in the advancement of her family's interest. Thus, rhetoric was a viable field of study to include within a woman's education, though it was conceived of as having very different objectives than it would for men. The inclusion of rhetoric for women in such treatises opened the way for women to learn the tools of rhetoric, but to also apply them to their own ends. Such application can be seen as clearly modeled by figures such as Mary and Elizabeth Tudor.

It is a historical irony that one of the individuals to most benefit from Catherine's insistence on an improved curriculum for women was the daughter of Anne Boleyn. Thus, while Elizabeth's performance may be unique, her training and models reflect larger movements at the time in regard to early modern noble women's education. Elizabeth's emergence as a conscious rhetor, who deftly employed the tactics of performance and imitation, resulted from tensions particular to Tudor culture. At the same time, her posturing is significantly influenced by continental discourses, signaling the larger, cosmopolitan nature of her education. Elizabeth's strategy emerges as the sophisticated fruition of intersecting trends that opened a space for female identity performances, through the discourse of imitation and mimicry, in the public sphere.

Watson rightly claims, "The educational theory and practice of a community are not things which arise *e nihilo*; they are the result of the thoughts, activities, conditions and circumstances which constituted the community's past life, especially as these were more directly related to the upbringing of the young" (v). Such is the case when analyzing the early modern texts that propose a more formalized curriculum for royal or aristocratic women. Grooming women for a public life was not widespread or even consistently a desired objective.

However, as the ever-changing political scene of early modern Europe collided with emerging humanist philosophies, derived from Graeco-Roman texts, the value of educating women in new ways to better serve their culturally determined roles became a subject of interest.

While interest in the subject of royal pedagogy and curricula is increasing, current scholarship often overlooks, or only casually addresses, the consequences of the scholars' subordinate social position, in regard to their royal patrons and charges, and the ways in which individual navigations influenced their teaching material. For instance, Correll acknowledges that humanist scholars were caught in the midst of shifting conceptions of masculinity, but does not connect such experiences, which often called for the scholar to mimic submissive postures, to pedagogical texts and practice. As such, this chapter seeks to highlight those subtle traces of mimicry that are embedded in manuals that propose avantgarde curricula for a Tudor princess, arguing that such texts unintentionally trained a royal female student to recognize the value of mimicry as a rhetorical strategy for agency.

IDENTIFYING IMITATION AS EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE AND RHETORICAL STRATEGY

In 2003, the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies defined “rhetorical agency” in terms of an individual’s ability to act, claiming that such action occurs as “resource constructed in particular contexts and particular ways ... [that] materializes out of a combination of individual will and social circumstances” (Giesler 12,14). In order to understand the complex, constructed nature of Elizabeth’s public persona, it is useful to examine the discussions surrounding pedagogy, rhetoric, and performance occurring within England prior to and during her time. By situating

Elizabeth within these tensions, the origins and evolution of her own rhetorical strategies can be highlighted. Elizabeth's iconic performance illustrates the potential inherent in the early modern pedagogical debates regarding educating women, marking a shift in educational thought from merely training women to enabling them to function within an enlarged understanding of the domestic sphere.

As educational treatises regarding female education emerged in the early part of the sixteenth century, a pattern developed in which the favored pedagogical approach assumed lived experience as a rhetorical model. Embedded in many tracts is a naturalized discussion of imitation, overtly encouraging the student to use the traditional practice of emulating authors and orators as part of daily training, while quietly reinforcing the concept that one's daily behavior is a performance, and therefore a rhetorical act which is informed by audience and purpose. Notably, those scholars tasked with developing the princely curriculum often occupied precarious positions within the social hierarchy, due to fluctuating conceptions of masculinity, competing religious discourses, and occupying a subordinate status to that of their pupils. Their personal experiences underpinned this pedagogical preference for accessing authority through the imitation of compliant submission. Elizabeth Mazzola notes an additional complication, stating, "But wherever we place the royal schoolmaster – in the classroom or a garden at Haworth, or in a bedchamber, unannounced – he would first need to take back the schoolroom from the royal women who had for so many years both crowded and supervised it" ("Schooling Shrews" 10). Indeed, scholars produced many of the educational tracts regarding women's education at the behest of a royal female patron.

The debate regarding proposed curricula for royal females subtly produced a rhetorical model that at the time was without a name; today scholars would likely describe such strategies

as “mimicry.” Modern mimicry theory, as derived from Jacques Lacan’s and Homi Bhabha’s works in particular, highlights the potential submissive posturing offers for socio-political agency. In “The Line and Light” (1966), Lacan describes mimicry as more than mere replication: “The effect of mimicry is camouflage, in the strictly technical sense ... It is not a question of harmonizing with the background, but against a mottled background, of becoming mottled - exactly like the technique of camouflage practiced in human warfare” (99). Lacan suggests that self-fashioning manipulates the way others perceive an individual; that fashioning relies on established cultural norms, at once reflecting previous performances while functioning as a distinct object within the gaze of an external other. In order to cultivate a seeming replication of cultural expectations, an individual may assimilate conventions in order to blend. The militaristic comparison to camouflage points to the threatening nature of the cultural context within which such a strategy may be employed. For the royal tutor to overstep his bounds in regard to asserting authority over a future monarch can potentially translate to social, if not physical, harm; conversely, cultivating subtle, but positive influence over such a student may pay long term dividends, both for the scholar and the nation at large.

Theorists such as Joan Riviere and Judith Butler explored the implications of mimicry as a strategy within a gendered context. In 1959, Riviere writes, “The reader may now ask how I define womanliness or where I draw the line between genuine womanliness and ‘masquerade.’ My suggestion is not, however, that there is any such difference; whether radical or superficial, they are the same thing” (38). Butler emphasizes the destabilizing nature of mimicry, as it undermines the concept of an authentic original. She writes, “Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being” (45). In other words, all identity,

including gender-based identity, is performance, informed by the gaze of others. Mimicry points to the rhetorical nature of such performances. Thus, the male scholar who does not prove his masculinity through means such as military might or political power must find a way to safeguard his position as masculine, while subverting his masculine authority to others, including in some instances, female students of higher rank. Likewise, these female students, tasked with potentially assuming the traditionally male mantle of monarchic authority, must establish a feminine identity that allows for the wielding of power without radically disturbing the entrenched constructions of submissive feminine behavior; to disturb such views risks the loss of royal power, a threat that the Tudors were well aware of, given their unique dynastic history.

Homi Bhabha identifies the socio-political potential of mimicry as a destabilizing strategy. Examining colonized societies, Bhabha explores the ways in which the colonized subject copies the colonizer, producing not a mirror image of the “original” figure, but a hybrid identity that exposes the tenuous nature of the colonizer’s supposedly authentic performance. Bhabha claims, “In mimicry, the representation of identity and meaning is rearticulated along the axis of metonymy” (90). The hybridity that occurs as a result of long time contact generates a third space, in which one may exploit ambivalence within the socio-political system in an effort to seize some agency. Bhabha characterizes mimicry’s ability to create this hybrid space:

Mimicry is, thus the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which ‘appropriates’ the Other as it visualizes power. Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses an imminent threat to both ‘normalized’ knowledges and disciplinary powers. (86)

Bhabha invokes Lacan’s comparison of mimicry to camouflage, emphasizing that, in his reading,

such imitation is not an effort to peacefully obscure difference, but to allow such difference to persist through a partial performance of conventions. He suggests, “[Mimicry’s] threat, I would add, comes from the prodigious and strategic production of conflictual, fantastic, discriminatory ‘identity effects’ in the play of a power that is elusive because it hides no essence, no ‘itself’” (90). The productive nature of this mimetic approach is key, due to the implication that there is no inherent authenticity to any identity.

Identifying such a strategy within the early modern pedagogical manuals can be difficult, as the rhetorical nature of the individual’s daily performance is only subtly addressed, drawing on experience rather than overt strategies. However, in 1474, Cristoforo Landino’s *Disputationes Camaldulenses* approached a theory of mimicry:

[T]here ought to be a careful rationale applied in imitating a writer, and we should not try to become the same as those we are imitating, but rather to become similar in such a way that the similarity is scarcely perceived, and even then it should only be apparent to the learned. (179)

Though Landino describes the commonly accepted definition of Renaissance *imitatio*, it is the productive nature of emulation and the “not quite sameness” effect produced by it that points to mimicry. Imitation should be essentially imperceptible, adopting another’s established and accepted performance in order to facilitate the creation of a new, but not repetitive, text.

In his preface to Margaret Roper’s translation of Erasmus’s *Treatise on the Lord’s Prayer* (1524), Hyrde invokes the naturalized function of imitation in education, stating, “For [education] sheweth the image and ways of good living, even right as a mirror sheweth the similitude and proportion of the body” (167). The early modern student was trained to emulate educational models, often drawn from history or Classical mythos. The student observes the

outward appearance of appropriate behavior, yet the student is not the same as the image she/he observes. This understanding of *imitatio* can be expanded to include the simulation of daily behaviors, using others' experience as a model for crafting an identity that is at once conventional and productive.

“GRAMMARIANS, SPEECHIFIERS, AND GREEKLINGS”: THE TENUOUS POSITION OF THE HUMANIST SCHOLAR

As members of an emerging intellectual class, humanist scholars occupied tenuous positions in terms of gendered and class expectations, as they did not represent the traditional modes of masculine authority. Correll describes this crisis of identity, stating, “the conflict between hereditary and intellectual or bourgeois claims to power reveals sexual anxiety in shifting notions of subordination and superiority” (242). Such scholars were not born to privilege or power, nor did they seize position through military prowess. Rather, their authority was the result of their personal intellectual endeavors and the public approval of fellow scholars and upper-class patrons. In other words, the new authority of the humanist intellectual posed a potential challenge to existent political and cultural authority figures, as it offered a model of masculinity that challenged traditional notions of inherited preeminence or feudal might. A well-placed scholar had the legitimate opportunity to influence the political future of the nation, as the pedagogical manuals for royal offspring highlight.

Issues of class and gender were further complicated by the tensions of religious politics, placing many such scholars at the intersection of competing discourses. Beyond the struggle to secure a masculine identity in terms of secular authority and rank, such religious conflict could

have dire consequences for the individual. Famously, Thomas More, a devout Catholic, refused to publicly acknowledge Henry VIII as Supreme Head of the Church of England or to acknowledge the annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, leading to his execution for treason in 1535 (Rockett 1067). For Vives, religion and ethnicity also troubled his position. Born in Valencia to a family that had converted from Judaism to Catholicism, Vives was a Spanish Catholic in the English court during Catherine of Aragon's descent from favor, which signaled the rise of Reformationist thinking at court (Watson 12). Mazzola highlights the dangers attendant upon the sixteenth-century humanist's position, stating, "Royal pedagogues like Juan Luis Vives, John Palsgrave, and Thomas Linacre, for example, were also compelled to weigh in on the legality or sanctity of Henry's first marriage and to respond to each other's positions on Katherine of Aragon's piety, wifely demeanor, chastity, and fertility" ("Schooling Shrews" 4). Though Vives declined Catherine's request to act as her legal advocate before Cardinal Campeggio, he was held in the London Tower for six weeks and then banished (Watson 13).

Even after leaving England in 1528, Vives continued to invoke Catherine as a model of feminine piety and strength (Watson 2). In *Office and Duties of a Husband* (1529), Vives describes Catherine:

[T]here was in her feminine body a man's heart, by the error and fault of nature ... I am ashamed of myself, and of all those that have read so many things when I behold that woman so strongly to support and suffer so many and divers adversities, that there is not one ... that with such constancy of mind hath suffered cruel fortune, or could have ruled flattering felicity, as she did. (*The Office and Duties of a Husband* 195)

Here, Vives continues to publicly demonstrate loyalty to her, praising Catherine's endurance. At the same time, he does not directly criticize Henry, blaming, "cruel fortune" for her suffering. In

this way, Vives is able to advocate for Catherine without condemning the king; he is at once submissive to royal authority while also carefully conveying a sympathetic image of the queen. Thus, it is possible that Catherine's political crisis may have served as a turning point in the narrative of English rhetorical history, training those at court to understand the value of mimicking overt submission in order to safely and subtly critique the royal prerogative.

Such a strategy was not relegated only to England, as it appears in the work of continental humanists engaged in similar pedagogical projects. For instance, in 1529, Konrad Heresbach, tutor to Prince William of Cleves, requested that Erasmus write a pedagogical treatise for the noble student; the text that resulted was *De Pueris Instituendi*. In the preface, Erasmus describes his pedagogical method, claiming it "is especially appropriate for children of rulers; they, more than anyone else, need a sound education" (qtd. in Correll 252). Erasmus then precedes to encourage the prince to allow his future conduct to: "Persevere in your glorious struggle, so that your instructor may illumine your lofty position with his teaching and you may surround his learning with the radiant aura of your good fortune and position" (qtd. in Correll 252). The instructor is thus positioned as a potentially feminized figure, as one who might "illumine" the royal student's "lofty" position. Erasmus tries to carefully negotiate this implicit feminization of the instructor by arguing for alternate ways of viewing such submission.

Furthermore, Erasmus's pedagogical texts, such as *De Civilitate Morum Puerilium* [*On Civility in Boys*] (1530) and the *Colloquia Familiaria* [*Colloquies*] (1518), focus on manners, proposing a subtle strategy in which one's own behavior influences the actions of social superiors. Correll describes such a strategy, stating, "[Erasmus creates] a strange model of substitute power: power to create the conditions of your own subordination" (246 - 247). For example, in "Coniugium," a female figure, Eulalia ("sweet talking") outlines a strategy by which

one may influence others through submission as she guides a young bride, Xantippe, to stop her husband's abuse; notably, Eulalia's name emphasizes the act of spoken communication. Eulalia encourages her friend to cease resisting her husband's authority; in place of defiance, she recommends careful, imperceptible manipulation of the husband's behavior through positive reinforcement. She describes this strategy of behavior modification, stating, "Mark the good in him, rather, and by this means take him where he can be held" (Erasmus, "Coniugium" 318). As a wifely teacher, Eulalia recommends molding one's husband into an accommodating master through the wife's willful submission and courtly praise. Through the appearance of acquiescent submission, the wife-teacher actually gains a degree of authority, as she informs the manner of domination to which she will submit, thereby allowing her to "hold" her husband-master. Correll acknowledges the complicated function Eulalia serves as a representation of the ideal wife: "She is responsible for instructing her superior to rule her in the best way, obliging her to demonstrate superior understanding and truly sophisticated techniques of self-control and psychic doubling; to have the power to instruct, on the one hand, matched by the control to invert that power into her own subordination, on the other" (248). In such a strategy, the individual is able to shape the behavior of others through a conscious crafting of their own behavior; even if such manipulation is often contingent upon a performance of self-subordination. This description of the cleverly pliant wife also highlights the tenuous position the humanist scholar occupies in relation to his royal female pupil.

Notably, Catherine of Aragon also charged Erasmus with the task of writing about schooling for women. The text that emerged, *de Matrimonio Christiano* (1526), adhered to many common humanist assertions regarding educated women, as it reaffirmed the belief that they belonged in the domestic sphere. The text asserts that educated women make better marital

partners and more fit parents, both familiar claims at the time. In fact, Watson states, “there is good reason to suggest that, writing three years after Vives had written *de Institutione Christiana Feminae*, Erasmus followed in many particulars the younger writer. Erasmus had far less direct knowledge of women’s education than Vives” (18). Erasmus’s engagement with the figure of the educated female is important to note, as it signals a broad conversation regarding the royal female student. Within his own work, these students also represent a complex site of social negotiation, as they may also metaphorically represent the humanist instructor’s place as subject to a royal student, a relationship that threatens to emasculate the instructor without an expansive definition of masculinity.

As such, Vives and Erasmus exemplify the complex rhetorical strategy of mimicry, as they carefully perform seeming submission, while creating a subsequent third space which allows them to exert some control over their royal audience, through their manipulation of multiple genres, such as the dedicatory preface, the book of manners, and the *principum specula* (mirrors of princes). Through such established genres, the scholars carefully craft hybrid texts, and by extension, hybrid identities, that appear to conform to socio-political expectations, yet open the space for them to construct their own authority. As a result, the scholars’ personal strategies for agency, primarily mimetic in nature, leak into their texts, coloring their suggestions in terms of rhetorical approaches to establishing and maintaining one’s position on a daily basis. The education of rulers remained a constant concern for early modern writers, many striving to create educational models that would mold those born to privilege into wise leaders. At the start of the sixteenth century, several handbooks emerged which Roxanne Roy describes as part of the *principum specula*, or “Mirrors of Princes,” tradition (85). Examples include Vincent of Beauvais’s *De Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium* (c. 1250), Thomas Aquinas’s *De Regno ad Regem*

Cypri (c. 1260), and Thomas Occleve's *De Regimine Principum* (c. 1410). Such *specula* are political writings intended to instruct those in positions of authority. Often written as handbooks, such texts contain guidelines regarding behavior, both in political and personal matters. These texts frequently constructed ideal rulers in the hopes that the reader would emulate such models (Gilbert 5). The educational tracts relied heavily on Classical theories of rhetoric and oratory, describing the ideal behavior for aristocratic and royal individuals. These are not literal mirrors, but ethical ones.

For much of their history, *specula* were intended as pragmatic guidelines that assumed a connection between ethics and politics, relying on Classical examples to validate recommendations made to a social superior. Such an undertaking could not be taken lightly. In *Arcadia* (1590), Philip Sidney emphasizes the importance of the prince's authority, stating, "the Princes persons in all monarchall governmentes the very knot of the peoples welfare, and light of all their doinges to which they are not onely in conscience, but in necessitie bounde to be loyal" (175). As the center of government, the ruler's influence had far-reaching consequences. Moreover, a poor ruler could be disastrous for the state as "there was no machinery for ridding a country of his administration" (Gilbert 3). As a result, *principum specula* were engaged in a significant project, offering subjects an opportunity to influence the prince's governance.

The sixteenth century *specula* demonstrate the influence of emerging humanist values. Linda Shenk highlights this shift in pedagogical thinking, stating, "the image of the educated monarch had gained particular political current when humanist thinkers marketed the schoolroom as the necessary training ground for both king and counselor. Learned status served as proof that one was sufficiently wise and virtuous to hold political office" (78). Rather than avoiding the world and its temptations, as French writer Vincent De Beauvais proposes in his *De*

Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium (The Education of Noble Children) and *De Morali Principis Institutione (The Moral Instruction of a Prince)*, humanist writers embraced the human experience as a means of transforming a prince into a better ruler. John Milton later sums up such thinking in his *Areopagitica* (1644): “I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and seeks her adversary” (570). Style, eloquence, and ornamentation no longer represented dangerous pitfalls into damnation; for a prince they were the path to glory and a means of validating their authority. Education did not shield the prince from the world; rather it was his means of entering the public sphere of politics.

VIVES AND MIMICRY AS PEDAGOGICAL, PERSONAL STRATEGY

Perhaps no figure is more prominent in the initial discussion of women’s education than Juan Luis Vives, admired by both Erasmus and More, and personally selected by Catherine in 1521 to create a model for her daughter’s royal education (Fantazzi 1). His work, in particular, illustrates the ways in which the *specula* tradition adapted to the exigencies of the early modern moment, establishing a curriculum for royal tutors to follow. He produced multiple texts detailing his academic principles for training upper class individuals. First, Vives wrote *De Institutione Feminae Christianae*, or *The Instruction of a Christian Woman* (1523), which he dedicated to Catherine, stating, “Therefore, all women will have an example to follow in your life and actions ... they will owe to your moral integrity, by which you have lived and through which I have been inspired to write” (*De Institutione* 50). His *Satellitium* (or “Bodyguard”), dedicated to Mary Tudor, contains a series of maxims to mold princely behavior, safeguarding the royal student from the lack of political and rhetorical savvy. The most revealing texts are

contained in *De Ratione Studii Puerlis* (*On a Plan of Study for Children*) (1524), as Vives responds to a request from Catherine for a revised curriculum for her daughter. These brief treatises, published together, offer an opportunity to compare his proposed, gendered curricula. Moving beyond superficial and obvious differences, however, one can observe the embedded importance of rhetoric in both treatises, as well the emphasis on mimicry.

Maria Dowling claims, “Without Queen Katherine’s education of Mary there would have been no model – and no textbooks – for those who supervised the instruction of Elizabeth, Jane Grey and their like” (243). As Vives’s work influenced Mary, Edward, and, to some degree, Elizabeth’s education, it is worthwhile to highlight his gendered curriculum as well as identify moments of indirectness and imitation embedded in his treatises. At times, one may witness his personal use of mimicry of generic conventions, such as in the dedicatory prefaces, in which Vives invokes convention in order to praise his patroness, Catherine, as well as establish the nature of his work through describing her ethos. At other times, within the proposed programs of study, Vives overtly invokes the traditional education practice of *imitatio*, in relation to writing, while subtly extending the value of imitation to daily behavior.

Throughout his various educational treatises, Vives returns to the concept of imitation. From the beginning of *De Institutione*, Vives foregrounds his belief that modelling and emulation is key, as he claims, “Your daughter Mary will read these recommendations and will reproduce them as she models herself on the example of your goodness and wisdom to be found in her own home” (50). In *De Ratione* Vives writes, “To those whom she thinks to be learned, let her give most close attention, and so let her herself speak; for this is *imitation* —a method, of no small usefulness, especially in a tender age which takes to nothing more willingly or to better purpose than imitation” (146). Hence, Vives foregrounds the value he places on imitation,

indicating that imitation has a long-lasting influence, especially when models found in the text are reinforced by daily behavior within the home.

In 1523, Vives composed *De Institutione Feminae Christianae*, or *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*, which, while ostensibly created as a guide for Mary's education, was intended for a wider audience. Fantazzi describes the significance of this text, stating, "It is the first systematic study to address explicitly and exclusively the universal education of women, even those who show no natural aptitude for learning" (1). The manual marks a shift from the medieval educational texts which situated women's education purely in religious terms. The original text was published six times: in 1523, 1538, 1540, 1541, and 1614 (Watson xiii). It was also translated into English by Richard Hyrde, which was then edited by Thomas More, who had planned to translate the text himself; this editing pedigree reflects the value placed on the text at the time (Watson 14). This version was published in 1540, 1541, with altered editions in 1557 and 1592 (Watson xiii). The publication history, extending well over sixty years, illustrates the longevity of the text's impact.

De Institutione is divided into three books, focusing on three stages of life an early modern woman might experience: childhood, marriage, and widowhood. The emphasis of education in the first book is on spiritual formation of women in their early years. Vives encourages mothers to serve as instructors to their daughters; a mother is a model to be emulated, as well as educated enough to pass on practical knowledge. Given this exhortation, the implications for Elizabeth's education following the death of her mother are significant, at least in terms of replacing the mother figure she is intended to emulate. The second book, aimed at married women, offers a unique shift, as it suggests that the ultimate goal of marriage is companionship, not offspring. Vives writes, "Marriage was instituted not so much for the

production of offspring as for the community of life and indissoluble companionship” (*De Institutione* 175). In order for a woman to be a suitable companion for her husband, she should be educated. Yet Vives quotes Publilius Syrus, a Latin writer known for his axioms, stating, “The good woman by obeying rules her husband” (*De Institutione* 177). Though this is an overt instruction to submit, Vives implies a strategy similar to the one espoused by Erasmus’s Eulia, in which submission leads to a degree of agency. Though Vives stresses that a woman should always obey her husband, he then acknowledges not all husbands are the same. He invokes Terence, stating, “The life of man is like a game of dice ... if what comes out in throw is not what you needed, correct it by skillful playing” (Vives, *De Institutione* 196). This stress on “skillful playing” while maintaining an adoring obedience to one’s domestic master highlights the idea that education trains a woman to observe the rhetorical situation and mimic a posture is visible here.

In his writing, Vives also demonstrates the sort of “skillful playing” required of a humanist scholar tasked with the difficult project of justifying and designing a program of study for a royal female. Vives opens *De Institutione* with a long, epideictic preface, addressing the text to Catherine of Aragon, whom he praises highly. His preface makes the remarkable claim that the education of Christian women is “a subject of paramount importance” (Vives, *De Institutione* 45). Given the novelty of this claim for Vives’s historical moment, it is understandable that Vives must support his claim, arguing for the significance of his text. He does so with a series of assertions, beginning with the concept that the spiritual development of women, whom he calls, “our inseparable companions in every condition of life,” can only benefit men (Vives, *De Institutione* 45). More provocatively, in a move which highlights the context within which he is writing, Vives intimately connects the welfare of the state with the education

of women. He claims, “With good reason Aristotle says that those states that do not provide for the proper education of women deprive themselves of a great part of their prosperity” (Vives, *De Institutione* 45). After invoking the *ethos* of Aristotle, Vives then draws a connection between the state and the domestic sphere, claiming, “And if this can be said good cause of states, all the more justly can it be said of the individual household” (*De Institutione* 45). For Vives, training a princess for statesmanship means training her to be a proper wife capable of running a household; this text suggests her function as a royal wife is the full extent of her involvement in political affairs. This particular maneuver is interesting, as later, Elizabeth will make a similar connection between her involvement in the public and private sphere. However, she will use that connection metaphorically, suggesting that she is wife to the nation, and the public sphere is her household to run.

Furthermore, Vives establishes a particular audience, writing, “my precepts will not appeal to stupid, vain, and foolish girls, who enjoy being looked at and courted and would like their vices to be approved by the multitudes of sinners, as if the consensus of the common crowd could change the way things are” (*De Institutione* 48). Such a statement is significant, as he writes the text specifically for Mary Tudor at Catherine’s behest. By dismissing “stupid, vain, and foolish girls,” Vives begins his construction of the ideal female reader, subtly implying that Catherine and Mary already meet his criteria. His claim defends his work, implying that such a curriculum does not upset the status quo in regard to gender politics; unworthy women will remain uneducated and therefore politically powerless.

His statement becomes more remarkable when placed next to a subsequent assertion, in which he compares writing to painting portraits, emphasizing that lived experience provides imitable models. Vives claims:

I dedicate the work to you, glorious Queen, just as a painter might represent your likeness with utmost skill. As you would see your physical likeness portrayed there, so in these books you will see the image of your mind, since you were both a virgin and a promised spouse and a widow and now wife ... and since you have so conducted yourself in all these various states of life that whatever you did is a model of an exemplary life to others. But you prefer that virtues be praised rather than yourself. (*De Institutione* 50)

Through metaphor, Vives's texts becomes a portrait and a mirror, reflecting Catherine's virtuous and feminine behavior. However, rather than merely capturing her likeness to appeal to her vanity, Vives claims such an effort should have an educational purpose. In other words, people should read his text, or view a portrait, in order to observe a model of desirable behavior. This connection between the written and the visual is incredibly significant, as is the assertion that looking and reading lead to modelling and emulation. As Vives makes this connection explicit, claiming that women may benefit from the model provided by Catherine's behavior, he implies his text is essentially a guide for emulating the queen.

It is striking that Vives opens his first chapter, regarding unmarried royal women, by invoking the field of oratory. The opening line states, "In his book on the instruction of the orator, Fabius Quintilian expresses the view that it should begin from the cradle, convinced that no time should be wasted that could be dedicated to the attainment of those skills that we have fixed for ourselves as our objective" (Vives, *De Institutione* 53). Vives continues, stressing that a virtuous woman must nurse a girl child, more so than a boy who will learn his values outside of the home.

This passage introduces two key concepts, each of which seem antithetical to his aims. First, by invoking the process for training an orator as a model for the curriculum needed to

educate royal women, Vives begins his text by calling to mind the art of public speaking. Yet his text will focus on using rhetorical education to train women in a different sort of public performance, which often emphasizes silence. Later, in the “Maid Out of Doors” section, Vives subtly implies there are situations in which silence and attentive listening will help a woman fulfill her obligations; one may read this claim as a rhetorical strategy, akin to the ones Nancy Myers identifies. Myers describes “purposeful silence” and “perceptive listening” as strategies that, “provided the social perception of conformity and submission while offering women the opportunity to make deliberate choices about when to be silent and when to speak” (59). Vives praises the Virgin Mary’s silence as a virtue to be emulated, writing, “At the cross she was entirely speechless, she asked nothing of her Son ... because she had learned not to speak in public. Imitate her, virgins and all women ...” (*De Institutione* 133). Overtly, one may witness how such advice may be out of place for a monarch, yet the idea of purposeful silence and observation suggests a subtle strategy. In his notes to his edition of Vives’s pedagogical works, Watson refers to this discussion as “the eloquence of silence” (100). Notably, Elizabeth’s later adoption of the personal motto, “Video et Taceo” (“I see and say nothing”) palpably echoes Vives’s advice (Crane 2).

Secondly, the opening passage quickly introduces the dual nature of “counterfeiting;” early models of behavior can be positive or negative, hence his caution regarding the selection of the nursemaid. Vives writes, “She shall first hear her nurse, first see her, and whatsoever she learneth in rude and ignorant age, that will she ever labour to counterfeit and follow cunningly. Therefore ... the nurse should be no drunkard, nor wanton, nor full of talk and chatt[er]ing” (*De Institutione* 54). Vives’s comments highlight the extent to which humanists assumed the ability of a personal model to establish a lasting influence on a royal pupil’s daily behavior.

The next three sections discuss educating a girl during her early childhood, puberty, and prior to marriage. Once again, the concepts of silence and chastity dominate, as Vives warns, “do not let her be infected with a proclivity to talkativeness” (*De Institutione* 56). For the high-born female child, language is a disease with which she can be afflicted and pass that affliction on to others. He also argues against allowing the girls of the sovereign’s household to play with dolls, claiming they are a form of “idolatry and teach girls the desire for adornments and finery” (Vives, *De Institutione* 57). Again, Vives invokes the power of mimicry’s pedagogical effect, when he refers to the damage it can cause when it appears in the wrong form; in this case, dolls in fine clothing might train young girls to emulate their decorative and functionless nature.

Vives does not set a particular age for beginning formal education, suggesting that the parents, in this case, Henry and Catherine, will best know when the child is ready. He stresses that a woman’s education should elevate her spiritual nature, improve her mind, and train her to manage a household (Vives, *De Institutione* 58). He writes:

But I should not wish any woman to be ignorant of the skills of working with the hands, not even a princess or a queen. What could she do better than this when free of all the household tasks? She will converse with men, I suppose, or other women. About what? Is she to talk forever? Will she never keep quiet? Perhaps she will think? About what? A woman’s thoughts are swift and generally unsettled, roving without direction, and I know not where her instability will lead her. (Vives, *De Institutione* 59)

Vives’s construction of women as pre-disposed to dangerous chatter functions as further support for his initial claim that women should be educated. An idle and ignorant woman will talk incessantly, inflicting her fluctuating thoughts upon others. However, a woman trained to perform domestic duties will always be useful to others. This passage is significant, as it reflects

contemporary attitudes regarding women and idleness. For instance, a queen might have more leisure time than women of another status; yet many royal women often occupied their time by producing domestic objects. Later, Elizabeth will also follow this model, to an extent, producing translations and poetry during her leisure moments. Her choice reflects Vives's emphasis on reading as the most desirable occupation for a woman's free moments (Vives, *De Institutione* 59). Vives later defines the value of reading, stating:

[T]he study of literature has these effects: first, it occupies a person's whole attention; second, it lifts the mind to the contemplation of beautiful things and rids it of lowly thoughts; and if any such thoughts creep in, the mind, fortified by precepts and counsels of good living, either dispels them immediately or does not lend an ear to vile and base things (*De Institutione* 70)

In other words, reading encourages mimicry of the examples provided within the text, as seen with Vives's invocation of models such as Cornelia, the More daughters, the Virgin Mary, and even Catherine herself.

As he begins the fourth section, Vives reiterates his argument regarding the value of educating women as he acknowledges that learned women are often viewed with suspicion. He rebuts such fears, stating, "The learning that I should wish to be made available to the whole human race is sober and chaste . . . If knowledge of these is harmful, I do not see how ignorance of them will be advantageous" (Vives, *De Institutione* 64). To illustrate his position, Vives combines Classical examples of learned and chaste women with contemporary examples, such as Isabella and her daughters, and even Thomas More's relations: "Then shall I mention the daughters of Thomas More - Margaret, Elizabeth, Cecilia, and their kinswoman, Margaret Griggs - whose father was not content that they be chaste but also took pains that they be very learned,

in the belief that in this way they would be more truly and steadfastly chaste” (*De Institutione* 70). Once again, the use of models implies an ingrained emphasis on mimicry of such figures. Vives dexterously counters possible criticism that his historical examples may be unachievable, drawing on living models to prove that such behavior is feasible.

When turning to the question of what women should read, Vives stresses that literature should teach virtue. He emphasizes, “I am not at all concerned with eloquence” (Vives, *De Institutione* 71). Rather, the texts the student reads must focus on morality. Once again Vives gestures to imitation, insisting: “do not have her imitate idle verses or vain and frivolous ditties, but rather some grave saying or a wise and holy sentiment from the holy Scriptures or the writings of philosophers, which should be copied out many times so that they will remain firmly fixed in the memory” (*De Institutione* 71). Vives places emphasis on reading the Early Fathers and practical ethical works like those of Erasmus, and the New Testament, as well as the Christian Latin poets. Vives permits girls to read certain Classical poets, such as Lucan, Seneca, and Horace. He omits Virgil from the list, even though in *De Ratione Studii Puerilis ad Carolum Montjoium Guilielmi filium (A Plan of Study for a Boy)*, he deems Virgil the most significant of Classical poets: “Virgil holds the first place, and rightly so, in my opinion, on account of his seriousness and his ideas” (Vives, *A Plan of Study for a Boy* 246). This notable exclusion once again gestures to the power of imitation, as Vives may have felt that such work would have ill-effects on a female reader. When dismissing chivalric adventures, Vives claims, “But a young woman cannot easily be of chaste mind if her thoughts are occupied with the sword and sinewy muscle and virile strength” (*De Institutione* 73). Virgil’s writing, with its own emphasis on male adventuring, may likewise have caused concern. Yet for male students, Vives places Virgil “first,” providing literary models of “virile strength” and “seriousness.” Overall, that Vives

encourages female students to emulate men points to the dual nature of mimicry. On one hand, the humanist scholar desires his student to emulate materials he considers to be moral and of high quality. On the other hand, this pedagogical approach means he must allow a woman to mirror male sentiments and behavior, establishing a pattern that is at odds with creating a distinctly feminine course of study and conduct.

Though *De Institutione* enjoyed great popularity for six decades, Catherine of Aragon requested that Vives make a second effort at constructing a curriculum for her daughter in particular. Vives's second attempt appears in *De Ratione Studii Puerilis (On a Plan of Study for Children)* (1524), is composed of two letters: one for princess Mary, and the other for Charles Mountjoy, the queen's chamberlain's son. *De Ratione Studii* was published at Louvain, as part of a collection (Watson 1). Watson claims the manual for Mary, *The Plan of Education for a Girl*, was the only text of its kind for generations, stating, "*The Plan of Education for a Girl* contains the actual practical methods and curriculum of instruction for girls, the only one as far as I know which was offered in detail in England, until the publication in 1673 of Mrs. Bathsua Makin's *Essay to Revive the Ancient Education of Gentlewomen*" (20).

The pamphlet is unique, in that it offers an opportunity for comparative analysis of gendered curricula. Additionally, the collection contains a brief manual outlining a specific course of study to be followed by Mary; that is to say, it suggests for the first time in England a curriculum aimed solely at training a woman for a position of authority. Vives opens his text by stating, "You have ordered me to write a brief plan of study according to which thy daughter Mary may be educated by her tutor" (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 137). Watson claims, "In writing this practical outline, Vives was perhaps tacitly aware that Mary, sole heir to the throne, might someday be destined to rule" (13). Hence, *The Plan of Education for a Girl* diverges from

De Institutione's broad discussion of a woman's life-long learning process and performance, offering instead a particular educational program. Vives continues, writing, "Gladly have I obeyed thee, as I would in far greater matters, were I able" (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 137). Once more, Vives foregrounds his submission to his royal female patroness, while obliquely expressing regret at his inability to help her in other political matters, without overtly censuring her oppressive husband, the king. In this way, Vives feigns complete submission to the king's royal authority while subtly marking his support to the queen in a way that does not criticize those in power.

When comparing the recommended reading material from *The Plan of Education for a Girl* to those suggested in *De Institutione*, it becomes evident that *The Plan of Education for a Girl*'s reading selection contains a far more marked concern with governance. In terms of writers who he believes demonstrate "right language and right living," Vives writes, "Of this kind are Cicero, Seneca, the works of Plutarch ... some dialogues of Plato—especially those which concern the government of the State. Then the epistles of Jerome, and some works of Ambrosius and Augustine, should be read. Further, the *Institutiones Principis*, the *Enchiridion*, the *Paraphrases* [of Erasmus], ... and the *Utopia* of Thomas More" (Vives, *The Plan of Education for a Girl* 147). For poetry, Vives suggests the Christian poets Prudentius, Sidonius, Paulinus, Aratus, Prosper, and Juvenius. He also draws on some Classical poets including Lucan, Seneca the Tragedian, and Horace, though he again omits Virgil. Finally, Vives also encourages daily readings from the New Testament, picked by the princess's tutor (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 148).

Unlike in *De Institutione*, Vives explores ways to develop the royal female student's ability in the art of eloquence. *The Plan of Education for a Girl* in general demonstrates Vives's

emphasis on active learning practices. For instance, he demands that the pupil learn Latin grammar and syntax in order to actively converse in the language. In order to encourage active use of the language, Vives recommends that students in small groups converse in Latin. He writes, “Let the princess speak with her tutor and fellow pupils in Latin. Of fellow-pupils let her have three or four, for it is not good to be taught alone” (Vives, *The Plan of Education for a Girl* 145). The injunction for fellow pupils also points towards mimicry in the classroom, as the royal student may improve through interacting with and listening to others using Latin. Vives also stresses the value of emulating Classical authors in regard to conversation, turning to Cicero, Terence, and Erasmus (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 245). In light of Vives’s emphasis on women’s silence in *De Institutione*, the concept of training women in conversational skills in *The Plan of Education for a Girl* is worth noting. Considering the royal nature of his intended audience, suggesting that an authoritative woman will have need of the *lingua franca* and opportunity to exercise its use actively in conversation is very unlike the cloistered, wifely figure constructed in *De Institutione*.

To facilitate such knowledge, Vives requires the student to copy significant or striking material, such as vocabulary, sententiae, and passages that the royal student deemed significant, in a notebook, so that the student may memorize those materials for later use in their own work as well as models for emulation. He writes:

Let her get a somewhat large note-book (*librum vacuum*) in which she may jot down with her own hand, first, words if (whilst reading important authors) she comes across any words useful for daily conversation, or rare or elegant words; next, let her note forms of speaking, expressions which are witty, graceful, neat, erudite; next, examples of sententiae, weighty, amusing, deep, polite, imaginative, and practical, *from which she*

may seek example for her life. [emphasis added] (Vives, *The Plan of Education for a Girl* 146)

This practice, which draws on classical methods, serves as a precursor to Roger Ascham's assignments in *The Scholemaster*. Watson claims, "Comparing Vives, writing in 1523, and Roger Ascham in 1570, shows that Vives is the earlier pioneer in the famous system of requiring pupils to keep Paper-books. The idea common to both these educationists is to induce pupils, as far as possible, to construct their own textbooks in grammar, and to collect systematized examples of classical usage" (27). Since Vives aims at Mary, Ascham's later adoption of the notebook recommendation for boys as well marks the impact of royal female education on all education. That Vives recommends allowing the student to select the materials she copies is also a progressive move, as it empowers the student to critically engage in the reading and construct her own archive of rhetorical materials. Vives asserts, "If she read an author, and either a word or opinion please her, let her jot it down; for those things stick in the memory which we have written with our own hand, rather than what is written by another's" (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 141). At the same time, the concept of imitation remains firmly embedded in such assignments, as the student is trained to memorize, imitate, and then adapt material for use in new contexts. This process therefore ingrains in a pupil a habit of stylistic emulation and adaptation.

In doing all this, Vives also reasserts the instructor's authority, stating the tutor must also pick passages: "The lines which are put before the pupil for imitation should contain some weighty little opinion (*sententiolam*) which it will be helpful to learn thoroughly ... Therefore care should be taken that at the outset in transcription it was written with strict correctness" (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 141). The emphasis on "strict correctness" recalls Vives's concern

regarding the negative consequences of imitation; if the phrases are not probably transcribed, the princess may learn them incorrectly and thus fail to emulate the model accurately. In order to build the student's memory, he prescribes reading an assignment two to three times before bed; in the morning she must recall the material. In this manner, he writes, "thereby her wit will be sharpened, and she will prepare her memory to become easily responsive and ready for her own use" (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 141). He retains nonetheless his vision of the woman in the domestic space, reflecting a lingering tension, as he recommends the female student should focus on learning Latin vocabulary for parts of the house. Still, he also encourages the female student to practice writing in Latin, stating, "Let her begin to turn short speeches (*oratiunculas*) from English into Latin ... Let these partly be serious and religious, and in part joyful and courteous" (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 144). The concept of education as "joyful and courteous" certainly signals a humanist transition from medieval pedagogy. Furthermore, this wavering between training royal women for authority and for domesticity illustrates mimicry's strategy of self-sovereignty within compliance. Such vacillating derives from Vives's own life experience and is transmitted into his teaching manuals for the royal female pupils.

This shift to including a study of eloquence and oratory is significant, as Vives valued the power of rhetoric, even though had previously denied its usefulness for a woman. However, his religious beliefs opened an ideological space for the value of training a woman in rhetoric. Fantazzi claims, "As a master of the art of rhetoric, [Vives] believed that persuasive language could be a very effective weapon to combat the darkness brought on by original sin" (2). Vives could reconcile his previously stated belief that women should be silent with training a woman in the persuasive arts, as such knowledge would serve to help maintain her chastity.

Vives concludes by stating, "This is only, in my view, a rough sketch of studies. Time

will admonish her as to more exact details, and thy [Catherine's] singular wisdom will discover for her what they should be" (*The Plan of Education for a Girl* 147). While returning to the conventional humility *topos*, Vives models courteous behavior while also acknowledging Catherine's involvement in her daughter's education. His concluding remark places agency in her hands, in perfect accord with his pedagogical belief that young women in particular benefit from close contact with parents worthy of emulation. Furthermore, this comment highlights once more Vives's subordinate position, as a scholar addressing his social superiors, instructing royal parents on how to raise their child. Any threat to the social order that such an effort might pose is mitigated by his submission to his royal patron's wisdom.

