ROYAL STUDIES JOURNAL

2015 II

"Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste" — Queen Elizabeth I's Biblical Analogies After Her Death'

Aidan Norrie,
University of Otago,
Department of English and Linguistics

WINCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

"'Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste" — Queen Elizabeth I's Biblical Analogies After Her Death'

Aidan Norrie

> Since Fate's All-ruling Hand has me [Elizabeth] remov'd...
> May England Flourish, and may Rome Decline...
> May gentle Peace and Plenty Grace the Isle,
> May Justice Triumph, and may virtue smile:
> ... May Britain's Ancient Liberty prevail,
> ... And may succeeding Princes learn from me,
> To reign with Wisdom, and with Clemency."[1]

Queen Elizabeth I of England died in the early hours of the 24th of March 1603, at the age of sixty-nine. Childless, the Tudor dynasty died with her. Her successor was King James VI of Scotland – Mary Queen of Scots' son who ruled both England and Scotland until his death in 1625. These political 'facts' are often how biographies of, or works on, the final Tudor monarch end. Yet, for ninety-five years after Elizabeth's death, her shadow loomed as an omnipresent force over her Stuart successors.[2]

Throughout her reign, Elizabeth and her supporters had employed biblical analogies to solidify the Queen's claim to be England's Providential Protestant monarch. These biblical analogies were literary devices in which a person, or the actions of a person – in this case Elizabeth – were compared to a figure, or the actions of a figure, from the Bible as a method of highlighting God's favour. During her life, Elizabeth's biblical analogies sought to turn religious legitimisation into religio-political legitimisation. This article, however, analyses the practice of comparing Elizabeth to biblical figures after her death. Her physical body – or in biblical terms her natural body – was no more, but her political body endured. As Carole Levin states, the "body politic ... was held to be unerring and immortal," and thus enduring.[3]

This article examines the biblical analogies of Elizabeth that have already been established in the historiography – those of Elizabeth to Daniel the Prophet, King David, King Solomon, Deborah the Judge and the widow Judith – and analyses how they were recast after her death to new effect.[4] The analogies post-death feature the same figures Elizabeth had been compared to whilst living; but many of these analogies included new

---

[1] *A kind congratulation between Queen Elizabeth, and the late Queen Mary II of ever glorious memory* (London: R. Smith, 1695).
This article had its genesis in a thesis undertaken at the University of Queensland, supervised by Dolly MacKinnon. I am also grateful to Nicola Cummins and Lyn Tribble at the University of Otago; to Robert Norrie, Rebecca Lush, and Lawrence Clarkson for their insightful feedback and invaluable support; and to the anonymous readers.
[2] Carole Levin, "Elizabeth's Ghost: The afterlife of the Queen in Stuart England," *Royal Studies Journal,* vol. 1 (2014), 1-16 (1).
[3] Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 122.
[4] The reason for analysing these five analogies and not others (such as Esther or Jael) relates to their history during Elizabeth's reign: Elizabeth herself drew a comparison with these five biblical figures at least once during her reign, which demonstrates that the queen saw particular merit or usefulness in their connection. For the analogies drawn to Solomon during Elizabeth's reign, see Linda Shenk's *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); for Solomon and David, see Susan Doran's "Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King," in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock's *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); for David, Daniel, and Deborah, see Michele Osherow's *Biblical Women's Voices in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), and for Deborah, see Alexandra Walsham's "'A Very Deborah?' The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch," in Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman's *The Myth of Elizabeth* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

parallels that had not been drawn during her life. For example, the analogies to David provided a convenient explanation for James' succession, as he was seen to be a Solomon, succeeding the Davidic Elizabeth. Many analogies employed after the Queen's death were drawn to highlight the extraordinary providential protection Elizabeth had experienced throughout her life. Other analogies served to justify a politically contentious event of Elizabeth's reign, such as the execution of Mary Queen of Scots. The analogies analysed in this article appeared in pamphlets, contemporary verses, and in published sermons throughout the seventeenth century – from Elizabeth's death in 1603, until the last analogy was published in 1699.