Vives also produced a textbook for Mary's use, known as the *Satellitium* (*The Bodyguard*). Watson claims that this text was the first of its kind in English, as it offered a set of axioms focused on morals and civics (20). Notably, Vives dedicates the textbook to Mary, acknowledging her as the *Princeps Cambriae*, or Prince of Wales, signaling the fluid gender space offered by the term "princeps." In his dedicatory epistle, Vives writes:

It has been customary that a satellitium (escort, guard) should be attached to princes, to keep constant watch over the safety of their life and body ... there is no guard more sure or more faithful than innocence, and love of the people; which is not wrenched out of them by warfare or terror, but is called forth by love, trust, diligence, and by provision of benefits for the good of all. (*Satellitium* 151)

Here, Vives implies that knowledge and wisdom will guard the leader's innocence, thereby gaining the love of the people. He dismisses the traditional function of the male ruler as a martial chief, elevating the concepts of garnering positive public opinion through preserving the general welfare of all classes as the primary concerns of an effective ruler. In order to safeguard the ruler

against vice and folly, Vives offers over 200 “guards” in the form of *symbola* (maxims). For each entry, Vives offers a brief saying, followed by a longer explanation, sometimes accompanied by an example. Notably, these maxims highlight a shift from his earlier stance regarding instructing royal women in domesticity to training them for public life. At the same time, the maxims remain broadly applicable, thus seeming not to overtly prepare a woman for exercising authority in the public sphere. In this way, Vives imitates compliance with tradition while preparing the royal pupil with advice that would be of use as monarch. For instance, Vives writes, “*Magnum satellitium, amor* - Love is the great bodyguard.” His explanation states: “Not arms, nor wealth is the protection of the kingdom, but friends; for no one wishes to hurt the one he loves” (Vives, *Satellitium* 156). This emphasis on public popularity calls to mind Elizabeth’s later careful crafting of her public relations. This cultivation of public opinion is evident as early as Elizabeth’s 1558 procession into London, as a firsthand account describes her response to the crowds: “her Grace, by holding up her hands, and merie countenance to such as stode farre of, and most tender and gentle language to those that stode nigh to her Grace, did declare herselfe no lesse thankfullye to receive her Peoples good wyll, than they lovingly offered it unto her” (*Progresses and Public Processions* 38). The performance of devoted interest in their approbation reinforces the populace’s sense of an emotional connection between sovereign and subject in which may be discerned in Elizabeth’s adoption of Vives’s proscription to incite love among one’s followers. Furthermore, this performance draws on a long monarchic tradition.

Throughout the maxims, the binary between a military-minded ruler and a ruler educated so as to be cautious is reinforced several times. For example, he writes dismissively of those who represent their authority through war-like imagery: “Their ferocities take upon them the insignia of lions, bears, panthers, wolves, snakes, dragons, hounds, eagles, vultures, swords, fires and

things of that kind; as if it were beautiful, magnificent and truly worthy in a King to be of a mind which imitates what is savage, greedy, cruel, bloodthirsty” (Vives, *Satellitium* 153). He amplifies this concept elsewhere, writing: “We must regard as noble all those who cultivate their mind by the practice of letters. Let others have painted on their escutcheons—lions, eagles, bulls, leopards; those possess more true nobility who could produce as their possessions images learned from the liberal arts in place of such ensigns” (Vives, *Satellitium* 153). This maxim anticipates Elizabeth’s later proudly displayed learning, in which markers of her robust education often replace symbols of military might as a means of establishing her royal ethos.

Princely sacrifice also appears throughout the text, as Vives encourages the royal student to consider the needs of the people before her own. For instance, maxim 121 states, “Princeps, multis consulendo (A Prince must consult the interests of the many) ... And so a Prince fulfils his duty by shaking off his own personal convenience, and his own feelings (*affectus*)” (Vives, *Satellitium* 156). Once again, his language points towards an ambiguously gendered space, as Vives refers to the princely figure using masculine pronouns, although his audience is ostensibly Mary Tudor. At the same time, he instructs the royal student to put her concerns last, an idea that is not unfamiliar with the prescribed early modern doctrine of feminine behavior. Again, Vives’s work anticipates, and likely influences, Elizabeth’s later royal posturing, as she often claims to put the needs of her people before her own. She expressed this sentiment during her 1558 procession into London, stating, “And wheras your request is that I should continue your good Ladie and Quene, be ye ensured, that I will be as good unto you as ever Quene was to her People ... And perswade your selves, that for the safetie and quietnes of you all, I will not spare, if need be, to spend my blood” (*Progresses and Public Processions* 49). The reference to self-sacrifice and bloodshed alludes to older models of royal authority, in which the monarch served as a

military leader. Though Elizabeth was unlikely to lead an army personally, she invokes the image of a military commander as well as a saintly martyr, metaphorically placing her physical well-being second to the preservation of her nation.

Though Elizabeth never studied under Vives, as he fled England in 1528, Watson believes it is likely that Elizabeth also studied Vives's *Satellitium*, writing, "We know that one of the books mastered by King Edward VI in 1546 ... was this very *Satellitium* and as the Princess Elizabeth at that time was educated by the same tutor, Richard Coxe, there is good reason for the conclusion that Elizabeth herself must have studied this textbook of Vives" (1-2). Making such a claim with at least this textbook, if not *De Institutione* and *The Plan of Education for a Girl*, strengthens the likelihood that Elizabeth observed early on the pedagogical strategy of imitation, in close connection to many rhetorical maneuvers that she would later apply in the political arena. Whether she consciously drew from this text, or even perhaps studied Vives's other works, is not clear. Yet Vives's material influenced leading thinkers of the era, establishing a pedagogical course of action for those individuals directly involved in teaching the Tudor offspring. However, Elizabeth's application of similar strategies demonstrates the intimate connection Vives would draw between education and practice. Watson writes, "Vives kept clearly in mind that all life is an education" (27). On a daily basis, a student might encounter models of behavior, such as that of instructors, that could prove useful to emulate in other contexts.

CONCLUSION

In his preface to Margaret Roper's translation of Erasmus's *Treatise Upon the Pater*

Noster, Hyrde urges the reader to emulate Roper, stating, “follow still in her steps, look ever upon her life, to inform your own thereafter, like as ye would look in a glass, to tire your body by” (172). Appearing as it does in a preface to a female-authored translation of a male-authored text, this invocation of imitation as a mirror to help one costume oneself indicates the pervasive and embedded role of modelling and imitation in educational and compositional practices. As the humanist curriculum encouraged students to translate pieces and memorize models to extract in later contexts, this practice created a space and strategy for female students to use such models to access new opportunities, as shown by Roper’s publication. Furthermore, this sort of exercise encouraged women to emulate men, to a degree, which opened the possibility of further imitation of other “masculine” behaviors.

Thus, the humanists evinced an uneasy relationship with their reliance on mimicry. The slippage is clear as early as Vives’s *De Institutione Feminae Christianae*. For instance, he calls upon the female reader to contemplate the ideal behavior of the Virgin Mary, claiming, “She must first of all reproduce in herself Mary’s unrivaled virtue, her modesty and moderation of spirit, which we commonly call humility” (Vives, *De Institutione* 114). As a Catholic, Vives knows that such a model is unattainable, so any reproduction will inevitably fall short. Later, when offering strategies for promoting harmony within marriage, Vives again encourages imitation, claiming that the clever wife will mimic her husband’s behavior: “She will take on his facial expressions, smile at him when he smiles, and be sad when he is sad” (*De Institutione* 215). In both instances, Vives offers a model for the female reader to mimic, knowing she can never be the ideal of the Virgin Mary or the authority figure in a marital relationship, such as the husband.

Yet Vives offers several invectives against mimicry in the same text. In a particularly

aggressive passage, he states, “Let women do nothing that is counterfeit and feigned so that they may appear good, nor should they hope to change or deceive nature. Things that are simulated do not have the same validity as things that are true” (Vives, *De Institutione* 114). This struggle between seeming and being opens a productive space. The proposed curricula emphasize imitation as a fertile tactic which produces mirrors of the models. Yet they recognize imitating the model does not lead to becoming the model. A sophisticated student, such as Elizabeth Tudor, might recognize and exploit the gap. At the same time, Vives clearly outlines the inherent danger of mimicry: the simulation may eventually be discovered, leading to the failure of the counterfeiter’s endeavor. In the context of performing royal authority, such a threat has wide-reaching consequences.

This discussion of modelling and emulation increases in significance when tied to Elizabeth Tudor, for if she had no particular model to imitate as a queen in her own right, other than Katherine Parr as Queen Regent, then she had to identify available models to invent her public persona. While Vives emphasizes a variety of female figures to imitate, his manual makes several assumptions. In fact, his education treatises contain significant gaps: they fail to contemplate a woman who does not have a mother to emulate, nor do they discuss a woman who never marries. Such silences leave exploitable gaps for a woman looking to establish a role with autonomous authority; by cobbling together aspects of familiar available types, a savvy rhetor can create a new persona that has the potential to be both original and socially acceptable.

Such manuals could not account for all possibilities; the interstitial space between the definitive roles for women offers fertile ground for generation and manipulation. Returning to the “eulalic” strategy of seeming compliance found in Erasmus’s “Coniugium,” Correll writes, “But that does not mean such power ... will extend beyond the devious and indirect, that it could

ever become more than a power that folds upon itself in a decisive moment of self-subordination” (249). Yet in Elizabeth, mimicry and eulalic posturing allows for the direct exercise of power through an indirect means of establishing a sophisticated model of female agency in the public sphere. Thus, it is fruitful to examine the bricolage of Elizabeth’s education against the early discussions regarding the ideal curriculum for a Tudor princess. To what degree did her educational experience align with the proposed program of learning? How might the deviations from the idealized norm that the young Elizabeth experienced, such as the loss of her mother and consequently her social rank, potentially prove useful in the creation of a rhetor proficient in mimicry and adaptation? What models of behavior and rhetorical performance were readily available to Elizabeth in her formative years? Nancy Myers offers a definition of rhetorical agency, stating, “as a construction, rhetorical agency operates performatively and dynamically, including not only language but also behavior/action and manner/dress” (59). Given this expansive definition, how might one witness the ways in which Elizabeth employed mimicry as a rhetorical strategy in multiple modes?

Returning to her speech at Oxford in 1566, while continuing her humble posture, Elizabeth states:

[B]lame ... belongs properly to me because, let everyone note, I have applied my effort for some time to good discipline and even longer in learning; however, my teachers have put their effort into barren and unfruitful ground, so that I am not able to do what I wish most, to show fruit worthy either of my worth or of their labors or of your expectation.

(“Latin Oration” 91)

It is the efforts of Elizabeth’s various instructors that are worthy of extended analysis, as even Elizabeth herself recognized their far-reaching impact on her public and political postures.

CHAPTER III

“A CAUSE TO MAKE US LIVE WELL”: ELIZABETH TUDOR’S HOUSEHOLD CIRCLES
AND KATHERINE PARR AS EARLY RHETORICAL MODELS

In 1549, Elizabeth Tudor pleaded for the release of her servant, Kat Ashley, stating, “We are more bound to them that bringeth us up well than to our parents, for our parents do that which is natural for them - that is bringeth us into this world - but our bringers-up are a cause to make us live well in it” (“To Edward Seymour” 34). This remark, at the intersection of pedagogy and politics illustrates how Elizabeth’s early education played a pivotal role in developing her rhetorical strategies for the public sphere. Elizabeth Mazzola emphasizes the importance of this early training, stating, “Elizabeth I will keep one foot in the schoolroom for nearly all of her reign, characterizing herself in a 1576 speech as ‘rather one brought up in school to bide the *ferula* than traded in a kingdom to support the scepter’” (*Learning and Literacy* 169). During Elizabeth’s youth, women’s education remained objective-oriented, preparing young aristocratic women for politically advantageous marriages. Yet, as Henry VIII struggled to produce a male heir, the possibility of a woman inheriting his throne became increasingly likely. This unique exigency likely leads to an anomaly in early English pedagogy: the educated royal female humanist.

Historians have commonly believed that the two Tudor daughters, Mary and Elizabeth, received very different training. Kathi Vosevich repeats this assumption, stating, “These opposing pedagogies produced very different Tudor rulers: Mary, who fashioned herself a ‘princess’ or a ‘queen,’ and Elizabeth, who preferred ‘prince’ or ‘king’” (62). Vosevich claims that Mary’s later behavior demonstrates the production of “specifically gendered pupil” (67).

However, it is likely that Elizabeth's formal education overall was similar to her half-sister's. Though Vives's texts were intended to direct Mary's education, Roger Ascham's accounts indicate Elizabeth inherited Mary's curriculum, though she experienced some modifications. The royal half-sisters appear to have shared a similar academic upbringing, modeled on the theories of Erasmus and Vives in particular. They read many of the same texts, practiced translation and composition in a similar manner, and recognized the value of public demonstrations of learning. Aysha Pollnitz claims Elizabeth's surviving lessons more closely imitate Mary's work than Edward's. While it is enticing to suggest that a humanist curriculum shaped by Protestant concepts better prepared Elizabeth for public life than did Mary's, Pollnitz suggests that this narrative is a retrospective construction of Roger Ascham's (136). Yet if Mary Tudor's curriculum, which was also humanist in nature, provided the basic model for Elizabeth's education, then what can explain the divergence in their public performances? What early influences trained the future queen in the art of mimicry?

Regarding Elizabeth's early education, current scholarship makes little of the life-long influence of her female instructors, as represented by her household servants and royal relatives. From the onset, educated women played a vital role in shaping the young princess for her future. In her work, Tracy Borman acknowledges the long-lasting impact of Elizabeth's relationships with other women, describing part of her work as, "focused upon those women who had the greatest influence on Elizabeth: those who forged her opinions in childhood, trained her for queenship, and helped her to achieve legendary status as Gloriana, the Virgin Queen" (xvii). From those noblewomen tasked with running the princess's household, to a royal step-mother who was the first woman to publish in England under her own name, Elizabeth encountered several female instructors. In most relevant scholarship on Elizabeth, their early influence is

typically overlooked or only glossed upon, in favor of the “formal” education offered by their male counterparts, such as William Grindal, Jean Belmaine, and Roger Ascham. Mazzola contextualizes the domestic learning environment and influence of these female instructors on early modern education in general, stating, “the writing taught by men was often set against the reading practices of women in the Tudor classroom, and the woman writer was posed against those women who had first helped her learn her letters” (“Schooling Shrews” 12). Though Elizabeth would later fashion for herself a model of female authority that was removed from the experience of other women, she was also shaped by the strategies she witnessed women using in order to achieve their objectives.

From the beginning, Elizabeth was immersed in a predominantly female household. As early as three months old, Elizabeth took her place at Hatfield, a household run by women tasked with caring for the royal child (Borman 25). Borman emphasizes the early and consistent influence of women on Elizabeth, stating, “In her own private world . . . it was the women, more than the men, who held sway” (xvi). Such female figures included the requisite female attendants and governesses. Early on, Elizabeth’s mother, Anne, would occasionally visit her; later, Henry’s subsequent wives would also interact with the young princess, to varying degrees. Elizabeth’s older half-sister, Mary, also resided with the princess for periods of time, initially giving precedence to the infant princess.

Many of the women in Elizabeth’s early household were not simply servants; they also acted as instructors for the princess, initiating her education. Though Vives emphasizes the mother’s role in a child’s early education, Elizabeth’s parents were by and large absent at the onset of her instruction. In their place, women instructors began to shape the child’s knowledge, introducing her to reading, writing, and translation. Such a system was reflective of a larger

trend, in which women actively engaged in educational practices within households, sharing information and resources. Mazzola describes the common practice as: “[a] scholarly and affective network, where women move in and out of each other’s households, share books and ideas, read together, and educate children” (*Learning and Literacy* 32). Thus, noble children, both male and female, began their education under the tutelage of a variety of female instructors. Instruction was incorporated into every aspect of daily living.

As the typical objective of female education was an advantageous marriage, domestic instruction often included training in etiquette, such as table manners and proper forms of address, and practical domestic crafts, such as needlework. Other activities included music, dancing, riding, as well as studying foreign languages, such as French and Italian. Borman claims, “Such courtly pursuits were the closest that Elizabeth came to be trained for the throne” (85). Ayasha Pollnitz echoes this dismissive view of Elizabeth’s early education by her female attendants, stating, “Her early education was not princely” (133). Views such as Borman’s overlook the radical potential inherent in these feminine pursuits, as these skills could serve as tools to be manipulated by a sophisticated rhetor in the public arena. At the same time, by foregrounding these traditionally accepted skills, a collaborative style of education allowed women to jointly inform the initial instruction of their royal female student without transgressing social mores.

In this regard, Elizabeth’s early childhood household was not exceptional. Lady Margaret Bourchier, later Lady Bryan, served as her Lady Governess for four years, as she had also done for Mary earlier. Bryan’s surviving letters indicate her fondness for the child. She describes Elizabeth, stating, “As toward a child of gentle conditions as ever I knew in my life ... she shall so do as shall be to the King’s honor and hers” (Bourchier 190). The Victorian historian Agnes

Strickland credits Lady Bryan with heavily influencing Elizabeth's character during her formative years, claiming, "Much of the future greatness of Elizabeth may reasonably be attributed to the judicious training of her sensible and conscientious governess" (10). Lady Bryan offered a consistent maternal figure in lieu of Anne during Elizabeth's transition from princess to lady when she was three years old; however, Elizabeth later lost Lady Byron's attention to Prince Edward in 1537 (Borman 62).

In Lady Bryan's place, Blanche Melbourne, Lady Troy became Elizabeth's governess, running the domestic part of her household. Melbourne may have taught Elizabeth, as well as her half-brother Edward, the fundamentals of writing (Borman 66). Melbourne introduced into Elizabeth's household Blanche Parry, sometimes referred to in records as "Apparrie," whose influence would be significant much later in Elizabeth's life. As Parry was bilingual, fluent in both English and Welsh, she likely exposed the princess to Welsh at an early age (Borman 66).

In 1536, Katherine "Kat" Ashley, previously Champernowne, joined Elizabeth's retinue, marking the start of a long, influential relationship. Ashley took charge of the then three-year old's education, assuming the governess position (Borman 69-71). Ashley's father, Sir Philip Champernowne, supported educating daughters. As a result, Ashley was versed in classical scholarship as well as in emerging humanist concepts (Borman 69). Ashley continued Elizabeth's training in reading and writing, introducing her to basic principles of grammar. Analyzing Elizabeth's earliest surviving letter, Pollnitz claims that Ashley may have also initiated Elizabeth in the study of Italian and French, rather than the classical languages (133). However, by the time Elizabeth was five, her education also included the study of Greek and Latin (Borman 85). Katherine's husband, John Ashley, a distant relative of Elizabeth's through her Boleyn relations, described their interactions as "Our pleasant studies in reading together

Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Cicero and Livy" (3). Roger Ascham, who later would serve as one of Elizabeth's formal tutors, openly praised Ashley's efforts in regard to Elizabeth's early training.

He writes:

Gentle Mrs. Ashley, would God my wit wist what words would express the thanks you have deserved of all true English hearts for that noble imp by your labour and wisdom, so flourishing in all godly godliness, the fruit wherof doth even now redound to her grace's high honour and profit, of singular commendations against men, and desert at God's hands, to the rejoicing of all that hear it, to the example of all that follow, and to me, although the least amongst the most, yet one knoweth best (Ascham, "To Mrs. Ashley" 85)

He also asks that Ashley give his regards to Lady Troy and "all that company of godly gentlewoman" (Ascham, "To Mrs. Ashley" 86). Here Ascham acknowledges and offers courteous praise to those women in charge of fostering Elizabeth's early learning, even though he will fail to do in his later account of Elizabeth's schooling in his text *The Scholemaster*.

In 1539, when Thomas Wriothesley visited Elizabeth's household, the precocious and intelligent child impressed him. Following the visit, he remarked, "If she be no worse educated than she now appeareth to me she will proved of no less honour to womanhood than shall beseem her father's daughter" (Starkey 26). Kat's tutelage lasted five years. Although in 1542, Richard Cox, Edward's tutor, took charge of Elizabeth's formal education, Elizabeth herself continued to affirm the strength of her relationship to Ashley, stating, "I will know nothing but that she shall know it" (qtd. in Borman 95). Such a comment from a royal offspring is significant as it shows the impact of a minor figure on a young woman of significant political standing.

Like the humanist pedagogues tasked with designing a formal curriculum for a royal female pupil, the women charged with Elizabeth's upbringing also negotiated complex and fluctuating statuses. As the young Tudor offspring's status altered, those women around her faced real political exigencies; they focused on re-defining Elizabeth's status following her mother's execution, worked to restore her to her royal father's favor, and strove to construct a pious image of Elizabeth as a means of surviving her half-sister's reign. Such efforts brought these women into dangerous proximity to those with political power; on more than one occasion, women close to Elizabeth were incarcerated in an effort to undermine the princess. From the very beginning, thus, Elizabeth witnessed the value of slyly mimicking authority as a means of creating a space for agency, as the women around her used the posture of an educated Christian woman submitting to patriarchal authority in order to influence those politically connected to their young royal charge.

ELIZABETH'S EARLY HOUSEHOLD AND WOMEN INSTRUCTORS

As the offspring of a legally questionable union and an individual with uncertain social status following Anne Boleyn's demise (1536), Elizabeth experienced an inconsistent curriculum. The goals of her education fluctuated. She was prepared initially as a potential heir to the throne, or at least, as a pathway to the throne via a political marriage, but once she was formally removed from the line of succession, her education guided her towards a public life as a courtier. While her early formal education well-prepared the princess for a more rigorous curriculum, her female instructors offered Elizabeth more subtle instruction in rhetorical strategies through their responses to the volatile nature of court life. As a result of these early

experiences, Elizabeth understood the value of adaptability and strategic posturing, learning to feign compliance as demonstrated by her educational training and displayed by those who instructed her.

The women of Elizabeth's household faced overt political pressures and real dangers as a result of their proximity to the princess. The makeup of Elizabeth's early household reflects the larger political tensions in the Tudor court, as those closest to her initially represented the Boleyn family interest. Lady Shelton and Anne Clere, Anne Boleyn's aunts, organized and maintained the household. Margaret Bouchier, Lady Bryan, who was Anne's maternal half-sister, was Elizabeth's "Lady Mistress" or governess. Lady Bryan's appointment highlights Elizabeth's status as a Tudor offspring, as she was Mary's governess previously for six years (Borman 26). Likewise, Blanche Melbourne, Lady Troy, also served in Elizabeth's household after serving in Mary's. The political implications of keeping Boleyn sympathizers close to the young Tudor mark a deviation from Mary's upbringing; the Boleyn women strived to shore up the political prestige of a family that did not have a royal lineage. Such efforts must have subtly altered, if not entirely discarded, older modes of establishing authority. Such political allegiances and agendas were cloaked in familial interactions and benign domestic concerns, especially during moments of crisis.

Following Anne's execution, Elizabeth's female attendants negotiated uncharted waters in regard to their young charge; the Boleyn connection was no longer a boon. Despite not being central figures at court, Elizabeth's female attendants now faced the problem of defining the parameters of a Tudor child's social status without the benefit of a royal mother or an accessible father. An early example of such cautious maneuvering appears in Lady Bryan's letters to Thomas Cromwell, in which she requests clarification regarding Elizabeth's status:

Now, as my lady Elizabeth is put from that degree she was in, and what degree she is at now I know not but by hearsay, I know not how to order her or myself, or her women or grooms. I beg you to be good lord to her and hers, and that she may have raiment, for she has neither gown nor kirtle nor petticoat (Bourchier 90)

At the time, such a request could be dangerous, yet Bryan poses as a servant in need of instruction, so that she may know the proper manner in which to rear the child. Bryan also writes to Henry's council regarding Elizabeth's supposed lack of attire, though Anne had recently ordered a whole new suite of clothes (Borman 55-56). Such domestic concerns were practical, but subtly served a larger political purpose. Borman states, "[Lady Bryan] was desperate to ensure that Elizabeth was not permanently neglected by the king and his council . . . But she was also ambitious and had no desire to become sidelined in a court where she was used to enjoying some status as chief custodian of the royal heirs" (56). Her letter of feminine concerns reminded the council of the child who could have been overlooked in the political shuffle as the Seymour family ascended in royal favor. It likewise also demonstrated that Lady Bryan remained an attentive and efficient governess, reminding the right people of her skills should the opportunity to rear another Tudor child arise. The approach worked; when Edward was born, Lady Bryan became his governess, leaving Elizabeth in the care of others. Thus, Lady Bryan's letters use of the guise of conformity as well, as the guise of the concerned servant allows her to speak to those in power, stabilize the young girl's social status and protocol around her, as well as put herself forward in the event of another royal birth.

Conversely, Katherine Ashley's multiple arrests vividly illustrate the significant dangers attendant to remaining close to a figure of such political significance as Elizabeth. Ashley, an intelligent but unconventional instructor, isolated her charge from female playmates and

disregarded contemporary instructional approaches which discouraged displays of affection towards one's pupil (Borman 71). This early relationship had a long-lasting influence on Elizabeth, as the pair maintained an intimate relationship into Elizabeth's adulthood.

During the Seymour Affair, in 1549, during which Thomas Seymour was accused of seeking to marry Elizabeth without the Privy Council's approval, both Elizabeth and Ashley were interrogated. During her deposition, Ashley admitted to initially entertaining the possibility of the marital alliance; she also asserted that she attempted to protect the young Elizabeth from Seymour's inappropriate behavior at Chelsea and Hanworth while under Katherine Parr's supervision. Ashley's deposition relies heavily on the language of propriety. For instance, when Seymour entered Elizabeth's bedchamber, Ashley claims that she "bad him go away for shame" (*Retrospective Review* 217). At the same time, she actively depicts Elizabeth as an unwilling participant in Seymour's pretenses at playfulness, taking pains to stress Elizabeth's virtuous response to his flirtations. On another instance in which Seymour invaded her private space, Ashley claims Elizabeth hid from him, stating, "she ran out of hir Bed to hir Maydens, and then went behind the curtain of the Bed, the Maydens being there" (*Retrospective Review* 218). This incident, which Ashley later claims not to have witnessed personally, portrays Elizabeth as a virtuous maiden, hiding from an intruder. Ashley also casts aspersions on Parr, who believed she saw Elizabeth embracing Seymour, stating she believes Parr concocted the event out of jealousy, "Howbeit, thereby this examine did suspect that the Queen was gelows betwixt them, and did but feyne this" (*Retrospective Review* 218). To add credibility to this dismissal, Ashley states that all of Elizabeth's women know such an encounter is unlikely, claiming, "for there came no Man, but Gryndall, the Lady Elizabeth's Scholemaster" (*Retrospective Review* 218). Such an assertion foregrounds the idea of Elizabeth's propriety and highlights her education, subtly

replacing the alleged image of her as a lascivious young woman embracing another's husband with the portrait of a studious and chaste lady. This is the posture that will be emphasized throughout Elizabeth's career.

Worth noting here is that much of Ashley's deposition relies on second-hand information and potentially strategic forgetfulness, interesting elements for the woman who was so close to Elizabeth. For example, in regard to when she first sent Seymour from Elizabeth's bedchamber, Ashley claimed, "she knoweth not if this were at Chelse, or Hanworth" (*Retrospective Review* 217). During the episode in which Elizabeth hid from Seymour, Ashley claims not to have been present, as the testimony claims, "[Ashley] heard of the Gentlewomen. She thinks Mr. Power told it her" (*Retrospective Review* 218). Noticeably, she seemingly cannot even recall who told her of such an incident, which at once distances her from the event, without putting other women directly under consideration. Ashley also disavows personally noticing signs of affection from Elizabeth towards Seymour, instead claiming her husband warned her to be cautious with their interactions. She concludes her response to this question by vaguely suggesting someone else had also noticed such signs: "And one other told hir so also, but she cannot tell who it was" (*Retrospective Review* 218). Ashley thus indicates awareness without implicating herself; she suggests her knowledge of any initial relationship between Elizabeth and Seymour is second-hand. In March 1549, Elizabeth demonstrated her affection for her instructor, advocating for her release from prison in a letter, asking:

[I]t would please your grace and the rest of the Council to be good unto her. Which thing I do not to favor her in any evil (for that I would be sorry to do) but for these considerations which follow ... because she hath been with me a long time, and many

years, and hath taken great labor, and pain in bringing of me up in learning and honesty
 (“To Edward Seymour” 34)

Elizabeth’s emphasis on “learning and honesty” subtly implies that if the council condemns Ashley for inappropriate behavior, then in a fashion, that verdict would be cast upon Elizabeth’s own reputation as this woman has been her long-time mentor. At the same time, that Elizabeth should stress Ashley’s involvement with her education marks the increased value placed on a royal woman’s education; Elizabeth offers it as an example of Ashley’s worth.

In 1554, Elizabeth was in political danger once more, due to suspicion of involvement with Sir Thomas Wyatt’s revolt. Evidence suggests that Ashley was also imprisoned at this time, for a period of of about fifteen months. On May 20, 1555, the Council ordered Sir Roger Cholmley “to set at libertie Katheryne Asheley who hath long tyme remained in his custodie” (*Acts of the Privy Council* 129). In May 1556, following the Throckmorton Plot and subsequent efforts in which conspirators planned to replace Mary with her half-sister, Mary’s officials searched Elizabeth’s houses for evidence of involvement. In the course of these searches, Katherine Ashley was found to be in possession of “seditious” texts and “and other defamatory libels;” she was arrested once more, as was Elizabeth’s Italian instructor Battista Castiglione (Borman 164). The Venetian ambassador described the dangerous materials discovered in Ashley’s possession, stating, “This governess was also found in possession of those writings and scandalous books against the religion and against the King and Queen which were scattered about some months ago” (*Calendar of State ... Venice* 475). That a person so close to Elizabeth should have this banned material did not bode well for Elizabeth, once again highlighting the perceived influence of one’s female mentors. However, Ashley only confessed to knowing about the plot “through common report” and not having informed officials (*Calendar of State Papers*

... *Mary I*, 82). Her failure to do so warranted capital punishment at the time, though she did not suffer the lethal consequence. Instead, the Venetian ambassador reports that Mary forbid her from returning to Elizabeth's service: "deprived not only of her office as governess, but forbidden ever again to go to her ladyship" (Michiel 717). During each dangerous period, Ashley posed as a humble and dedicated servant, yet deftly avoided implicating herself in direct involvement with dangerous activities by emphasizing that her knowledge comes secondhand.

These noble-born women tasked with caring for and educating Elizabeth thus provided early models of women engaging with and reacting to political exigencies. Their proximity to the young Tudor often placed these women in fraught situations. Throughout her childhood, Elizabeth witnessed the women around her use their education to create various acceptable guises that allowed them to navigate the fluctuating tide of political power, as they strove to support Elizabeth as well as their own familial or personal agendas. Though their contributions to Elizabeth's education were often domestic or rudimentary in nature, these women did not just impart formal learning to the young Tudor but also the skills that she would draw upon later in her effort to craft a feminine posture of royal authority. As such, women from multiple social strata, such as Elizabeth's early female mentors, used affectation and emulated tradition in order to actively pursue agendas antithetical to the patriarchal norm. Young Elizabeth witnessed such strategies that obscured the intent to exercise agency in order to influence events, learning the value of appearing to comply with or mimic societal conventions. The rhetorical lessons Elizabeth learned from them is reflected in the fact that throughout her life, Elizabeth kept many members of her early household by her side. She explained her decision to retain these educated women, including the controversial Ashley, as, "Our love naturally continues toward those with whom we have passed our youth" (qtd. in Borman 71).

THE INFLUENCE OF ROYAL WOMEN ON ELIZABETH'S EDUCATION

Surrounded by female attendants daily, Elizabeth also encountered royal female models throughout her life, though on far less consistent basis. While significant speculation exists concerning the lasting psychological influence of Elizabeth's mother, step-sister, and several step-mothers, scholarship has yet to engage in a nuanced consideration of their impact specifically on Elizabeth's education. At different intervals, a royal woman took charge of Elizabeth's curriculum, appointing instructors, overseeing text selection, and monitoring the princess's progress. These women interacted with significant scholars of the age, modelling the ways in which a royal woman might exert authority through the guise of an educated Christian woman involved in domestic matters, rather than overtly invoking her queenly authority.

Though she was only briefly and sporadically a part of Elizabeth's childhood, her mother Anne Boleyn initiated a progressive program of study for her daughter. Well-educated in courtly skills, such as singing, dancing, and playing instruments, Anne was also proficient in literary studies and foreign languages, such as French. She honed her courtly abilities in the French court, attending first Mary Tudor, and then Queen Claude; she also formed a friendly attachment to Margaret of Navarre (Borman 5-6). As a result, Anne encountered a series of models of authoritative women as well. Anne's connection to Navarre is of particular interest, given her support for advancing women's education, as is Elizabeth's later translation of Navarre's *Miroir de L'âme Pécheresse*, which she titles *The Mirror or Glass of the Sinful Soul*.

Though their time together was brief, Anne's experience is recognizably a significant influence on Elizabeth's later rhetorical strategies. Borman writes:

But above all, it would be the example provided by Anne's life- in particular its end- that would prove her greatest legacy to Elizabeth ... Anne had had qualities that would have made her a great queen, but she also had a number of fatal flaws. It was in learning from both that Elizabeth was able to become the queen that her mother was never able to be.

(47)

Though scholarship often focuses on Anne's spectacular fall from royal favor, her strategies for creating social and political opportunity were sophisticated and effective. Anne provided her daughter with a legacy in which performance played a key role in creating agency. Most notoriously, Anne used coyness and delaying tactics to hold the attention of a fickle, yet extremely powerful man, Henry VIII, for six years. Her famous use of delay and ambiguity in response to Henry's ardent courtship foreshadows her daughter's own deft use of such tactics. For instance, in a surviving example of Henry's correspondence with Anne, he writes, "By turning over in my thoughts the contents of your last letters, I have put my self into a great agony, not knowing how to understand them, whether to my disadvantage, as I understood some others, or not; I beseech you now, with the greatest earnestness, to let me know your whole intention as to the love between us" (H. Tudor, "Letter IV" 10). Later, Anne sought to rescript her identity, replacing the image of the desirable lover Henry sought with a public posture that embraced chastity. During her procession into London, Anne invoked the image of the Virgin Mary, dressing in white with her hair unbound as a means of illustrating her purity and worthiness to be queen (Borman 13). As queen, Anne worked to promote religious reformers, often soliciting positions for them constructing such maneuvering as appropriate for a queen concerned with the good of the public. In one such instance, when the recipient of her favor, Edward Crome, hesitated to accept a proffered position, Anne wrote to chastise him:

We greet you well, marveling not a little that, albeit heretofore we have signified unto you at sundry times our pleasure concerning your promotion unto the parsonage of Aldermary ... which we have obtained for you, yet you hitherto have deferred the taking on you of the same; by which your refusal, we think that you right little regard or esteem your own weal or advancement. We, minding nothing more than the furtherance of virtue, truth, and godly doctrine ... signify therefore unto you, that our express mind and pleasure is that you shall use no farther delays in this matter (Boleyn, “Queen Anne Boleyn to Dr. Crome, 1535”)

Anne constructs her critique as concern for Crome’s well-being and promotion, claiming that he seems to “little regard or esteem [his] own weal or advancement.” She further claims her interest in his placement stems only from a desire for the public good as represented by “the furtherance of virtue, truth, and godly doctrine.” This justification of her intervention deflects any suggestion that she stands to gain personally from his placement or that she is overstepping her queenly duties by advancing reformationists. Later her daughter, Elizabeth, would use similar theatrics and coyness.

In the wake of Anne’s fall from power, Mary Tudor became Elizabeth’s unlikely champion at court (Borman 60). Though their relationship was fraught with tensions throughout their lives, Mary appears to have softened towards the young, motherless child. During Anne’s reign, Mary served in Elizabeth’s household, demoted from princess to lady. With Anne removed, Mary assumed some control over Elizabeth’s daily life, including overseeing her lessons (Borman 63). Through Mary’s supervisions of Elizabeth’s lessons, it is likely that the latter’s early education included the same curriculum that Mary had.

Surviving evidence of Elizabeth's early school-work includes religious translations, similar to Mary's school exercises. When Mary was about eleven, she produced an English translation of Latin prayer by Thomas Aquinas, which asks for the ability to be virtuous: "Lord, let all worldly things be vile to me for thee, and that all thy things be dear to me, and thou, good Lord, most specially above them all" (qtd. in Strickland 109). Like Mary's work, Elizabeth's translations circulated at court, showcasing Elizabeth's early mental prowess. The circulation of Elizabeth's religious translations, such as her translation of the first chapter of John Calvin's *Institution de le Religion Chrestienne* and Marguerite de Navarre's *The Mirror or Glass of the Sinful Soul* which explored themes of personal virtue and religious contemplation, point to a posture that Mary also frequently assumed: that of the educated Christian woman (Pollnitz 133). Pollnitz stresses this point, claiming, "Elizabeth and her teachers evidently saw the pattern of the well-educated Christian woman as a useful hand-me-down from Mary. Perhaps they thought it would help to establish Elizabeth's virtue in the eyes of those who had seen her mother's disgrace" (135). The choice to circulate religious translations to a public courtly audience reflects the way in which Elizabeth's coterie of instructors wanted her to be perceived at court and in royal circles. The lasting influence of this model is apparent: even as late as November 1566, Elizabeth seemingly disavowed her rich privileged upbringing, telling Parliament, "Indeed, I studied nothing else but divinity till I came to the crown, and then I gave myself over to the study of which was meet for government" ("Speech to a Joint Delegation" 96). In this way, Elizabeth appeared simultaneously as a devout Christian woman, learning appropriate material until her circumstance changed. In the quotation, Elizabeth disingenuously postures as though she only considered any knowledge related to exercising civic authority only after it became necessary for

her to do so, maintaining the non-threatening narrative of her early education as purely for religious contemplation.

While Elizabeth's immediate royal relations might reasonably be considered significant influences, a series of other royal female figures entered the young Tudor's life through her father's several marriages. For instance, Henry's fourth wife, Anne of Cleves, showed an interest in fostering a relationship with Elizabeth. Following the annulment of her royal marriage, Anne still expressed a desire to be in Elizabeth's company, requesting that the girl be allowed to visit. Anne stated, "to have had [her] for her daughter would have been greater happiness to her than being queen" (Strickland 15). Despite the brevity of her marriage, Anne likely represents an undervalued influence, given her rare ability to survive marriage to Henry and turn the disastrous match to her advantage. Anne assumed the posture of Henry's modest and loving sister, leveraging this guise into a political tool that allowed her to cultivate a space at court and a comfortable life without the control of a husband. In 1523, in response to Henry's request for an annulment, Anne wrote:

It may please your majesty to know that, though this case must needs be most hard and sorrowful unto me, for the great love which I bear to your most noble person, yet, having more regard to God and his truth than to any worldly affection ... though it be determined that the pretended matrimony between us is void and of none effect ... yet it will please you to take me for one of your humble servants, and so determine of me, as I may sometimes have the fruition of your most noble presence ... and that your highness will take me for your sister. (Boleyn, "Letter LXXIII" 160)

Here Anne submits graciously to the king's will, disguising any eagerness on her part through her devout posture, granting God and the clergy the ability to rule on the marriage's validity.

Thus, she gives Henry what he wants without offering any insult. At the same time, she furthers her cause, by continuing to appeal to Henry in familial terms, seeking the protection a brother might extend to a sister. Elizabeth likely observed such nuanced maneuvering. It would be difficult to say that an observant young Elizabeth would not have seen lessons in clever political behavior from the discreet maneuvers of Anne of Cleves.

Yet it is Henry's last wife, Katherine Parr, whose impact may be the most remarkable, especially when seeking potential divergences in the Tudor half-sisters' educational experience. In contrast to Elizabeth Mary was 27 years old by the time Henry married Katherine. Then 10 years old, the former was at an impressionable stage in her education. William Hunt and Reginald Poole describe Parr as "Watchful of the king's abrupt and angry humours ... [as] the mild Queen Katherine, with her books, her devotions, her seemly reverence for the Lady Mary, her strict sense of discipline, is a refreshing figure" (453). This description highlights Parr's ability to recognize kairotic moments through her "watchfulness," negotiating Henry's mercurial nature and leveraging his affection at the opportune moments into political action. Moreover, it is her "seemly" behavior that enables her to influence the political scene of England, including the education of the royal heirs. Given that children often learn a great deal from observing the behavior of their elders, Parr offered a young Elizabeth a distinctive model of royal female behavior.

Like other women in Elizabeth's life, Katherine Parr was the product of a progressive education. Her widowed mother, Maude, established a school for her own family and other noble-born children in her home at Rye House, drawing on humanist models for educating both boys and girls (Porter 34). As Pearl Hogrefe details "Roger Ascham wrote to Anne [Katherine's younger sister and later Lady Herbert, Countess of Pembroke] in Latin and she lent him a Latin

volume of Cicero; she also wrote him at one time that the education in her family had been modeled on that of the More household” (183). Anthony Martienssen goes as far as to claim that Juan Luis Vives taught Katherine Parr at this court school, which would create an enticing direct line of transfer from Vives to Parr to Elizabeth, stating, “From 1523 onwards, the principal tutor at the Royal school at court was Juan Luis Vives ... Catherine [of Aragon] persuaded Henry that he would be better employed [than teaching at Cambridge] as tutor to Princess Mary and the other girls at court. Katherine Parr was nine years old, and Princess Mary was seven when Vives took over their education” (21). No historical evidence, however, supports this claim regarding the direct interaction of Vives, nor does Martienssen cite or indicate any primary sources that led him to this conclusion.

Yet the connection between Vives’s educational model and Parr should not be dismissed entirely. Anne Parr’s letter to Ascham directly mentions Thomas More’s household as an influence on her family’s education; More and his clerk Richard Hyrde worked to develop the first English translation of Vives’s *De Institutione*, suggesting it is likely that this text influenced More’s own model. Familial connections existed between the Parr and More family, first through Katherine’s father Thomas, who was friends as well as in-laws with Thomas More, and then through Cuthbert Tunstall, a distant cousin but significant male figure following the death of Thomas Parr, who had formed close friendships with humanist figures such as More, Thomas Linacre, and Erasmus (Porter 30). More actually refers to Cuthbert in the opening of *Utopia*, stating, “his virtue and learning be greater and of more excellency than I am able to praise them” (Porter 30). Given the connections between those responsible for supervising her curriculum it is likely that Katherine’s education was rigorous. Thus, there are several lines of transmission for Vives’s ideas to have significantly shaped Parr’s own educational experience and rhetorical

strategies, which then leads to the plausible correlation that Parr potentially drew on this model for informing her supervision of Elizabeth's education.

Katherine's education is an important factor to consider when analyzing Elizabeth's later rhetorical maneuvering. Unlike her half-sister, Mary, who was also trained within a humanist framework, Elizabeth was influenced by a surrogate mother-figure with both strong humanist and Reformationist interests. As part of her education, Katherine encountered the work of thinkers such as: Quintilian, Plutarch, Cicero, Homer (in Latin translation), Aristotle, Erasmus, Thomas Linacre and Guillaume Bude (Porter 36). She also embraced the humanist notion that valued direct readings of classical works and scripture as a means of avoiding reliance on centuries of intervening interpretation and scholarship by Church figures (Porter 35). Given Vives's emphasis on a mother's role in a girl's education, it makes sense that Elizabeth's learned stepmother filled the void; Katherine used her role to influence the Tudor children who had significant political futures.

In 1544, Katherine chose to become closely involved in the supervision of the younger Tudor children's education (*Learning and Literacy* 31). First, she established Edward and Elizabeth in a newly reorganized household at Hampton Court; as part of the reorganization, she also revised the royal school (Hogrefe 201). Borman describes the royal curriculum under Katherine's guidance as: "languages, theology, history, rhetoric, logic, philosophy, arithmetic, literature, geometry, and music" (91). In 1544, the same year Elizabeth was restored to the succession, Katherine selected William Grindal as Elizabeth's personal tutor. Notably, Katherine Ashley influenced Katherine's choice, demonstrating a valuable link between the women in Elizabeth's company daily and the woman now in charge of her affairs (Borman 92). The earliest example of Elizabeth's writing, dated, July 31, 1544, is addressed to Katherine Parr. In

the letter, written in Italian, an 11 years old Elizabeth eulogizes Katherine's many virtues (Porter 196-197). Parr also introduced Elizabeth to the writings of Marguerite de Navarre, such as *Miroir de lame pecheresse (The Mirror of the Sinful Soul)*, which Elizabeth translated into English in 1548. Her translation was published as *A Godly Medytacion of the Christen Sowle* ("Introduction" 426). This choice of text is significant for a number of reasons, the first of which is that Marguerite was a preeminent example of an educated royal woman who wielded great influence. Secondly, Borman claims that *The Mirror of the Sinful Soul* offered further rhetorical guidance to Elizabeth, encouraging her to distance herself from other women: "One of the most important lessons that Elizabeth had taken from Margaret of Navarre was that women were essentially weak, inferior beings and that only by emulating the characters of men could a queen succeed in this world" (99). In examining a history of influences that may have informed Elizabeth's later strategies, it is useful to note how this text might have suggested to Elizabeth the strategy of constructing an identity for herself separate from that perceived of other women. Though the text certainly paints the female speaker as abject, sinful, and submissive before a male God, Borman's analysis overlooks the remarkable chain of female influence, linking Marguerite de Navarre, Katherine Parr, and Elizabeth Tudor. Katherine's selection of texts such as that of Navarre suggests an innovative approach to educating a young royal female, as the text simultaneously conforms to the moral principles espoused by pedagogues such as Vives and by introducing such an author into the princess's curriculum, adds a female model to the pantheon of learned postures.

However, Katherine did more than simply oversee Elizabeth's education. She also provided an effective model of an educated female monarch. For example, Katherine used her education as a means of establishing her *ethos* as an appropriate match for the king, despite her

lack of royal blood. At her behest, William Grindal was appointed Elizabeth's tutor; later, she selected Roger Ascham to replace him. On that occasion, Ascham writes:

Would God my wit wist what words would express the thanks you have deserved of all true English hearts, for the noble imp by your labour and wisdom now flourishing in all goodly godliness, the fruit whereof doth even now redound to her Grace's high honour and profit. I wish her Grace to come to that end in perfectness with likelihood of her wit, and painfulness in her study ... which your diligent overseeing doth most constantly promise. ("To Mrs. Ashley" 85)

Ascham's letter demonstrates the effectiveness of her "labour and wisdom" in generating a queenly reputation. Furthermore, Katherine modelled the way in which the guise of a learned Christian woman could be used to create a space for political agency. For instance, Katherine conducted salon-style discussions with her attendants, both women and men (Hogrefe 196).

Mazzola states, "What I would emphasize ... is the particular scholarly environment Parr shaped for the women in her circle, so that the skills which courtly wives and servants needed to employ included intellectual and editorial ones" (*Learning and Literacy* 31). On a daily basis, she would study with others for an hour in the afternoon, typically reading through scripture. Hogrefe claims, "Sometimes her group also listened to sermons on abuses in the church. Though she held these meetings with the approval of the king and even discussed them with him, they may have roused the fear of conservatives" (196). Henry permitted these meetings, likely due to their devout nature. Notably, as a New Year's gift in 1546, Elizabeth gave Katherine her translation of the introductory chapter of the first French edition of Calvin's *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne* (1541), which demonstrates Katherine's influence and openness to such topics. These meetings also demonstrated that women and men could consider complex and fraught

social issues together, perhaps offering an impressionable Elizabeth a model in which collaboration, scholarship, and Christian ideology played significant roles for navigating dangerous and divisive issues.

In the fall of 1544, Katherine demonstrated the potential of her posture as a devout and educated woman, when she ruled in Henry's absence while he led an expedition to France. Present at Hampton Court, and therefore in close proximity to Katherine, at 11 years old Elizabeth witnessed first-hand an immediate model of female rulership. Porter underscores the importance of the event, stating, "It gave her the unique opportunity to observe a woman ruler in action ... While Elizabeth watched, Katherine governed England" (199). Borman likewise emphasizes this under-examined moment, claiming, "Classics and languages were all very well, but this sojourn with her stepmother was providing [Elizabeth] something far more valuable: a role model for queenship" (98). Katherine demonstrated political prowess and foresight. For instance, on occasion she included Mary Tudor in her informal meetings with foreign envoys (Hogrefe 198). By having Mary present, Katherine highlighted her right to act as Henry's regent, as he trusted her to look after his offspring and successors while he was absent. Furthermore, Katherine allowed Mary, now as an adult, to witness royal interactions and remain connected to foreign figures, both of which Katherine likely thought might prove useful in the future. A young Elizabeth thus witnessed mentorship between women. While it is hard to determine how much a child would have deliberately extracted from witnessing such mentorship, the experience was likely formative for Elizabeth. For a full understanding, however, of the model of strategic posturing that Parr displayed for Elizabeth it is necessary to conduct a careful examination of Parr's *Lamentation of a Sinner*.

MIMICRY AND UNREADABILITY IN KATHERINE PARR'S LAMENTATION OF A
 CONFESSED SINNER

Katherine Parr holds the literary distinction to be the first female English author to publish under her own name. *Lamentation of a Confessed Sinner* was published November 5, 1547, nine months after Henry died. The work was published again in 1548, then once more in 1563, indicating a degree of popularity (Hogrefe 192). *Lamentation* contains a preface by William Cecil, which praises Parr's work to further religious reform. Cecil writes:

Here mayst thou see ... a woman of high estate: by birth made noble, by marriage most noble, by wisdom godly; by a mighty King, an excellent Queen; by a famous Henry, a renowned Katherine. A wife to him that was a King to realms: refusing the world wherein she was lost, to obtain heaven, wherein she may be saved; abhorring sin, which made her bound, to receive grace, whereby she may be free; despising flesh, the cause of corruption, to put on the Spirit, the cause of sanctication; forsaking ignorance, wherein she was blind, to come to knowledge, whereby she may see; removing superstition, wherewith she was smothered, to embrace true religion, wherewith she may revive. The fruit of this treatise, good reader, is thy amendment; this only had, the writer is satisfied. ("Prefatory Letter" 445).

At the same time, his preface encourages the audience to pardon the confessional tenor of the text, in which the queen assumes a self-castigating posture, fervently confessing her previous transgressions as a result of her previously uncritical acceptance of the unreformed religion. Cecil claims, "This good lady thought no shame to detect her sin, to obtain remission; no vileness, to become nothing, to be a member of Him, which is all things in all ... This way

thought she her honor increased, and her state permanent ... Of this, I would thee warned, that the profit may ensue” (“Prefatory Letter” 445). Cecil explains Katherine’s self-castigation as an act of public good, as she offers an example for others to emulate. Janel Mueller claims, “It is understandable that Cecil considered his *apologia* necessary. By late 1547 English readers had been exposed to nothing resembling such abjection in print from so exalted a personage” (“Introduction” 426). Yet the text is not merely an exercise in individual abjection; rather, Katherine writes in order to offer a model to Christians, working to highlight the benefits of Lutheran and Calvinist practices. A singular piece without direct antecedents, Katherine’s text alternates between conventional postures in order to make public a private experience with the intent of encouraging others to undergo a similar personal transformation. In other words, a Tudor queen offers to the public a carefully crafted version of her private experience as a cultural model to be emulated, while drawing on accepted and conventional models in order to do so.

Cecil concludes his prefatory letter stressing that the text is inherently aimed at encouraging emulation. He states, “See and learn hereby what she hath done: then mayst thou practice and amend that thou canst do. So shalt thou practice with ease, having a guide; and amend with profit, having a zeal ... See thou her confession, that thou mayst learn her repentance; practice her perseverance, that thou mayst have like amendment” (Cecil, “Prefatory Letter” 445). Thus, *Lamentation of a Sinner* proposes a model of lived experience, while also assuming conventional postures that allow the queen to boldly offer her example to a public audience. Mueller remarks on the generic hybridity of the text, noting that the text moves from the private experience to the public sphere (“Introduction” 427). Borman makes a further assertion, stating, “Katherine adopted the persona of a ruler who chastised his subjects for their lack of faith. ... Katherine was not promoting the rights of women over men; she was promoting

her own rights, and in so doing, setting herself apart from the rest of the female sex as an exceptional example of learning and authority” (103). Given the strong likelihood of Elizabeth having read Parr’s work, such posturing can be interpreted as a striking early rhetorical model by a woman for Elizabeth to encounter, one which she internalized in her own rhetorical practices.

Notably, for a text that uses a private experience as the springboard for wider, public changes, Katherine’s work contains very few autobiographical details. Those which are included establish her *ethos* as an authority figure, due to her marriage to Henry. At the same time, that exalted status problematizes her abjection, as it might undermine her authority, as Cecil’s preface fears. Katherine’s text diverges from the literary convention in which women translated *ars moriendi* texts, which focused on dying well. Instead, *Lamentation* addresses how one should live. As a result of this divergence, Katherine’s literary predecessors are male, forcing her to undergo complex authorial negotiations. Mueller claims, “enablement is not merely a product of circumstances. It is also the process that the woman author makes readable in the very production of her text. She reveals both the force and the limits of this process in how she, as author, handles her compositional models” (“Tudor Queen” 18). Parr’s status as queen at once gives her some space to write, but it constrains how she may frame what she has to say in regard to living a devout life.

The text’s composition and publication history points to Parr’s awareness of the need for caution when addressing a public audience. During her brief tenure as regent in 1544, Parr proved an apt leader. The following year, her first text, *Prayers or Meditations*, was published. However, though Parr composed *Lamentation* in 1547, the text was not published until the following year, after Henry had passed away. With its more daring subject matter, in which Parr openly criticized Catholicism and offered opinions on the ways in which the reformed religion

should take shape, the publication's timing is strategic. Following Henry's passing, the widowed queen could harness positive public sentiment and sympathy, even drawing on nostalgia as she represented a connection to the king that severed the ties to Catholic church. Her *Lamentation* thus made use of the unique period in her life in which she was a highly visible figure with ties to the court and a positive reputation, public sympathy, and freedom from the threat of displeasing a powerful husband with a history of violently discarding offending wives. Finally, the transition to a new reign, through Edward VI's Regency Council, marked a moment in which new political and religious concepts seemed possible. Katherine's connection to the past allows her to speak about the possibilities for the future.

Parr's *Lamentation* is preoccupied with creating a Christian community based on a shared faith derived from Scripture and lived experience (Mueller, "Tudor Queen" 19). To model the way in which individuals contribute to and construct such a community, the text moves from the speaker's private experience to more public, and at times political, concerns. *Lamentation* begins with the speaker's personal process of converting to a reformed version of Christianity, describing her increasing awareness of the flaws of her past behavior through a series of "moralized commonplaces" (Mueller, "Tudor Queen" 25). Parr writes:

When I consider, in the bethinking of mine evil and wretched former life, mine obstinate, stony, and untractable heart to have so much exceeded in evilness that hath not only neglected, yea, contemned and despised God's holy precepts and commandments, but also embraced, received, and esteemed vain, foolish, and feigned trifles: I am, partly by the hate I owe to sin, who hath reigned in me, partly by the love I owe to all Christians, whom I am content to edify, even with the example of mine own shame, forced and constrained with my heart and words to confess and declare to the world, how ingrate,

negligent, unkind, and stubborn I have been to God my Creator; and how beneficial, merciful, and gentle He hath been always to me, His creature, being such a miserable and wretched sinner. (447)

Even as she describes her own failings and transgressions, Parr constructs her text as an act of service to other Christians, claiming she is “content to edify” others with her example. Then, Parr advances her agenda by drawing on the established genre of devotional work, describing the Crucifix as an internalized image Christians should contemplate. Finally, Parr describes her conclusions from such contemplations, calling for moral renewal for those who delay the establishment of Protestantism and a reformed community of Christians in England. Parr states, “I beseech the Lord to send the learned and unlearned such abundance of His Holy Spirit, that they may obey and observe the most sincere and holy Word of God. And show the fruits thereof, which consisteth chiefly in charity and godly unity: that, as we have professed one God, one faith, and one baptism, so we may be all of one mind and one accord, putting away all biting and gnawing” (480). However, as Mueller claims, “But she stops short of proposals for institutional reform, contenting herself with decrying abuses and promoting godly uses of learning” (“Tudor Queen” 39). This lack of overt calls for public or political action points to an intentional rhetorical strategy, as the queen strives to expose wrongs, both in her past behavior and the religious institution that fostered it, through her individual experience, offers a replicable process through the filter of conventional devotional literature, and then merely hints at the actions that would institute greater changes. Thus, through the guise of a devout Christian woman, properly concerned with private experiences and silent, internal contemplation, Parr suitably suggests that her readers could make active changes in the religious and political arena.

Tracy Borman and Janel Mueller read her cautious posturing in very different ways.

Borman claims Parr assumes a masculine guise, posturing as a ruler advising his people how to save themselves from the errors of a flawed institution, stating: “Katherine adopted the persona of a ruler who chastised his subjects for their lack of faith” (103). If this interpretation is accepted, then Parr’s literary effort offers an early model to the young Elizabeth, creating a posture in which a queen may speak without arguing that all women should be permitted to do so. However, Mueller finds the speaker of Katherine’s text to be less aggressive, rejecting the idea that the speaker assumes an authoritative stance. She claims, “the genderlessness of the self-representation [derives from] the combination of universalism and personalism that energized early Protestants ... [which] empowers Katherine to conceive of herself as a subject for discourse on these common grounds” (Mueller, “Tudor Queen” 25). Through this lens, Katherine uses conventional self-effacement as a means of erasing her identity, thereby striving to establish a universal entity that is devoid of gender through which she might speak. For instance, Parr states, “Truly, I have taken no little, small thing upon me: first, to set forth my whole stubbornness and contempt in words ... Who is he that is not forced to confess the same, if he considers what he hath received of God, and doth daily receive? Yea, if men would not acknowledge and confess the same, the stones would cry it out” (448). Furthermore, to avoid transgressing too far into masculine territory, Parr draws on her position as a Henrician queen, conforming to expectations by overtly constructing herself as a wife in service of her husband (Mueller, “Tudor Queen” 34-35). Parr overtly ties her project to Henry’s own religious reforms, claiming, “But our Moses, and most godly, wise governor and King hath delivered us out of the captivity and bondage of Pharaoh. I mean by this Moses, King Henry the eight[h], my most sovereign, favorable lord and husband ... And I mean by this Pharaoh the Bishop of Rome, who hath been and is a greater persecutor of all true Christians than ever was Pharaoh, of the children of Israel” (468). As a

result, Parr creates a posture that is at once universal to Christians and also situated very specifically in her unique position as a royal wife.

Katherine's text is an amalgamation of established genres, such as a conversion narrative and personal history, drawing on literary conventions to introduce her unconventional religious concepts. Thus, the interjection of personal details advances the text's agenda, moving from the internal, private experience to the larger public sphere with possible implications for religious and political action. During those moments that Katherine overtly calls attention to her gender, she harnesses traditionally feminine roles as a means of establishing her *ethos*. For instance, she claims that being a wife is her vocation, then describes the value of married Christian women. Katherine emphasizes the educational role early modern women played, stating, "they teach honest things, to make the young women sober-minded, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste housewifely, good obedient unto their husbands, that the Word of God be not evil spoken of" (Parr 482). By defining the function of the Christian wife as an instructor, and emphasizing that she herself is a married woman, she thus creates the space in which she can speak in an instructional manner without transgressing cultural norms. Parr ends this portion of *Lamentation* by emphasizing the roles each person plays, including wives, writing:

The true followers of Christ's doctrine hath always a respect and an eye to their vocation ... If they be women married, they learn of Saint Paul, to be obedient to their husbands, and to keep silence in the congregation, and to learn of their husbands, at home ... But they teach honest things, to make the young women sober-minded, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, housewifely, good, obedient unto their husbands, that the Word of God be not evil spoken of. Verily, if all sorts of people

would look to their own vocation, and ordain the same according to Christ's doctrine, we should not have so many eyes and ears to other men's faults as we have. (482)

Notably, Parr stresses the educational function of women within the domestic sphere, indicating their far-reaching influence, at least in terms of preparing other women for their domestic obligations and moral behavior. Her concerns, couched in private, familial language, also apply to the entire English population. Mueller claims, "Parr characteristically ends this reflection by generalizing her concern, appropriate to her royal status, for social and religious concord throughout the realm of England" ("Introduction" 439). As the wife of the king, it is appropriate for Katherine to reflect on the welfare of the nation, while she also insists her opinions derive entirely from private, personal experience. She clearly offers this private experience as a model for others to contemplate. In his preface to the work, Cecil echoes this objective, stating, "Let us, therefore, now feed by this gracious Queen's example" ("Prefatory Letter" 446).

At the same time, *Lamentation of a Confessed Sinner* relies on the language of self-abasement, as Katherine often asserts her unworthiness. For instance, Katherine writes, "I have, certainly, no curious learning to defend this matter withal, but a simple zeal and earnest love to the truth, inspired by God" (Parr 459). This humble posture was common for women writers; Elizabeth mirrors it as a child and throughout her life. Mazzola suggests this humility and claims of faulty knowledge and literacy be viewed as another strategy, stating, "A woman could easily disown a scandalous piece of writing by attributing it to her inadequate training ... Early modern women's texts often arrive packaged in doubts and misgivings, asking their readers to contemplate a writer alongside of rather than embedded in her work- to conceive of literary authority as a kind of knowing distance from a text" (*Learning and Literacy* 2). Thus, by employing such language, Katherine in some ways highlights her identity, insisting the reader

consider the sort of training, or lack thereof, that might mitigate any problematic issues in the text, while also creating a safe distance from potentially dangerous sentiments.

Throughout *Lamentation*, Katherine uses a series of comparisons in order to describe how unlike Christ her past behavior has been. In one such binary, she states, “Christ came to serve His brethen; and I coveted to rule over them. Christ despised worldly honor; and I much delighted to attain the same” (Parr 452-453). While this contemplation remains personal in nature, the emphasis on ruling is important to note, as it once again points to Katherine’s social status. Though the binary is presented as an individual experience, the implication is that a Christian ruler should be less invested in personal gain; rather, the ideal Christian ruler should place the needs of her people first. The significance of such a statement should not be overlooked, as it is a daring comment from a Henrician queen writing while Henry is still alive.

The *Lamentation* can be read as a subtle instruction manual for serving as a Christian prince within a reformed framework. At first, Katherine stresses that a prince is unable to match God’s example, asking:

Is there any worldly prince or magistrate that would show such clemency and mercy to their disobedient and rebellious subjects, having offended them? I suppose they would not with such words, allure them, except it were to call them whom they cannot take, and punish them, being taken. But even as Christ is Prince of Princes and Lord of Lords, so His charity and mercy surmounteth all others. (Parr 455)

The pious language cloaks a potentially subversive critique, as Katherine places mercy as a prime virtue of a Christian prince. Given the political and religious turmoil that marked Henry’s reign, comments regarding clemency for those who offended the monarch could be dangerous, as is the reminder that the monarch is second to Christ. Yet this passage also demonstrates that a

royal female rhetor can deploy religious discourse in order to speak back to the patriarchal structure, a strategy Elizabeth often used, referring to Christ as a model for her behavior.

Katherine overtly invokes religious discourse to create the space for her intervention in arenas typically inaccessible to an early modern woman, as she states, “Well, I shall pray to the Lord to take all contention and strife away, and that the sowers of sedition may have mind to cease their labor” (Parr 467). Though she claims that prayer is the way in which she will intervene in the efforts of those individuals looking to disrupt peace in the nation, it is clear that her text itself is a more active effort to influence a public audience.

Embedded throughout the text is a continued comparison of worldly princes and Christian subjects to Christ, gently offering a model of secular authority modelled on religious virtues. Katherine elaborates on Christ’s virtues, describing them as: “humility, patience, liberality, modesty, gentleness, and with other His divine virtues” (Parr 461). Again, a female monarch could easily draw on these characteristics, as they are already marked as “feminine” by scholars such as Vives. Katherine also comments, “If the victory and glory of worldly princes were great, because they did overcome great hosts of men, how much more was Christ’s greater ... The princes of the world never did fight without the strength of the world” (Parr 461). While this commentary continues emphasizing Christ’s superiority to worldly monarchs, it also offers an alternative definition of strength that rejects military might. Such a definition is of particular use to a ruler looking to build a form of authority that is not reliant on traditionally masculine pursuits. In other words, a female monarch might assimilate a definition of authority that relies on displaying authority in a way that does not rely on military might. This concept of a secular monarch’s authority being affirmed through mercy, rather than violence, appears again later, as Katherine states, “When a prince, fighting with his enemies which sometime had the sovereignty

over his people, and subduing them, may kill them if he will, yet he perserveth and saveth them ... Now, in such a case, the prince doth show himself a greater conqueror, in that he hath made them, which were rulers, to obey; and the subjects to be lords over them, to whom they served, than if he had utterly destroyed them upon the conquest” (462-463). This preoccupation with princely mercy in a text overtly dedicated to sharing a personal conversion experience is interesting, as what might otherwise be read as critique or instruction to a social superior is coached in the discourse of private contemplation.

Katherine demonstrates a keen awareness that her text may tread dangerous ground, as she directly invokes the figure of Henry VIII, assigning to him the many virtues that she has just privileged. She writes, “But thanks be given unto the Lord, that hath now sent us such a godly and learned King, in these latter days, to reign over us: that, with the virtue and force of God’s Word, hath taken away the veils and mists of errors, and brought us to knowledge of the truth by the light of God’s Word” (Parr 467-468). Given Mueller’s supposition that this text was likely composed in the wake of the Privy Council’s efforts to undermine Katherine in 1546, this passage in particular highlights her use of the humble and submissive guise in an effort to reaffirm her reputation as a wise and modest woman (Mueller, “Introduction” 24-25). The emphasis on Henry’s role as both the speaker’s sovereign and husband points to her proximity to the king while also reminding the reader of her wifely posture. At the same time, she avoids appearing to criticize or instruct the king, as she depicts Henry as an illuminating figure who sees more clearly than his subjects.

Despite seeming to be a spiritual biography, the text performs a bit of mimicry itself, as it repeatedly, yet subtly, functions as a conduct manual, aimed not only at suggesting ideal behavior for princes, but also behavior for English subjects at large. Borman’s claim that

Katherine behaves like a (male) monarch in the final section of *Lamentation* is plausible, as Katherine confidently asserts that all people should strive to imitate Christ's behavior. She openly laments that many individuals only go so far as to appear to be following his example, stating:

For they are clothed with Christ's garment in utter appearance, with a fair show of all godliness and holiness in their words. But they have so shorn ... and turned Christ's garment and so disguised themselves that the children of light ... account and take them for men which have sold their Master's garment, and have stolen a piece of every man's garment. Yet, by their subtle art and crafty wits, they have so set those patches and pieces together that they do make the blind world and carnal men believe it is Christ's very mantle. (Parr 478)

The metaphor of clothing as representing posing, "a fair show of all godliness and holiness," calls to mind Richard Hyrde's description of emulating admirable models: "like as ye would look in a glass, to tire your body by" (172). Furthermore, Katherine's comments regarding improper posturing, "by their subtle art and crafty wits ... they do make the world blind," anticipates what will be Roger Ascham's anxiety regarding the misappropriation of strategic simulation by the unscrupulous, the "graceless grace" of "som Smithfield Ruffian" (*The Scholemaster* 43 - 44).

This concern signals the dangers inherent to the improper use of mimicry.

Considering that in 1545, Elizabeth translated into Latin, French, and Italian, Katherine's first text, as well as her continued intimacy with Parr, Borman's suggestion that Elizabeth likely encountered Parr's *Lamentation* as well is not unreasonable (Mazzola, *Learning and Literacy* 31; Borman 103). In the letter prefacing her 1545 translation of the first chapter of Calvin's *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne*, also a gift for Parr, Elizabeth states:

[F]ollowing principally the intention of my author, I was emboldened, and ventured to translate it word for word, and not that it might be a perfect work, but assuring myself that your Highness will pay more regard to the zeal and the desire I have of pleasing you than you will to the capacity of my simple ability and knowledge ... I most ardently entreat to vouchsafe that you may grow so very perfectly in the knowledge of Him that the organ of your royal voice may be the true instrument of His Word, so as to serve as a mirror and lamp to all true Christian men and women. (E. Tudor, "To Queen Katherine" 12)

Embedded in this preface are the early markers of Elizabeth's seeming compliance, as she draws on the conventional posture of humility in order to engage with and share controversial material. The final sentiment regarding Katherine's "royal voice" is particularly remarkable, as it suggests a space in which the queen might actually "speak" to a public audience with Elizabeth's aid in the form of the translation. Also notable is Elizabeth's suggestion that Katherine would serve as a mirror, the omnipresent metaphor for modelling: "that the organ of your royal voice may be the true instrument of His Word, so as to serve as a mirror and lamp to all true Christian men and women." By invoking this metaphorical intersection of identity and voice, Elizabeth pointedly highlights the way in which Katherine's rhetoric can guide others towards emulation.

Thus, when piecing together the history of Elizabeth's early rhetorical instructors and models, Parr played a significant part that is often overlooked, both in terms of her brief Regency, as well as her sophisticated deployment of mimicry in her public efforts. Regarding her authorial voice, Mueller writes, "While she as a woman can neither legislate nor preach reform, she can make an example of herself as a regenerate sinner through her authorship" ("Tudor Queen" 40). Parr overtly offers herself as a model for people of either gender to follow; however,

her rhetorical maneuvering for doing so also projected a model that a sophisticated rhetor can emulate, in which a royal female sets herself apart from other women, relying on accepted conventional postures to pursue an unconventional agenda.

CONCLUSION

Nicholas Udall alludes to Katherine Parr's influence on women at court, as demonstrated by her salon style meetings, stating:

When I consider, most gracious Queen Katherine, Dowager, the great number of noble women in ... England, not only given to the study of humane science and of strange tongues, but also so thoroughly expert in holy scriptures that they are able to compare with the best writers as well as indicting and penning godly and fruitful treatises to the instruction and edifying whole realms in the knowledge of God, as also in translating good books out of Latin and Greek into English for the use ... of such as are rude and ignorant of the said tongues, I cannot but think ... the famous learned antiquity so far behind these times (Hogrefe 192-193)

Udall's comment regarding the use of women's translations for use outside their private circles points to the increasing visibility of educated women. Part of this visibility connects directly to early modern English women's role in educating children from an early age, as was the case for Elizabeth. Yet, the influence of these early female instructors on the evolution of Elizabeth Tudor's rhetorical strategies, by and large, is overlooked by scholarship. During the sixteenth century, contemporaries acknowledged the significant role such women played in the early

education of noble and royal women, remarking on the shifting cultural values in which an education and intellectual curiosity became desirable traits for courtly women.

While court figures such as Udall may have praised such women for their scholarly pursuits, others expressed anxiety over the lasting influence of female figures in regard to training children. For instance, in *De Institutione*, Vives demonstrates anxiety regarding early female influences, starting with nursemaids and governesses, emphasizing that a young pupil must avoid incautious women:

Therefore let the maid flee [from such woman] unto her mother as unto a sanctuary and show unto her what that ungracious body would have done, or else so avoid and keep herself from her, that they that see it may perceive by her cheer that she feareth the mischievousness of that woman, and so she shall do herself good with the deed, and other[s] with her example, when she showeth other maids, what they ought to fear in that woman. (*De Institutione* 85)

Vives's caution that the connection with a poor female guardian is enough to seriously damage one's reputation subtly acknowledges the significant impact these early models had on their pupils. The passage reinforces the idea of modelling, as the young woman's rejection of an inappropriate female figure will supposedly reinforce the behavior Vives values. Ironically this passage displays the slippage in Vives's concern regarding female influence, implying that women exert the most influence on one another's actions and reputations.

Whereas Vives indirectly betrays an awareness of the lasting impact of these early instructors, Roger Ascham will later completely erase their contributions in his retrospective account of Elizabeth's schooling. While such a self-serving strategy is not surprising given that Ascham's stated objective for *The Scholemaster* is to offer an instructional model for other male

instructors to follow, Ascham's neglect of these female mentors is mirrored by his famous pupil. Including the solitary instances noted earlier, Elizabeth rarely identified herself in connection to her female instructors and predecessors, crafting an identity that did not rely on her immediate female models. Mazzola states that this distance from other women is apparent even in the way that later Tudor era women referenced their education, stating, "when Elizabeth Tudor and Jane Grey write about themselves, they write about their learning, and they adopt a very different position towards reading than that of their mothers or other female teachers, women who had probably instructed these girls how to read in the first place. None of Elizabeth's later writings or speeches ... make any reference to powerful women" (Mazzola, "Schooling Shrews" 12-13). Unlike her predecessors, Elizabeth proudly used her learned status as a rhetorical tool, often highlighting her scholarly prowess as a means of affirming her authority. Yet Elizabeth also deftly deployed the posture of humility, apologizing for her supposedly clumsy efforts, a strategy that many women shared. So, even though Elizabeth's compositions did not overtly reference authoritative women, the lack of such figures does not mean she was not keenly aware of the ways in which women negotiated precarious cultural positions in order to pursue their agendas. Mazzola claims, "Early modern Englishwomen's writings often conceal rather than reveal what women knew" (*Learning and Literacy* 2). The lack of drawing attention to such figures may have allowed her to more easily emulate their strategies without inheriting affiliations with traditional women's roles or displaying undesirable connections to her royal female forerunners.

Unsurprisingly, while much is made of Elizabeth's efforts to establish herself as distinct from other women, she typically maintained close relationships with her early female mentors. Many women from her childhood household later occupied positions at her court, remaining in close proximity to the queen. For instance, on September 26, 1562, a newsletter in Rome

remarks on Kat Ashley's enduring connection to Elizabeth, describing her as "Mrs. Asheley, who had such influence with the Queen that she seemed, as it were, patroness of all England" (*Calendar of State Papers: Rome* 105). Mazzola describes the female instructors, stating, "There are many reasons to regard these early modern children's early teachers as full-fledged partners in the humanist scholars who might take over instruction later, and not as rivals to or homespun versions of them" (*Learning and Literacy* 26). That Elizabeth continued her intimate connection with women such as Kat Ashley and Blanche Parry while she was queen, even while not much mentioning them in her writings, is a testament to the value she placed on their early interactions and contributions to her development. The various ways in which these early women figures conducted themselves through the shifting political climates of their lives, using feigned compliance, seeming conformity, apparent submission, emulation, and posturing, constitute a deliberate strategy of mimicry that allowed them to craft self-agency without appearing to do so. Given their proximity to Elizabeth during her formative years, she likely observed in their behavior a model of strategic mimicry that she would later adopt. Elizabeth's insistence that her behavior and reactions to political events were uncalculated confirms the hidden nature of such a political method, which camouflages itself in the naturalism of circumstance, allowing her to act independently without exposing her as designing to do so.

CHAPTER IV

“HOW UNCULTIVATED I AM IN LETTERS”: EDUCATION OF A TUDOR PRINCESS

In her poetry, Elizabeth Tudor writes, “If he who leads [a child] is wise/ And takes care where it goes, / Little by little he will hurry it along” (“Twenty-Seven Stanzas” 414). That this poem, describing her efforts to rule and establish her authority, as guided by God, should invoke the metaphor of a male figure perhaps even echoing a divine guidance leading a child to progress through small steps hints at the significant role instructors play in shaping their pupils. Within the poem, the instructor is a Godly presence for the queen, showing her how to proceed. In practice, a coterie of male scholars attended to Elizabeth from an early age; these men continued to play a significant role in her court in later years. Her male instructors worked in tandem with the women of Elizabeth’s household, extending her early domestic education into a broader, formal humanist curriculum. However, scholarship regarding Elizabeth’s education has overlooked or only touched on the rhetorical strategies of her formal instructors. The role of mimicry, both as a pedagogical strategy emerging from the practice of *imitatio* and as a living example in her instructors’ daily posturing, is important in considering the evolution of Elizabeth’s own performances of authority.

Elizabeth inherited the fruits of the educational discussion between figures, such as Desiderius Erasmus, Thomas More, and Juan Luis Vives, that had happened decades earlier. As humanists considered the possibility of formally educating young women, they had to decide whether women and men could achieve the same educational objectives. While Vives would hesitate to fully assign women the same intellectual abilities as men, native English scholars made declarations that set the stage for royal female children, such as Elizabeth, to receive

expansive and rigorous training. For instance, in a letter to his children's tutor, Thomas More states, "Nor do I think that the harvest will be affected whether it is a man or a woman who sows the field. They both have the same human nature and the power of reasoning differentiates them from the beasts; both, therefore, are equally suited for those studies by which reason is cultivated and is productive like a plowed field on which the seed of good lessons has been sown" (qtd. in Reynolds 135). More's reference to the one who sows, or teaches, indicates that either a man or a woman can train pupils through good lessons; likewise, a female student may learn reason as well as a male, provided the instruction is good.

Throughout accounts of Elizabeth's early training, the queen's male instructors feature more prominently than their female counterparts, with Roger Ascham literally writing an account of her education. Such men represented the progression of the changing nature of a courtier that began earlier in the 16th century; intellectual abilities began to outweigh military prowess as markers of a capable courtier (Mazzola, *Learning and Literacy* 19). Karen Cunningham claims that figures such as Roger Ascham took advantage of the changing cultural landscape, striving "to produce social organization from the shifting ground of grammatical constructions and literary canons ... to legitimate language study as something appropriate for a grown man to spend his time on ... [identifying] study with a particular view of labor" (209 - 210). Those scholars placed in the princess's household had intimate ties to Henry's court. Ascham's *The Scholemaster*, which contains a retrospective account of Elizabeth's education under his tutelage, highlights this connection between court and classroom. Jonathan Goldberg claims that this text reflects the upward social movement of the formal educator, reconstructing the court as the "apex of pedagogic culture" (44).

Her instructors' visibility could be dangerous. These scholars experienced much of the same social and political turbulence as the women of Elizabeth's household, particularly when the princess was accused of being involved in dealings against her half-sister, Mary. Often, these individuals had to negotiate competing allegiances while subtly attempting to advance personal agendas. Thus, like their humanist colleagues decades before, Elizabeth's tutors implicitly or directly taught her mimicry in order to negotiate the frequently changeable nature of court. Mazzola acknowledges the embedded nature of the instructors' reliance on mimicry: "The writing master's intimacy with his student and the mistress who employs him remains a crucial relationship in the early modern period, linking humanism with the court ..., so that merely copying as an activity required great tact, some anatomical know-how and politician's gift for timing" (*Learning and Literacy* 10). Though she labels the act of copying *imitatio*, Mazzola imbues that act with rhetorical considerations, such as delivery, purpose, and *kairos*, anticipating the transformation of imitation into mimicry. Likewise, the humanist curriculum, which relied heavily on *imitatio*, the practice in which a student copies and memorizes effective passages from established authors, then eventually strives to create new material in the style of such passages, actively paved the way for learning models and deploying mimetic postures at kairotic moments as a rhetorical strategy.

At the same time, these men also served as exemplars of the mimicry which was part of Elizabeth's rhetorical education. The writings and actions of her male instructors, such as Roger Ascham's *The Scholemaster*, demonstrate an understanding of the rhetorical and political potential of mimicry, in which a rhetor emulates culturally accepted postures in order to produce change. This transformation and assertion of marginalized figures into political circles were necessitated by Elizabethan hierarchy and fluidity. Bhabha describes the effect of mimicry as "a

discursive process by which the excess or slippage produced by the *ambivalence* of mimicry (almost the same, *but not quite*) does not merely ‘rupture’ the discourse but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a ‘partial’ presence” (85). As such, Elizabeth’s formal tutors provide examples of early modern precursors to modern mimicry strategies later defined by Jacques Lacan and Homi Bhabha.

MALE INSTRUCTORS WITHIN THE PRINCESS’S HOUSEHOLD

During her 1566 state visit to Oxford College, Elizabeth Tudor assumed a self-effacing posture, prefacing her speech with an apology. She claimed:

[B]lame ... belongs properly to me because, let everyone note, I have applied my effort for some time to good discipline and even longer in learning; however, my teachers have put their effort into barren and unfruitful ground, so that I am not able to do what I wish most, to show fruit worthy either of my worth or of their labors or of your expectation.

(E. Tudor, “Latin Oration” 91)

This modest language points to a savvy rhetor drawing on the humility *topos*, as is conventional for a marginalized figure wishing to cultivate a receptive atmosphere. Yet as queen, Elizabeth could hardly be counted as marginalized; her long apology indicates a recognition that despite her royal authority, her embodied femininity calls for such rhetorical maneuvering. At the same time, her diffidence to her instructors acknowledges their lasting influence on this significant figure; she displays her erudition even in the act of denying she has it.

The coterie of instructors that made up Elizabeth’s early household reflected the curricular changes considered during the early part of the 16th century among scholars such as

Erasmus, Vives, and More. John King describes the impact of humanism on early modern English women's educational experiences. He states:

The activities of Bible reading, religious zeal, and anti-papal animus that Ascham advocates [in *The Scholemaster*] had received the approval of the circle of aristocratic women who actively patronized reformist authors, preachers, and translators, and who had control over the education of ... almost every potential claimant to the throne of England. (King 59)

Such a transformation was made possible by the combination of increasingly educated female instructors and college-educated male instructors assigned to female students. While the early female instructors remained in Elizabeth's household, their authority was superseded by male schoolmasters tasked with training the princess during her adolescence. These formal scholars established classroom practices with study exercises, set readings, and developmental standards (*Learning and Literacy* 18).

Elizabeth's education was an amalgamation of shared lessons and private tutoring. At court, the royal school at times combined male and female students, sharing instructors and lessons. Such was the case with Elizabeth and her half-brother, Edward, as they shared tutors: Richard Cox taught the Greek and Latin languages, as well as issues surrounding contemporary political events; John Cheke taught Greek pronunciation and classic texts; Roger Ascham taught italic script, as well as Greek and Latin; and Jean Belmain taught the French language (Porter 179).

The predominantly religious translations that circulated at court do not reflect the full spectrum of Elizabeth's early learning. Pollnitz suggests that the public circulation of these exercises demonstrate a purposeful strategy on the part of Elizabeth's instructors, as they sought

to cultivate an image of the princess as a “well-educated Christian woman” (132, 135). However, unlike her half-sister, Mary, many of Elizabeth’s instructors were reformers; through personal experience, such scholars learned to carefully advocate for emerging concepts that challenged the status quo. These complex negotiations as advocates of innovation working within the established constraints of royal education likely influenced their pupils; the scholars’ strategies of manipulating conventions are often apparent in the material they produced, such as dedications, translations, and pedagogical manuals.

For example, Jean Belmain, a French Huguenot, served as Elizabeth’s French-language instructor. Belmain was likely responsible for a French translation of Katherine Parr’s *The Lamentation of a Sinner* (Mueller, “Introduction” 427). Belmain’s potential translation illustrates the exchange of ideas between tutor and patrons with additional implications for the possibility that, having engaged deliberately with Parr’s ideas, he may have communicated those concepts or the text itself to young Elizabeth. If so, Elizabeth would have witnessed the careful posturing in her step-mother’s writing. It also demonstrates the reformationist nature of those individuals and texts Elizabeth encountered at an early age. In 1545, Belmain likely instigated Elizabeth’s translation of Margaret of Navarre’s *Le miroir de l’ame pecheresse* or *The Glasse of the Synnefull Soule*, which Elizabeth gave to Katherine Parr as a New Year gift in 1545. The choice of the text, written by a Reformist queen, is significant, as the content is suggestive of the material that young Elizabeth encountered, as well as the contemporary female models in authoritative positions and their rhetorical strategies of which she would have been made aware. Susan Snyder describes the text, stating, “The speaker of the poetic monologue presents herself as a wretched sinner ... Parsing out that relationship [with God] into a series of familial paradigms—daughter, mother, sister, wife—she explores each area of defection through an

exemplary episode from the Bible” (445). Young Elizabeth translated a text, composed by a royal woman, which subtly discusses the way in which faith can enter a woman, just as it can a man, allowing her to compose a work that centers on a variety of conventional female postures and their Biblical models. Each such model is a sinner that is redeemed through another’s grace, a perfect metaphor for a young woman seeking favor with her royal step-mother, and by extension, her father. Thus, the princess likely recognized the strategic value of selecting *The Glasse of the Synnefull Soule*.

In 1543, the year after Henry VIII’s *The Third Succession Act* restored Elizabeth to the line of succession, Katherine Parr selected instructors specifically for Elizabeth, such as William Grindal (Pollnitz 133). When Grindal passed away in 1548, Elizabeth herself reportedly asked that Ascham replace him (Borman 112). This frequent changing of instructors was to continue as Elizabeth’s fortunes fluctuated. For instance, Johannes Spithovius, briefly served the princess as yet another tutor in classical languages. In 1549, through the recommendations of Archbishop Cranmer and Edmund Allen, Elizabeth’s chaplain, Spithovius joined Elizabeth’s household; he replaced Roger Ascham as her Greek and Latin instructor (Adams and Gehring 37). Spithovius continued in her household until Elizabeth was imprisoned in 1554. On November 30, 1554, Spithovius wrote to his mentor, Philip Melanchthon, urging him to contact the princess as her sister pressed her to conform to Catholic practices. Spithovius also praised Elizabeth as the hope for the Anglican Church (Adams and Gehring 37). Such maneuvering was dangerous, as his outward support for Elizabeth could not be seen as actively undermining Queen Mary. Though the cause for his departure from the princess’s service is not known, Simon Adams and David Gehring note that in February 1554 Mary Tudor ordered foreign heretics to leave the country. With the princess in prison, her household would not be protected against such an order. They

suggest that in April of that year, when Christian III asked for the release of the reformer, Miles Coverdale, he might have also sent for Spithovius (Adams and Gehring 38). Yet, while his pupil was incarcerated, Spithovius dared to encourage her in efforts to reject Mary's Catholicism, even putting such sentiments to paper and prompting his mentor to also support Elizabeth in her endeavor. If the princess's changed circumstances and the political climate in England were responsible for his departure, Spithovius's experience highlights the volatile and sometimes dangerous nature of the royal instructor's position and what an observant Elizabeth could have learned from it about the necessity of posturing for weathering the turbulence of political instability.

PROXIMATE MODEL FOR RESPONDING TO POLITICAL AND PERSONAL DANGER

The day-to-day political life of her male tutors provided examples of the lesson of mimicry for young Elizabeth to witness. One such example is evident in the form of the princess's Italian tutor, Giovanni Battista Castiglione, who served Elizabeth throughout much of her life. Castiglione's family heritage is notable, as his father Pietro Castiglione was related to Baldassare Castiglione, who served as the Duke of Urbino's ambassador to Henry VII's court in 1506, marking early ties between the Castigliones and Tudors (Bowyer 370). Baldassare's text, *Il Libro del Cortegiano (The Book of the Courtier)* (1528), famously detailed courtly behavior and rhetorical strategies; this connection is of particular interest, given Giovanni's role as Elizabeth's Italian instructor and later Gentleman of her Privy Chamber. His proximity to the princess allowed him to provide a model for posturing with mimicry when faced with personal danger, as

he endured the same fluctuation in fortunes as Elizabeth, as part of her retinue and as a foreigner, and thus outsider.

Giovanni Battista Castiglione's rise through the ranks demonstrates the shifting nature of the court, as a man of military experience became a royal tutor. His eldest son, Sir Francis Castillion, offers a brief biography in a memorial for his father, dated 24 September 1631. He writes:

In this monument resteth Baptist Castillion, Esq're, who was in the Warres at Landerse; then served Henry VIII at Bullen, captayne of foot. Being there recommended by some about the King, was sent over with letters, unto the Private Council in England; to preferre him unto the Lady Elizabeth's Grace, daughter unto King Henry the VIIIth; chiefly to read the Italian, being then 13 years of age (Castillion)

Though the memorial claims Elizabeth was 13 when Castiglione entered her service, she was likely closer to 11. Further evidence of his integration into the household at Hatfield suggests the value that was placed on his service. For instance, on October 29, 1550, Castiglione was granted letters of denization without paying for them, indicating that he was in royal service by this point. In 1551, records from Hatfield mention payment to "John Baptist," suggesting that Castiglione was then serving the princess (Bolland 41- 42). He served as the princess's Master of the Italian Tongue and Tutor in the Italic Script. In addition to his role as instructor, Castiglione also protected the princess, acting as her bodyguard (Wyatt 125). The duality of his role is significant, as he instructed her in the humanist fashion, but his function as physical protector acknowledges the omnipresent danger for one of Elizabeth's status.

The influence of his instruction and presence on the young Elizabeth was marked. Wyatt claims, "Elizabeth had learned to speak and write Italian at an early age ... Her preference for

Italian & the prominence she accorded Italian culture can to a high degree be ascribed to the close presence in her life of Giovanni Battista Castiglione” (125). Giovanni Battista’s connections to the prestigious Castiglione family no doubt prepared him from an early age for courtly posturing. His early history must be pieced together from fragmentary evidence, in order to glimpse the nature of this foreign instructor who spent decades in Elizabeth’s service, providing a non-English model of courtly behavior. Francis Castillion, Giovanni’s eldest son, verifies the familial connection to Baldassare Castiglione when he inscribes a history into an Italian text, *Elogi Historic di lacuna personage della famiglia Castiglione* (1606), stating, “This booke was sent me from Mantua in Italie 1610, from the Counte Baldazar Castilion ... Also he sent me ye armes of the familie ... from a younger of which house we are descended, as may appeare from a pedigree I have” (Bowyer 369). Given Giovanni Battista’s connection to Baldassare Castiglione, it is plausible that the princess’s Italian instructor shared *Il Libro del Cortigiano* as a text to practice translation, and in doing so, also exposed her to the lessons regarding courtly behavior and strategies for negotiating public life.

This lasting intimacy between instructor and student likely evolved due to the former surviving fraught political situations that threatened both the princess and those within her household. Castiglione suffered incarceration at least twice for his loyalty to the princess. In 1554, he was incarcerated for carrying Elizabeth’s letters after the Wyatt Rebellion. In 1631, his son, Castillion, describes Castiglione’s initial experience with imprisonment:

But in the 1st of Queene Mary, for trusty service then done by him, touching her Grace’s safety, then a Prisoner, he was committed close prisoner to the Tower of London. And being twice out of prison a few weeks, the lady Elizabeth writ letters secretly to him, all of her owne hand; to goe unto the French Ambassador, and King Phillip’s confessor, at

Whitehall; with other her letters, late in the night, about her Grace's troubles, whereof he was strictly examined in the Tower, by Bishop Gardener, then Lord Chancellor - Suffered on the Racke to confesse his trust therein, being lame thereof: but he would make no confession, whereby the Lady Elizabeth may come in danger of being wrongfully accused about Wiatt's Rebellion, as the chronicles maketh mention ... (Castillion)

Castiglione suffered physical torment and permanent damage to his body yet refused to implicate his pupil in any wrong-doings. His loyalty and suffering on her behalf likely further cemented this early connection.

In 1556, Castiglione returned to the Tower, as anti-Catholic tracts were traced to Elizabeth's household (Bolland 41- 42). However, on June 2, Giovanni Michiel, the Venetian Ambassador to the English court, describes the arrest of Elizabeth's household:

Amongst the domestics is a certain Battista, an Italian, native of Piedmont, the Signora's master for the Italian tongue, & who has twice before been imprisoned on her account, he being much suspected on the score of religion, as is likewise the governess and all the others. I am told that they have already confessed to having known about the conspiracy; so not having revealed it, were there nothing else against them, they may probably not quit the Tower alive ... (Calendar of State Papers, Venetian Collection 475)

Michiel's claim that Castiglione has been arrested on two previous occasions emphasizes the danger present in serving the princess, even as an instructor. His description points to religious tensions, as well as larger political implications of the aforementioned proposed union between Seymour and Elizabeth. The ambassador recognizes that the purposeful inaction of Elizabeth's servants will likely be their demise. Yet, once more, Elizabeth's household managed to sidestep

implicating the princess in anything more direct or active than an awareness of others' efforts on her behalf.

Castiglione's responses to interrogation were submitted in a report on May 31, 1556; his measured responses shed some insight into the rhetorical model he may have provided for the princess to emulate. Interrogators pressed him on recent communications, interactions, and movements. To all such questions, Castiglione responded with the mundane details of his daily life, never indicating any involvement with political machinations. For instance, when asked about his letters, Castiglione indicated he had only written or received letters recently regarding money he had sent or owed. When asked about his movements in London, he offered a list of items he shopped for, including, "a cap, gloves, a girdle ... [and] strings for my lady grace's lute." When asked directly about any interactions with the French and Venetian ambassadors, or their servants, Castiglione definitively responds, "I never resorted to or spoke to any of them." He later further adds to his description of his extensive shopping while in London, before reiterating, "I had no talk but about my business" (*Calendar of State Papers, Mary I, Domestic Series, 1556*). Castiglione's flat denial of being involved in any suspect communications in conjunction with his overabundance of detail regarding his shopping blends compliance with resistance, posturing as though he was little more than a servant running mundane and wholly expected errands while in the big city.

Regardless of his testimony, Castiglione remained imprisoned until Elizabeth ascended the throne in November 1558 (Bolland 41- 42). Castillon describes this change in fortune in his memorial to his father, writing:

But Queen Marie being dead and the Lady Elizabeth coming to the Crowne; he was presently sent for out of the Tower of London, being then a Prisoner, and came to Court,

then at Whitehall; where he was sworn of her Majesty's Private Chamber; and gave him the Manor of Benham Valence in the county of Berkshire, and many other great gifts; sufficient to beare the honour of a Baron, if he had made the right use of these Princely gifts.

Castiglione became a Gentleman of Elizabeth's Privy Chamber (Overell 197). Due to his connection and proximity to the queen, Castiglione served as a significant mediator for the Italian factions at the English court throughout his life (Wyatt 126).

In these roles, first as instructor, later as groom, Castiglione provided a daily model of rhetorical performances in response to fluctuating circumstances. Evidence of such sophisticated posturing appears in his preface to Giacomo Aconcio's *Una essortatione al timor di Dio* (*An Exhortation on the Fear of God*), published by John Wolfe. In 1579, Castiglione commissioned this text, which was the first Italian text to be published in England. In it, he wrote a poem in honor of Elizabeth, as well as a dedicatory preface to Elizabeth. Castiglione's preface performs a complex posture, as he carefully explains the motivation for publishing Aconcio's text, which contains potentially inflammatory religious concepts. Given Aconcio's reputation as a radical opposed to religious dogma and persecution, Anne Overell suggests that leaving the text in Italian was likely a safety precaution (197). According to Castiglione's account, the text's publication is providential, rather than calculated and politically motivated. He writes, "Searching through some of my writings recently, and a few beautiful poems coming into my hands, including a most beautiful Canzone written in praise of your majesty, it occurred to me to make a small volume of them and this other work" (qtd. in Lawrence 56). Castiglione foregrounds the desire to praise Elizabeth through his work and others' poetry, slipping in Aconcio's work as though it were an afterthought, rather than the impetus for the publication.

Castiglione continues, describing Elizabeth's resistance to criticism and political efforts to undermine her authority. He claims, "Of which not only did not conquer her steadfastness but instead adorned her but equipped her with an unusual prudence among all the others" (Translator's Note, Preface, *Una essortatione al timor di Dio*, Castiglione A5)¹. Notably, Castiglione claims that experience offers Elizabeth a tool to "equip" and wear, pointing once more to lived experience. While this praise continues the posture of deference, it also presents the text as aligned with Elizabeth's prudent governing. He describes her actions in religious terminology, claiming, "she has so wisely governed this her happy kingdom, exterminating entirely every divine cult ... liberating and freeing it from fair tyranny and cruel servitude with which the Antichrist held it oppressed: and continued to lift up the oppressed ones" (Castiglione A5). Elizabeth appears as a bold protector of the reformed religion in England; Castiglione constructs her as the appropriate figure to support the public proliferation of this text. He concludes the dedication by claiming to share the text on the Queen's behalf, encouraging the reader to view the text "with serene thoughts," comparing Elizabeth's support of such a text to King Artaserse offering water to a peasant (Castiglione A6). Thus, Castiglione slyly leverages Elizabeth's generous patronage and approval of the text, elevating the material beyond a small collection of paeans to a text that contains invigorating material.

Many years after Elizabeth's death, Castiglione maintains Elizabeth's innocence, noting she was "wrongfully accused," a notion that his father likely asserted and maintained for decades. That she entrusted Castiglione with letters for other significant political figures during her crisis demonstrates Elizabeth's close ties to her Italian instructor, even before he was

¹ Translation provided by Silvio Mancosi, a freelance translator and native speaker, in personal correspondence. From Aconcio, Iacopi. *Una essortatione al timor di Dio con alcune rime Italiane, nouamente messe in luce*. London, 1570. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 15 May 2016. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_val_fmt=&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:29269:1>.

imprisoned. Moreover, Elizabeth witnessed this unwavering dedication to establishing and maintaining her public image, learning that such an image required constant reinforcement over a long period of time.

ASCHAM, THE QUEEN'S SCHOOLMASTER

Among the many individuals and instructors responsible for influencing Elizabeth's education, one in particular is well-known for his efforts. In 1548, when William Grindal passed away, his Cambridge instructor, Roger Ascham, replaced him as Elizabeth's primary tutor, employing many of Juan Luis Vives's instructional strategies (Vosevich 68). Ascham later detailed his pedagogical approach in *The Scholemaster* (1570), describing in an accessible manner emerging pedagogical methods related to learning the Latin language. In particular, Ascham embraced the traditional teaching tool of "double translation" in which a student translated a text from Latin to English, and back again. Furthermore, he emphatically supported the practice of imitating rhetorical models. This process of double translation prepared the student for more than mere imitation, providing a stockpile of models to draw on. Furthermore, as seen with the French instructor, Jean Belmain, the choice of text, as well as the possible public dissemination of such a translation exercise, required the instructor and student to consider audience, delivery, and timing, if striving to achieve a particular effect.

Ascham himself identified the product of such work, drawing on Cicero's description of oration's focus on two concepts: "In good matter, and good handling of the matter" (*The Scholemaster* 143). Ascham's instructional strategy arms the student with "good matter," equipping that student with the ability to manipulate and transform, or "handle," that material in

response to the exigencies of the moment. Ascham also draws on Cicero's distinction between expressing ideas (*exprimere*) and fashioning materials (*effingere*), which he describes as "the very proper words of Imitation" (*The Scholemaster* 153). Ascham implies that the latter involves crafting, thereby tying this distinction to imitation directly, describing the rules Cicero applies to these concepts: "if that diligence were taken, if that order were used, what perfite knowledge of both [Latin and English], what readie and pithy utterance in all matters, what right and deep judgment in all kinds of learning would follow, is scarce credible to be believed" (*The Scholemaster* 153). At the same time, his work aptly demonstrates such manipulation and posturing. When explicitly defining "imitation," Ascham acknowledges it as an "arte," stating, "for all the workes of nature, in a maner be examples for arte to folow" (*The Scholemaster* 135). Asserting that imitation is artful implies that in order to emulate rhetorical models, one must have a set of skills that are consciously deployed, rather than merely relying on superficial imitation. Moreover, a savvy rhetor may engage in the political art of mimicry by purposefully imitating a wide array of models, often fluidly moving between postures during the same rhetorical performance. Within *The Scholemaster*, Ascham deftly demonstrates mimetic prowess, as he uses other speakers to introduce his construction of the ideal schoolmaster, which is the synthesis of several models, including John Cheke and Elizabeth. Ascham suggests that he himself fits this ideal construction, as he supposedly reports what others have to say about him; through their praise, he asserts his authority to speak on the subject of effective schoolmasters.

Notably, Ascham appears to have a hand in repairing Elizabeth's reputation following the Seymour Affair (Mazzola, *Learning and Literacy* 23). However, this perception of his influence on the princess is likely the result of his efforts to craft a history of his influence on the princess in *The Scholemaster*, using his experience with the young princess as a means of validating the

model of an instructor he proposes. Pollnitz claims it is the success of the English Reformation that is responsible for the perception that Elizabeth's training was significantly different from her half-sister's, pointing towards Roger Ascham's self-promotion and religious agenda (135). She claims, "Ascham rewrote his account of Elizabeth's education retrospectively in order to suggest that he had cultivated her for rule from her childhood ... Through his influential representations, Elizabeth's education became the education of a philosopher-king, but only after the fact" (Pollnitz 138). Thus, *The Scholemaster* provides a retrospective construction of Elizabeth's education after the fact, while simultaneously demonstrating the way in which one of her own instructors relied heavily on mimicry, as shown by his retroactive account of his instructional strategies in order to publicly advance a new model of the instructor figure. Furthermore, this text demonstrates the sort of rhetorical posturing Elizabeth would have witnessed when interacting with her instructor; it is also likely she read this text, observing the way in which her instructor appropriated their shared history in order to influence contemporary opinions.

In his preface to the *The Scholemaster*, Ascham demonstrates his masterful use of mimicry by fluidly moving between multiple postures, synthesizing these layered roles into a new construction of an early modern schoolmaster. He begins his posturing by projecting the motivation for his work unto another, in the form of Richard Sackville, Elizabeth's Chancellor of the Exchequer. He claims that on December 10, 1563, Sackville approached him about writing a text that outlined an improved model of instruction. Using Sackville in this manner subtly introduces the text's main concepts as though they come from a social superior, rather than Ascham himself. Through what is again a retrospective narrative, which takes place following a dinner with the queen and William Cecil, among others, Sackville approaches Ascham in the queen's chambers to make his request that Ascham "put in some order of writing ... the right

order of teachinge, and honestie of liuing, for the good bringing vp of children & yong men” (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* xviii). Ascham describes the moment, stating, “After dinner I went up to read with the Queenes Maiestie. We red than together in the Greke tongue, as I well remember that noble Oration of Demosthenes against Aeschines, for his false dealing in his Ambassage to king Philip of Macedonie ... in hir Maiesties priuie chamber” (*The Scholemaster* xvi). This story initiates Ascham’s self-fashioning of the scholar-servant protagonist that he will advance in the text; he is seen as intimately connected with political figures, and a confidant to his most famous pupil, Elizabeth, long after her early education is completed. Having briefly taught Elizabeth when she was an adolescent, Ascham continued to serve in Elizabeth’s royal administration; she was about thirty at the time Sackville made his request to Ascham to write about his pedagogical method. Ascham highlights his proximity to the queen, by pointedly describing in some detail their joint reading in her private space, ostensibly linking his authority intimately to hers. Furthermore, he postures as though *The Scholemaster* itself is an act of service in the form of intellectual labor, instigated by a social superior for the national good. He quotes Sackville explicitly, claiming, “you should please God, benefite your countrie ... if you would take the paines, to impart to others, what you learned of soch a Master, and how ye taught such a scholer” (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* xviii). Through Sackville, Ascham introduces the overt objective for his work, as Ascham believes the improvement of instructional strategies leads to the improvement in behavior and morality among young men of the upper classes (*The Scholemaster* xiv). At the same time, using Sackville’s voice, Ascham plants the concept of intellectual labor as public service. He also employs Sackville to introduce a new layer of posturing, beyond Ascham as Sackville’s servant and instructor, in which Ascham is a student as well, indicating that education is a connected network of modelling.

In *The Scholemaster*, Ascham discreetly blends his own instructional acumen with the idealized account of his female pupil and monarch, thereby elevating the role of the instructor to one of national importance. Within the text, he identifies three masculine means of educating: “*praeceptore, paedogogo, parente*. The schoolmaster taught him learning with all gentleness; the governor corrected his manners with much sharpness; the father held the stem of his whole obedience” (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* 35). As such, he expressly outlines at least three postures that relate to learning, demonstrating his intention to move between and combine such modes of instruction. Jonathan Goldberg argues that Ascham’s work is also invested in increasing the social prestige of the early modern instructor, which is achieved by transforming the court into the “apex of pedagogic culture” (44). Such elevation occurs through a rhetorical sleight of hand, in which a retrospective account of Ascham’s work with an extraordinary student, Elizabeth, serves to praise the queen while using her image to promote an instructor’s personal agenda.

Both *The Scholemaster* and his letters to Johannes Sturm, a German schoolmaster, provide the most direct insight into Elizabeth’s curriculum. For example, in a correspondence with Sturm, Ascham references the princess’s education, claiming:

[S]he read with me almost all Cicero and great part of Titus Livius: for she drew all her knowledge of Latin from those two authors. She used to give the morning to the Greek Testament and afterwards read select orations of Isocrates and the tragedies of Sophocles.
(“Letter XCIX” lxiii)

It must be remembered, though, *The Scholemaster* is not intended to document the princess’s education nor outline a course of study for women; Ascham’s express purpose is to improve the schooling of noblemen. Ascham describes the objective of his text, citing Richard Sackville’s

request, “I pray you, at my request, and at your leysure, put in some order of writing, the cheife pointes of this our taulke, concerning the right order of teachinge, and honestie of liuing, for the good bringing vp of children & yong men” (*The Scholemaster* xviii). While the text’s explicit aim is to outline a plan for male education, Ascham frequently references his time with Elizabeth, lavishing his former student and now queen with praise for her education and rhetorical prowess. In this unmarked reversal, a woman is upheld as the ideal student, and her training provides the model for noblemen. Cunningham describes the function of the Elizabeth figure within the text, “An avatar of discipline-as-allure, this Elizabeth is the extraordinary proof of an extraordinary method” (219). Thus, Ascham is retroactively constructing the ideal instructor, using a version of his history to model such behavior. His text provides insight into Elizabeth’s personal educational history from a narrow perspective, while also demonstrating the sophisticated maneuvering needed to re-script power structures from marginal positions.

In early drafts of *The Scholemaster*, Ascham praises Elizabeth’s learning, though he describes her virtue through the lens of both chivalric and humanist values. Kathi Vosevich, while qualifying that one must accept his accounts as accurate, points specifically to Ascham’s text as evidence of Elizabeth’s unique training. She states, “By teaching ... his student seemingly without regard for her sex, Ascham, unlike Vives, unwittingly may have prepared her to formulate her subsequent self-fashioning as prince and king of England rather than as queen” (Vosevich 69). An initial version of *The Scholemaster*, likely written in 1562-63, depicts Elizabeth’s learning as domestic in nature. For instance, he claims Elizabeth excels at “Ridinge most trymlie ... dansing most comlye, in playing of Instrumments most excellentye in all cunning needlework, & finest portraiture” (Ascham, qtd. in “Christian” 137). This description of her domestic skills does not construct an image of an individual prepared for public life and

authority. Such training in feminine accomplishments is sensible, as it was originally unlikely that Elizabeth would ever ascend the throne. However, once she was queen, Ascham could take some personal credit, while furthering his own humanist agenda. In the printed version, Ascham focuses on Elizabeth's ability to be a just ruler due to her education, dropping out references to chivalric virtues, such as chastity. For instance, he describes her accomplishments as, "that which is the most praise wortie of all, within the learnying, to vnderstand, speake, & write, both wittely with head, and faire with hand" (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* 63). Thus, he reconstructs Elizabeth's early education, casting it as a deliberate effort to prepare her for the rulership she has when he is composing *The Scholemaster*.

In his original preface, Ascham also uses Cecil as an idealized figure, describing him in a way that is reminiscent of Baldassare Castiglione's concept of *sprezzatura*, or effortless grace. Ascham writes, "M. Secretarie hath this accustomed maner, though his head be never so full of most weightie affaires of the Realme, yet, at dinner time he doth seeme to lay them alwaies aside: and findeth euer fitte occasion to taulke pleasantlie of other matters, but most gladlie of some matter of learning" (*The Scholemaster* xiv). Ascham's description acknowledges that Cecil chooses this social posture, yet also takes the opportunity to blend together the concepts of learning, political matters, and courtly pleasantries. Through Cecil, Ascham offers a model of an ideal early modern politician. At the same time, Cecil serves as another instrument of mimicry for Ascham, as he adopts another posture, in which Ascham acts in response to Cecil's initial query. It is Cecil who raises the topic of severe instructors who unintentionally train students to reject learning. Cecil broaches the topic by commenting upon news that students have fled Eton for fear of being beaten by stern instructors, leading him to desire, "some more discretion were in many Schoolmasters in using correction, than commonlie there is ... Whereby many Scholars,

that might else prove well, be driven to hate learning, before they knowe what learning meaneth: and so are willing to forsake their booke, and be glad to put to any other kinde living” (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* xiv). In support, Ascham advocates, “yong children, were soner allured by love, than driven by beating, to atteyne good learning” (*The Scholemaster* xv).

The Scholemaster begins with a retrospective account of Ascham’s own educational history, as well as highlights his time as Elizabeth’s instructor. This account profiles Ascham’s record of posturing, as he indicates that he models himself after John Cheke; Elizabeth would have witnessed such posturing, and perhaps recognize his strategy when reading this text. Ascham’s efforts to construct a heroic scholar figure begins when Sackville describes Ascham’s own history with the queen:

And I know verie well my selfe, that you did teach the Quene. And therefore seing God did so blesse you, to make you the Scholer of the best Master, and also the Scholemaster of the best Scholer, that euer were in our tyme, surelie, you should please God, benefite your countrie, & honest your owne name, if you would take the paines, to impart to others, what you learned of soch a Master, and how ye taught such a scholer. (*The Scholemaster* xviii)

The passage offers a complex, dual reflexivity, in that Ascham first posits his own instructor, John Cheke, as “the best Master,” thereby drawing on his instructor’s ethos to establish his own authority. Second, Ascham asserts he is instructor to the “best Scholer,” Elizabeth, which serves the dual function of praising the Queen while also elevating his own status, as the implicit suggestion is that Ascham has had some part in producing such an ideal student. Moreover, by having another person describe him in this manner, Ascham slyly constructs himself as the ideal scholar figure that his work advocates, while simultaneously highlighting the influence of his

own instructor, John Cheke, and the far-reaching impact of his instructional endeavors through the ideal student, Elizabeth. Thus, Ascham seamlessly draws on and projects elements of three figures: Cheke, Elizabeth, and his idealized, retrospective schoolmaster.

The body of the work is split into two books; the first book focuses on Ascham's proposed process for early education, while the second dwells on the concept of imitation, in various forms, as an educational strategy. Ascham's educational strategies draw heavily on classical methods, in which a student's learning is scaffolded through stages; to learn a concept, the student is introduced to the concept, then analyzes examples of the concept in use and imitates that use, before finally putting the concept into practice in an original composition. Throughout, the idea of "right" phrasing dominates, suggesting that the educated individual may reference a catalogue of rhetorical postures to deploy in kairotic moments. Very early in the first book, Ascham claims, "There is a waie, touched in the first booke of *Cicero De Oratore*, which ... as I know by good experience, workes a true choice and placing of wordes, a right ordering of sentences, an easie understandyng of the tonge, a readines to speake, a facultie to write, a true iudgement, both of his owne, and other mens doinges, what tonge so euer he doth use" (*The Scholemaster* 2). Thus, Ascham asserts a vast and lofty goal for language study. Not only does such an education create an eloquent speaker, but it also prepares one to effectively read others' performances and respond accordingly, which is to say, to be able to re-fashion oneself in a kairotic manner.

Within the first book, Ascham crafts his proposed postures for his ideal instructor and aristocratic pupil. For the titular schoolmaster, Ascham dictates the following behavior: "plaine construinge, diligent parsinge, dailie translatinge, cherefull admonishinge, and heedfull amendinge of faultes: neuer leavinge behinde iuste praise for well doinge, I would have the

Scholer brought up withall” (*The Scholemaster* 5-6). The emphasis is on the need for the instructor to make learning accessible and persistent, while also maintaining an approachable demeanor in order to retain the student’s trust. Likewise, Ascham carefully advances the importance of such an education for highborn pupils, stating, “For he knoweth, that Nobilitie, without vertue and wisdom, is bloud in deede, but bloud trowellie, without bones & sinewes: & so of it selfe, without the other, verie weeke to beare the burden of weightie affaires” (*The Scholemaster* 40). He continues, stressing that those born to privilege also carry responsibility, much like a ship with heavy cargo; such a vessel requires a “skilfull master” (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* 41). However, Ascham also subtly provides a pressing motivation for going through such an educational process, as he implies that noble children’s social status is potentially tenuous, requiring that they actively retain such an adaptive process. He states, “ye must kepe [your place], as they gat it, and that is, by the onelie waie, of vertue, wisdom, and worthinesse” (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* 41). The delicate suggestion is slyly posited as a compliment, as Ascham quickly affirms that the progenitors of such pupils deserve their positions by virtues that their offspring must emulate. Thus, Ascham demonstrates the skillfulness required for the complex posturing he advocates.

To reinforce his point, Ascham dwells on those who would assume postures they did not deserve, such as men who would feign a militaristic demeanor without having engaged in combat. Disdainfully, Ascham describes such a hypothetical “privie mock”:

And if som Smithfield Ruffian take up, som strange going: som new mowing with the mouth: som wrinching with the shoulder, som braue prouerbe: som fresh new othe, that is not stale, but will rin round in the mouth: som new disguised garment, or desperate hat, fond in facion, or gaurish in colour (*The Scholemaster* 43 - 44)

While dismissing such a rude caricature as “graceless grace,” a powerfully reflexive phrase in itself, Ascham actually outlines the various tools of performance that his training will polish, such as facial expressions, body movement, allusions, speech, and costuming. The concept of “graceless grace” also points to the classed nature of posturing; Ascham indicates that effective posturing inherently belongs to the educated upper classes. His artful phrasing, also demonstrative of verbal maneuvering, establishes the stark contrast between the type of posturing his method of teaching will produce and what others perform without training. He completes his admonishment against disingenuous posturing with a brief verse: “To laughe, to lie, to flatter, to face:/ Foure waies in Court to win men grace / If thou be thrall to none of thiese, / Away good Peek goos, hens Iohn Cheese: /Marke well my word, and marke their dede, / And thinke this verse part of thy Crede” (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* 45). The ideal schoolmaster could teach the student the “right” way to employ the elements of posturing, with the implication that education gives one more control of such fashioning.

That Ascham is interested in posturing is clear, though he would not describe it as such. For instance, he makes it a point to mention one of the key texts of the era regarding fashioning, *The Book of the Courtier*. Ascham writes, “To ioyne learnyng with cumlie exercises, *Conto Baldesar Castiglione* in his booke, *Il Cortegiano*, doth trimlie teache ... And I meruell this booke, is no more read in the Court, than it is, seying it is so well translated into English by a worthie Ientleman Syr *Th. Hobbie*” (*The Scholemaster* 61). This assertion clearly illuminates Elizabeth’s experience of the famous text, given that her Italian instructor had a familial connection to that text’s author and that her Classical language instructor valued that text so highly. In fact, Elizabeth likely encountered different perspectives on that text, given Castiglione’s position as a foreign soldier and Ascham’s experience as an English scholar; yet

both of her instructors, as individuals moving socially upward, likely recognized the value of posturing and manipulation advocated within *Il Cortegiano*. Notably, like Castiglione, as well as Vives, before him, Ascham also expresses concern regarding the influence of inappropriate models. He states, “But see the mishap of men: The best examples haue neuer such forse to moue to any goodnes, as the bad, vaine, light and fond, haue to all ilnes” (Ascham, *The Scholemaster* 64). Like the rough individual who inappropriately assumes aspects of a performance that he should not, Ascham also fears the power of a bad model to lead a courtier astray.

Turning more directly to the concept of modeling and emulation, Ascham runs through recent examples of ideal noblemen in England’s recent history, including Edward VI. Yet it is Elizabeth that Ascham offers as a model to imitate. Ascham states, “It is your shame, (I speake to you all, you yong Ientlemen of England) that one mayd should go beyond you all, in excellencie of learnyng, and knowledge of diuers tonges ... the Queenes Maiestie her selfe” (*The Scholemaster* 63). He stresses her daily endeavors to further her knowledge on a multitude of topics and languages, while asserting she is fluent in at least five foreign languages. While he praises Elizabeth, such praise potentially challenges gender norms, as the female monarch outperforms her male courtiers. Furthermore, Ascham encourages these courtiers to emulate a woman’s behavior. Yet his subtle suggestion is that the male courtiers may restore order by matching the queen’s knowledge; while they may not become her social equal, they may mirror her intellectual abilities. Karen Cunningham claims, “the example evades gender confusion and anarchy by positing a competitive end for the male-female identification and suggesting that it is only temporary ... If the scholar works hard enough, though he may not acquire a monarchy (or monarch), he will acquire a certain majesty” (220). Ascham continues, “[The Queen’s] onely

example, if the rest of our nobilitie would folow, than might England be, for learnyng and wisdom in nobilitie, a spectacle to all the world beside” (*The Scholemaster* 63 - 64). He returns to the concept of imitation as productive action for the public good; to draw on the queen’s behavior is to become a figure who also has the ability to affect political matters for an international audience. Moreover, that Ascham invokes the concept of “spectacle” in connection to his project of constructing intellectual labor highlights the performative nature of such an education; for one’s learning to influence the political realm, others must be able to witness it in action. Thus, Elizabeth as the ideal pupil serves to motivate male behavior. Through all of this, though, Ascham demonstrates his ability to fluidly move between postures, drawing on a moralizing stance as another strategy to drive noble readers to imitate Elizabeth; he poses as a humble instructor, proud citizen, and moral preacher within a short space, in order to assert the potentially dangerous concept that a woman is the supreme model. The rhetorical lesson cannot have been lost to Elizabeth herself.

Elizabeth’s virtues that Ascham describes also function to establish the ability of the male instructor. Ascham proceeds, claiming, “it pleased God to call me, to be one poore minister in setting forward these excellent giftes of learnyng in this most excellent Prince” (*The Scholemaster* 63). His humble posture, as the “poore minister,” is appropriate, in order to not detract from his construction of the queen, “this most excellent Prince”; at the same time, he implies he is responsible for leading Elizabeth to this love of constant learning. As Cunningham suggests, “her achievement is not her achievement, but the teacher- hero’s” (222). Thus, double posturing is deeply embedded in the design of Elizabeth’s education, as her instructor’s complex mimicry informs both her formal education and the models she witnesses on a daily basis. The accomplished protégé reflects the effectiveness of her instructor, establishing that he is a model

for other scholars to emulate as well. This duality of his posture, as both a “poor” but effective instructor tasked by divine mandate, further demonstrates Ascham’s use of multi-faceted performances, something his pupil, Elizabeth, likely witnessed throughout her time with him.

In the second book of *The Scholemaster*, Ascham focuses on the practice of double translation, leading him to discuss *imitatio* extensively. He recommends having the pupil read texts by Cicero, Terence, Caesar, and Livy, then translate them into English, then back again into Latin. He also proposes creative endeavors, such as the tutor composing a letter seemingly from the student to a familiar recipient, then requiring the pupil to translate it into Latin. Ascham claims:

Ye perceiue, how *Plinie* teacheth, that by this exercise of double translating, is learned, easely, sensiblie, by litle and litle ... the choice of aptest wordes, the right framing of wordes and sentences, cumlines of figures and formes, fitte for euerie matter, and proper for euerie tong, but that which is greater also, in marking dayly, and folowing diligentlie thus, the steppes of the best Autors ...: whereby your scholer shall be brought not onelie to like eloquence, but also, to all trewe vnderstanding and right iudgement, both for writing and speaking. (*The Scholemaster* 103)

Noticeably, Ascham uses Pliny’s ethos to enhance the validity of this strategy; at the same time, he draws on Quintilian’s theory regarding mimicking effective writers. Describing the value of reading models, Quintilian explicitly draws a connection between reading and performance, stating, “[The student] must accumulate a certain store of resources, to be employed whenever they may be required ... For there can be no doubt that in art no small portion of our task lies in imitation, since, although invention came first and is all-important, it is expedient to imitate whatever has been invented with success” (10.1.5; 10.2.1). Thus, Quintilian supports the

practicality of rhetorical imitation, emphatically encouraging rhetors to draw on previous rhetorical postures. By drawing on these authors, Ascham establishes himself as a follower of Classical tradition, clothing his pedagogical innovations as well-established strategies. At the same time, Ascham evinces anxiety, indicating that such bolstering is needed when he claims that the “ignorant, unlearned, and idle student ... [would protest] piddling thus about the imitation of others ... They will say it were a plain slavery and injury, too, to shackle and tie a good wit and hinder the course of a good man’s nature with such bonds of servitude in following others” (*The Scholemaster* 142). He constructs such servitude as a good, as a pathway to “trewe vnderstanding and right iudgement,” which one may interpret as the rhetor’s sophisticated understanding of context and audience. The pupil may come to understand the appropriate posture to construct within a given moment if he has a catalogue of established rhetorical models to draw on.

Finally, as earlier stated, Ascham directly addresses the concept of imitation itself, giving a definition of *imitatio*: “*Imitation*, is a facultie to expresse liuelie and perfitelie that example: which ye go about to folow. And of it selfe, it is large and wide: for all the workes of nature, in a maner be examples for arte to folow” (*The Scholemaster* 135). The inclusion of “all the workes of nature” points to a broader understanding of modelling, as this suggests that there are models outside the classical canon that one may learn, once the pupil understands how to draw on such rhetorical skills. That Ascham refers to this ability to extrapolate from and apply aspects of other models as an “arte” points to his understanding of such mimicry as a rhetorical act. He proceeds to identify three types of imitation in learning: the first, the imitation of life as it appears in comedies and tragedies, he dismisses as inappropriate for instructional use. The second kind of imitation, for which he advocates, requires one to emulate one or many great authors. Ascham

claims the third style of imitation is a subset of the second, stating, “as when you be determined, whether ye will folow one or mo, to know perfitlie, and which way to folow that one: in what place: by what meane and order: by what tooles and instrumentes ye shall do it, by what skill and iudgement, ye shall trowelie discern, whether ye folow rightlie or no” (*The Scholemaster* 139). This concept of the rhetor’s discernment is the key element in the transition from simple imitation to productive mimicry. Ascham reiterates this distinction when exploring Cicero’s *De Oratore* (55 B.C.), claiming Cicero’s work on oration focuses on two concepts: “In good matter, and good handling of the matter” (*The Scholemaster* 143). The “good handling” is the final product of Ascham’s system, as he focuses on training the student to skillfully apply strategies learned from models in new contexts. Elsewhere, Ascham refers to identifying moments in Cicero’s work in which he either commits “*exprimere*,” to express, or “*effingere*,” to fashion, which Ascham claims, “be the verie propre wordes of Imitation” (*The Scholemaster* 153). Thus, there is a clear distinction between using material to express an idea and fashioning material in a new way, potentially for a new purpose.

Though the concept of mimicry, as posited by Jacques Lacan and Homi Bhabha, was not overtly named as such during Ascham’s time, he clearly anticipates their ideas in the way he stressed the importance of imitation, beyond a learning stratagem and rhetorical inventory to draw on. Correct and “perfect” discernment transforms practice into public action. In fact, Ascham thought to write a book dedicated to imitation, which identified rhetorical precepts first, then identified their manner of use in canonical examples, similar to composition textbooks used for later generations. Ascham states, “it came into my head that a verie fitable booke might be made *de Imitatione*, after an other sort, than euer yet was attempted of that matter, conteyning a certaine fewe fitte preceptes, vnto the which should be gathered and applied plentie of examples”

(*The Scholemaster* 152). While he acknowledges he is not the only one interested in creating such an innovative text, Ascham dismisses previous efforts, stating, “They order nothing: They lay before you, what is done: they do not teach you, how it is done: They busie not them selues with forme of buildyng” (*The Scholemaster* 154). Ascham’s proposed text would focus on analysis in order to lead to action; the rhetor reads in order to compose and perform.

Thus, Ascham simultaneously performs and constructs his concept of the ideal instructor throughout the text, one who values Classical oratorical masters as a productive archive of rhetorical opportunity for a pupil to accumulate and then manipulate. His schoolmaster is approachable, patient, and well-practiced. Moreover, the ideal instructor does not insist on constricting learning to only canonical authors. For instance, he explains why he begins a student’s instruction with Varro, Salust, Caesar, and Cicero, though he acknowledges the valuable work of Latin poets. Ascham writes, “I purpose to teach a yong scholer, to go, not to daunce: to speake, not to sing, ... but *Oratores* and *Historici* be those cumlie goers, and faire and wise speakers, of whom I wishe my scholer to wayte vpon first, and after in good order, & dew tyme, to be brought forth, to the singing and dauncing schole” (*The Scholemaster* 187). This recognition of learning as an on-going pursuit, with the transfer of skills learned in one context to another, points to Ascham’s understanding of the fluid use of the models that could result from his imitation-based educational system. His manner of teaching imitation, through deference and self-effacement, is the ultimate lesson in what he is advocating, which a young but watchful figure such as Elizabeth inevitably took to heart.

CONTINUED INFLUENCE OF INSTRUCTORS IN ELIZABETH'S COURT

Similar to many of the women who shaped Elizabeth's education and early experiences, her male tutors also remained fixtures in Elizabeth's court, long after her childhood ended. These individuals held prestigious court positions close to the queen, as trusted and influential figures. The evolution of schoolmasters into politically influential courtiers may seem odd to modern sensibilities; yet the royal instructors' work was already political in nature. To educate royal offspring meant the very real possibility of shaping the future of the nation at large. That the monarch might retain the services and foster the relationship with her teachers is thus unsurprising, as in many ways, these individuals served as her first counsel, introducing her to new ideas, rhetorical strategies, and educational discussions. Their influence is evident, not simply in the ephemeral nature of observing the network of individuals that informed Elizabeth's rhetorical performances, but also in very tangible ways.

As noted earlier, Giovanni Battista Castiglione, the Italian instructor remained a loyal courtier and close confidant. In this privileged position, Castiglioni served as a mediator for Italians at court, representing their interests to those with authority. The text he compiled, added to, and published, *Una Essortazione al Timor di Dio*, was the first Italian text published in England, representing the increasingly international nature of the Tudor court (Bolland 42). That the queen's Italian instructor should be the first to publish such a text - with a controversial Reformist's material as well as Castiglione's own prefaces praising the queen - highlights the royal privilege he enjoyed.

Castiglione remained in the queen's service throughout his life, passing away in 1598. Regarding her ability to converse in Italian, Elizabeth stated to the Venetian envoy, Giovan Carlo

Scaramelli: “I do not know if I have spoken well in this Italian language, yet given that I learned it as a girl I do believe that I have not forgotten it” (qtd. in Wyatt 127). Given her long relationship with her Italian instructor, this feint points to learning beyond the ability to speak another language. Georgia Brown highlights the prevalence of such a rhetorical maneuver at that time, describing it as, “[a] game of partial veiling and unveiling ... a characteristically Elizabethan kind of self-consciousness which is dependent on artifice and produced by images that simultaneously hide and indicate a self” (95). Anne Ferry similarly tracks the emerging early modern notion of interiority through an analysis of sonnets, demonstrating that such rhetorical strategies were part of a larger cultural sensitivity. For instance, Ferry claims that the first line in *Astrophil and Stella*, “Loving in truth, and faine in verse my love to show,” alters poetic language, by emphasizing a divide between authentic sensation and what verse can capture (128). As such, Phillip Sidney’s poem thus suggests Astrophil lives “a conscious and continuous, hidden existence” (157). Ferry analyzes Astrophil’s assertion, “I am not I,” stating, “[it] lays claim to what it wittily denies: that behind the pitiable ‘tale of’ ... is an ‘I’ with an identity distinct but unexpressed, held in reserve” (135). Likewise, Elizabeth often exploits this dichotomy between outwardly seeming and an inward, “authentic” self. Elizabeth’s feigned humility, the deliberate denigration of her ability, reminds the listener that she has been fluent in Italian for some time, remaining so in a way that obscures her effort: the quintessence of *sprezzatura*.

As noted previously, the continued relationship between Elizabeth and her instructors influenced international politics as well, as is clear by the return of her classical languages tutor, Johannes Spithovius, as an envoy for the Danish court. From 1559-1560, he was involved in an effort to convince the queen to marry the Danish king, Frederick II. That Spithovius was selected

for significant political encounters with the English queen points to a recognition of her on-going esteem for her one-time instructor (Adams and Gehring 36). Letters by Dorothea of Denmark and Spithovius survive which describe elements of this encounter. In her writing, Dorothea refers to Spithovius as Elizabeth's "faithful minister" (Adams and Gehring 42). In November of his visit, Elizabeth awarded Spithovius the prebend of Gillingham Magna in Salisbury Cathedral, as acknowledgement of his past service to her. In a letter to Dorothea, Spithovius recounts his initial encounter with Elizabeth on his return:

On the fourth day, after I came to London I met the most serene queen. She received me happily, and the same time gave thanks that I had wished to return to her, as if I were returning to my homeland after exile. We spent an hour or so walking under a fair sky and talking about various matters. (50)

Spithovius's account of his informal interactions with the queen highlight the likelihood that he was selected as envoy as his prior relationship as her instructor would grant him private access to the queen's company (Adams and Gehring 43).

Spithovius then provides a nuanced account of the obstacles facing the queen should she consider a marital alliance. He begins his account with posturing, claiming, "Indeed, I do not dare to be overly meddlesome in a foreign country, especially in this one, where everybody wishes to be most observant of the situation" (Spithovius 52). This practical caution is echoed later, when he cryptically claims, "I have done a few things in a general way, but as yet nothing specific. Indeed, no convenient opportunity has yet been given ... I shall exhibit fidelity and diligence as much as I am able and ought to do" (Spithovius 53). Adams and Gehring suggest that Spithovius may have been tasked with presenting Frederick as a potential marital partner (54). As such, Spithovius must navigate complicated alliances, demonstrating loyalty to his

current liege without appearing to disrespect his previous master. He must also interfere in foreign politics without seeming to do so, given the large-scale significance of the marital alliance he may be advocating. That he does not overtly state his objective is telling, as Spithovius exhibits within the letter the cautionary behavior he feels is needed. Furthermore, Spithovius's vague reference to having done "a few things in a general way" and lament that he has not had an opportunity to do more belies his initial posture that he does not wish to intervene in English affairs. Clearly, Spithovius has begun to lay the groundwork for broaching a topic of political impact, attempting to foster an environment receptive to his agenda.

At the same time, Spithovius demonstrates a keen understanding of the political situation surrounding the queen's possible marriage. While ostensibly on a visit for a foreign government, his analysis demonstrates empathy for Elizabeth when considering her options for marital partners. He claims:

If the queen observes the will of her father, which is what the people desire, she ought to be married within the kingdom. But where will she find an equal here, the male royal lineage having died out entirely? The remaining nobility, what few there are, are of inferior rank, and are without the prudence required for the administration of the realm. There are certainly others who are prudent, but they lack nobility of descent, which brings authority ... If she were to look upon someone foreign, and one with a capable character, to join him to herself, the people would be indignant, for they are frightened by the remains of the past, and this prince, whoever in the end he might be, would be implicating himself in a serious war which is to be feared from the Frenchman. Hence however the affair should fall out, this change will hardly take place without the greatest evils and dangers. (Spithovius 52-53)

Through his recitation of the issues Elizabeth faces, Spithovius illustrates his ability to read the English political environment. His empathetic posture somewhat obscures his likely larger objective, which is assessing the likelihood of a successful marital alliance with Frederick. At the same time, it contains a carefully indirect caution, as Spithovius suggests that marriage to Elizabeth may lead to a French war and suspicious subjects. Spithovius also indirectly praises Frederick, if he is indeed there to advance a potential marriage, suggesting that Frederick possesses a “capable character” in addition to his noble birth. As he lists the various obstacles to Elizabeth’s marital options, both within and without her kingdom, Spithovius states, “Authority, power and prudence, however, are all necessary for the good running of a state” (53). His sharp insight into her marital conundrum and its potential impact on Denmark, his careful negotiation of his dual loyalties, and the instructional nature of his commentary regarding what is necessary to successfully rule shows a continued sense of connection while also providing some insight into the sort of implicit training in leadership such a person might have conveyed to a younger Elizabeth.

It is possible that Giovanni Battista Castiglione was involved in similar marital machinations, as on May 26, 1568, Castiglione described Elizabeth’s favorable response to a portrait of Charles, Archduke of the Holy Roman Empire. On March 26, 1568, Cecil writes to Sir William Brooke, the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, in which he mentions, “I think you shall have Mr. Baptista with you shortly to pass secretly over” (“Cecil Papers: 1568”). As such, Castiglione may have travelled as an envoy to pursue marriage discussions for Elizabeth, though the match never came to fruition. At the least he was close enough to the queen to witness her response to such a suitor. That the queen’s former instructors should be selected to travel to represent various political interests emphasizes the continued esteem in which they were held;

others recognized that Elizabeth afforded these men certain privileges, allowing them to address sensitive topics.

Perhaps Roger Ascham best embodies the enduring nature of Elizabeth's early mentors during turbulent and changeable times. In 1550, Ascham was dismissed from Elizabeth's service by the court; the reasons for this dismissal are unclear, but Ascham referred to this episode as his "shipwreck" and "a storm of recent violence and injury" (Pollnitz 136; Ryan 112). Following his dismissal, Ascham returned to Cambridge, then traveled in the continent (Pollnitz 136). Ascham then served as Latin secretary to Mary, eventually holding the same role under Elizabeth's rule (Ryan 112). Ascham's casual mention in his preface to *The Scholemaster* of reading with the queen in her private chamber demonstrates the completeness of his return to grace (xvi). His text retroactively scripts the queen's past as well as his own, constructing the pair engaged in a purposeful program aimed at grooming a young woman for rule. It also conveniently overlooks any breaks in the connection between student and instructor, creating the perception of uninterrupted tutelage. Pollnitz claims, "Indeed Ascham's relentless self-promotion has arguably been a significant factor in generating the praise that scholars have heaped on Elizabeth's learning" (137). Thus, Ascham, like many other instructors in Elizabeth's circle, embodies the concepts of adaptability and mimicry, adeptly maneuvering through changing political environments in order to survive and flourish, while also shaping public perceptions of his pupil. In the process, he offers a template for Elizabeth's posturing in her public life as queen, though his status is complicated by his non-aristocratic status, rather than gender.

In *The Scholemaster*, Ascham identifies three masculine means of educating: the schoolmaster, the governor, and the father (35). These masculine means of instruction have parallels in the ways in which Elizabeth, as monarch, constructs herself. She also draws on the

posture of a teacher, a care-taker, and a parent. For instance, during her first speech before Parliament in February 10, 1559, Elizabeth poses as both governor and parent, stating, “And reproach me so no more that I have no children: for everyone one of you, and as many as are English, are my children and kinsfolks” (E. Tudor, “First Speech Before Parliament” 59). Each pose has the dual qualities of authority and guidance embedded. Thus, from her time with individuals who made great use of the flexibility such postures and roles afforded them, Elizabeth created a series of metaphors that infused her rule with the language of education. To learn is to submit to the authorities of others; to teach is to hold authority over. Elizabeth understood the need to shift between such postures, often within a short space of time.

CHAPTER V

“SHREWDNESS AND ELOQUENCE”: EVIDENCE OF THE IMPACT OF ELIZABETH
TUDOR’S EDUCATION AND MIMICRY IN HER MONARCHIC CAREER

Elizabeth’s training in mimicry was apparent in her later political performances, as she drew on her learning to support her political authority during her reign. Roger Ascham describes his pupil when she is queen, as “The shining star, as it were, is my Lady Elizabeth ... She stands out not so much for brightness of birth as for the splendor of virtue and letters” (qtd. in Pollnitz 136). She often pointedly highlighted her educational accomplishments while seemingly negating them, inhabiting the postures of learned scholar and humble woman simultaneously as a means of creating a unique model of royal authority. Elizabeth’s education played a central role in her construction of royal identity. For instance, as Linda Shenk points out, in speeches at Oxford and Cambridge in 1556 and 1564, Elizabeth, “displayed her erudition, emphasized alliances with her current learned counselors and articulated the relationship she expected from her university scholars” (79). At the same time, Elizabeth assumed the traditionally feminized role, feigning modesty and undermining her learning by claiming to struggle with Latin. This strategy mirrors Erasmus’s claim, “a prince’s prestige, his greatness, his royal dignity must not be established and preserved by noisy displays of privileged rank but by wisdom, integrity, and right action” (*Education of a Christian Prince* 14). By minimizing her intellectual accomplishments and linguistic prowess, Elizabeth avoids a “noisy display,” opting instead to assume a conventional pose that does not overtly challenge her audience’s preconceived notions of gender. Such a choice is demonstrative of the “right action” Erasmus values, marking Elizabeth as a savvy rhetor. Throughout her public performances, while Elizabeth deployed a

variety of rhetorical strategies aimed at establishing and preserving her authority by embodying the virtues Erasmus espoused, she often engaged in mimicry, drawing explicit connections between her actions and appearance and established models of feminine and royal behavior.

That such posturing was necessary is clear, given that England lacked a ready tradition of autonomous female rulers. *The April 1554 Act of Parliament*, known as *The Act of Regal Power*, decreed that Mary Tudor had the same royal authority as her male predecessors, stating, “the reagall power of thys realme is in the quenes maiestie as fully and absolutely as ever it was in anye her mooste noble progegnytours kynges of thys realme” (qtd. in Borman 142). Four years later, Elizabeth ascended the throne. While such decrees legitimized the queens’ authority, that their power had to be legally affirmed in such a way highlights the dearth of English models of female authority. The female Tudor monarchs had to rely on mimicry to assimilate traditionally masculine postures in order to rhetorically establish their authority. For instance, during Mary Tudor’s first speech at Guildhall in 1553, she states:

Now, loving subjects, what I am, ye right well know. I am your Queen, to whom at my coronation, when I was wedded to the realm and laws of the same (the spousal ring whereof I have on my finger, which never hitherto was, nor hereafter shall be left off) you promised your allegiance and obedience to me. (M. Tudor, “Queen Mary’s Oration” 414)

Mary invokes the marriage metaphor, in which she claims to be married to England. Cristy Beemer examines this moment, stating, “The people of England did not have an image of a queen regnant, so Mary must explain what that means to her people. After all, it is not simply who she is, but ‘what I am’ that she explains to her audience” (“Female Monarchy” 263). Given the newness of such a role for an English audience, both Mary and Elizabeth would recognize

the need for an on-going, fluid performance of power and legitimacy. Elizabeth, however, could draw on the strategy of rhetorical appropriation modeled by her half-sister, extending these efforts into a life-long strategy in an effort to carve out a cultural space for the performance of autonomous female royal authority.

Mimicry pervades Elizabeth's efforts to create an effective performance of royal female authority. Mortensen and Kirsch claim, "Authority and gender are so closely linked that we often have trouble recognizing authoritative gestures that arise particularly from women's experience" (561). As seen with figures such as Katherine Parr, as well as Elizabeth's various instructors, mimicry is a strategy that can be used with varying degrees of subtlety, allowing the rhetor to operate within, and at times make alterations to, established social conventions, permitting them space to exercise some agency. Janel Mueller highlights this scenario as she describes Parr's authorship, stating, "At such junctures, as a subject both held by and holding in suspension a yet-incomplete discourse, what Parr intimates is just so much of the woman in the author as her times and purpose will bear" ("Tudor Queen" 18). That female authority and authorship is "a yet-incomplete discourse" requires Elizabeth to draw on previous models, most of which are contemporary to her, of individuals emulating and adapting established roles (Mueller, "Tudor Queen" 18).

In his *Relazione d'Inghilterra* (1551), Petruccio Ubaldini, originally an Italian mercenary for Henry VIII and later a calligraphist and Italian tutor settled in England during Elizabeth's reign, remarks on Elizabeth's strategic use of knowledge, describing her as "most cunning in the art of persuasion and insinuation. Because of her not inconsiderable grasp of history, given her knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages as well as Italian and French, she also uses an admirable finesse with foreigners, through whom she can gain praise beyond the Realm for her

shrewdness and eloquence” (qtd. in Wyatt 128). Discernable here is the impact both Roger Ascham, as Elizabeth’s Classical language tutor and a proponent of mimicry, and Giovanni Castiglione, as Elizabeth’s Italian instructor and conduit to the Italian contingent at her court, had on the young Elizabeth. Ubaldini’s comments identify key elements in Elizabeth’s use of her education for strategic political performance, namely her shrewd “finesse” and knowledge of the past. To develop Elizabeth’s grasp of history and rhetoric, her instructors followed Classical pedagogical strategies, which relied firmly on imitation. Ascham expressed anxiety regarding detractors of the imitation method: “They will say it were a plain slavery and injury, too, to shackle and tie a good wit and hinder the course of a good man’s nature with such bonds of servitude in following others” (*The Scholemaster* 142-143). However, Karen Cunningham asserts, “But those ‘bonds of servitude’ are precisely the point: they legitimate Elizabeth’s appropriateness as ruler by tying her tightly to a classically authorized textual tradition rather than to individual freedoms” (220). Likewise, Elizabeth, as “a good wit” was able to emulate her instructors and proximate models of authority, all of whom used such education as a repository of established cultural postures to be deployed and adapted at key moments. Thus, the schoolroom imitation exercises evolved into the conscious, active rhetorical strategy of mimicry that enabled a queen to invoke the method of her predecessors while carving a space for her unique wielding of authority.

“ANSWER ANSWERLESS”: ELIZABETH’S VIEW OF MIMICRY

Elizabeth’s network of influence, which consisted of scholars, domestic servants, royal relatives, and formal instructors, provides a useful context for examining evidence of her

awareness and purposeful deployment of mimicry. While she did not write conduct manuals or pedagogical treatises, embedded within her speeches and writing is often a discussion of behavior from which one might glean some insight into her understanding of rhetorical performativity.

Her speeches, in particular, demonstrate her fluid use of various postures, making explicit at times the models she is mirroring and adapting, while also remonstrating her courtiers for not properly performing their own roles. Within such reproaches, she implies that their failure lies in the lack of ready models for their unique situations in dealing with such monarch. Janel Mueller claims, “What remains finally significant ... about Elizabeth’s manipulations of gender in her public self-representations is the felt imperative that the perils and extremities of her experience during her long reign can be seen to be placed upon her. She would seek justification for her sovereignty in every crucial register of her time and culture because she defined the measure of her rule as omniscience” (“Virtue and Virtuality” 56). The queen’s kairotic posturing that developed in response to the “creative pressure” and her public scolding of her courtiers’ inability to mirror such posturing thus suggests that Elizabeth was cognizant of her strategic mimicry.

Elizabeth’s overt references to roles she re-purposes reveal circumstantial evidence of her awareness of her mimetic strategy. The queen explicitly acknowledges the performative nature of her public role on November 12, 1586, in her first speech addressing the issue of Mary Stuart, stating, “We princes, I tell you, are set on stages in sight and view of all the world duly observed. The eyes of many behold our actions; a spot is soon spied on our garments, a blemish quickly noted in our doings” (E. Tudor, “First Reply” 194). Her allusion to the trappings of prestige in the form of clothing that must remain immaculate is instantly associated with princely behavior,

establishing a parallel in which a prince, like a player, wears authority like a costume. Moreover, her allusion to a “spot is soon spied on our garments” also acknowledges the gendered nature of such observations; her reputation as a woman and a virgin must remain unsullied. Her comments highlight the precarious nature of such performances, in that faltering will be immediately damaging to her *ethos*. Her regal power is an abstract concept that must be made visible in more ways than one.

For instance, Elizabeth frequently alludes to her status as an educated individual, leveraging her knowledge to construct a scholarly identity that informs her royal authority. Shenk claims there is a failure in current scholarship to “examine an expression of the queen’s learning as a political gesture” (93). Such references rely on convention and imitation in order to be well-received. At these moments, Elizabeth often also performed humility, so that she at once asserted her authority to speak or rule while seemingly undermining it with conventional expressions of feminine unworthiness. Once again, such humble posturing reflects the influence of her instructors, particularly Ascham who seemingly downplayed his own significance by posturing as merely the student of John Cheke, “the best Master” and instructor to the “best Scholer,” Elizabeth; such associations clearly elevate him beyond a simple mediator of knowledge, as Ascham’s history discussed earlier suggests he has been trained by the best instructor and in turn trained the best student. Likewise, Elizabeth’s comments to the learned audiences at Oxford and Cambridge typify this mimetic and seemingly paradoxical strategy. During her 1566 state visit to Oxford University, Elizabeth described herself as “barren and unfruitful ground” in terms of learning (E. Tudor, “Latin Oration” 91). At the same time, Elizabeth claims, “Indeed I confess that my father took most diligent care to have me correctly instructed in good letters, and I was even engaged in the variety of many languages” (qtd. in

Mueller, “Virtue and Virtuality” 17).² This assertion is significant as despite her humble posturing she also invokes nostalgia and masculine *ethos* by projecting the credit for her education onto Henry; a king valued her learned status, elevating her scholarly pose to one that has been royally sanctioned.

On November 24, 1586, during her second speech addressing the crisis in regard to Mary Stuart, Elizabeth states, “I was not simply trained up, nor in my youth spent my time altogether idly, and yet when I came to the crown, then entered I first into the school of experience, bethinking myself of those things that best fitted a king: justice, temper, magnanimity, judgement” (E. Tudor, “Second Reply” 198). Notably, Elizabeth alters the characteristics of a just man Plato outlines in Book 4 of *The Republic*, which she had read under Ascham’s tutelage. Mueller considers this allusion, pointing out that the original attributes are wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice: “Significantly, Elizabeth omits courage from her otherwise Platonic quartet of the cardinal political virtues” (“Virtue and Virtuality” 49). She claims that for Elizabeth, courage is a concept that remains troubling in its gendered implications early in her reign. Beyond that substitution, Elizabeth’s assertion is different from other references to her training, in that Elizabeth is overtly claiming her early education and personal engagement, while also establishing a value for a different style of learning, which she deems the “school of experience;” this aligns with Mueller’s concept of “felt imperative.”

² The first quote from this speech is drawn from *Elizabeth: Collected Works*, which uses as its source Bodleian Library, University of Oxford, MS Additional A. 63, fols. 16v-17r. Janel Mueller offers a translation of a passage referencing Henry from a later version of the Oxford 1566 speech, Bodleian, MS Rawlinson D. 273, fol.111r. Of this second version, Marcus states that it “circulated more widely” than the one contained in *Elizabeth: Collected Works*. Therefore, even if this passage referring to Henry did not occur in the original oration, it was read by a wider audience later, meaning that the connection between Elizabeth and Henry would be made for this secondary audience.

In a heated response to a Parliamentary delegation which approached her about marriage and the succession in 1566, Elizabeth adds an additional dimension to her educational history, stating, “It is said I am no divine. Indeed I studied nothing else but divinity till I came to the crown; and then I gave myself to the study of that which was meet for government” (E. Tudor, “To a Joint Delegation” 96). Even this statement is somewhat disingenuous, as Elizabeth’s allusions to Plato and her personal, turbulent history prior to ascending the throne would suggest. Malcolm Yarnell claims, “Elizabeth’s speeches ... functioned as a public means for Elizabeth to lead the people to embrace God’s will for them, a will manifested through her religion-political leadership ... In other words, Elizabeth’s authorization for rule was explicitly and consciously theological in foundation” (253). In her speech, Elizabeth poses as a “divine” first, and a ruler second, assimilating clerical *ethos* to further bolster both her educational history and right to rule, as well as her status as head of the church, which many of her contemporaries disputed. She then follows this claim with a definition of the role of kingship; the four characteristics she lists (justice, temper, magnanimity, judgement) are the same traits she must convey to her audience in her behavior (E. Tudor, “Second Reply” 198).

That she should invoke her extensive learning and define kingship during this critical point in her reign is significant, as Elizabeth must construct her delaying tactics as kingly, rather than merely feminized hesitation. Mary Beth Rose describes this process of “self-definition” stating, “Elizabeth creates herself as *sui generis*, an exceptional woman whose royal status and unique capabilities make her inimitable. Her rhetorical technique involves addressing widespread fears about female rule by adhering to conventions that assume the inferiority of the female gender only in order to supersede them” (35). A soft heart or fear does not stay her hand; rather the cautious logic of a scholar or cleric and requirements of an effective king force her to make

decisions slowly. In regard to the issues of marriage and succession, Elizabeth uses this cautious posture to establish herself as careful and just to her people and eventual successor:

A strange thing that the foot should direct the head in so weighty a cause... There were occasions in me at that time, I stood in danger of my life, my sister was so incensed against me. I did differ from her in religion and I was sought for divers ways. And so shall never be my successor. I have conferred with those that are well learned, and have asked their opinions touching the limitation of Succession. (E. Tudor, "To a Joint Delegation" 96)

Within this passage, Elizabeth constructs herself as a persecuted innocent and a just ruler who has learned from personal experience. Additionally, she postures as one who works collaboratively with her subjects, valuing their insight into the succession processes. Such research requires time, thereby crafting her hesitation as just and kingly action that rejects haste. Within the same speech, Elizabeth acknowledges that it is both her formal instruction and experience that has led her to select such a model of kingship for her to occupy in difficult moments; this is a model she has willingly chosen after careful thought, adapted from a Platonic concept.

On January 28, 1563, in response to Parliament's request to Elizabeth to address concerns regarding her marriage and succession, she invoked another posture that offers some insight into her purposeful use of mimicry. She states:

I read of a philosopher whose deeds upon this occasion I remember better than his name, who always when he was required to give answer in any hard question of school points, would rehearse over his alphabet before he would proceed to any further answer therein ... If he, a common man, but in matters of school took such delay the better to shew his

eloquent tale, great cause may justly move me in this so great a matter touching the benefit of this realm and the safety of you all to defer mine answer till some other time ...

(E. Tudor, "Answer to the Commons' Petition" 71)

Once again, Elizabeth invokes her learning, but this time does so somewhat differently, in that she feigns forgetfulness while overtly proposing to mirror this scholar's model of hesitation. Ilona Bell states, "Why flaunt the fact that she could not remember the philosopher's name? Elizabeth was tempting her listeners to respond, 'see, you do lack wit and memory' ... eliciting and exposing their prejudices about women's wit" (*Voice of a Monarch* 98). Thus, her forgetfulness as a pose is also a pointed comment on her subjects' presumptuous behavior, as her analysis of the philosopher's actions highlights her intelligence and rhetorical savvy. Her posture as a forgetful woman, which she instantly undermines, is thus a veiled criticism intended to put her audience in the defensive posture, rather than continuing to actively oppose her. Rather than primarily offering her learning as royal *ethos*, Elizabeth forthrightly states she will emulate a philosopher's rhetorical strategy of delay, adapting his purpose of academic debate to her need for time to consider weighty matters of state. Hopkins notes the pervasiveness of such delaying in Elizabeth's tactics, stating, "All her life her preference was to play for time, to compromise, to resist at all costs any burning of her bridges or narrowing of her options; and although it frequently drove her ministers to distraction, it was a policy that served her well" (26). In this instance, she does not offer herself as a scholar, but rather a monarch valuing the strategy of a "common man," a subtle move that also demonstrates her ability to draw connections to her audience. Finally, Elizabeth demonstrates that she is cognizant that her reading, as well as the strategies of scholars, inform her political performances. This statement is an explicit recognition of the lasting influence of education and the rhetorical strategies of those who teach.

Elizabeth's response to others' rhetorical performances also offers some insight into her conception of effective persuasion and strategic posturing. For example, on January 2, 1567, in her speech dissolving her second Parliament, Elizabeth issued a scathing analysis of her courtiers' efforts to address the succession issue. Elizabeth begins this remonstrance by instantly invoking unsuccessful simulation, stating, "I love so evil counterfeiting and hate so much dissimulation that I may not suffer you depart without that my admonitions may shew your harms and cause you shun unseen peril" (E. Tudor, "Dissolving Parliament" 105). Elizabeth starts her admonishment with deliberately opaque wording, "I love so evil counterfeiting and hate so much dissimulation," strategically deploying a reflexive juxtaposition of concepts to heighten the sense of her displeasure. Maria Perry describes Elizabeth's rebuke, suggesting that "Attempts to restrain her or influence her policy were dissimulation or underhand dealing" (144). Notably, Elizabeth's reference to "counterfeiting" also invokes the contemporary practice of clipping coins, so that a coin appears to be worth more than it is (Perry 143). Likewise, she suggests her courtiers engage in de-valued performances and are attempting to cheat her in a fashion. Like Ascham's distaste for poorly executed imitation, Elizabeth accuses her Parliament of a dangerous sort of mimicry, that damages rather than supports a rhetor's objectives. Later in the same speech, she claims, "Two visors have blinded the eyes of the lookers ... under pretense of saving all, they have done none good" (E. Tudor, "Dissolving Parliament" 105). She asserts that the courtiers feign good intention, "pretense of saving all"; as a result, their rhetorical efforts lack authenticity and fail to produce a positive result, "done none good." Perry claims that to Elizabeth's mind, "Prying into these matters by the House of Commons was a breach of government security" (144). Elizabeth identifies the two "visors" as "succession and liberties" (E. Tudor, "Dissolving Parliament" 105). What follows is Elizabeth's prescription for how

courtiers should navigate the unique exigencies of her reign, first admonishing them that she, as prince, should have been consulted in private prior to such matters being brought before a public audience. Notably, this is subterfuge on her part given that they did admonish her privately first. However, such an assertion is also a moment of mimicry, in that she postures as a private citizen in relation to marriage, while simultaneously foregrounding her privilege as a prince to insist on a private consultation. Elizabeth continues her withering analysis, claiming, “It had been convenient that so weighty a cause had had his original from a zealous prince’s consideration, not from so lip-labored orations out of such subjects’ mouths ... they have done their lewd endeavor to make all my realm suppose that their care was much when mine was none at all” (E. Tudor, “Dissolving Parliament” 105). The descriptive emphasis on “lip-labored orations” highlights her focus on rhetorical strategies. Overwrought speeches fail to persuade Elizabeth as they inadequately address the power differential between courtier and prince. Moreover, she suggests that the courtiers have done a further disservice to their prince, in that their posture as caring about the welfare of the nation makes her appear careless, an identification she denies (Perry 144). She continues exploring this concept of failed audience analysis, stating, “Their handling of this doth well shew, they being wholly ignorant, how fit my grant at this time should be to such a demand” (E. Tudor, “Dissolving Parliament” 105). Poorly conceived rhetoric therefore has the potential to damage the relation between the rhetor and the intended audience.

A key moment occurs as Elizabeth concludes her analysis of the courtiers’ rhetorical efforts. Elizabeth changes tone, saying, “In this one thing their imperfect dealings are to be excused, for I think this be the first that so weighty a cause passed so simple men’s mouths as began this cause” (E. Tudor, “Dissolving Parliament” 105). This back-handed comment, which excuses the petitioners as “simple,” once again invokes the concept of imitation, as it hints that a

rhetorical model does not exist for them to emulate. In other words, she recognizes that the situation is unique in English history. The courtiers had not yet adapted to the “creative pressure” of their political exigencies when dealing with a monarch such as Elizabeth.

Further insight into Elizabeth’s conscious use of mimicry is evident following her speech to Parliament on March 15, 1576. In this speech, and many other devotions, she famously describes herself as God’s handmaid: “rather brought up in a school to bide the ferula than traded in a kingdom to support the scepter” (E. Tudor, “Close of the Parliamentary Session” 169). Notably, such a posture evokes Baldassare Castiglione’s emphasis on *sprezzatura* or effortless effort, as Elizabeth suggests she has not spent time being educated in leadership, subtly indicating that her ability to rule is natural or divinely inspired. Once again, the specter of schooling versus experience arises, yet Elizabeth has been thoroughly tutored through both modes of learning. Certainly, from an early age, she was a witness to and therefore more familiar with the exercise of royal authority than most royal women. Notably, following her speech, Elizabeth sent a copy to her godson, John Harington. In it Elizabeth writes:

Boye Jacke, I have made a clerke wryte faire my poore wordes for thyne use, as it cannot be suche striplinges have entrance into parliamente assemblye as yet. Ponder theme in thy howres of leysure, and plaie wyth theme tyll they enter thyne understandinge; so shallt though hereafter, perchance, fynde some goode frutes hereof when thy Godmother is out of remembraunce (Harington 127)

That Elizabeth shared her speech as an educational tool for the young Harington is telling, even as she postures as a “poore” rhetor. First, by acknowledging he is too young to attend Parliament, she reveals that the motivation for sharing this speech is to prepare Harington for a political career. Second, her direction to “ponder” and “plaie wyth” her words are significant. Elizabeth

does not direct him to simply memorize her speech. Rather, she encourages him to understand the rhetorical maneuvering that occurs within it, so that he might adapt, or “plaie wyth,” such strategies in his own political career, exactly as she herself is doing. That Elizabeth hopes he might “fynde some goode frutes hereof” implies that such an exercise is intended to be productive, rather than just idle exercise during his leisure time. Noticeably, Elizabeth invokes her role as godmother, rather than pointing to her princely status. Her directions are couched in familial terms rather than royal mandate. Finally, by claiming that he may make use of such strategies when she is no longer present, Elizabeth asserts herself as both an immediate and enduring rhetorical model, overtly encouraging another to imitate and adapt her strategies. As such, this passage is close to an open admission of her own approach to purposeful mimicry.

These examples of her speeches suggest that Elizabeth understood the circumstances that shaped her rhetorical strategies. Furthermore, even though contemporary discourse would not label the act of imitation “mimicry,” Elizabeth’s note to Harington in particular implies that she, like her instructors before her, understood and valued such a strategy. Significantly, such comments show that Elizabeth saw herself as entering the tradition of rhetorical models, hoping that political figures such as Harington would emulate her rhetorical stylings after her time.

“SUCCEED HAPPILY THROUGH A DISCREET START”: EARLY PUBLIC PERFORMANCES OF MIMICRY

As a product of her particular circumstances and the turbulent Tudor court cultures that forced her instructors to rely on mimicry to survive as well as socially advance, Elizabeth essentially had no choice but to draw on this rhetorical strategy. Evidence of her particular

mimetic performances exist in multiple vectors. While the clearest examples may be found in her recorded speeches and portraits, other moments, often more informal in nature, illustrate her long history of using mimicry to her advantage.

One of the most remarkable early instances occurred while Elizabeth negotiated the complicated issue of her religion during her Catholic half-sister's reign. While Mary and her government signaled a return to Catholicism, Elizabeth occupied a tenuous position. She recognized that to retain her position within the succession, she had to submit to Mary's rule. At the same time, Elizabeth privately remained aligned with the reformed religion. As such, she initially attempted to avoid attending mass. In a strategy that would become commonplace for Elizabeth, she asked to delay her public submission to Catholicism, claiming she had "never been taught the doctrines of the ancient religion" (Hibbert 41). This delaying and obfuscation of her intent would later become defining characteristics of Elizabeth's response to potential marital alliances. In this early instance, Elizabeth pleaded with her half-sister for time and texts to become familiar with the Catholic religion.

Yet by delaying her public submission to the new Queen's faith, Elizabeth provided a exemplum for those who did not wish to return to papal control (Skidmore 41). Charles V's ambassador, Simon Renard, recognized the danger Elizabeth posed, as well as the ambiguity of her strategy. He writes, "She seems to be clinging to the new religion out of policy to attract and win the support of those who are of this new religion. We may be mistaken in suspecting her of this, but at this early stage it is safer to forestall than be forestalled" (Renard, *Negotiations between England and Spain* 10). Mary insisted that Elizabeth publicly comply with Catholic practices by openly attending Catholic mass, in an effort to demonstrate her acquiescence to the faith to a wide audience (Hopkins 31). While Elizabeth went through the motions of submitting

to Mary's injunctions, she also used such public appearances to her advantage, strategically undermining her seeming compliance with her sister's wishes. For instance, while attending Mass on the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin on September 8, 1553, Elizabeth portrayed her reluctance to participate while traveling to the church, loudly complaining, "that her stomach ached, wearing a suffering air" (Hibbert 42). While seeming to acquiesce to Mary's wishes, Elizabeth seized the opportunity to convey her discomfort without directly stating opposition to the queen. The casual observer could easily infer that Elizabeth was so opposed to the experience that it made her physically ill. On other occasions, Elizabeth wore a book-shaped ornament which had inscribed upon it a prayer that her half-brother, Edward VI, had supposedly made three hours before his death (Hibbert 42). The presence of this ornament suggested Elizabeth's continued dedication to the Protestant faith that her brother advocated, thus belying her seeming obedience and signaling to others that she was not, in fact, committed to the Catholic faith. With this sort of behavior, Elizabeth was able to transform moments of potential defeat into advantageous opportunities, at once seeming to obey while publicly indicating that she offered a Protestant alternative to Mary.

Following such performances, Mary and her advisors, such as Charles V's ambassador, Simon Renard, openly displayed their disbelief in Elizabeth's intention to consider conversion. Renard records a meeting between the half-sisters, in which Mary describes Elizabeth's attendance as, "merely a pretense, made through deceit or timidity" ("Simon Renard to Charles V" 85). In response, Elizabeth claims she was sincere in her interest in the Catholic faith, promising to publicly declare that she attended in accordance with her own conscience and without intent to deceive others (Renard, "Simon Renard to Charles V" 85). However, Renard also claims, "We have since been told, however, that the said Lady Elizabeth is very timid, and

that while she was speaking with the Queen she trembled very much. Nevertheless, Sire, we interpret her reply and her trembling quite differently, and maintain that she appears quite composed and proud” (“Simon Renard to Charles V” 85). Whether such physical attributes of anxiety were authentic or not is impossible to ascertain. However, that others recognized Elizabeth as a clever and resourceful rhetor who might purposefully play upon the image of the frightened and powerless younger sister indicates a pattern of behavior. If Elizabeth was indeed performing this anxiety, it placed her half-sister in the difficult position of being unable to determine the sincerity of her desire to convert. Elizabeth’s public attendance of mass was a useful instrument in influencing public sentiment in favor of the return to Catholicism. However, if Mary were seen as being unduly harsh with a young woman unfamiliar with the Catholic religion through no fault of her own, and who had expressed a willingness and desire to learn this faith, then Mary would likely suffer politically. Thus, Elizabeth turned even a dangerous direct confrontation to her advantage through mimicry, invoking conventional postures which placed the obligation on Mary to provide for her half-sister.

Elizabeth’s early efforts at resisting total compliance with Catholic practices identified her as a royal alternative to Mary from the start of her reign. Moreover, John Green claims, “Nor were these years of waiting without value for Elizabeth herself ... More and more she realized what was to be the aim of her life, the aim of reuniting the England which Edward and Mary alike had rent into to two warring nations” (233). In other words, Elizabeth spent this tempestuous period deliberately planning ways in which to address the issues afflicting England. This objective drew like-minded individuals to her, including William Cecil, a careful and effective courtier who had also served her father, half-brother, and half-sister. The first known contact between the pair occurred in 1548 regarding land Elizabeth was to inherit; by 1550, she

employed William Cecil as the surveyor of that same property (Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* 220). Like Elizabeth, Cecil outwardly conformed to Mary's Catholicism during her reign by attending mass with the rest of her court (Hopkins 67). Green describes this strategic mimicry as a commonplace behavior, claiming, "It is idle to charge Cecil, or the mass of Englishmen who conformed with him in the turn to the religion of Henry, of Edward, of Mary, and of Elizabeth, with baseness or hypocrisy ... Every English subject was called upon to adjust his conscience as well as his conduct to the varying policy of the state" (234). Yet such adjustments required careful crafting of public behavior, so as not to appear dangerous to the royal policy. As a result of his own tenuous positions throughout the various reigns of Tudor monarchs, Cecil's own use of mimicry is visible within his political maneuvering, which became especially apparent in his service to Elizabeth in the early decades of her reign.

She often relied on Cecil to collaborate on the composition of her public material, trusting him to help her navigate difficult situations. Skidmore describes their relationship, stating, "[Cecil] became Elizabeth's mouthpiece; at times their separate voices are indistinguishable, as Cecil crafted the thoughts and polished the words of the queen's proclamations, letters and speeches" (73). Elizabeth felt it was unseemly for her to explain her actions to others, stating, "Kinges and princes soverains ... owe noe service nor tribute to any in the erth but onelie to God Almightye the king of kinges [and] are not bownd to mak accompt of their actions or defences of supposed crimes to anie earthlie persone, being onele answerable to the judgment seate of God" (qtd. in Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* 225). Within this framework, Cecil relied heavily on mimicry to perform his duties, which included explaining or validating the queen's actions.

For instance, Elizabeth's excommunication in 1570 and the Pope's command that Catholics deny her legitimacy, gave rise to a standing fear that English Catholics would attempt to undermine the stability of Elizabeth's government. As a result, in December 1581, Edmund Campion and two other Catholic priests who conducted secret masses were executed for sedition (Simpson 307). To defend the Elizabethan government's actions against English Catholic subjects, Cecil composed *The Execution of Justice in England*, published in 1583. In this text, he poses as an unnamed loyal English subject defending the Crown's persecution of Catholics, particularly its policy of imprisoning and hanging Catholic priests (Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* 225). Such a defense was more valuable when seeming to come from subjects other than Elizabeth's immediate advisors. By obscuring his identity, Cecil poses as though this text reflects the common English subject's sentiments, rather than disseminating the defense as an official government policy. Cecil describes the purpose of the text, "for maintenaunce of publique and Christian peace, against certeine stirrers of sedition, and adherents to the traytors and enemies of the Realme, without any persecution of them for questions of Religion, as is falsely reported" (*The Execution of Justice* 11). He further describes such individuals as intent on inciting rebellion to depose the queen, stating, "whereby if they had not bene speedily resisted, they would have committed great bloodsheddés and slaughters of her Majestie's faithfull subjects, and ruined their native country" (Cecil, *The Execution of Justice* 14).

Notably, Cecil also comments about his opponents' tendency to imitate obedience, stating, "especially to be noted certaine persons naturally borne subjects in the Realme of England and Ireland, who having for some good time protested outwardly their obedience to their souveraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, have nevertheless afterward bene stirred up and seduced" (*The Execution of Justice* 13). Such performances by Catholics call to mind Elizabeth's

own performance of submission to Mary's religious demands. Yet Cecil constructs such performance as inherently threatening to the national welfare, as it obscures the intent to incite civil war. As such, his tract explains and defends Elizabeth's policy towards defiant priests, re-scripting them as political opponents rather than religious martyrs. This later writing suggests that Cecil may have also served as a rhetorical influence on Elizabeth throughout her career, as he too engaged in mimicry.

In the *Fragmenta Regalia*, Robert Naunton offers an anecdote which depicts Elizabeth's strategic theatricality on November 17, 1558, when she learned of her half-sister's death.

Naunton writes:

On Her Sister's departure, She most religiously acknowledged, ascribing the glory of Her deliverance to God alone, for She received the news both of the Queen's death, and her proclamation, by the generall consent of the House, and the publique suffrage of the people, whereat, falling on her knees (after a good time of respiration) she uttered this Verse of the *Psalms*, *A domino factum est istud, & est mirabile in oculis nostris*, which we finde to this day on the stamp of her gold" (5)

In this version of events, Elizabeth describes her ascension as an event brought about by divine intervention, reciting from the 118th Psalm in Latin: "It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes" (Hibbert 60). It is worth noting, however, that Naunton's account is written seventy years after the fact. So, while there is no eyewitness account verifying her kairotic utterance of the phrase at this moment, the phrase was continuously associated with her later via her authorized coins. While the sentiment, with its claim that God was responsible for her good fortune, may have been genuine, her choice to use it obscures her own purposeful maneuvering prior to Mary's death. Moreover, the previous verse of the Psalm states, "The same stone which

the builders refused is become the head-stone in the corner” (Skidmore 70). Many of her contemporaries would recognize the Psalm and thus also understand that Elizabeth intentionally invoked the unstated line, highlighting how her turbulent fortunes had changed without overtly appearing to gloat. Thus, her continued association with the Psalm is at once seemingly humble and jubilant.

Rather than being caught unaware by the transition, Elizabeth and Cecil were ready with a plan for fulfilling key appointments almost immediately. Indeed, in the week preceding Mary’s death, other courtiers gathered at Hatfield to pay their respects to the next queen; Elizabeth knew the time was near. Mary had also realized her time was ending. Mary sent a missive to Elizabeth, stating, “she as her sister should become Queen, and prayed her to maintain the kingdom and the Catholic religion” (qtd. in Surian 1549). Elizabeth’s answer was once more evasive, as she claimed, “I promise this much, that I will not change it, provided only that it can be proved by the word of God, which shall be the only foundation and rule of my religion” (qtd. in Sandys 4). This promise without substance maintained Elizabeth’s previous strategy of seeming to conform to Mary’s wishes, while leaving herself the opportunity to act as she wished.

Nor did Elizabeth waste time in using mimicry to foster a sense of continuity within the Tudor dynasty. For instance, during her coronation on January 15, 1559, Elizabeth wore Mary’s own coronation clothing from 1553; the outfit is depicted in the “Coronation Portrait” of Elizabeth (Arnold 727). *An Inventory of the Wardrobe of Robes*, prepared in 1600, describes the robes as, “The Coronation Robes: one Mantle of Clothe of golde tissued with golde and silver furred with powdered Armyons [i.e., ermines] with a Mantle lace of silke and golde with buttons and Tassels to the same’ and ‘one kirtle of the same tissue, the traine and skirts furred with powdered Armyons the rest lined with Sarceonet, with a paire of bodies and sleeves to the same”

(qtd. in Arnold 727). Prior to the coronation ceremony, Elizabeth ordered a new bodice and pair of sleeves made for the kirtle, purchasing “Four yards of Clothe of Tishewe the grounde golde and Tyshewe Sylver” (qtd. in Arnold 728). Jane Arnold notes that the cloth ordered for these alterations were cheaper than Mary’s original material and likely had less metal thread woven into it (728). As such, wearing her sister’s coronation gown and robes was likely a savvy and economical choice, allowing the new queen to save some money while still looking resplendent. Il Schifanoia, an Italian eye-witness to the procession through London the day prior to the coronation, describes Elizabeth’s appearance, stating she was “dressed in a royal robe of very rich cloth of gold with a double-raised stiff pile, and on her head over a coif of cloth of gold beneath which was her hair, a plain gold crown without lace, as a princess” (Il Schifanoia 300). At the same time, the gowns established a connection to the prior queen, highlighting the dynastic continuation. Given that Elizabeth altered the dress, it is possible to read another subtler purpose behind her costume choice, as it highlighted the physical differences between the half-sisters. Elizabeth appeared younger, slimmer, taller, and full of promise for a new English future. While such grandiose, public demonstrations of wealth, authority, and continuity are common moves for new monarchs, Elizabeth’s particular approach, with its assimilation and repurposing of Mary’s recognizable gown, points to a deliberate strategy of mimicry. Her efforts also highlight the unique anxiety regarding both the Tudor dynasty’s legitimacy and Elizabeth’s own complicated place within courtly politics to this point in her life.

Mimicry was a matter of political policy as even Elizabeth’s religious policy relied upon mimicry and precedent, though her approach would not mirror the unpopular violence and fervor of Mary’s reign. Though she placed what the Marian regime would have called “heretics” such as Cecil in key positions, she did not expel all Catholics from the prior regime. Of the thirty-nine

members of Mary's Council, Elizabeth kept ten (Skidmore 72). Christopher Hibbert claims, "It was generally conceded that ... in her more important appointments, she had chosen well to maintain stability, retaining the most capable members of the old nobility on her Privy Council while dropping several Catholic Councilors who were too closely connected to the policies of her predecessor" (63). This hybrid administration was intended to display unity and lessen fears, as the dominant religion changed once more. Likewise, Elizabeth's own hybrid approach to religion fed this sense of tolerance. Later in life, she claimed, "There was only one Jesus Christ, and one faith and all the rest they disputed about but trifles" (qtd. in Skidmore 87). Her refusal to dictate in many particulars of religion lead to an ambiguity which initially caused the Spanish ambassador to claim Elizabeth "differed very little [from Catholics] ... and only dissented from three or four things in mass" (qtd. in Skidmore 88). However, this early, strategic delay served Elizabeth well, as Norman Jones claims, "the religious confusion of the 1560s allowed Elizabeth to gain firm control over her realm, prevented a Catholic revolt or even her excommunication until the end of the decade" (19). Elizabeth's ambivalent posture invited others to view her as a potential ally and thus as a political figure to continue courting.

Mimicry also subtly underpins her Religious Settlement as well, implicitly allowing her subjects to perform conformity. In 1559, her Parliament grappled with the issue of religion, settling on the *Act of Supremacy 1558* and the *Act of Uniformity 1558*. The *Act of Supremacy* revived Henry VIII's religious policies, situated Elizabeth as the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and made it difficult to categorize Catholicism as heresy (Jones 22). The *Act of Uniformity* outlined a return to mass as it was celebrated in 1552, as well as requiring individuals to attend church weekly (Jones 23). While Protestantism dominated, Catholics in Parliament were allowed to inform this policy, crafting the Acts so that individuals might

privately believe in concepts such as transubstantiation. Elizabeth famously claimed, “I do not wish to make windows into men’s souls” (qtd. in Hopkins 26). In other words, Elizabeth did not wish to punish others for not sharing her beliefs, so long as they appeared to conform and did not create trouble within her state (Hopkins 26). That her Parliament followed her lead in this strategy is significant, as it marks the internalized prevalence of mimicry. In other words, religious mimicry was made into official policy, as the government accepted that the outward performance of acceptance of the reformed religion may not align with the individual’s internal beliefs. This sort of religious mimicry mirrored the early experiences of Elizabeth, Cecil, and other Protestants during Mary’s reign (Hopkins 67).

Upon her accession, Throckmorton advised Elizabeth to be cautious as she undertook reforming royal policies, encouraging her to “succeed happily through a discreet start” (qtd. in Hibbert 63). In other words, as Elizabeth gathered the reigns of royal power, she was encouraged to obscure her machinations so as to avoid appearing threatening. Discretion and mimicry allowed her to survive the tumultuous lead up to her new life as queen. She would continue to draw on these strategies throughout her reign.

ASSIMILATING AND ADAPTING PREVIOUS PERFORMANCES OF ROYAL AUTHORITY

As queen, Elizabeth strategically used feminine and masculine postures as metaphorical parallels to inform her own situation. Elizabeth knowingly re-framed her role, continually transforming the common understanding of her royal position. On November 12, 1586, in the midst of the Mary Stuart crisis, Elizabeth states, “I have had good experience and trial of this

world. I know what it is to be a subject, what to be a sovereign, what to have good neighbors, and sometime meet evil-willers ... These former remembrances, present feeling, and future expectations of evils ... taught me to bear with a better mind these treasons than is common to my sex" (E. Tudor, "First Reply" 193). Elizabeth testifies to the shifting nature of one's performances and audiences as a public figure. Once more, she emphasizes that experience, or in Mueller's terms "felt imperative," have led her to "bear with better mind ... than is common to my sex" (E. Tudor, "First Reply" 193). However, Elizabeth does more than "bear" the ever-changing nature of her political circumstances. While she separates herself from other women, she leverages the feminine posture of forbearance to allow her to act in the manner she sees best as a prince during one of the most significant crises of her reign. Through such mimetic moments, Elizabeth seizes royal agency, suggesting that her particular experience prepared her to exercise her authority carefully. At the same time, even as she refers to her unique experience, Elizabeth often looked also to her royal predecessors as rhetorical models.

Naturally, Elizabeth may be expected to have studied her contemporary royal women as immediate models for her own rhetorical performances. Beemer firmly asserts that she did so, arguing, "As the first reigning women of England, the historical monarch in the mirror was a man ... Without a mirror of female rule, reigning women turned to one another, as contemporary mirrors, to guide them in the discovery of their rhetorical selves" (Beemer, "Female Monarchy" 258). One of the earliest such examples for Elizabeth would be Katherine Parr, who Elizabeth witnessed rule as Regent in Henry's stead from July to September 1544 (Porter 199). However, Katherine's brief tenure as Regent likely would not be sufficient for providing a lasting model of autonomous queenship. Elizabeth's half-sister, Mary Tudor, offered a more immediate and thorough model. A comparison of two of the half-sisters' speeches demonstrates this exchange.

Crowned in 1533, Mary I was the first reigning English queen, which forced her to create rhetorical strategies that overcame gendered concepts of power. One of her most enduring strategies was the manipulation of traditionally feminized roles; she would pose alternately as a maiden, spouse, or mother in order to appropriate the *ethos* associated with these accepted postures (Beemer, "Female Monarchy" 258). By appearing to accept these feminine postures, rather than challenge them, Mary established a connection to her audience that created space within each in which she might speak and exercise power. Elizabeth borrowed this posturing throughout her own rhetorical career, thereby imitating both conventional postures as well as her half-sister's performance of such postures.

The half-sisters' early speeches regarding marriage and the succession issue illustrate this exchange. As discussed previously in this chapter, on February 1, 1553, Mary addressed the issue of the Wyatt Revolt. In this first speech, she strives to rouse her audience, encouraging them to defend her as the symbol of their own well-being. She begins by stressing that she comes to deliver her message in person, a courageous act given the potential danger, stating, "I am come unto you in mine own person" (M. Tudor, "Queen Mary's Oration" 414). She then establishes that the danger is not only to her person, but to their shared interests, stating, "a number of Kentish-men have assembled themselves against both us and you" (M. Tudor, "Queen Mary's Oration" 414). By doing so, Mary aligns her personal well-being with her public's interests. Mary's next move is to establish her status in connection to the audience, as Mary claims, "Now, loving subjects, what I am, ye right well know. I am your Queen" ("Queen Mary's Oration" 414). She then claims that she has wed England, invoking her coronation ring as a mark of her metaphoric marriage to the country (M. Tudor, "Queen Mary's Oration" 414). In order to make this new construction of female royal authority familiar to her audience, Mary

draws on the marriage as a unifying act, assuming the role of one of the new spouses. Through this metaphor, Mary assumes multiple postures at one time. First, claim the wife's passive position, stating, "I was wedded to the realm and laws of the same" ("Queen Mary's Oration" 414). In this way, she does not challenge the audience's gendered expectations. At the same time, she insists on fidelity to her as a prince, stating, "when I was wedded to the realm ... you promised your allegiance and obedience to me" (M. Tudor, "Queen Mary's Oration" 414). Political obedience is repackaged as symbolic marital fidelity, both concepts which were typically demanded by a male figure. Mary as England's wife promises to be loyal to her country, serving its needs, as would be expected of a woman at this time. At the same time, as England's prince, she assumes the husband position, claiming political fidelity from her audience.

Mary also invokes her status as the daughter of a king, recalling Henry VIII's royal authority. She states, "My father, as ye all know, possessed the same regal state, which now rightly is descended onto me: and to him always ye showed yourselves most faithful and loving subjects; and therefore, I doubt not, but ye will show yourselves [such] likewise to me" (M. Tudor, "Queen Mary's Oration" 414). Her reference to Henry does more than evoke nostalgia; it pointedly situates "regal state" as an object, something that can be inherited, regardless of gender. The transactional nature of this transfer of power begins with her posture as a feminine daughter but leads to a masculine authority figure who may inherit authority and the service of others.

As she acknowledges that Wyatt's rebellion is in part occasioned by her own intent to marry Philip of Spain, Mary vows that she will not wed without the informed consent of her people. She states, "And on the word of a queen that if it shall not probably appear to all the

nobility and commons in the high court of parliament, that this marriage shall be for the high benefit and commodity of the whole realm, then will I abstain from marriage while I live” (M. Tudor, “Queen Mary’s Oration” 415). This claim situates the queen as in service to her people, suggesting that they have the ultimate ability to determine her marital situation. However, her suggestion that she might remain unmarried, at her people’s behest, sets the stage for Elizabeth’s later, famously prolonged, unwed status.

Elsewhere in the speech, Mary assumes another conventionally feminine posture, this time appropriating motherhood. She says:

And I say to you, on the word of a prince, I cannot tell how naturally the mother loveth the child, for I was never the mother of any; but certainly, if a prince and governor may as naturally and earnestly love her subjects, as the mother doth love the child, then assure yourselves, that I, being your lady and mistress, do as earnestly and tenderly love and favor you. (M. Tudor, “Queen Mary’s Oration” 414)

Though Mary emphasizes that she has not personally experienced motherhood, her acknowledgment points to her potential to do so. Beemer describes this strategy as *apophasis*, in which a rhetor only partially references feminine figures in order to support their *ethos* by pointing back to their bodies (“Female Monarchy” 259). Mary’s body is the vehicle through which succession concerns will be addressed; in this instance, that body requires protection, in order to maintain national order. Nor does she claim that she is mother to the nation. Rather, she simply associates the metaphorical value of motherhood with the traditionally masculine exercise of royal authority. She extends this metaphor by stating, “And I, thus loving you, cannot but think that ye as heartily and faithfully love me” (M. Tudor, “Queen Mary’s Oration” 414). This

language of love and care, as a mutual exchange between prince and subjects, has its roots in her maternal posture. Elizabeth would copy this strategy frequently as well.

In many ways, Mary's first speech provides a rhetorical map to Elizabeth's use of feminine posturing throughout her reign. Like Mary, Elizabeth faced questions regarding marriage and succession. She also responded by posturing as a maiden, mother, and spouse, who is wed to her subjects and engaged in a loving exchange. Elizabeth's use of Mary's speech recalls Jean Belmaine's lesson years earlier when he showed Elizabeth the importance of choosing texts strategically by selecting Margaret of Navarre's *Le miroir de l'ame pecheresse* for her to translate. However, as speaker and translator Elizabeth did not simply echo her model's words; she subtly altered them, paving the way for a different form of queenship. Elizabeth's first speech before Parliament in February 10, 1559, which also responds to early concerns regarding marriage and royal heirs, bears a striking resemblance to Mary's, but with significant alterations.

For instance, Elizabeth also draws on the posture of a young Christian woman who remains virginal, acknowledging cultural conventions for women. Like her half-sister, in one version of the speech, Elizabeth claims metaphorically to be married to England. However, first, she claims that during the transition from a private subject to a prince, she believed that her marriage would, in fact, be detrimental to the nation, using Mary as an implicit example. Elizabeth states, "But when the public charge of governing the kingdom came upon me, it seemed unto me an inconsiderate folly to draw upon myself the cares which might proceed of marriage" ("First Speech Before Parliament" 59). This suggestion lays the groundwork for re-envisioning a royal marriage as potentially selfish or dangerous to her subjects; Elizabeth postures as sacrificing something that might be personally satisfying, but "inconsiderate" of her

subjects. She then claims, “To conclude, I am already bound unto a husband, which is the kingdom of England, and that may suffice you” (E. Tudor, “First Speech Before Parliament” 59). Unlike Mary, Elizabeth overtly assumes the feminine position of wife in this marriage between prince and state, though in later speeches she will borrow Mary’s role as wife to the kingdom. Beemer suggests, “She stands before Parliament a married woman, but the denial is implicit. She will not need to marry another [man]; she does not need to be a man’s wife” (“Female Monarchy” 266). Thus, Elizabeth again assumes a feminized posture as a wife, seeming to bow before convention, while providing for herself the space to dismiss the need for a husband. Mary’s previous ambiguous posture lacks this aggressive denial. However, Elizabeth does not fully dismiss the possibility, suggesting, “Nevertheless, if God have ordained me to another course of life, I will promise you to do nothing to the prejudice of the commonwealth, but as far as possible I may, will marry such a husband as shall be no less careful for the common good, than myself” (“First Speech Before Parliament” 59). While this phrasing is reminiscent of Mary’s promise to not marry against her subjects’ wishes or to their detriment, Elizabeth adapts this promise, making it conditional by placing the power to decide in God’s hands as well as her own determination. This is a classic instance of Elizabeth’s deft posturing, in which she activates and mimics multiple roles without committing to any.

Elizabeth also mimics her half-sister’s use of the coronation ring as an object reflective of this metaphorical marriage. Notably, the history of her coronation ring is obscure. It is possible that this ring to which she is calling attention is Mary’s coronation ring, as Elizabeth received it from Throckmorton as evidence of her death. At the very least, it is likely a ring that the Crown already owned, as the contemporary record of the items and cost involved in Elizabeth’s coronation, “The Abridgement of the Coronation of our sovereigne Lady quene Elizabeth,”

simply states, “To be prepared owte of the Jewel howse The Sceptre, The Rodde, The Balle, Three Crownes, A Ringe (Arnold 735). That the ring is not associated with a cost implies it is not new; its inclusion with the most significant artifacts of the coronation ceremony suggests that this is the ring considered to be the “coronation” ring. As such, it is possible that once more Elizabeth cleverly appropriated a symbol of the Tudor dynasty, whether it is Mary’s actual coronation ring or simply one created during a previous Tudor’s rule, while keeping cost down. Whereas Mary recalled the ring as a symbol of her audience’s obligation to remain loyal, in 1559 Elizabeth invoked it as a reproach to her subjects, stating, “And this [ring] makes me wonder that you forget, yourselves, the pledge of alliance which I have made with my kingdom” (“First Speech Before Parliament” 59). The suggestion that her subjects have forgotten her “marriage” is key, as it implies they should view her royal obligations as paramount to and perhaps separate from her private relationships, despite the fact that such relationships, or lack thereof, would have national consequences.

Elizabeth anticipates the rebuttal to her wifely posturing, drawing on Mary’s metaphor of the prince as parent. She states, “And reproach me so no more that I have no children: for everyone one of you, and as many as are English, are my children and kinsfolks” (E. Tudor, “First Speech Before Parliament” 59). Once more, she alters the posture, diverging from Mary’s gentle comparison of maternal and princely love. Rather, Elizabeth insists that the prince is a parent, rather than simply being similar to a parent. Just as she is already married and therefore does not need to wed again, she already has offspring in the form of her subjects, and therefore does not need to reproduce. When considering the same subject, Mary says, “But if, as my progenitors have done before, it may please God that I might leave some fruit of my body behind me, to be your governor, I trust you would not only rejoyce thereat, but also I know it would be to

your great comfort” (“Queen Mary’s Oration” 163). Mary’s vision of succession relies on precedent, invoking her royal lineage. However, Elizabeth turns the topic of a potential heir on its head, returning to the idea of remaining unwed and virginal. She states, “And if I persist in this which I have proposed unto myself, I assure myself, that God will so direct my counsels and yours that you shall have no cause to doubt of a successor which may be more profitable for the commonwealth than him which may proceed from me, sithence the posterity of good princes doth often-times degenerate” (E. Tudor, “First Speech Before Parliament” 59). Elizabeth’s suggestion that God would provide an heir other than one she physically produced is markedly different from her sister’s stance. In fact, the strange assertion that her own offspring might prove unfit to govern, like any Catholic heir of Mary’s, casts an unusual aspersion on Mary’s strategy of continuing a royal lineage; it is even more unusual considering Elizabeth herself is a product of a “good prince.” Yet with Elizabeth’s posture as a metaphorical parent, many subjects-as-offspring could become potential heirs, reducing her need to procreate and making the ability to choose from so many options potentially palatable to her audience. Having offered this tempting possibility to her subjects, thereby rhetorically nullifying the need to be concerned about her physically producing an offspring, Elizabeth reiterates that she would be content to live and die a virgin queen.

While some scholars, such as Beemer, reduce the canon of royal models available to Elizabeth to her female contemporaries, it is possible to observe moments when Elizabeth mimics postures from her male relatives as well. Some scholarship suggests Elizabeth performed androgyny as a means of “re-gendering” her princely status. For instance, Cheryl Glenn states that, “To distinguish herself from all the English kings who had gone before, as well as from all other women in the realm, she appeared an androgyne, the perfect trope for an imperialistic,

nationalistic state” (159). However, this suggestion does not account for moments that inherently foreground Elizabeth’s embodied status, such as during “The Petticoat Speech” in which she offers the provocative and fundamentally feminine image of her wandering in her undergarments. At the same time androgynous posturing does not account for the moments she decisively assumes masculine postures or imitates her male royal predecessors. Janel Mueller offers yet another way to account for the combination of masculine and feminine posturing, which she describes as “virtual gender.” She states, “‘Virtual’ here signifies that she has full potentiality to perform feminine roles as a wife and mother but also that it is valid for her, as sovereign, to leave these feminine roles unactualized, concentrating instead on the office, qualities, and roles of a [male] monarch” (Mueller, “Virtue and Virtuality” 40). Ann Weatherall describes a strategy in which royal women would reference men as models, choosing to distance themselves from other women (127). Likewise, in order to connect herself more strongly to her Tudor lineage, Elizabeth also strategically mimicked her male Tudor predecessors. The hybridity of virtual gender allows Elizabeth to mimic rhetorical models from a wider range of individuals than Beemer’s initial assertion regarding royal mirrors suggests. By making use of rhetorical strategies of her male counterparts, Elizabeth did not erase her embodied reality of being female to become androgynous. Rather, she wove the masculine and feminine together, deploying various gendered conventions at kairotic moments.

One of the most significant examples of her creating a princely “virtual gender” is the direct result of her emulating and adapting her half-brother Edward VI’s theory of dual bodies, designed for a male ruler, in order to navigate her embodied experience as a woman. This philosophy, was originally written to validate Edward’s authority, given concerns about his youth. As Ernst Kantorowicz has famously described this theory:

[F]or the king has in him two bodies, viz. a body natural, and a body politic. His body natural (if it be considered in itself) is a body mortal, subject to all infirmities that come by nature or accident, ... But his body politic is a body that cannot be seen or handled, consisting of policy and government, and constituted for the direction of the people, and the management of the public-weal. And this body is utterly void of infancy, and old age, and other natural defects and imbecilities which the body natural is subject to, and for this cause what the king does in his body politic cannot be invalidated or frustrated by any disability in his natural body. (7)

Early on, Elizabeth recognizes the value of this metaphorical duality. On November 20, 1558, at Hatfield, Elizabeth first alludes to having two bodies, stating, “I am but one body naturally considered, though by His permission a body politic to govern” (“First Speech, Hatfield” 52). Elizabeth returned to this concept on January 28, 1563, in response to Parliament’s earlier mentioned attempts to pressure her into marriage and a resolution to the issue of succession. First, she gestures to her embodied experiences as a woman, claiming, “The weight and greatness of this matter might cause in me, being a woman wanting both wit and memory, some fear to speak and bashfulness besides, a thing appropriate to my sex” (E. Tudor, “Answer to the Commons’ Petition” 70). Having assumed the “appropriate” feminized diffident posture, Elizabeth immediately negates it by invoking “the princely seat and kingly throne wherein God (though unworthy), hath constituted me” (“Answer to the Commons’ Petition” 70). Elizabeth’s arguments for her space to act as a public rhetor rely on mimicry, adapting a political philosophy of the king’s two bodies to bind not a natural and spiritual body but instead a female and divinely ordained monarchic body. This duality, derived from a theory designed for Edward, becomes central for Elizabeth’s construction of queenship, as her royal status with its divine sanction

elevates her to one who may speak, while seemingly acknowledging the restrictions expected for women in the public arena.

While her royal half-siblings certainly provided models for Elizabeth to consider, her father, Henry VIII, also loomed large over her rhetorical performances. Current scholarship repeatedly notes his lasting influence on Elizabeth. For instance, Tracey Borman claims, “She prides herself on her father and glories in him ... The many references that she made to Henry VIII, and the way in which she tried to emulate his style of monarchy when she became queen, all support this view” (4). David Starkey goes so far as to describe Elizabeth as Henry’s “daughter, imitator, heir and pupil” (56). In 1545, Elizabeth acknowledged this debt to Henry in a letter accompanying her translations of Katherine Parr’s *Prayers and Meditations*. In it, she describes herself to Henry as “not only ... an imitator of [Henry’s] virtues but indeed an inheritor of them” (E. Tudor, “Princess Elizabeth to King Henry VIII” 10). This early reference to imitation points once more to a conscious effort to emulate. At the same time, even a young Elizabeth gestures to something more than simple imitation, transforming that act into a validation of her legitimacy, as she implies those virtues naturally descend to her. Throughout her reign, Elizabeth alluded to her father, using nostalgia and his memory to support her own authority. For instance, in “The Petticoat Speech,” she claims, “though I be a woman, yet I have as good a courage answerable to my place as ever my father had” (E. Tudor, “Speech to a Joint Delegation” 97). In this instance, she uses Henry’s memory to also transfer the traditionally masculine quality of courage to herself, subtly suggesting again it is an inherited trait.

A comparison of the monarchs’ final speeches to Parliament illustrates Elizabeth’s long habit of emulating her father. On December 24, 1545, Henry addressed his Parliament for the final time. Edward Hall, who was likely an eye witness, recorded this speech, publishing it two

years later in his *Hall's Chronicle*, after Henry had passed. Henry delivered his oration as a “speech from the throne”; Elizabeth capitalized on this genre throughout her career (Starkey 54). The parallels between Henry’s rhetoric and Elizabeth’s are immediately obvious. Starkey outlines the overall composition of Henry’s speech, stating:

But nevertheless his speech followed all the rules of rhetorical composition that formed so important a part of both his and Elizabeth’s education. First came the *explanation* of why he had chosen to speak; next the *deprecation* of the speaker’s praise of his talents; and then the *gratulation*, or thanks, for parliament’s generosity in voting him a subsidy (55).

No doubt, she read her father’s speech in manuscript or published form, for when she faced a comparable situation at the end of her own reign, her own speech closely mirrored her father’s final oration.

Elizabeth’s speech mirrored her father’s, closely conforming to this outline in a way that indicates purposeful imitation. Indeed, Elizabeth draws on far more than basic structure; she imitates her father’s postures as well, subtly crafting them to fit her unique situation.

Henry opens his 1545 address to Parliament by thanking the Speaker for serving as his mediator to Parliament but offers a justification for why he chooses to speak for himself on this occasion. Henry states, “yet he is not so able to open and set forth my mind and meaning, and the secrets of my heart, in so plain and ample manner, as I myself am, and can do” (“King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament” 451). This reference to the sharing of the king’s “secrets of [his] heart” immediately establishes an intimacy with his audience, seemingly placing them in his confidence. Furthermore, Henry thanks his subjects, saying, “I most heartily thank you all, that you have put me in remembrance of my duty, which is, to endeavor myself to obtain, and get

such excellent qualities, and necessary virtues, as a prince or governor should or ought to have; of which gifts I recognize myself both bare and barren” (“King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament” 451). His expression of gratitude implies an exchange between prince and subjects, in which they motivate him to be an ideal ruler; as such, the prince needs his subjects in order to excel. At the same time, Henry performs deprecation, a maneuver that his daughter will repeatedly deploy. By denying that he possesses the qualities of an ideal prince, while thanking his subjects for assigning such qualities to him, Henry postures as a self-aware and humble ruler. His following statement that God has granted him some “small qualities” that he will use to “to get and acquire me such notable virtues, and princely qualities, as you have alleged to be incorporate in my person” also suggests that the ideal king is constantly striving to improve (H. Tudor, “King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament” 451-452).

Henry then moves to the *gratulation* in response to Parliament’s approval of a subsidy. He states, “I eftsoons thank you again, because that you, considering our great charges (not for our pleasure, but for your defence, not for our gain, but to our great cost) ... have freely, of your own mind, granted to us a certain subsidy” (H. Tudor, “King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament” 452). His insistence that the subsidy will be used for the benefit of the public, rather than personal gain, is key; Elizabeth will repeat this assurance in her own speeches. Henry also reiterates throughout his speech an acknowledgment of his subjects’ good opinion of him, saying, “I consider the perfect trust and sure confidence which you have put in me, as men having undoubted hope and unfeigned belief in my good doings, and just proceedings” (“King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament” 452). Later, he repeats this assertion: “Now sithence I find such kindness on your part, towards me, I cannot choose but love and favour you, affirming, that no prince in the world more favureth his subjects, than I do you; nor any subjects or commons

more love and obey their sovereign lord, than I perceive you do me” (H. Tudor, “King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament” 452). The repeated allusions to his subjects’ loyalty and high opinion cultivates the sense of a familiar and intimate exchange between a prince and his people; his daughter will borrow this strategy to connect with her subjects.

Next, Henry turns his attention to the subject at hand, in which he reproaches his audience. As he begins this reproach, Henry outlines his view of the key functions of a prince, using *apophasis* to imply he is not guilty of the faults he proposes. He claims, “Surely, if I, contrary to your expectations, should suffer the ministers of the church to decay, or learning (which is so great a jewel) to be minished, or poor and miserable people to be unrelieved, you might say, that I ... were no trusty friend to you, nor charitable man to mine even Christian, neither a lover of the public wealth, nor yet one that feared God” (H. Tudor, “King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament” 452). Henry offers several postures for the ideal monarch: a friend, a charitable individual, a defender of the nation’s prosperity, a proponent of learning, and a God-fearing Christian. These postures will also prove fruitful for Elizabeth.

Henry’s central message pertains to religious turmoil in the kingdom, for which he blames the clergy and the nobles. To make his point, he offers several rhetorical questions, which he then answers. For instance, he states, “Behold then what love and charity is amongst you, when the one calleth the other heretic and anabaptist, and he calleth him again, papist, hypocrite, and pharisee. Be these tokens of charity amongst you? Are these the signs of fraternal love between you? No, no” (H. Tudor, “King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament” 453). He then instructs his audience to address this tumult; if they do not, Henry promises to intervene, in accordance with the obligations he has already outlined for himself prior. If he failed to act, he would become “an unprofitable servant, and an untrue officer” (H. Tudor, “King Henry VIII’s

Speech in Parliament” 453). Henry ends his speech by exhorting Parliament to perform their duties as well, in the service of the common good.

In comparison, Elizabeth’s speech delivered on November 30, 1601, demonstrates the similarities between the monarchs’ rhetorical performances. The 1601 Parliament hotly debated granting the queen more funding in connection to her ability to grant monopolies, which a member described as “the whirlpoole of the prince’s profittes” (Hartley 375). As such, when faced with a situation comparable to Henry, Elizabeth mimics her father’s oratorical structure and royal postures. Elizabeth draws on similar strategies to reaffirm her dedication to the common good. She begins with an explanation of why she has chosen to speak to Parliament, stating, “We have heard your declaration and perceive your care of our estate. I do assure you there is no prince that loves his subjects better, or whose love can countervail our love. There is no jewel, be it of never so rich a price, which I set before this jewel: I mean your love” (E. Tudor, “Golden Speech” 337). Once more, the language of love and intimacy between monarch and subjects appears. Like her father, Elizabeth couches the language in royal gratitude; whereas Henry thanked his audience for reminding him of his duties, Elizabeth is initially grateful to preside over subjects who appreciate her efforts. Later, she reiterates this thankfulness, this time more in line with her father’s reasoning, as she asserts that her Parliament have made her aware of a grievous error on her behalf. She states, “Mr Speaker, you give me thanks but I doubt me I have greater cause to give you thanks, than you me, and I charge you to thank them of the Lower House from me. For had I not received a knowledge from you, I might have fallen into the lapse of an error, only for lack of true information” (E. Tudor, “Golden Speech” 341). Notably, Elizabeth labors, like Henry, to establish her definition of an ideal ruler’s objectives; any deviation from her goals she suggests is not a defect in character but from lack of proper council.

She borrows the posture of prince as servant to the nation, saying, “Neither do I desire to live longer days than I may see your prosperity and that is my only desire ... so I trust by the almighty power of God that I shall be His instrument to preserve you from every peril, dishonour, shame, tyranny and oppression” (E. Tudor, “Golden Speech” 339). As such, she casts herself as a protective figure, safeguarding the nation through divine mandate.

Elizabeth performs these postures also as a means of validating Parliament’s decision to give her additional funding, which she calls “intended helps” (E. Tudor, “Golden Speech” 341). Once again mirroring Henry, Elizabeth insists that a prince is a vehicle for strategically directing funds for the public good. She claims, “My heart was never set on any worldly goods. What you bestow on me, I will not hoard it up, but receive it to bestow on you again” (E. Tudor, “Golden Speech” 341). In this formulation, so reminiscent of Henry’s, the prince serves as a national financial manager.

Another similarity to Henry’s rhetoric arises when Elizabeth turns to the issue at hand, considering the consequences for those who misled her for their personal profit. She first pardons those in Parliament who have complained about the monopolies, assigning to them patriotic sentiment. Elizabeth suggests that she agrees with their belief that her mandates harmed her people, claiming, “our kingly dignity shall not suffer it” (“Golden Speech” 341). Like Henry, she offers rhetorical questions that she then answers. For instance, she asks, “Shall they, think you, escape unpunished that have oppressed you, and have been disrespectful of their duty and regardless of our honour? No, no” (E. Tudor, “Golden Speech” 339). She then stresses that it is her conscience, rather than a desire for popularity, that drives her decision to not prosecute those who have misled her. Furthermore, to avoid appearing foolish, Elizabeth insists that the subjects who received these monopolies purposefully deceived her by implying that they were to the

benefit of many.

Paralleling Henry's insistence that his royal duty comes at a personal cost, Elizabeth asserts, "To be a king and wear a crown is a thing more glorious to them that see it than it is pleasant to them that bear it" ("Golden Speech" 342). Stressing that leadership is valuable mandate from God, Elizabeth implies that this heavy burden is eased by the love of her people. Whereas Henry once suggested, "that no prince in the world more favoureth his subjects, than I do you . . .," his daughter now claims, "And though you have had, and may have, many princes more mighty and wise sitting in this seat, yet you never had nor shall have, any that will be more careful and loving" ("King Henry VIII's Speech in Parliament" 452; E. Tudor, "Golden Speech" 340). When analyzing assertions of love in Henry's final speech to Parliament, Starkey asserts, "This has the authentic Elizabethan ring. Or rather, when Elizabeth struck this note herself, she was a true Henrician" (55). These claims to a superlative princely love for one's subjects, tied to Elizabeth's tradition of claiming inherited virtues, suggests that such royal affection is part of a Tudor tradition of kingship.

Elizabeth also concludes her speech with instructions for her audience, although hers are less threatening in nature than her father's concluding remarks to his Parliament. Henry blamed his Parliament for religious tensions, therefore closing by exhorting them to correct the issues before occasioning his intervention. On the other hand, Elizabeth takes upon herself some blame for the discontent associated with the monopolies, so her final exhortation to action is instead a call for a demonstration of loving and ongoing fidelity. She asks that the members of Parliament kiss her hand, re-establishing the hierarchy between prince and subject as they each pay her a visible sign of loyalty, despite this misstep on her behalf. Thus, Elizabeth tempers her father's strong conclusion, while still asserting the power dynamic in which she remains at the top of the

political hierarchy. Throughout the speech, Elizabeth repeatedly invokes her royal status, referring to herself as king, queen, and prince.

In some instances, Elizabeth's speeches exist in multiple versions, so it can be difficult to definitively draw parallels in specific phrasing to other models. Yet the parallels to her royal predecessors are often striking; even if the exact phrasing in versions of speeches differ, the content and meaning typically remain. Nor is this situation unique to Elizabeth; the speeches of her Tudor predecessors often survive in variations having been recorded only after the initial delivery. For instance, although Hall recorded Henry's speech after it was delivered, the speech's authenticity does not have to be totally discounted. Rather, it was common practice for a speech to be delivered first, with the orator composing key points in advance and adding extemporaneously. Afterwards, observers would document royal speeches as they could best remember. Later, Elizabeth's courtiers would lament that their transcription of her speeches lost part of the orator's style and personality (Marcus 1074). However, the later, documented versions of the speeches of both Henry VIII and Elizabeth with their textual permanence become the versions known to a wider audience.

Furthermore, some scholars might question the extent to which Elizabeth was the author of her own speeches. Yet if Sir John Neale, one of the most distinguished historians of Elizabeth, is correct, Elizabeth's Parliamentary speeches "were always composed and written by herself" (May xxiii). Steven May offers strong evidence of her authorship through a brief analysis of remaining manuscript copies, some of which Elizabeth revised by hand. May claims, "Yet Elizabeth lavished considerable care on their wording, repeatedly changing her drafts for the sake purely stylistic rather than substantive effects ... The evidence of these drafts argues that Elizabeth was extremely sensitive to how her words would affect her parliamentary audience"

(xxiv). Many of these revisions were likely for publication, rather than oral delivery. Thus, one may conclude that when her speeches appeared to mirror or mimic her royal predecessors, Elizabeth did so purposefully, with a keen eye towards achieving her objectives.

“WELL WORTH THE TROUBLE”: MIMICRY AND ELIZABETH’S MANIPULATIONS OF FOREIGN DIPLOMACY

Naturally, Elizabeth’s use of strategic mimicry extended into her foreign politics, coloring small interactions as well as internationally significant events. As an unmarried monarch with Protestant sympathies, Elizabeth offered the potential for a new kind of political alliance, though many assumed such alliances would be made through the traditional methods, such as marriage. As foreign representatives attempted to understand how they might best use this queen to their nation’s advantage, Elizabeth exploited their entrenched notions of gendered political interactions, often posing as a woman intent on a political advantageous marriage. However, her use of delaying tactics, conventionally feminine postures, and intentional ambiguity that derived from and mirrored her predecessors, allowed her to craft her own image of authority within foreign diplomacy.

While Elizabeth’s protracted, and ultimately fruitless, marriage negotiations with various foreign suitors are well-known, it is worth examining the way in which she constructed her royal identity for these foreign representatives through mimicry. For instance, despite inheriting a country with significant debt, Elizabeth understood the rhetorical value of royal magnificence; a radiant monarch symbolizes the power and stability of the entire nation. As such, she made explicit efforts to amplify the resources available to her, so that she might appear wealthy

without drawing on depleted resources. Elizabeth embarks on this project from the outset of her reign, as seen earlier in her repurposing of Mary's coronation robes. In 1581, Elizabeth's use of mimicry noticeably extended even into the spaces she used for such negotiations. While entertaining the Duke of Alençon, it became apparent that Whitehall needed a new banqueting hall. Instead of building a permanent hall, Elizabeth ordered the construction of an impressive canvas structure, or what Lisa Hopkins describes as a "glorified tent" (111). "The Manore and Charge of the Makyng of the Greate Banketyng House at Whythall at the Intertaymt of Mounsere by Queen Elyzabethe, 1581, 23 Eliz" records the details of this remarkable structure:

Against the Coming of serteyn Com missioners out of Fraunce into England ther was a banquet howse made in manner & fourme of a long square 332 foot in measure about; 30 principalls made of great masts, ... The walls of this howse was closed wth canvas, and painted all the out sides of the same howse most arteficially wth a worke called rustick, much like unto stone. This howse hath 292 lights of Glas ... in the top of this howse was wrought most cuninglie upon canvas works of Ivie & holy, ... spanged wth gould & most ritichlie hanged. Betwene thes works of baies & Ivie were great spaces of Canvas, wch was most cuninglie painted, the cloudes wththe starrs, the sunne and sunne beames, wt diverse other coats of sundry sorts belonging to Qs matie, most ritichlie garnished wth gould." ("The Manore")

The account concludes that 375 people worked on the structure, completing it within only three weeks and three days. This canvas structure is a notable instance of mimicry, on many levels. First, the tent-like structure was made to emulate a more permanent building, obscuring the relatively cheap cost and efficiency of its construction. Second, the inside of the structure was made to mirror the external world it protected courtiers from, with its plethora of flora and its

“cunniglie” portrayed heavens. Third, and most notably, the structure borrowed from Henry VIII’s diplomatic history, invoking his own magnificent structures at the Field of Cloth of Gold (Hopkins 111). Such a choice was likely not accidental, as this temporary structure allowed Elizabeth to showcase her royal prestige while also calling to mind a glorious diplomatic event between England and France, establishing precedent within her own family for such exchanges. That Elizabeth was successful in showcasing the wealth she did have to foreign suitors is apparent, as Archduke Charles of Austria’s envoy, Baron Caspar Breuner, describes Elizabeth’s value:

[T]here is no Princess of her compeers that can match her in wisdom, virtue, beauty and splendour of figure and form ... [with an income of] three million in gold annually ... several very fine summer residences ... richly garnished with costly furniture of silk, adorned with gold, pearls and precious stones ... Hence she is well worth the trouble.
(Breuner 15)

However, “the trouble” to which Breuner alludes pervaded her negotiations for decades, as she used mimicry in order to appear amenable to several political suitors.

Several ambassadors found themselves frustrated and thwarted by Elizabeth’s performances. The Spanish ambassador Gómez Suárez de Figueroa y Córdoba, who represented Archduke Ferdinand’s suit, asserts, “I want the matter pressed so as to make this woman show her hand. Sometimes I think she might consent to it, and at other times that she will not marry and has some other design” (y Cordoba 67). His replacement, Alvaro de la Quadra, was equally frustrated by Elizabeth’s posturing. After Quadra suggested the possibility of marriage to Ferdinand’s younger brother, Charles of Austria, Elizabeth deployed mimicry in yet another way, using one of her ladies as an informal mediator. In September of 1559, she asked Mary

Sidney to communicate to Quadra that he had the queen's consent to address the issue of a marital alliance. Moreover, through Sidney, Elizabeth suggested that Quadra encourage Emperor Ferdinand to send Charles to Elizabeth's court. Using Sidney in this way allowed Elizabeth to indicate favor and interest without formally committing to the negotiations (Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* 205). When this possibility came to nothing, Quadra recognized that Elizabeth had manipulated the pair, despite Elizabeth's claim that Mary Sidney had "good intentions but without any commission from her" (Quadra, "From the Same to the Same" 81). Quadra describes his suspicions, "I am obliged to complain of somebody in this matter and have complained of Lady Sidney only, although in good truth she is no more to blame than I am" ("From the Same to the Same" 81). He further outlines his interpretation of Elizabeth's strategy, pointing directly to her mimicry and the purposes it might serve, stating:

She makes her intimates think she is favorable to the archduke's affair, and her women all believe such to be the case, as do the people at large, but there is really no more in it than there was the first day, and I believe for my part that she is astutely taking advantage of the general opinion to reassure somewhat the Catholics who desire the match and to satisfy others who want to see her married and are scandalized at her doings (Quadra, "From the Same to the Same" 81)

Quadra recognized that Elizabeth astutely performed certain interests with various audiences, while never fully disclosing her intentions, allowing her to temporarily satisfy multiple crowds. Whether or not Elizabeth ever sincerely considered some of the more promising alliances is debatable. Yet her pattern of behavior, which Feria describes as "naturally changeable", was consistent in its inconsistency, implying a purposeful strategy of obfuscation through such posturing (Skidmore 138). Elizabeth pretends cooperation while secretly holding back it.

Elizabeth herself describes this tension between artifice and reality, detailing mimetic behavior. In a poem attributed to Elizabeth titled, “On Monsieur’s Departure,” she claims, “I grieve and dare not show my discontent;/ I love, and yet am forced to seem to hate;/ I do, yet dare not say I ever meant;/ I seem stark mute, but inwardly do prate. / I am, and not; I freeze and yet am burned,/ Since from myself another self I turned” (l.1-6). Giovanni Iamartino and Angela Andreani situate the poem within the early modern English literary predilection for poetry that reveals as it conceals. They write, “Whether it is mere affectation or authentic output, it is impossible to establish ... And if it is quite common for women writers in the Renaissance to cultivate secrecy and to rhetorically exploit the interplay between private feelings and public image, this must have been even more true of the Queen and her communicative strategy” (Iamartino and Andreani 124). Elizabeth’s claim that “I freeze and yet am burned” points to the Petrarchan tradition, marking a moment of specifically literary appropriation. Even though poetry of the era often explored the dichotomy between the internal experience and outward appearances, such as in Philip Sidney’s *Astrophel and Stella*, due to the author’s royal status the poem transcends mere literary convention. Rather, the poem also may be interpreted as a critical window into Elizabeth’s rhetorical strategies in tenuous political situations, as she outlines a purposeful tactic of suppressing personal desires in favor of public obligations. While keeping the former instinct alive in the latter responses, the poet-speaker performs another level of concealment, as she claims she is forced, presumably by the court and public opinion, into repressing her personal inclinations. Yet, while such pressure was certainly present, it is very possible that Elizabeth never fully intended to carry through with the marriage. The poem allows her to shift the blame for the failure onto her subjects, leaving open the option for continued amicable relations. Moreover, the poem implies the poet-speaker feels compelled to be silent,

which the act of speaking through the poem belies. Ilona Bell claims, “Elizabeth’s opening lines make little effort either to situate the speaker or to assist the reader, which suggests that the poem was either written for Elizabeth herself or for a private lyric audience which was privy to the underlying events” (“The Queen of Enigma” 145). If the poem was circulated within a small group as was the practice for poetry, no doubt Elizabeth also carefully selected these readers for the strategic purpose of expressing her displeasure and disappointment, or at the very least, creating the appearance of feeling such sentiments. Even the choice of a poem to convey these sentiments is sophisticated in terms of diplomatic communications, as it allows Elizabeth to draw on a culturally accepted genre that conventionally addresses love and disappointment as Elizabethan sonnets generally do without having to make a more formal declaration in opposition to her people’s wishes or seeming to deviate from cultural norms in asserting that she behaves differently than she would like.

Nor did Elizabeth constrain such manipulation to her own marriage negotiations. Her interactions with Mary Stuart also relied heavily on mimicry and performance. For instance, at one point, Elizabeth advanced the proposal that Mary might wed one of her favorites, Robert Dudley (Hopkins 153). Had such a union gone through, it would have placed one of Elizabeth’s courtiers in close proximity to a political threat. At the same time, if Elizabeth was not sincere in her support of this alliance, she at least attempted to delay Mary Stuart’s moving forward with other marital alliances that might pose a more serious challenge to her own throne. However, Mary Stuart’s envoy, James Melville, explored the possibility of a marriage between Mary Stuart and Robert Dudley by visiting Elizabeth’s court. During this visit, Elizabeth pressed the envoy to compare the two queens in terms of their appearances, which he strategically sidestepped (Melville 123). The next day, in a likely orchestrated event, Henry Carey brought the Scottish

envoy to privately overhear Elizabeth as she played the virginals. Upon discovering his presence, Elizabeth chastised Melville, claiming she only played for herself, to “eschew melancholy” (Melville 124). She also continued to press him for a comparison, hoping he would determine which queen was the better player (Melville 124). That this small encounter was planned is likely, suggesting Elizabeth valued displaying her own abilities while needing acknowledgement from a foreign envoy that she in some way excelled beyond his own monarch’s capabilities. Yet this need for acknowledgement likely points to more than mere royal vanity. Rather, Elizabeth insisted upon the protocol of submission from Mary Stuart’s courtier, requiring him to mimic adoration. This insistence demonstrates that mimicry within the courtly circles was cyclical in nature, as both monarch and envoy engaged in rhetorical posturing in response to one another.

Like the envoys seeking Elizabeth’s agreement in a marital alliance, Melville struggled to identify Elizabeth’s true intentions. For instance, he reported a moment in which Elizabeth attempted to convey her sisterly devotion to his royal patron. Following a discussion in which Melville broached the possibility of naming Mary Stuart as her successor, Elizabeth claimed she would “open a gud part of her inwart mynd,” so that he “mycht schaw it again unto the quen” (Melville 120). She then brought Melville to her bed chamber, where she showed him a portrait of Dudley, a large ruby, and a portrait of Mary, which she kissed. Melville asked her to send to Mary either the portrait of Dudley or the ruby, to which Elizabeth responds, “[Mary] Wald get them baith with tym, and all that sche had” (Melville 122). Elizabeth, without declaring Mary Stuart as her heir, offers this possibility while implicitly tying it to Mary agreeing to wed Dudley,

However, Melville was not persuaded by this performance of seeming familial devotion, nor convinced that Elizabeth had been direct with him. Mary Stuart, upon hearing the details of Melville’s trip, inquires, “whither [Melville] thocht that Quen menit trewly towardis hir asweill

inwarty in hir hart, as sche apperit to do outwardly be hir speach” (Melville 129). Notably, Mary emphasizes the difference between outward appearances and internal intentions, anticipating Elizabeth’s own language from “On Monsieur’s Departure.” Echoing the frustration of other representatives before him, Melville points disparagingly towards Elizabeth’s use of mimicry, stating, “ther was nather plain dealing nor uprycht meanyng, bot gret dissimulation, emulation, and fear” (129). Melville’s emphasis on Elizabeth’s use of “dissimulation, emulation, and fear” explicitly ties Elizabeth’s performance to her perception of a political and personal threat, thereby profiling her pretense of those emotions as a survival strategy. He also acknowledges that Elizabeth has somewhat succeeded in her aim at preventing a threatening political alliance, as she “already hendrit [Mary Stuart’s] marriage with the Archeduc Charles of Austria” (Melville 129).

The relationship between Elizabeth and Mary Stuart remained complicated to the very end. When Mary escaped the Scottish rebellion by entering England, Elizabeth faced a difficult political situation. While self-interest dictated that she preserve the status of a fellow anointed queen, Elizabeth necessarily had to come to agreeable terms with the Scottish regents. Thus, she delayed making a decision in regard to Mary’s status for decades, while continuing her familial posturing in letters exchanged with Mary. Mary also offered a candidate for those looking to replace Elizabeth, thereby continuing to pose a threat to Elizabeth’s kingdom. When Francis Walsingham gathered, or perhaps even created, significant evidence that Mary was complicit in a plot against Elizabeth, the stakes grew even higher. As Elizabeth’s council pressured her to execute Mary, she resorted to her typical pattern of delaying, waiting three months to decide on a course of action (Hopkins 71). On February 1, 1586, Francis Walsingham and William Davison

acted as Elizabeth's intermediaries, reproaching Mary's goaler, Amias Paulet, for failing to poison the woman he had charge of for years. They write:

[W]e find by speech lately uttered by her Majesty that she doth note in you both a lack of that care and zeal of her service that she looketh for at your hands, in that you have not in all this time of yourselves ... found out some way to shorten the life of that Queen, considering the great peril she is subject unto hourly, so long as the said Queen shall live ... And therefore she taketh it most unkindly towards her, that men professing that love towards her that you do ... for lack of the discharge of your duties, cast the burthen upon her, knowing as you do her indisposition to shed blood, especially of that sex and quality, and so near to her in blood as the said Queen is. (Walsingham and Davison 259-360)

That the letter comes from Walsingham and Davison, in which they posture as though they are doing Paulet a favor by conveying conversations Elizabeth has had rather than a directive from the queen, allows Elizabeth to deny that she intended Paulet to murder Mary Stuart. Yet Davison later explicitly identifies Elizabeth as the letter's instigator. He claims that while he was present, Elizabeth "entered of herself into some earnest discourse of the danger she lived in, and how it was more than time this matter [with Mary Stuart] were dispatched ... and there-upon made some mention to have letters written to Sir Amias Paulet for the hastening thereof, because the longer it was deferred the more her danger increased" (Nicholas 246-247). So, while it is Walsingham and Davidson who write the letter, it is Elizabeth who is inquiring. The letter allows Elizabeth, who is asking her servant to commit a politically significant and illegal act, to posture as though she is the wronged party, the victim of a disloyal and uncaring subject who exposes her to on-going danger. She also projects blame onto Paulet for forcing her to be the one who must act, invoking her "indisposition" to murder a figure so like herself. Such a posture

ironically overlooks the fact that such decisions are the duty of a monarch, given the larger, international political ramifications. Davison will later describe this duty when Elizabeth finally signs the warrant, stating, “seeing her Majesty had for her part performed as much as in any honor, law, or reason, was to be required at her hands” (Nicolas 241). Had Paulet assassinated Mary Stuart of his own accord, then Elizabeth would not have had to formally act against a fellow anointed queen, potentially diminishing the prestige of their queenly positions in the eyes of others and exposing Elizabeth to possible retribution.

In the end, Elizabeth’s method for handling the execution of her decision significantly highlights her reliance on mimicry. On the same day that Walsingham and Davison sent the letter to Paulet, Elizabeth signed the warrant for Mary Stuart’s execution. Perhaps due to hesitation, or at least the appearance of hesitation, Elizabeth asked for the document again. However, she did not insist upon its return when she learned that it was already sealed, thereby failing to display a desire to stop the process (Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* 88). Two days later, on February 3, her councilors moved to deliver the warrant to Fortheringhay. On February 8th, Mary Stuart was executed. At this point, Elizabeth begins posturing in a remarkable fashion. Davison, tasked with bringing her the warrant and bearing it away, reports her response to the news of Mary Stuart’s execution:

[S]he would not at the first seem to take knowledge of it, but the next morning, falling into some heat and passion about it ... she disavowed the said execution as a thing she never commanded or intended, casting the burthen generally upon them all, but chiefly upon my shoulders, because (as she pretended) I had, in suffering it to go out of my hands, abused the trust she reposed in me (Nicholas 248).

Davison became the scapegoat for the event, as Elizabeth accused him of overstepping his bounds, allowing others access to a warrant she had not intended to see carried out. For his troubles, Elizabeth sent him to the Tower (Nicholas 249). Davison continues to protest against these accusations, repeatedly accusing Elizabeth of “pretending,” stating, “Howbeit, seeing it is pretended that her Majesty gave me a special commandment not only not to impart the said warrant with any of her Council, but also to stay the same in my hand till some greater necessity should enforce her to proceed therein, as thing not to put in execution” (Nicholas 249-250).

Davison denies these claims, insisting she sent for him in order to sign the warrant, then directed him to give it to Walsingham. He lists all the principal counsellors who were involved in this process as a means of indicating that he would have no means nor reason to keep the warrant secret (Nicholas 250-251). He concludes his defense resolutely, insisting that the queen is posturing and concealing the truth, stating, “All which, with a number of other foregoing and following circumstances, too long to rehearse, may sufficiently testify her Majesty’s resolute disposition to have that proceeded in according to her direction and warrant aforesaid, whatsoever be now pretended to the contrary” (Nicholas 255). Whether such a performance and claims lessened the negative opinions of Mary Stuart’s execution is difficult to ascertain.

However, that Elizabeth first encouraged Paulet to assassinate the queen indicates her objectives, which were the removal of Mary as a threat with as little blame as possible. To achieve this end, she strategically imitated once more a queen whose servants undermined her. First, she constructed Paulet as a servant who failed to take matters into his own hands in her defense. In Davison’s case, given that Elizabeth played an active role by signing the warrant, she sought to diminish her involvement by posing as the wounded party whose commands were not obeyed. In

both cases, Elizabeth insists she did not want to execute a fellow queen, downplaying the fact that she herself set that very process into motion.

Throughout her political career, Elizabeth relied on the strategy of delay and obfuscation to negotiate difficult situations, imitating various postures in an effort to delay action while appearing to be performing her royal duty. For instance, Elizabeth uses this tactic in 1594, when the Earl of Essex, Robert Devereux, accused her personal physician, Roderigo Lopez, of plotting to assassinate her. Due to his reputation as a skilled physician, Lopez rose to moderate prominence, eventually being named Physician-in-Chief to Elizabeth in 1586 (Dimock 140-141). As a Portuguese immigrant and a Christian with Jewish heritage, Lopez was often viewed with some suspicion. Gabriel Harvey, an English writer of the era, described Lopez in terms that highlight the suspicion with which some regarded the doctor, stating:

Doctor Lopus, the Queenes physitian, is descended of Jewes: but himselfe A Christian, & Portugall. He is none of the learnedest, or expertest physitians in ye Court: but one, that maketh as great account of himself, as the best: & by a kind of Jewish practis, hath growen to much wealth, & sum reputation: aswell with ye Queen herselfe as with sum of ye greatest Lordes, & Ladyes. (158)

Due to his proximity to high ranking English courtiers and his Portuguese background, Lopez also became involved in foreign political matters. In 1590, likely as part of a larger subterfuge by Francis Walsingham and Essex, Lopez, through Manuel de Andrada, communicated with the Spanish Ambassador in Paris, Don Bernardino de Mendoza (Harvey 172). Thus, Lopez was positioned at the intersection of English tensions regarding Spain, religious difference, and concerns regarding his access to the queen's vulnerable physical body.

When, in 1593, Elizabethan intelligence intercepted a series of communications from Portuguese and Spanish individuals, coded correspondence seemed to suggest Lopez's involvement in a plot with Spain.³ Initially, Elizabeth's administration, save for Essex, was not convinced that Lopez's interactions with Spain had treasonous intent. Starting January 23, 1594, Essex, Robert Cecil, and William Cecil (Lord Burghley), conducted Lopez's first formal examination over the course of three days (Gwyer 181). Burghley's presence, his only involvement in the matter, is significant, as it is likely that the Elizabeth personally requested he be present at the interview. Gwyer claims, "She was more doubtful of Lopez's guilt and wished to have the opinion of her most trusted minister and the man who knew most about the earlier background" (182). Gwyer surmises that in the course of his three-day interview Lopez likely revealed his plans for communicating with Spain. Burghley, having known of Walsingham's original stratagem, may have believed Lopez's account and his subsequent behavior. If so, he likely shared his knowledge of events with Elizabeth. As a result, she remained unconvinced by Essex's attempts to paint Lopez as a dangerous foreign agent (Gwyer 181-182). In fact, in the presence of Robert Cecil and Lord Howard of Effingham, Elizabeth upbraided Essex for his treatment of Lopez. Thomas Birch describes Elizabeth's castigation of Essex, stating, "upon his coming to the queen ... [she] took him up, calling him rash and temerarious youth, to enter into a matter against the poor man, which he could not prove, and whose innocence she knew well enough; but malice against him, and no other, hatch'd all this matter, which displeas'd her much, and the more, for that, she said, her honor was interested herein" (qtd. in Gwyer 150). The final point regarding Elizabeth's concern for her honor is significant, as it implies a motivation for her subsequent actions in the matter.

³ According to many scholars, Essex was the instigator of Lopez's downfall, supposed by some to be triggered by Lopez's alleged disclosure of Essex's sexually transmitted disease for which Lopez was treating him.

At the end of February 1594, Lopez was convicted of high treason (Dimock 463). Following the trial, William Cecil published *A True Report of Sundry Horrible Conspiracies of Late Time Detected to Haue (by Barbarous Murders) Taken Away the Life of the Queenes Most Excellent Maiestie: Whom Almighty God Hath Miraculously Conserued Against the Trecheries of Her Rebelles, and the Violences of Her Most Puissant Enemies* (1594). Dimock suggests that this treatise is actually Elizabeth's effort to publicly address the matter (468). If so, then this pamphlet serves as another example of Elizabeth's masking, in that she used Cecil as an instrument to defend actions taken on her behalf. This treatise also explains why her administration finds the idea of a foreign monarch supporting such a plot plausible, as it lists several foiled plans to assassinate the queen.

After three months of delaying, Elizabeth finally relented, permitting the execution to proceed on June 7, 1594. However, the wording of Elizabeth's order was characteristically ambiguous, stating it was intended "for the freeing of the lieutenant of the Tower from his restraint" (qtd. in Dimock 468). Before taking action, Sir John Puckering and Lord Buckhurst verified with Burghley and Cecil, who were present when the queen issued the order, that she intended the execution to be carried out (Dimock 468-469). However, following Lopez's public execution, Elizabeth agreed to restore most of his property to his family, an unusually generous gesture given the charges (MacNalty 1182). In this way, Elizabeth expressed her uncertainty regarding Lopez's guilt, seemed to take action against a Spanish threat, maintained the authority of her close courtier, and appeared magnanimous to Lopez's family following his conviction for treason.

Throughout this series of events, a gold ring, "set with a large ruby and a large diamond" played a central role (Dimock 446). Initially, this ring was gesture of intent from King Phillip

regarding opening peace negotiations, originally given to Manuel de Andrada, then passed to Lopez (Gwyer 168). At one point, Lopez attempted to give the ring to Elizabeth, perhaps with the hope of enticing Elizabeth to pursue peace negotiations (Gwyer 170). However, Elizabeth rejected the gift, albeit with “gracious words” (qtd. in Dimock 446). However, after Lopez’s execution, the ring was the only item Elizabeth did not return to Lopez’s family. Gwyer writes, “That the Queen kept for herself, and ever afterwards, we are told, wore at her girdle. It was her final enigmatic comment on the whole affair” (184). If this anecdote regarding Elizabeth wearing the ring is true, it marks another instance in which she acted publicly to eliminate a political threat while also appearing to convey a more personal message, whether that was lingering doubts, sentimentality, or even perhaps even a reminder of how close she might have come to assassination.

Elizabeth’s strategic mimicry extended beyond England’s borders, as is evident in her careful interactions with Muslim leaders in Morocco and the Ottoman Empire. Such instances, in which the cultural differences are thrown into relief, illustrate the pervasive nature of Elizabeth’s rhetorical fashioning. She had to both successfully negotiate with a potential ally so unlike herself while also bearing in mind the way in which other foreign, typically Catholic, powers might respond to productive political relations between Protestant and Muslim leaders. Elizabeth and her ambassadors strove to publicly construct interactions with Moroccans and Turks as purely commercial in nature, obscuring the potential for military alliances against Catholic Spain, in particular.

In March 1579, Sultan Murad III initiated direct communication with Elizabeth, addressing the arrival of William Harbone and two English merchants, Edward Osborne and M. Richard Staper, who sought an audience with him; he granted them safe passage in his lands and

the ability to trade with Ottoman subjects (Burton 131). The resulting correspondence between rulers demonstrates careful identity construction and posturing, in an effort to achieve a productive political alliance. Palmira Brummett describes the rhetorical maneuvering, claiming it, “served to legitimize sovereign claims, rally military and popular support, and disarticulate the competing claims of other states” (180). For instance, each leader adjusts how they refer to themselves, as Murad simplified his traditional and lengthy Islamic epithet to “Imperiall Musulmanlike highnesse of Zuldán Murad Can,” while Elizabeth elaborated her titles (Murad 257). In place of her usual “Elizabeth, by the grace of God, Queen of England, France and Ireland, defender of the faith, et cetera,” she postures as, “Elizabeth, by the grace of the most mighty God, the three part and yet singular Creator of heaven and earth, queen of England, France, and Ireland, the most invincible and most mighty defender of the Christian faith against all the idolatry of all those unworthy ones who live amidst Christians, and falsely profess the name of Christ” (E. Tudor, “The answer of her Maiestie” 261-262). Thus, Murad’s styling suggests familiarity and ease, whereas Elizabeth seeks to style herself as a worthy equal to the Sultan. Furthermore, Burton suggests, “Rather than acknowledging Christian unity in the face of an Islamic threat, Elizabeth’s letter transforms Catholicism into Christianity’s principal threat while rendering the Turks as a valuable ally. For Elizabeth’s government recognized that it was not the Muslim Turks who stood threateningly at England’s door, but rather the Catholic Spaniards” (137). In her self-portrayal, Elizabeth implies that Protestantism and Islam share a common goal of opposing religious idolaters, or, in this construction, Catholics. As such, in a slippery moment of mimicry, Elizabeth aligns herself with Islam, mimicking that religion’s values while simultaneously crafting herself as a defender of the Christian faith.

Publicly, Elizabeth and Murad sought to establish simple trade relations. Elizabeth responded to Murad on October 25, 1579, thanking him for granting her subjects free passage through his lands. She claims that these three men entered his territory “at their onely request without any intercession of ours” (E. Tudor, “The answere of her Maiestie” 263). The attempt to sell English goods in Ottoman territory obscures the diplomatic intention behind the encounter. Elizabeth asks Murad to extend the ability trade freely to all English merchants, granting them general access as he has done for other countries. She also stresses that England has resources that other countries lack (E. Tudor, “The answere of her Maiestie” 263- 264). Though Elizabeth does not elaborate on those resources, it is likely that she means to highlight English “bell metal,” or metal from confiscated church objects, that was easily appropriated for military use (Burton 134). As such, the commercial venture also held a significant political connection, in that it was essentially an arms trade between Protestant and Islamic nations. In fact, Elizabeth’s first letter to Murad arrives on the *Prudence*, a ship which the Spanish ambassador to England claimed carried “bell-metal and tin to the value of twenty thousand crowns” (Burton 134). Yet in the surviving letters between the rulers no overt mention is made of an arms trade.

Elizabeth repeats this careful mimicry when offered the opportunity to ally with Moroccans against Spain. In 1600, the King of Morocco, Mulai Ahmad al-Mansur, sent a large diplomatic entourage to London, with his principle secretary Abd el-Ouahed ben Messaoud ben Mohammed Anouk, serving as ambassador (Habib 31). On August 19 and September 10, 1600, Messaoud, via an interpreter, spoke with Elizabeth (Habib 31-32). The Moroccan ambassador arrived with dual purposes, overtly expressing a desire to increase trade between England and Morocco, while covertly sharing the king’s proposal for an Anglo-Moroccan invasion of Spain (Habib 32). Once again, trade negotiations obscured a proposed military alliance, allowing

Elizabeth to perform as though she was not considering waging war against Catholic powers. While Elizabeth courteously rejected such an overt aggression against Spain and a public military alliance with a Muslim nation, she countered with a subterfuge that would allow her to imitate impartiality. Imtiaz Habib describes the political situation, stating, “guaranteeing public suppression of the awkward putative alliance of a Christian kingdom with an unlikely Muslim partner was the challenge the project faced at home and abroad” (37). Thus, Elizabeth proposed that the Moroccans would pay a hundred thousand pounds to the English in advance of such a military engagement. In this way, rather than portraying England as a political equal attacking Spain, Elizabeth is able to craft England’s involvement as a mercenary, rather than political endeavor (Habib 41). Habib claims, “The difficulty of the choice for the English could only be navigated by turning the military collaboration into a commercial proposition that would preserve the foundational separation of Muslim and Christian while reaping both politically strategic and financially smart benefits, the latter in military agreement as well as the new trade relations.” Elizabeth’s feint transforms an alliance with a “traditionally anti-Christian entity” into a lucrative and powerful transaction without seeming to undermine England’s position as a Protestant nation (Habib 42).

In both instances in which Elizabeth interacts with Muslim powers, she operates under the guise of establishing commercial relations, while maneuvering to support military action against Catholic powers that threatened England and her reign. These exchanges are lucrative for England. Even though other European powers condemned such interactions, acknowledging Elizabeth’s role in supporting military aggression against Christian nations, rhetorically, Elizabeth rejected the appearance of formal alliances with Islamic nations (Burton 133). Her posturing allowed England to benefit from these untraditional relations, but, “it would still hold

the Muslim at arm's length while making him pay for that relationship" (Habib 42). Profit and the possibility of damaging European threats enabled Elizabeth to portray herself as a defender of the Christian faith who merely supplied Islamic nations with English goods and manpower.

Many envoys and courtiers would dismiss Elizabeth's "pretending" as part of her changeable nature or attribute her vacillation between postures to her sex. Yet her use of mimicry at key moments, when she must craft the way in which others interpret her intentions and identity, emphasizes the significance of the strategy. Her use of mimicry often enabled her to suspend decisions that would close off opportunities or expose her political objectives before they were achieved. Regardless of the frustration others experienced as a result of this mimicry, Elizabeth constantly manipulated her royal persona to her advantage, wielding various postures as effective political tools.

ELIZABETH'S USE OF VISUAL MIMICRY TO PORTRAY ROYAL AUTHORITY

Evidence of Elizabeth's use of mimicry is also available in her state portraiture. As with her speeches, it can be difficult to fully credit Elizabeth with agency in these visual representations, as she is not the artist. However, given Elizabeth's attention to detail demonstrated in her personal revisions of the speeches, it is highly likely that she would exert the same level of control of her visual representations, ensuring that they aligned with her efforts to construct a particular model of queenship. Indeed, generally, for all portraits anywhere, it is hardly credible that they could be done without the cooperation and agreement of the sitter.

A brief analysis of a few of Elizabeth's state portraits in terms of composition may productively draw on the rhetorical methodology offered by Gunther Kress and Theo Van

Leeuwen in *Reading Images*, focusing in particular on the placement of objects, observing the rhetorical strategy of highlighting her seeming adherence to contemporary feminine discourses. While Elizabeth and those artists that collaborated with her certainly borrowed the *ethos* offered by traditionally masculine artifacts, the strategy of imitation, or more appropriately, mimicry, also played a significant role in establishing her iconic figure as a female subject at the apex of a patriarchal system, emphasizing her feminine posture as a means of appearing to conform while working from within and against a system designed to divest her of agency. Such visual rhetoric demonstrates one means for carving a place for female agency within the public sphere during the early modern era.

Elizabeth Tudor's status as an unwed female monarch required innovative strategies for asserting her right to rule. The strategic use and placement of symbols associated with the contemporary discourse of femininity worked in conjunction with traditionally masculine symbols of authority to establish Elizabeth's original model of authority. The portraits create a fluid association between the symbols while insistently foregrounding Elizabeth's observance of cultural expectations regarding the performance of femininity rather than attempting to mask it. As such, the feminine is imbued with authority, offering a unique model of leadership that values cautious protection while borrowing at times the established *ethos* of masculine symbols.

In order to analyze the strategies employed by Elizabeth and her portrait painters, one may connect Kress and Van Leeuwen's "grammar of visuals" and Homi Bhabha's post-colonial adaptation of Jacques Lacan's mimicry theory. The first theory breaks the images into their basic components, providing a framework, albeit qualified, for attempting to understand compositional choices through social semiotics. The second theory, regarding mimicry, suggests an underlying strategy for consciously working through pre-established conventions and discourses, as it allows

for agency. Notably, both theories point to the potential to change the discourse from within, a key element for a figure in a position of authority from which she would typically be excluded.

Kress and Van Leeuwen provide a methodology for analyzing not only the content of an image, but also the reading practices that informed its composition, practices that are often deeply ingrained and naturalized to the point of being obscured. They describe such conventions as a “grammar” suggesting, “What is expressed in language through the choice between different word classes and clause structures, may, in visual communication, be expressed through the choice between different uses of colour or different compositional structures. And this will affect meaning” (Kress and Van Leeuwen 2). They describe the available modes of communication and their uses as “the semiotic landscape,” stressing that meaning is historically and culturally specific, and agreed upon by social groups (Kress and Van Leeuwen 35).

Kress and Van Leeuwen identify three “grammatical” categories for analyzing an image’s composition: information value, salience, and framing. Of particular importance when considering Elizabeth’s use of visual mimicry is the first, information value, which considers the placement of the elements within an image. They claim that the placement of objects and elements in the visual composition “endows [the elements] with the specific informational values attached to the various ‘zones’ of the image: left and right, top and bottom, center and margin” (Kress and Van Leeuwen 191). The meaning of the placement is culturally determined, and certainly not universal even within a cultural system. However, they argue that general trends can be extrapolated. In terms of Western culture, Kress and Van Leeuwen assign each axis a heuristic for reading the image. For images that make extensive use of the horizontal axis, those elements placed on the viewer’s left are considered “Given,” or familiar and commonplace to the viewer, whereas those elements placed on the viewer’s right are “New,” meaning it is either

unfamiliar or not yet commonly accepted (180-181). For images using the vertical axis, the information value of the upper portion is aligned with the “Ideal” and the bottom portion is aligned with the “Real,” creating a dichotomy between the desired and the pragmatic, the latter which is often marked by the presence of more details (186-187). If an image relies extensively on the center, surrounding one element with others, the central object is deemed the most vital in terms of information, whereas the Margins are dependent on the Center for their meaning (196). An image may make use of multiple axes, thereby creating a complex narrative.

Worth noting is Kress and Van Leeuwen’s claim that the metaphoric process of analogy occurs as social power determines which metaphors, and their related classifications, become naturalized (6). Yet these criteria are open to alteration. Kress and Van Leeuwen state, “Yet it is the transformative action of individuals, along the contours of social givens, which constantly reshapes the resources, and makes possible the self-making of social subjects” (12-13).

Elizabeth, through her use of consistent and carefully selected visual metaphors, may alter the criterial aspects of the monarchy, allowing her construction of rulership, with its fluid use of feminine and masculine iconography and adaptation of traditional monarchical portraiture, to become naturalized and conventional.

It is this claim that an individual may reshape discourses that provides a bridge to Homi Bhabha’s concept of mimicry as a productive strategy. Bhabha adapts Jacques Lacan’s theory of mimicry, in which Lacan states, “The effect of mimicry is camouflage. ... It is not a question of harmonizing with the background, but against a mottled background, of becoming mottled - exactly like the technique of camouflage practiced in human warfare” (99). Bhabha extends this discussion of mimicry, applying it to the colonial Other, who, by imitating the colonizer, reveals through slippage the lack of essential identity in the colonizer and renders ineffectual the

colonizer's power over the colonial Other. Likewise, the successful exercise of authority by a woman in the patriarchal position of monarch reveals that the criterial component of "masculinity" is not inherent to the position.

Bhabha also claims that mimicry is most visible at points of interdiction: "a discourse at the crossroads of what is known and Permissible and that which though known must be kept concealed; a discourse uttered between the lines and as such both against the rules and within them" (7). In terms of visual analysis, this utterance "between the lines" may be read through the filter of Kress and Van Leeuwen's heuristics of placement, salience, and framing, as a careful sign-maker may manipulate expectation, imitating what is asserted as "permissible," but creating slippage that allows for a new set of criterial aspects to alter the discourse.

Within the early modern period, royal portraiture served a vital function, not merely for familiarizing the public with the monarch's image, but also as visual arguments for various ways of performing royal authority, a message directed more specifically at courtiers and ambassadors than the general public of the time. Roy Strong claims, "the Renaissance Neo-Platonist portrait painter was concerned with the ruler, not as an individual, but as the embodiment of the "Idea" of kingship" (35). Yet each monarch manifested the "idea of kingship" in different ways.

For instance, the portraits of Henry VIII, Elizabeth's father, mark a shift from previous royal images. In one of the most well-known examples, *Portrait of Henry VIII* (1537) painted by Hans Holbein, Henry's entire body is depicted, emphasizing his famously imposing stature. He faces the viewer straight on, with his assertive stance highlighting his muscular calves, his right hand gripping leather riding gloves and his left resting casually on a dagger hanging from his waist. Notably, the center of the painting is in fact not Henry's face, which is placed at the top of the portrait. Rather, his impressive codpiece occupies the center place of the large portrait,

reminding the viewer of his virility as a man and therefore as a ruler. Henry's clothes and setting are emphatically opulent; this is a vision of monarchical authority that relies on wealth and virility as a means of embodying kingship.

The idea of wealth, virility, and dynasty as criteria for kingship also appears in *The Family of Henry VIII* (c. 1545). Once again, Henry is central, though he now sits on the throne of state, flanked by his son Edward VI and his then-deceased wife, Jane Seymour. On Henry's right, and the viewer's left, stands Mary, his daughter from Catherine of Aragon, and to Henry's left, and the viewer's right, Elizabeth. The placement of the figures signals their proximity to the accession at this time, but also perpetuates the concept of kingship as the ability to peacefully ensure the smooth transition of power through dynasty and inheritance. Applying Kress and Van Leeuwen's lens to the composition of the painting, Henry is Central, with all figures marginal to him, though their placement indicates hierarchy. By positioning Edward and Mary on the viewer's left side, as the Given, the suggested narrative is one of expected precedence in the line of inheritance. While the placement of Elizabeth on Henry's left and the viewer's right creates balance, it also marks her as New, or as yet unfamiliar; her placement in the line of succession was often unclear.

It is vital to identify how Elizabeth, in her unique position, controlled her public image through the careful manipulation of what Kress and Van Leeuwen describe as "the grammar of visuals" and traditional conventions in regard to the visual presentation of royal authority, mimicking those conventions in order to adapt them. *The Family of Henry VIII: An Allegory of the Tudor Succession* (c. 1572) demonstrates this mimicry and adaptation quite aptly. The image mirrors the original dynastic portrait, with Henry as the central figure. However, the other figures have changed in significant ways. Mary Tudor and her husband Phillip of Spain appear to

Henry's right and the viewer's left, in the space read as the "Given"; Mars, the God of War, accompanies the couple. The contemporary viewer is familiar with the history in which Mary's marital alliance to the Spanish, and Catholic, Phillip lead England into a war that did not advance its interests and almost bankrupted the nation. On the right side of the painting, or the "New," Elizabeth is accompanied by Peace and Prosperity, who trod upon the weapons of war. Henry, while still central, shifts his body towards the New, pointing to Elizabeth, posthumously lending his *ethos* to her version of royal authority, which avoids military engagement when possible. Edward is also placed in the New narrative, holding the sword of Justice behind Elizabeth.

In this alternate version of the Tudor dynasty, Elizabeth draws on the *ethos* of her male, Protestant - leaning predecessors, while relegating her sister's Catholic and more traditional model of queenship to the past, implicating it in ruinous foreign alliances. It is also worth noting that Mary is accompanied by male figures, her husband and the God of War, whereas the unwed Elizabeth is attended by female, and supposedly feminine, virtues. Here, Elizabeth aligns herself with the feminine discourse, and mimics acquiescence to the traditional gender hierarchy, privileging the males of her family, and notably English-born individuals, over a marriage, and subsequent submission, to a foreign power. While Elizabeth's involvement in the composition of the painting cannot be fully documented, the fact she gifted it to Sir Francis Walsingham (as is indicated at the bottom of the painting) indicates that she was in agreement with its content. The residual uncertainty of her involvement in the composition of the painting suggests another strategy of camouflaging, as she allows others to create her image seemingly without her guidance, yet it is very likely she had input before allowing it to be shared publicly.

Elizabeth was often depicted throughout her life within the individual portrait tradition. However, later in her career, with the aid of artists, Elizabeth adapted the conventions of the

royal portrait, relying heavily on allegory, as she did in the adaptation of the dynastic portrait. Strong claims these images were not meant to be realistic, but rather to “evoke in the eyes of the beholder those principles for which the Queen and her government stood ... [and the] abstract principles of rule” (34). While her royal portraits draw on the conventions established by her Tudor predecessors, they also continue to argue in favor of Elizabeth’s unique political posturing, highlighting feminine aspects as productive signs of her authority.

The Armada Portrait (c. 1588) by George Gowers demonstrates this evolution of the royal portrait tradition. Like Henry’s portrait, the *Armada Portrait* is life-sized and overwhelming. Elizabeth looks out of the portrait, but unlike Henry’s bold stare, averts her eyes slightly. This may be read as both feminine and powerful; she is at once modest, yet socially superior and aloof. Though this is not a full body portrait, like Henry’s, it comes close. Rather than merely focusing on Elizabeth’s face, or depicting simply her upper half, the portrait-painter takes pains to depict the queen in her detailed and luxurious attire. Also like Henry, the setting of the portrait reflects upon her wealth and thus her authority.

However, the portrait diverges from the Tudor portrait tradition in many ways, the first being that it is horizontal in structure. Also, it is Mannerist in style, meaning that it does not seek to depict the sitter or the setting in mimetic ways. Thus, the style encourages the viewer to make meaning from the portrait beyond a mere depiction of the queen’s person. Returning to the grammar offered by Kress and Van Leeuwen, one may begin to construct the portrait’s message.

First, on the left side of the image, or the Given, sits the imperial crown, marking her monarchic authority. Also on the left is a globe with Elizabeth’s hand resting lightly upon the northern hemisphere, indicating England’s growing dominion. Behind Elizabeth, on the left side and through a window, the English fleet appears in golden, calm waters. Notably, the queen’s

gaze is towards the side in which all appears peaceful. Thus, images of dominance, peace, and authority are presented as the accepted knowledge. On the right side of the image, or the New, the “Great Wind” causes the destruction of the Spanish Fleet; the argument is that there is a new world order, as England rises, peacefully, to imperial prominence under Elizabeth’s guidance. Noticeably to the far right on the bottom, a mermaid appears as a carved decoration. As the mermaid figure often suggests either sexual promiscuity in women or danger for men when conflated with sirens, the placement of the figure is important (Pederson 13). As it is situated within the New, the mermaid is evocative of the queen’s femininity within a masculine tradition, potentially serving as an empowering symbol in which a woman can be alluring, powerful, and dangerous to those that threaten her nation. It may also be read as part of the destruction of the Armada; the lure of military engagement can be costly for a nation. As the mermaid is composed in profile with its face turned towards Elizabeth in the Center, seeming to mirror her in miniature and therefore drawing an implied connection to Elizabeth, this symbol subtly suggests that it is particularly dangerous to take on such a female ruler.

However, this portrait also contains an interesting narrative on the vertical axis. Naturally, in the Center of the portrait stands Elizabeth. All symbols radiate around her, from the crown, to the globe, the white feather fan, the mermaid, and the windows. In other words, Elizabeth is the center of England’s, as well as international, affairs. Yet her face does not occupy the central point in the painting. Rather, her head is placed at the top of the painting, framed by the images of the opposing fleets. Returning to Kress and Van Leeuwen’s grammar, the top portion may represent the Ideal. As such, the queen’s head is centered between the normative Given and the new, Ideal world order, in which the victory of the English fleet signifying final peace occurs due to her wisdom and God’s grace.

Yet her body occupies a large portion of the bottom half; her feminine dress with its pearls (representing wealth and chastity), pink ribbons, and wide spread panels cannot be overlooked. As the bottom represents the Real, this recalls the dichotomy established in her speech at Tilbury, when she supposedly states, “I know I have the body but of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king and a king of England too” (“Armada Speech” 326). Elizabeth’s head occupies the Ideal space, while her body is placed within the Real. Yet her body, through its thin waist, emphasized hips, and ostensibly feminine garb is not presented as a negative factor. Rather, it suggests that though she is a woman, she is the ultimate woman, modest in behavior, but powerful enough to rest her hand upon the world while battle rages behind her.

The issues of salience and framing are also noteworthy. Though the symbols that radiate outwards from Elizabeth are, in terms of spacing, equally important, other compositional factors highlight certain objects. For instance, the imperial crown is placed higher than other elements such as the globe, closer to Elizabeth’s face and the Ideal space, but beneath the image of the fleet. Thus it is associated with Elizabeth, though she is not wearing it, and underlines the peaceful image of the English fleet. The globe’s bright color palette and round shape call attention to it, though Elizabeth’s famous hand remains even paler, so that she remains privileged.

Also intriguing is the use of compositional framing in this image. Kress and Van Leeuwen claim, “The stronger the framing of an element, the more it is presented as a separate unit of information” (202). The most readily apparent example of framing within the painting by elements occurs with the windows and the sea battle. This is the backdrop; it occurs independently of Elizabeth, yet she is able to garner the *ethos* of a military victory, while

remaining visually separated from it. Her dress marks her as a decidedly non-combatant. Above all, Elizabeth's face is also framed by her impressive ruff, which has solar attributes, stressing again that this feminine figure is the center of national and imperial politics.

Though Elizabeth did not paint her portraits, she did strive to control her public image throughout her reign. In the case of official portraits, she almost certainly had a great deal of input. Particularly in the latter part of her reign, as her opportunities to marry and provide heirs faded, her portraiture became increasingly allegorical; likewise, her image remained, largely, that of an ageless Gloriana. For instance, very few contemporary portraits depict Elizabeth in her old age. In 1596, her Privy Council went so far as to order the destruction of portraits of the queen which caused her "great offence." Strong writes "It must have been exposure to the searching realism of both Gheeraerts and Oliver that provoked the decision to suppress all likenesses of the queen that depicted her as being in any way old and hence subject to mortality" (147). From that point on, Elizabeth's images were created from an ageless face pattern Nicholas Hilliard created, denoted by art historians as the "Mask of Youth" (Strong 147). To engage in the project of convincing her people that she remained a viable and authoritative monarch, despite her deviation from tradition, in which a monarch could be visually identified by criterial aspects such as virility and military might, Elizabeth had to communicate her argument through recognizable and thus readable conventions, that she then adapted. As a result, her portraits rely on appeals to royal tradition as well as an insistence on highlighting her posture as a feminine figure. Indeed, Strong, in describing another famous allegorical image, the *Ditchley* portrait, claims she appears as "a ruler of legendary fame, a visionary figure towering above her realm of England, an image of almost cosmic power. In a span of forty years an individual has been transposed into a symbol" (4). This transposition required careful and conscious manipulation, producing iconic

images of an original leader constantly engaged in the project of validating her authority.

CONCLUSION

For decades during the sixteenth century in England, Elizabeth Tudor produced and maintained a unique model of leadership which redefined the gendered expectations for a monarch, made possible by a fluid use of mimicry as a rhetorical strategy. Lloyd Bitzer describes the practical function of rhetoric in general, stating, “The rhetoric alters reality by bringing into existence a discourse of such a character that the audience, in thought and action, is so engaged that it becomes mediator of change. In this sense rhetoric is always persuasive” (Bitzer 3-4). Elizabeth’s imitation and adaptation of conventional postures and strategies offered by her royal predecessors created a discourse in which she could acknowledge her embodied status as a woman yet exercise public authority without overtly threatening the traditional gendered hierarchy. In this way, the audience could accept such leadership, as it seemingly conceded to cultural expectations; ironically, their acceptance allowed for an alteration to the performance of royal authority.

Throughout her career, Elizabeth drew on productive mimicry as a means of manipulating discourses that would hinder her in the pursuit of her political goals. As a young woman whose future was often uncertain, Elizabeth learned to perform various postures in order to avoid persecution, appeasing her royal relatives, such as Henry VIII and Mary I, who exercised absolute power over her. Later, Elizabeth manipulated her Tudor heritage, using rhetorical maneuvers established by her predecessors in speeches and appropriating Tudor images to establish her royal legitimacy, regardless of her contested status as Anne Boleyn’s

daughter, a Protestant, and a woman. Elizabeth's mimicry is apparent in moments of political crisis, often buying her time to control public perception of her actions. Events such as the executions of Mary Stuart and Rodrigo Lopez highlighted Elizabeth's strategic use of delay as a means of intimating feminine hesitation; such behavior allowed her to remove threats while publicly avoiding the appearance of unfeeling brutality, or at least, disperse the blame for politically dangerous actions. Likewise, as Elizabeth sought to bolster England's security and increase trade, she used mimicry to negotiate political relations with unconventional allies, such as the Ottoman Empire and Morocco, while simultaneously keeping such allies at a figurative and literal distance in order to avoid further European intervention.

Clearly, Elizabeth was not alone in her strategic use of mimicry. For instance, her half-sister Mary manipulated traditionally feminine postures, providing at least one rhetorical roadmap for Elizabeth to follow later. Elizabeth's courtiers also drew on this strategy, as is clear with Walsingham's pragmatic suggestion regarding duplicity as an official strategy for obscuring attempts to establish diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Empire. Likewise, Murad III demonstrated a proclivity for mimicry as he altered his usually elaborate title to a more intimate version as an invitation to Elizabeth to view him as an equal and friend. In all cases, such posturing provided Early Modern individuals with the ability to navigate new situations under the guise of previously accepted behaviors; established postures enabled new opportunities to be tried without seeming to deviate from the status quo. Though any ruler occupies a contested cultural space, Elizabeth's position was particularly complicated. She was always the inheritor of the Tudor anxiety regarding their royal legitimacy and legacy. Elizabeth was also always the Protestant queen, standing in opposition to overwhelming Catholic forces. Finally, she could never set aside her embodied experience as a woman in a traditionally male role; Elizabeth was

always a female prince. As such, Elizabeth's use of mimicry as a rhetorical strategy, while not unique to her, constituted a sustained performance in contrast to the kairotic use by her contemporaries.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND AFTERWORD

The principles of effective leadership are vitally important to the proper functioning of society; leaders often define and become representative of the culture they seek to influence. As such, who should lead and how they should lead are frequently debated. Formal education and early experiences are often where such concepts regarding leadership strategies originate and are transmitted to those who will assume such public roles. However, rhetorical scholarship tends to overlook educational networks when exalting individual leaders-as-rhetors and their strategies. During the sixteenth century in England in particular, this anxiety regarding the most effective type of monarch is clear in those texts addressing training royal women for public positions, as it reflects the unique intersection of class and gender at this point in time. Kevin Sharpe acknowledges the impact of Elizabeth's response to such tensions, "Though no representations were without ambiguities and tensions ... there can be little doubt that the success of royal representation played no small part in the stability of Elizabethan government and the historical reputation of the queen" (442). Tracing the history that led to such careful manipulation of cultural discourses is significant, as it demonstrates how many voices and experiences lead to the emergence of an effective rhetorical strategy.

Elizabeth clearly displayed an anxiety regarding leadership and others' perception of her role as a leader, an anxiety that was part of her Tudor legacy. For instance, Elizabeth often used rhetorical questions which implicitly ask others to consider her rulership. Mueller summarizes these sorts of questions, suggesting Elizabeth typically inquires, "Who was I before I came to rule? How have I come to rule England? What qualities do I need to rule England well? When

(or if) I manifest these qualities, what kind of ruler am I? What is my relation to my subjects, and theirs to me?" ("Virtue and Virtuality" 40). Often, she answered these questions by using the strategy that enabled her to redefine the monarch as not inherently masculine, drawing on conventional postures or mimicking her royal predecessors.

In order to more fully understand an individual rhetor's strategy, it is helpful to examine the discursive network that informs the rhetor's development. Elizabeth's mimicry emerges from a tradition in which early modern individuals used imitation and adaptation to craft new, hybrid spaces for individual agency. She did not create the strategy, though she certainly mastered it. Rather, there is a long rhetorical tradition that preceded her engagement with mimicry, extending back to Classical imitation exercises. Sixteenth century scholars, such as Juan Luis Vives and Roger Ascham, often alluded to mimicry, without naming it as such. In terms of educational practices, they laid the groundwork with early exercises in imitation, training students to identify stylistic and functional aspects of rhetoric offered by previous models. As students advanced, they learned to adapt these models to their own ends; in other words, they learned to mimic. Furthermore, such scholars demonstrated within their own writing and public performances a tendency to mimic, creating new definitions of masculinity which rested on mental prowess rather than physical efforts. Sophisticated students, such as Elizabeth, frequently in their company and familiar with their work, would no doubt recognize when their instructors engaged in moments of strategic mimicry themselves.

Nor was mimicry solely the strategy of the formally educated. Women across the social classes engaged in strategic imitation, particularly those in close proximity to court. From Elizabeth's early domestic instructors to her royal female relatives, these women necessarily engaged in mimicry. In some instances, they did so to advance Elizabeth's cause as the offspring

of an unfortunate marriage, or even ensure her survival. In other instances, such as with Katherine Parr, mimicry allowed a woman to share ideas publicly or exercise authority without seeming to undermine expectations. Elizabeth witnessed these efforts; armed with her formal education and personal experience, she likely understood the value of strategic manipulation of accepted postures.

Throughout her life, the evidence suggests that Elizabeth consciously embraced fluid mimicry to avoid traditional constraints. For instance, within her early letter to Katherine Parr, which accompanied her translation of Margaret of Navarre's *The Mirror of the Sinful Soul*, Elizabeth displayed humility and familial loyalty, in an effort to appease her father and his wife. Later, as the stakes increased under her half-sister Mary's reign, Elizabeth demonstrated strategic duplicity, appearing to concede to Mary's demands that she attend Mass, while still indicating to a public audience that she did so against her own will. When she became queen, Elizabeth manipulated conventionally feminine postures, posing as wife and mother to the nation, as she sought to re-define royal authority as something that was not purely masculine. Throughout her reign, Elizabeth appropriated her Tudor predecessors' speeches and images, adapting them to serve her own ends within new contexts while also drawing on their *ethos* to legitimize her efforts. Mimicry pervaded her political endeavors, so much so that her court also embraced mimicry as a rhetorical strategy, and at times, official policy, as seen with Walsingham's assessment of Anglo-Ottoman relations. Thus, Elizabeth and her court assimilated established behaviors and postures past to carve out a cultural space for her new construction of royal and English power.

From a contemporary point of view, mimicry is flawed as a feminist strategy. Addressing mimicry, Weatherall suggests, "This strategy is problematic because a limitation of an

assimilation strategy is that it preserves the values and belief systems of the dominant group, and thus does not seriously challenge the status quo” (128). She acknowledges, however, that women such as Elizabeth were not invested in undermining the dominant system of patriarchy because they pragmatically could not be, though by restoring the nation to Protestantism, Elizabeth dramatically altered the framework within which she performed. Furthermore, such women worked to challenge the gendered construction of monarchy. While such posturing may not have radically impacted the general understanding of gendered roles, it is hard to imagine that the woman at the apex of sixteenth-century English culture did not influence or alter the rhetorical postures available to other women.

POTENTIAL FOR EXPANSION AND FUTURE AVENUES OF RESEARCH

This study suggests further lines of inquiry regarding Elizabethan mimicry. Foremost, further work could focus more extensively on Elizabeth’s life, in all its stages, identifying key moments of mimicry. Additionally, such an in-depth expansion could continue to analyze the trans-media nature of mimicry, exploring in detail Elizabeth’s use of imagery in a variety of contexts, such as paintings, pageants, architecture, and so on. Additional work might also explore Elizabeth’s writings, particular her letters, examining the postures she draws on or figures she strategically imitates.

Other research possibilities include additional consideration regarding those courtiers orbiting the queen. First, a project might highlight how courtiers other than Cecil also discussed the queen’s rhetorical strategies or postures. To what degree were they able to identify exactly how she engaged in her fluid gendering? Also, if it is useful to track an early network of

influence, then it might also be beneficial to consider how courtiers discussed or used mimicry in response to a monarch such as Elizabeth. To do so, one might examine pamphlets circulating at the time. This project might also extend beyond the queen's passing, analyzing evidence of the queen's long-term impact on England's rhetorical practices at court. Steven May claims, "The Queen's public speaking remained widely available in print and manuscript for generations after her death" (xxv). In her letter to John Harington, Elizabeth herself suggests the hope that she might have such an impact, even on the individual level, stating, "Ponder [my words] in thy howres of leysure, and plaie wyth theme tyll they enter thyne understandinge; so shallt though herafter, perchance, fynde some goode frutes hereof when thy Godmother is out of remembraunce" (qtd. in Harington 127). Given the re-emergence of Elizabethan fervor about thirty years after her death, and the cyclical nature of interest in Elizabeth, as is evident during the Victorian era, a project might consider the longevity of her reputation and rhetorical influence (Perry 154; Melman 185). Did Elizabeth actually become a rhetorical model for others to imitate and adapt? Such work might also investigate whether Elizabeth's rhetorical efforts had a lasting influence, analyzing whether her strategy successfully established a cultural space for a female monarch in a masculine tradition, allowing her successors to eschew the fluid posturing Elizabeth necessarily engaged in. For instance, scholarship might examine whether two centuries later Victoria drew on a similar rhetorical strategy, deploying mimicry in order to shape the monarchical role.

A recurring motif in early modern texts was the use of the metaphor in which rhetoric functions as clothing or costume; notably this motif is typically attached to the idea of posturing as a mirroring action. The rhetorical posturing-as-costuming metaphor appears in works by Juan Luis Vives and Roger Ascham. Elizabeth also uses this metaphor, stating, "And in this case as

willingly to spoil myself quite of myself, as if I should put off my upper garment when it wearies me, if the present state might not thereby be encumbered” (“Close of the Parliamentary Session” 170). As such, another project might identify multiple invocations of this metaphor, considering when it is deployed. This particular metaphor seems to suggest that mimicry was fairly pervasive as a recognizable rhetorical strategy. Though this metaphor seems to align with Stephen Greenblatt’s discussion of “self-fashioning,” it would be productive to identify when this metaphor of rhetoric as clothing is deployed and by whom, and when it is mimicry and when it is not (1).

Finally, this history also suggests a rhetorical strategy that those who would exercise authority today, but who are traditionally excluded from leadership positions, might draw upon. Might mimicry continue to be a vital rhetorical tool for women and minorities in their effort to increase representation and political influence on national and global stages? Are such political figures already using mimicry in a fashion similar to Early Modern rhetors? If so, how have modern rhetors identified this strategy; through formal education or perhaps in more grassroots efforts? When do these figures use productive mimicry? How do modern audiences respond to mimicry; do they recognize the strategy? Are audiences now more or less rhetorically savvy when it comes to strategic duplicity? At the same time, when this rhetorical history of sixteenth century mimicry is compared to recent and current political events, one might consider the ways in which such a strategy might require modulation in order to work effectively in a contemporary political arena.

MIMICRY IN THE PRESENT MOMENT

Mimicry remains a vital concept to this day, as is made evident by emerging research on the impact of contemporary educational practices that incorporate imitation. Often referred to as “modelling,” “observational learning,” or “imitative learning,” students of all levels are often encouraged to analyze and imitate exemplars. In *Imitation and Education: A Philosophical Inquiry into Learning by Example*, Bryan Warnick defines the current standard model of imitation as consisting of three elements: “the description of an example’s action, the description of the results of the action, and an exhortation to do what the example did” (26). He then explores the value of imitation, examining “assumptions that are implicit in the discourse surrounding modeling, imitation, and education” (Warnick 9). To do so, Warnick strives to identify the beliefs that have accumulated regarding imitation over the centuries, before theorizing on the practical impact of imitation on education at large and offering suggestions for improving imitative assignments, to avoid merely copying (11-12). As current writing pedagogy continues to use imitation in the early stages, much like the Classical *imitatio* exercises, it stands to reason that these strategies rhetors who may also learn to emulate conventions and models and adapt, much like their early modern predecessors.

Today, rhetorical and pedagogical scholars might consider how to explicitly harness imitation exercises to train individuals, especially those forced to operate from marginalized positions, to deliberately imitate with the intent to transform the discourse with which they are engaging. What pedagogical practices might move students beyond imitation, with its inherent transfer of knowledge between contexts, into purposeful mimicry? Like sixteenth century England, individuals from all classes, genders, races, religions, and so forth, vie for

representation and the opportunity to influence their culture; heated political contexts and emerging digital possibilities make the discussion of arming individuals with the knowledge of strategic mimicry particularly timely.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1554-1556. Vol 5. Ed. John Roche Dasent. HM Stationery Office: London, 1899. Print.

Act of Supremacy 1558 (Regnal. 1 Eliz 1). *Legislation.gov.uk.* Web.

Act of Uniformity (1559) (1 Eliz, Cap. 2). *Documents Illustrative of English Church History.* Ed. Henry Gee and William John Hardy. New York: Macmillan, 1896: 458-67. Print.

Ancrene Wisse. Ed. Robert J. Hasenfratz. Western Michigan University, 2000. Web.

Anne of Cleves. "Letter LXXIII. Queen Anne of Cleves to King Henry the Eighth."

Letters of Royal, and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, from the Commencement of the Twelfth Century to the Close of the Reign of Queen Mary. ed. Mary Anne Everett Wood. Vol. III. London, 1846: 160-161. Print.

Aquinas, Thomas. *De Regno ad Regem Cypri (On Kingship, to the King of Cyprus).* Translated by Gerald B. Phelan, PIMS, 1949. (c. 1260). Print.

Ascham, Roger. "Letter XCIX. To Sturm." St. John's, April 4, 1550. Edited by Giles, John Allen. Vol 1, Part 1: 85-87. London, 1865: lxxiii – lxxiv. Print.

---. *The Scholemaster: By Roger Ascham.* Edited with Notes by John EB Mayor. Bell, 1863. Print.

---. "To Mrs. Ashley." *The Whole Works of Roger Ascham: Life and Letters.* Edited by Giles, John Allen. Vol 1, Part 1: 85-87. London, 1865. Print.

- Ashley, John “John Astely to R. Ascham.” *The English Works of Roger Ascham: Preceptor to Queen Elizabeth*. Ed. White, Cochran. London, 1815: 3-4. Print.
- Bacon, Francis. *In Felicem Memoriam Elizabethae, Angliae Reginae*. Trans. T. Newcomb ([1606] 1651). Microfilm.
- Blunt, John Henry, ed. *The Myroure of Oure Ladye: Containing a Devotional Treatise on Divine Service, with a Translation of the Offices Used by the Sisters of the Brigittine Monastery of Sion, at Isleworth, During the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: from the Original Black-letter Text of 1530 AD, with Introd. and Notes*. Vol. 19. Early English Text Society, 1873. Print.
- Boleyn, Anne. “Queen Anne Boleyn to Dr. Crome, 1535.” In *Anne Boleyn: In Her Own Words & the Words of Those who Knew Her*. Ed. Elizabeth Norton. Amberley Publishing Limited, 2011. Web.
- Bourchier, Margaret. “Lady Bryan.” Henry VIII: August 1536, 1–5, *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 11: July–December 1536 (1888)*: 90–103. Print.
- Bowyer, George. “XXXII.- Letter from George Bowyer, Esq. D.C.L., F.S.A. to Albert Way, Esq. Director S.A., on the History of the Family of Castiglione.” Web.
- Breuner, Caspar. “Baron Breuner to the Archduke Charles. London, 7th June 1559.” *Queen Elizabeth and Some Foreigners: Being a Series of hitherto unpublished letters from the archives of the Hapsburg Family*. Edited by Victor Klarwill et al. John Lane, 1928: 15-16. Print.
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth and James I, 1547-1625 preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office*. Ed. Lemon, Robert. London, 1856. Print.

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts: Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives and Collection of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy. Ed. Raydon Brown.

Vol 6, Issue 1. H.M. Stationery Office, 1877. Print.

Calendar of State Papers: Rome, 1558- 71. London, 1916. Print.

Calvin, Jean. *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne.* Ed. Jean Crespin. Geneva, 1978. Print.

Castiglione, Baldassare. *Il Libro del Cortegiano (The Book of the Courtier)* (1528). Mineola, New York: Dover, 2003. Print.

Castiglione, Giovanni Battisti. Preface. *Una Essortatione al Timor di Dio con Alcune Rime Italiane, Nouamente Messe in Luce* by Iacopi Aconcio. London, 1570.

Translated by Silvio Mancosi. *Early English Books Online.* Web. 15 May 2016.

Castillion, Sir Francis. *Letter Book.* James Marshall and Marie-Louise Osborn Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. n.p. Web.

Cecil, William. "Cecil Papers: 1568." *Calendar of the Cecil Papers in Hatfield House*, Volume 1, 1306-1571. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1883. 352-387. *British History Online.* Web.

---. *The Execution of Justice in England (1583).* Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1937. Web.

---. Prefatory Letter. In *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence.* Ed. Janel Mueller, University of Chicago Press, 2011: 443 - 446. Print.

---. *A True Report of Sundry Horrible Conspiracies of Late Time Detected to Haue (by Barbarous Murders) Taken Away the Life of the Queenes Most Excellent Maiestie: Whom Almighty God Hath Miraculously Conserued Against the Trecheries of Her Rebelles, and*

- the Violences of Her Most Puissant Enemies.* London: Charles Yetsweirt Esq., 1594.
Early English Books Online. Web.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Cicero on the Ideal Orator.* Ed. James M. May and Jakob Wisse. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.
- de Cordoba, Martín. *Jardín de Nobles Donzellas: A Critical Edition and Study.* Ed. Harriet Goldberg. University of North Carolina Press, 1974. Print.
- y Cordoba, Gómez Suárez de Figueroa. "Count de Feria to the King. May 10, 1559." *Calendar of Letters and State Paper Relating to English Affairs. Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simanacas.* Edited by Martin Hume. Vol 1. Cambridge University Press, 1892: 66-68. Print.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Colloquies: Collected Works of Erasmus.* Vol. 1. Translated and edited by Craig R. Thompson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1997. Print.
- . "Coniugium." In *Colloquies: Collected Works of Erasmus.* Vol. 1. Translated and edited by Craig R. Thompson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1997. Print.
- . *De civilitate morum puerilium (On Good Manners for Boys).* Translated by Brian McGregor. In *Collected Works of Erasmus* 25 (1985): 277-78. Print.
- . *De Matrimonio Christiano: Acc. Ludv. Vivis de Conjugii origine et utilit. discursus.* 1526. Print.
- . *De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis, libellus & nouus & elegans Eiusdem De ciuilitate morum puerilium. De ratione studij. De ratione instituendi discipulos. Concio de puero Iesu. Omnia per autorem recognita, & locupletata.* 1531. Internet Archive. Web.
- . *Erasmus: The Education of a Christian Prince with the Panegyric for Archduke Philip of Austria.* Ed. Jardine, Lisa, Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.

The Family of Henry VIII. c. 1545, Oil on canvas. Hampton Court Palace, London. Painting.

Fleetwood, William. "*Itinerarium ad Windsor*" or a Dialogue Between the Right Honourable Robert Earl of Leicester, Thomas Lord Buckhurst, and William Fleetwood. Written by the Said Recorder. BL Harleian MS 6234 fols.10r-25v, fol.22r. Manuscript.

The Good Wife Taught Her Daughter; The Good Wyfe Wold a Pylgremage; The Thewis of Gud Women. Edited by T. F. Helsinki Mustanoji, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran, 1948. Print.

Gower, George. *The Armada Portrait*. 1588, oil on oak panel, Woburn Abbey, Woburn. Painting.

Hall, Edward. "Hall's Chronicle; Containing the History of England." London: J. Johnson, 1809: 425. Print.

Harington, John. *Nugæ antiquæ: being a miscellaneous collection of original papers, in prose and verse; written during the reigns of Henry VIII. Edward VI. Queen Mary, Elizabeth, and King James*. Vol. 1. Vernor and Hood, 1804. Web.

Hartley, Terence. *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth 1, Vol. 3 1593-1601*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 1995. Print.

Harvey, Gabriel. *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*. Ed. Smith, G.C. Moore, Vol. 3. Shakespeare Head Press, 1913. Web.

Heere, Lucas de. *The Family of Henry VIII: An Allegory of the Tudor Succession*. 1572, oil on panel. Sudeley Castle, Gloucestershire. Painting.

Hyrde, Richard. "Preface to Margaret Roper's Translation of Erasmus's *Treatise on the Lord's Prayer*." In *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*. ed. Foster Watson.

- Longmans, Green & co., 1912: 162-163. Print.
- Il Schifanoia. "Il Schifanoia to the Castellan of Mantua." [*Venetian State Papers.*] *The Girlhood of Queen Elizabeth: A Narrative in Contemporary Letters*. Ed. Frank Mumby, 1909: 298 – 310. Print.
- Landino, Cristoforo. "Disputationes Camaldulenses." 1474. Translated in *Bernini's Biographies. Critical Essays*. Ed. Maarten Delbeke, Evonne Levy, and Steven Ostrow. Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006. Print.
- "The Manore and Charge of the Makyng of the Greate Banketyng House at Whythall at the Intertaymt of Mounsere by Queen Elyzabethe, 1581, 23 Eliz." B.M. Harl. MS. 293, f. 217. "The Banqueting House." *British History Online*. B.M. Harl. MS. 293, f. 217. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol13/pt2/pp116-139> Web.
- Marguerite, Queen, consort of Henry II, King of Navarre, 1492-1549. *Le Miroir De L'âme Pécheresse*. Helsinki: Soumalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979. Print.
- Melville, James, and George Scott. *The Memoirs of Sir James Melvil of Halhill ...* pr. by T. and W. Ruddimans. Sold by G. Hamilton, A. Martin, and other booksellers in town, 1735. Web.
- Michiel, Giovanni. "Giovanni Michiel, Venetian Ambassador in England, to the Doge and Senate." *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts: Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives and Collection of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*. Ed. Brown, Raydon. Vol 6, Issue 1. H.M. Stationery Office, 1877: 717-718. Print.
- Milton, John. *Areopagitica, and Other Political Writings of John Milton*. Liberty Fund, 1999. Print.
- Murad III. "The letters sent from the Imperiall Musulmanlike highness of Zuldán Murad Can, to

the sacred recall Maiestie of Elizabeth Queene of England, the fifteenth of March 1579, conteyning the grant of the first privileges.” Hakluyt, Richard. *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, And Discoveries Of The English Nation*. Ed. Edmund Goldsmid, FRHS, Vol. V: Central and Southern Europe, Edinburgh, 1889: 257-259. Web.

The Myroure of Oure Ladye: Containing a Devotional Treatise on Divine Service, with a Translation of the Offices Used by the Sisters of the Brigittine Monastery of Sion, at Isleworth, During the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: from the Original Black-letter Text of 1530 AD, with Introd. and Notes. Ed. John Blunt. Vol. 19. Early English Text Society, 1873. Print.

Naunton, Robert. *Fragmenta Regalia, Or Observations on Queen Elizabeth: Her Times & Favorites*. Folger Books, 1985. Print.

Occleve, Thomas. *De Regimine Principum: A Poem by Thomas Occleve, Written in the Reign of Henry IV*. Edited by Thomas Wright. Nichols and Ss., 1860. Print.

Oliver, Isaac. *Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I*, known as *The Rainbow Portrait*. c.1600, oil on canvas. Hatfield House, Hatfield Hertfordshire. Painting.

Parr, Katherine. *The Lamentation of a Sinner*. (1547). In *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence*, edited by Janel Mueller, University of Chicago Press, 2011: 443 - 485. Print.

---. *Prayers or Meditations*. (1544). In *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence*, edited by Janel Mueller, University of Chicago Press, 2011: 214 - 368. Print.

Peacham, Henry. *The Garden of Eloquence (1593): A Facsimile Reproduction*. Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1954. Print.

Pius, V. "Regnans in Excelsis." *Given at St. Peter's at Rome, on 25* (1570). *Papal Encyclicals Online*. Web.

The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth: Among Which are Interspersed Other Solemnities, Public Expenditures, and Remarkable Events During the Reign of that Illustrious Princess. Vol. 1. Ed. John Nichols. Printers to the Society of Antiquaries, 1823. Print.

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie*. Reprinted by Edward Arber (1869). Web.

Quadra, Álvaro de la. "From the Same to the Same." *Calendar of Letters and State Paper Relating to English Affairs. Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simanacas*. Edited by Martin Hume. Vol 1. Cambridge University Press, 1892: 75-77. Print.

The Quenes Maiesties Passage Through the Citie of London to Westminster the Day Before Her Coronacion. Ed. Osborn, James Marshall, Vol. 1. Yale University Press, for the Elizabethan Club, 1960. Print.

Quintilian. *The Institutio Oratoria*. Ed. Harold Edgeworth Butler. Vol. 4. Harvard University Press, 1922. Print.

Renard, Simon. *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simanacas and Elsewhere, vol. II, Edward VI and Mary, 1553*. Edited by R. Tyler. London: Public Record Office, 1998: 10. Print.

---. "Simon Renard to Charles V." *Record Office Transcripts*. London, September 23, 1553. *The Girlhood of Queen Elizabeth: A Narrative in Contemporary Letters*. Edited by Frank Mumby, 1909: 84-86. Print.

The Retrospective Review, and Historical and Antiquarian Magazine. Eds. Southern, Henry and Nicholas Harris Nicolas. London, 1827. Print.

Sandys, Edwin. "Edwin Sandys to Henry Bullinger, Strasburg, December 29, 1558." "Zurich Letters." *The Zurich Letters: Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers, During the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.* Edited by Hastings Robinson. Vol. 43. University Press, 1845: 4. Print.

Scrots, William. *Elizabeth I When a Princess.* c 1546, oil on panel. Windsor Castle. Painting.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene.* New York: Penguin ([1590] 1978). Print.

Spithovius, Johannes. "Johannes Spithovius to Andreas Barby, Chancellor of the King of Denmark and Bishop of Lübeck, 27 February 1559." In "Elizabeth I's Former Tutor Reports on the Parliament of 1559: Johannes Spithovius to the Chancellor of Denmark, 27 February 1559." Translated by Simon Adams and David Scott Gehring. *The English Historical Review* 128.530 (2013): 50-54. Print.

Surian, Michiel. "Michiel Surian, Venetian Ambassador with King Phillip, to the Doge and Senate, November 27, 1558." *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy.* Edited and Translated by Rawdon Lubbock Brown. Vol. 6: 1557-1558. Cambridge University Press, 2013: 1549. Web.

Tudor, Elizabeth. "The answere of her Maiestie to the aforesaid Letters of the Great Turke, send the 25 of October 1579, in the Prudence of London by Master Richard Stanley." Hakluyt, Richard. *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, And Discoveries Of The*

- English Nation*. Ed. Edmund Goldsmid, FRHS, Vol. V: Central and Southern Europe, Edinburgh, 1889: 261-264. Web.
- . "Elizabeth's Golden Speech, November 30, 1601." Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 335- 346. Print.
- . *A godly medytacyon of the christen sowle, concerninge a loue towardes God and hys Christe, compyled in frenche by lady Margarete quene of Nauerre, and aptely translated into Englysh by the ryght vertuouse lady Elyzabeth daughter to our late souerayne Kyng Henri the. Viii.* Ed. By Bale, John, 1548. EEBO, Web.
- . *Institution de le Religion Chrestienne*, Chapter 1. *Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544-1589*. Edited by Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel, University of Chicago Press, 2009. 203 - 287. Print.
- . *The Mirror or Glass of the Sinful Soul. Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544-1589*. Edited by Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel, University of Chicago Press, 2009. 40-125. Print.
- . "On Monsieur's Departure." (c. 1582). 302. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 302. Print.
- . "Princess Elizabeth to Edward Seymour, Lord Protector, March 7, 1549." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 33- 35. Print.
- . "Princess Elizabeth to King Henry VIII, Prefacing her Trilingual Translation of Queen Katherine's Prayers of Meditations, December 30, 1545." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 9-10. Print.

- . "Princess Elizabeth to Queen Katherine, Prefacing Her English Translation of Chapter 1 of John Calvin's *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne* (Geneva, 1541) December 30, 1545." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 10-13. Print.
- . "Princess Elizabeth to Queen Katherine, Prefacing Her New Year's Gift of an English Translation of Marguerite of Navarre's *Miroir de Lame Pecheresse*, December 31, 1544." Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 6-7. Print.
- . "Queen Elizabeth's Answer to the Commons' Petition that She Marry, January 28, 1563." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 70-72. Print.
- . "Queen Elizabeth's Armada Speech to the Troops at Tilbury, August 9, 1588." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 325-326. Print.
- . "Queen Elizabeth's First Reply to the Parliamentary Petitions Urging the Execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, November 24, 1586." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 196-200. Print.
- . "Queen Elizabeth's First Speech Before Parliament, February 10, 1559." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 58-60. Print.
- . "Queen Elizabeth's First Speech, Hatfield, November 20, 1558." *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose.

- Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 51–52. Print.
- . “Queen Elizabeth’s Latin Oration at Oxford University, September 5, 1566.” *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 89–91. Print.
- . “Queen Elizabeth’s Second Reply to the Parliamentary Petitions Urging the Execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, November 12, 1586.” *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 190–196. Print.
- . “Queen’s Elizabeth’s Speech at the Close of the Parliamentary Session, March 15, 1576.” *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 168–171. Print.
- . “Queen Elizabeth’s Speech Dissolving Parliament, January 2, 1567.” *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 105-106. Print.
- . “Queen Elizabeth’s Speech to a Joint Delegation of Lords and Commons, November 5, 1556.” *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 94-98. Print.
- . “Twenty-seven Stanzas in French (composed circa 1590).” *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: 414, ll. 48–50. Print.
- Tudor, Henry VIII. “King Henry VIII’s Speech in Parliament, Towards the Latter End of his Reign, 24 December 1545.” *Dodd’s Church History of England*. Vol. 1. Edited by M.A. Tierney. London: Charles Doman, 1839: 451 – 454. Print.

- . "Letter IV." *Love-Letters from King Henry VIII. to Anne Boleyn: some in French, and some in English. To which are added, translations of those written in French. With an appendix, containing Two Letters from Anne Boleyn, To Cardinal Wolsey; With Her Last to Henry the VIIIth.* Edited by Thomas Hearne. London, 1714: 10-11. Print.
- Tudor, Mary. "The Quene's Letter." *Norfolk Archaeology, or, Miscellaneous Tracts relating to the Antiquities of the County of Norfolk.* Ed. Muskett, Charles, Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society, 1855: 182-183. Print.
- . "Queen Mary's Oration in Guildhall." (February 1, 1553). *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe.* Ed. Stephen Reed Cattley. Vol. 2. London: R. B. Sheeley and W. Burnside, 1838: 162-163. Print.
- Vincent of Beauvais. "*De Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium*": *The Education of Women.* Ed. Tobin, Rosemary Barton. Lang, 1984. Print.
- . *De Morali Principis Institutione (The Moral Instruction of a Prince)* Ed. Robert J. Schneider, 1996. Print.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *De Institutione Feminae Christianae (The Education of a Christian Woman): A Sixteenth-Century Manual.* Ed. and trans. Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. Print.
- . *De Ratione Studii Puerilis ad Carolum Montjoium Guilielmi filium (A Plan of Study for a Boy).* ed. Foster Watson. *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women.* Longmans, Green & co., 1912: 241-250. Print.
- . *De Ratione Studii Puerilis (On a Plan of Study for Children) (1537)* ed. Foster Watson. *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women.* Longmans, Green & co., 1912. Print.

- . *The Office and Duties of an Husband, made by the Excellent Philosopher, Lodovicus Vives, and Translated into English by Thomas Paynell.* (London, 1553). Edited by Foster Watson. *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women.* Longmans, Green & co., 1912: 195 - 209. Print.
- . *The Plan of Education for a Girl.* ed. Foster Watson. *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women.* Longmans, Green & co., 1912: 137 - 148. Print.
- . *Satellitium* (1524). ed. Foster Watson. *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women.* Longmans, Green & co., 1912: 151 - 158. Print.
- Walsingham, Francis, and William Davison. "To Sir Amias Poulet." *The Letter-books of Sir Amias Poulet, Keeper of Mary Queen of Scots.* Burns & Oates, 1874. Web.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Adams, Simon, and David Scott Gehring. "Elizabeth I's Former Tutor Reports on the Parliament of 1559: Johannes Spithovius to the Chancellor of Denmark, 27 February 1559." *The English Historical Review* 128.530 (2013): 35-54. Print.
- Anthony, Katharine. *Queen Elizabeth.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1929. Print.
- Arnold, Janet. "The 'Coronation Portrait' of Queen Elizabeth I." *The Burlington Magazine* 120.908 (1978): 727-726. Print.
- Beemer, Cristina. "The Female Monarchy: A Rhetorical Strategy of Early Modern Rule." *Rhetoric Review* 30.3 (2011): 258-274.
- . "*Usurping Authority in the Midst of Men*": *Mirrors of Female Ruling Rhetoric in the Sixteenth Century.* Dissertation, Miami University. 2008. Print.

- Bell, Ilona. *Elizabeth I: The Voice of a Monarch*. Springer, 2016. Print.
- . "The Queen of Enigma and Monsieur's Departure." *Elizabeth I*. Palgrave Macmillan US, 2010. 145-171. Print.
- Belsey, Catherine. *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*. New York: Methuen, 1985. Print.
- Bender, Daniel. "Imitation." *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*. Edited by Theresa Enos. Routledge, 2013: 343-345 Print.
- Bhabha, Homi. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Birch, Thomas. *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, from the Year 1581 Till Her Death*. Vol. 1. A. Millar, 1754. Web.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (January 1968): 1-14. Print.
- Blasius, Mark. "The Discourse of World Order." *Culture, Ideology, and World Order*. R.B.J. Walker, ed., Boulder: Westview Press, 1984. Print.
- Bolland, Charlotte. "Alla Prudentissima Et Virtuosissima Reina Elisabetta: An Englishman's Italian Dedication to the Queen." *Leadership and Elizabethan Culture*. Palgrave Macmillan US, 2013. 37-49. Print.
- Borman, Tracy. *Elizabeth's Women: Friends, Rivals, and Foes who Shaped the Virgin Queen*. Bantam, 2010. Print.
- Brown, Georgia. *Redefining Elizabethan Literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.
- Brummett, Palmira Johnson. *Ottoman Seapower and Levantine Diplomacy in the Age of*

- Discovery*. SUNY Press, 1994. Print.
- Burton, John. "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in Tamburlaine." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30.1 (2000): 125-156. Print.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Clark, Danielle. *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing*. New York: Longman, 2001. Print.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. "The Theory and Practice of Imitation in Classical Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication*. 22 (October 1971): 243-50. Print.
- Correll, Barbara. "Malleable Material, Models of Power: Woman in Erasmus's 'Marriage Group' and Civility in Boys." *ELH* (1990): 241-262. Print.
- Cousins, Anthony D. "Humanism, Female Education, and Myth: Erasmus, Vives, and More's To Candidus." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65.2 (2004): 213-230. Print.
- Crane, Mary Thomas. "'Video Et Taceo': Elizabeth I and the Rhetoric of Counsel." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 28, no. 1, 1988: 1-15. Print.
- Crowley, Sharon, and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999. Print.
- Cunningham, Karen. "'She Learns As She Lies': Work and the Exemplary Female in English Early Modern Education." *Exemplaria* 7.1 (1995): 209-235. Print.
- Dimock, Arthur. "The Conspiracy of Dr. Lopez." *The English Historical Review*, vol. 9, no. 35, 1894: 440-472. Web.
- Dollimore, Jonathan. "Introduction: Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism and the New Historicism." *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Ed. Jonathan

- Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985. Print.
- Donawerth, Jane. "Conversation and the Boundaries of Public Discourse in Rhetorical Theory by Renaissance Women," *Rhetorica*, vol. 16 (1998):181-99. Print.
- Doran, Susan. "Elizabeth I: Gender, Power, and Politics." *History Today*, 53.5 (2003): 29-35. Print.
- . *Elizabeth I and Her Circle*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2015. Print.
- Dowling, Maria. *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*. Routledge, 1986. Print.
- Fantazzi, Charles. Foreword. *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*. Ed. and trans. Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. Print.
- Ferry, Anne. *The "Inward" Language: Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne*. University of Chicago Press, 1983. Print.
- Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. "The Idea of Rhetoric in the Rhetoric of Science." *Rhetorical Hermeneutics: Invention and Interpretation in the Age of Science* (1997): 25 – 88. Print.
- Geisler, Cheryl. "How Ought We to Understand the Concept of Rhetorical Agency? Report from the ARS." (2004): 9-17. Print.
- Gilbert, Allan H. *Machiavelli's Prince and Its Forerunners*. Durham, NC, 1938. Print.
- Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1997. Print.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. *Writing Matter: From the Hands of the English Renaissance*. Stanford University Press, 1991. Print.
- Green, John. "Larger History of the English People." *A Library of Standard History*. Ed Alden, John. New York, 1885. Print.

- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. Print.
- Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982. Print.
- Gwyer, John. "The Case of Dr. Lopez." *Transactions Jewish Historical Society of England*. 1945–1951. 16: 163–84. Print.
- Habib, Imtiaz. "The Two-faced Muslim in the Early Modern Imagination: The Cultural Genealogy of a Modern Political Dialectic." *Islam and Postcolonial Discourse*. Routledge, 2017: 31-48. Print.
- Halliwell, Stephen. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton University Press, 2002. Print.
- Hartman, Geoffrey H. "Understanding Criticism." *A Critic's Journey: Literary Reflections, 1958-1998*. Yale University Press, 1999: 17- 41. Print.
- Hibbert, Christopher. *The Virgin Queen: Elizabeth I, Genius of the Golden Age*. Perseus Books: Reading, 1991. Print.
- Hogrefe, Pearl. *Women of Action in Tudor England: Nine Biographical Sketches*. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1977. Print.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *Queen Elizabeth I and Her Court*. Vision Press, 1990. Print.
- Howe, Elizabeth Teresa. *Education and Women in the Early Modern Hispanic World*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2008. Print.
- Hunt, William, and Reginald Lane Poole, eds. *The Political History of England*. Vol. 3. Longmans, Green, 1920. Print.
- Iamartino, Giovanni, and Angela Andreani. "In the Queen's Name: The Writings of Elizabeth

- between Public and Private Communication.” *The Language of Public and Private Communication in a Historical Perspective*. Ed. Nicholas Brownlees, Gabriella Del Lungo, John Denton. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010: 116- 134. Print.
- Jones, Norman Leslie. *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age: England in the 1560s*. Blackwell, 1993. Print.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (1957). Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997. Print.
- Kelly-Gadol, Joan. “Did Women Have a Renaissance?” *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*. Edited by Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz, Boston, (1977): 148-61. Print.
- King, John N. “Patronage and Piety: The Influence of Catherine Parr.” *Silent But For the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators and Writers of Religious Works* (1985): 43-60. Print.
- Kress, Gunther R., and Theo Van Leeuwen. *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. Psychology Press, 1996. Print.
- Krontiris, Tina. *Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators of Literature in the English Renaissance*. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Lacan, Jacques. “The Line and Light,” in *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1978: 91-104. Print.
- Lawrence, Jason. “*Who the Devil Taught Thee So Much Italian?*”: *Italian Language Learning and Literary Imitation in Early Modern England* (2005). Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea, ed. *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995. Print.
- MacNalty, Arthur S. “Medicine in the Time of Queen Elizabeth I.” *British Medical Journal*

- 1.4821 (1953): 1179 - 1185. Web.
- Marcus, Leah S. "Confessions of a Reformed Uneditor (II)." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (2000): 1072-1077. Print.
- Marcus, Leah S., Janel Mueller, Mary Beth Rose, eds. Preface. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000: xi – xxiv. Print.
- May, Steven W. *Queen Elizabeth I: Selected Works*. Simon and Schuster, 2004.
- Mazzola, Elizabeth. *Learning and Literacy in Female Hands, 1520-1698*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2013. Print.
- . "Schooling Shrews and Grooming Queens in the Tudor Classroom." *Critical Survey* 22.1 (2010): 1-25. Print.
- Melman, Billie. *The Culture of History: English Uses of the Past 1800-1953*. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2006. Print.
- Menon, Rajiv Krishna. "Unheard Screams and Silent Acceptance: Modern Indian Cinematic Representations of Subaltern Women." *Wide Screen* 1.1 (2009). Print.
- Montrose, Louis. "'Shaping Fantasies': Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture." ed. Stephen Greenblatt. *Representing the English Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California (1988): 31- 64. Print.
- Morris, Rosalind. Introduction. *Can the Subaltern Speak?: Reflections on the History of an Idea*. Ed. Rosalind Morris. Columbia University Press, 2010 :1-20. Print.
- Mortensen, Peter, and Gesa E. Kirsch. "On Authority in the Study of Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1993: 556–572. Print.
- Mueller, Janel. Introduction to *The Lamentation of a Sinner. Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence*, edited by Janel Mueller, University of Chicago Press, 2011:

- 425-442. Print.
- . "A Tudor Queen Finds Voice: Katherine Parr's Lamentation of a Sinner." *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1988), 15-47. Print.
- . "Virtue and Virtuality: Gender in the Self-Representations of Queen Elizabeth I." *Virtual Gender: Fantasies of Subjectivity and Embodiment*. Eds. Mary Ann O'Farrell and Lynne Vallone. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999. 37-64. Print.
- Myers, Nancy. "Purposeful Silence and Perceptive Listening: Rhetorical Agency for Women in Christine de Pizan's *The Treasure of the City of Ladies*." *Silence and Listening as Rhetorical Arts* (2011): 56. Print.
- Newman, Karen. *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991. Print.
- Nicolas, Nicholas Harris. *Life of William Davison, Secretary of State and Privy Counsellor to Queen Elizabeth*. 1823. Print.
- Overell, Anne. *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c. 1535-c. 1585*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2008. Print.
- Peacock, John. "The Politics of Portraiture." *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake. Houndsmill: Basingstoke (1994): 199-228. Print.
- Pedersen, Tara E. *Mermaids and the Production of Knowledge in Early Modern England*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2015. Print.
- Perry, Curtis. *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice*. Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.
- Perry, Maria. *The Word of a Prince: A Life of Elizabeth I from Contemporary Documents*.

- Boydell Press, 1999. Print.
- Pigott, Chris. *The Pigott Family of Queen's County, Ireland; Some Ancestral Connections*.
<http://pigott-gorrie.blogspot.com/2008/05/italian-in-tudor-london-giovanni.html>
 Accessed May 25, 2016. Web.
- Pollnitz, Aysha. "Christian Women or Sovereign Queens? The Schooling of Mary and Elizabeth." Ed. Alice Hunt and Anne Whitelock. *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010: 127-142. Print.
- Porter, Linda. *Katherine the Queen: The Remarkable Life of Katherine Parr, the Last Wife of Henry VIII*. St. Martin's Press, 2010. Print.
- Reynolds, Ernest Edwin. *Thomas More and Erasmus*. London, Burns & Oates, 1965. Print.
- Ritchie, Joy and Kate Ronald, eds. *Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s)*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001. Print.
- Riviere, Joan. "Womanliness as a Masquerade." *Female Experience: Three Generations of British Women Psychoanalysts on Work with Women (1997)*: 228. 127. Print.
- Rockett, William. "The Case Against Thomas More." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* (2008): 1065-1093. Print.
- Rose, Mary Beth. *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature*. University of Chicago Press, 2002. Print.
- Roy, Roxanne. "L'institution oratoire du Prince ou le savoir au service du bien dire." *Renaissance & Reformation/Renaissance et Reforme* 31.4 (2008). Print.
- Ryan, Lawrence V. *Roger Ascham*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1963. Print.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth Century Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.

- Shenk, Linda S. "Elizabeth I's Learned Persona and her University Orations: Turning Learned Authority in Royal Supremacy." *Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman*, ed. Carole Levin, et al (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003): 78–96. Print.
- Sidney, Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia: The New Arcadia*. Edited by Victor Skretkowicz, Oxford University Press, USA, 1987. Print.
- Simpson, Richard. *Edmund Campion: A Definitive Biography*. TAN Books, 2013. Print.
- Skidmore, Chris. *Death and the Virgin Queen: Elizabeth I and the Dark Scandal that Rocked the Throne*. St. Martin's Press, 2011. Print.
- Skilliter, Susan A. "William Harborne and the trade with Turkey, 1578-1582: A Documentary Study of the First Anglo-Ottoman Relations." British Academy, 1977. Print.
- Smith, Alan Gordon. *William Cecil the Power Behind Elizabeth*. Ardent Media, 1934. Print.
- Snyder, Susan. "Guilty Sisters: Marguerite de Navarre, Elizabeth of England, and the *Miroir del'ame pecheresse*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 50.2 (1997): 443-458. Print.
- Spivak, Gayatri. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Harvard University Press, 1999. Print.
- . "The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives." *History and Theory*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (October, 1985): 247-272. Print.
- Starkey, David. *Elizabeth: Struggle for the Throne*. New York: HarperCollins, 2001. Print.
- Stimpson, Catharine. Foreword. *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama*, by Karen Newman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991: xii. Print.
- Strickland, Agnes. *Lives of the Queens of England*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1872. Print.
- Strong, Roy. *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. London: Pimlico, 1999. Print.

- Vosevich, Kathi. "The Education of a Prince(ss): Tutoring the Tudors." Ed. Mary Burke, Jane Donawerth, Linda Dove, and Karen Nelson. *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2000: 61 - 76. Print.
- Warnick, Bryan R. *Imitation and Education: A Philosophical Inquiry into Learning by Example*. SUNY Press, 2009. Print.
- Watson, Foster, et al. *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*. Longmans, Green & co., 1912. Print.
- Weatherall, Ann. *Gender, Language and Discourse*. East Sussex: Routledge Inc., 2002. Print.
- West, David and Tony Woodman. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979. Print.
- Wyatt, Michael. *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England: A Cultural Politics of Translation*. Vol. 51. Cambridge University Press, 2005. Print.
- Yarnell III, Malcolm B. *Royal Priesthood in the English Reformation*. Oxford University Press, 2013. Print.

APPENDIX A: LICENSE FOR THE RAINBOW PORTRAIT

Bridgeman Images

274 Madison Avenue, Suite 1604, New York, NY 10016, USA

T: +1 212 828 1238 F: +1 212 828 1255

E: nyaccounts@bridgemanimages.com W: www.bridgemanimages.com

Bridgeman Images is a trading name of Bridgeman Art Library International Limited registered with Companies House in England as Limited Company 3324579 of 17-19 Garway Road, London W2 4PH, United Kingdom. Federal Tax ID No.: 13-3947335

UK • USA • France • Germany • Italy

**Invoice Client****MEGAN MIZE**

Megan Mize
201 Clayton Drive
Yorktown VA 23693
United States

Booking Client**MEGAN MIZE**

Megan Mize
201 Clayton Drive
Yorktown VA 23693
United States

Invoice

Please mail checks payable to: Bridgeman Images.
Alternatively please remit to:

Bank: Citibank NA Branch #3
Branch Sort Code: 021000089
Account Number: 27695068
Swift Code: CITIUS33

To pay by credit card, call us on +1 212 828 1238

Invoice No: 1038342
Date: 12 Jul 2018
Your PO no/ Ref:
Payment Terms: 30 days
License Start Date: 1 Aug 2018
License End Date:
ISSN / ISBN:

Total (in USD)	50.00
-----------------------	--------------

This invoice has been issued in accordance with our [Terms & Conditions](#)

Project: Constructing an Early Modern Queen

Page 1 of 2

Image	Ref.	Description	License fee	Line Total
		<p>Stills / Publishing / Book Publishing / Educational Publication / Print and Digital formats / Single Continent / Single language</p> <p>Non-exclusive rights, US distribution, English, single placement in the interior of a PhD dissertation + electronic version.</p> <p>To be published in "Constructing an Early Modern Queen: Posturing, Mimicry, and the Rhetoric of Authority" by Megan Mize (2018).</p>		

Please read our [Terms and Conditions](#), including our cancellation policy, which can be found online at www.bridgemanimages.com within the 'About' section. Cancellation fees: within 7 days of invoice date \$50 per image/clip; 7-30 days at 50% of invoice amount; no cancellations accepted after 30 days. Artist's copyright clearance is your responsibility. Permission to use this image is subject to your obtaining clearance when appropriate. Copyright fees are only included if specifically itemized above. Please send us a complimentary copy.

Bridgeman Images

274 Madison Avenue, Suite 1604, New York, NY 10016, USA

T: +1 212 828 1238 F: +1 212 828 1255

E: royalaccounts@bridgemanimages.com W: www.bridgemanimages.com

Bridgeman Images is a trading name of Bridgeman Art Library International Limited registered with Companies House in England as Limited Company 3324579 of


17-19 Garway Road, London W2 4PH, United Kingdom. Federal Tax ID No.: 13-3947335

UK • USA • France • Germany • Italy



Project: Constructing an Early Modern Queen

Page 2 of 2

Image	Ref.	Description	License fee	Line Total
	HTF739819	<p>Stills / Publishing / Book Publishing / Educational Publication / Print and Digital formats / Single Continent / Single language</p> <p>Queen Elizabeth I, The Rainbow ... Oliver, Isaac (c.1565-1617) Credit: Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, UK/Bridgeman Images</p>	50.00	50.00

APPENDIX B: LICENSE FOR THE ARMADA PORTRAIT

Order Number: 7380

[Close](#)

Purchased By: MeganMize (mmize@odu.edu), self_employed.

Only after receipt of payment, you have the right(s) to use the image(s) on this invoice ONLY for the specific rights outlined on this invoice. All terms of both our AGREEMENT FOR BOTH RIGHTS-PROTECTED AND ROYALTY FREE IMAGES and our WEBSITE USER AGREEMENT which you agreed to when registering for access on our website are incorporated herein. Any unauthorized use of any images will be prosecuted to the fullest extent under the law. If you need additional rights for any of the images below, or want to renew an expired, or soon to expire licence, please contact us.

Image ID: 541

Purchase Date: 06-05-18

Project Title: CONSTRUCTING AN EARLY MODERN QUEEN:
POSTURING, MIMICRY, AND THE RHETORIC OF AUTHORITY

License Start Date: 24-08-18

License End Date: N/A

License to use strictly limited to the following:



Original Full Size File - 300DPI

Thesis : This Academic Licence entitles you to reproduce this image within a thesis document submitted by you – a student at an educational establishment – and to store an electronic version of the research online as long as it is made available online at no cost to the end user. It confers no further rights, and is made on condition that you will caption this image with the name of the artist and the title of the portrait, and credit it: '© National Portrait Gallery, London', and that you will not pass it on for third-party use, crop, change or manipulate it or use it in any way which is unlawful or deceptive or which damages the good name or reputation of the National Portrait Gallery, the artist or the persons depicted in the image.

VITA

Megan K. Mize

Batten Arts and Letters 5000 · Old Dominion University · Norfolk, VA 23529

EDUCATION

- 2018
(Anticipated) Ph.D English Studies, Old Dominion University; Norfolk, Virginia
Dissertation: *Constructing an Early Modern Queen: Posturing, Mimicry, and the Rhetoric of Authority*
- 2006 M.A. Literature (Distinction), Old Dominion University; Norfolk, Virginia
Thesis: *Mary Stuart's Casket Sonnets: A Reassessment*
- 2004 B.A. English (Cum Laude), The College of William and Mary; Williamsburg, Virginia

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

- 2018 – Present Associate Director for ePortfolios and Digital Initiatives
- 2015 – 2018 ePortfolio Training and Support Coordinator, Academic Enhancement, ODU
- 2014 – 2015 ePortfolio Learning Coordinator, Honors College, ODU
- 2011 – 2013 Research Assistant, Department of English, ODU
- 2006 - Present Adjunct Faculty, Department of English, ODU

AWARDS

- 2017 University Mentoring Leader of the Year Award, ODU
- 2014 University Graduate Leader of the Year Award, ODU