The continued use of the biblical analogies drawn during Elizabeth's life allowed her supporters to depict the dead queen as the embodiment of a providential ruler from the Old Testament: a model other English monarchs should emulate. As Carole Levin states, "the best queen is ... one who can look down from heaven and advise on how things on earth ought to be different."[5] As an extension of their use as a model for Protestant monarchs, analogies were used throughout the seventeenth century to give retrospective religious legitimisation to questionable political decisions Elizabeth had made. In doing this, the analogies served to deflect any criticism of Elizabeth's actions. Finally, analogies provided a divine course of action for dealing with contemporary political and diplomatic situations: Elizabeth's actions were compared to similar biblical events, which were then offered as examples for the current Stuart monarch to emulate. As Alexandra Walsham notes, "Elizabeth became a whip with which to beat the Stuart monarchs, a yardstick by which to measure their perceived deficiencies."[6]

It is important to note that Elizabeth was by no means the first English monarch to employ the use of biblical analogy. As John N. King in his *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* has convincingly argued, Henry VIII instigated the use of biblical characters for his own political purposes. By turning his back on centuries of established Roman Catholic royal iconography, the first English Protestant monarch had to develop a "completely new regal style," and biblical analogy provided powerful examples of "Godly government."[7] Thus, "royal iconography in the … court of Henry VIII … [consisted] of Bible translation and the vision of the king as the fulfilment of Old Testament types for monarchy and prophecy."[8] Post-Reformation, Henry VIII often drew comparisons with David (who also "had the task of drawing together a divided kingdom"), and with Solomon (who "offered a model for unparalleled regal wisdom and piety").[9]

Similarly, his son and successor, Edward VI, employed comparisons with Moses and Josiah for political purposes. Edward was spared from the Pope's persecution, just as Moses had been spared from Pharaoh's wrath. Likewise, he was depicted as a contemporary Josiah, the pious boy-king who had cleansed the temple and rid the land of Israel of idolatry.[10] Perhaps unsurprisingly, Mary I did not employ a Protestant religio-political iconography. This decision, however, did not prevent her apologists from comparing her to Deborah and Sarah, and her Protestant critics from comparing her to Jezebel. Elizabeth's use of biblical analogy throughout her reign therefore simply continued a practice employed by her predecessors. The difference, however, between Elizabeth's analogies and

[5] Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King,* 169.
[6] Walsham, "'A Very Deborah?", 159.
[7] John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), xvi.
[8] John N. King, "The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography," *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 38 (Spring 1985), 41-84 (42).
[9] King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, 34.
[10] King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, 75, 93-94.

those of her predecessors, was their longevity.

Neither Henry VIII nor Edward VI's analogies made any direct appearance during, or after, Elizabeth's reign. While the opposite sex of her predecessors may account for some of this absence, I consider the contexts of the analogies to be more relevant. Henry VIII only employed biblical analogies after he was established as a king; therefore, there was not an easy connection to be made to the newly crowned Elizabeth. Edward, on the other hand, reigned for too short a time to create a lasting iconographic impression, and his primary comparison to Josiah had little relevance for Elizabeth.[11]

Elizabeth, therefore, is unique among her family for the longevity of her biblical analogies after her death. But in terms of existing historiography, there is no single piece of scholarship that addresses Elizabeth's post-mortem analogies chronologically. This article will begin to fill this gap by building on the small number of partial references in the existing historiography. Alexandra Walsham's chapter on Elizabeth and Deborah briefly analyses the Queen's iconographic depiction after her death. Walsham notes that her "chapter explores the origins, evolution and uses of the myth [of Elizabeth] in the reigns of Elizabeth I and her Stuart successors."[12] She also states "at the end of the [seventeenth] century Elizabeth once again became the prey of party politics and a vehicle from competing forms of propaganda ... [particularly] in the context of the Exclusion Crisis."[13] She concludes by stating "Elizabeth as an instrument of divine intervention and a reincarnation of the godly rulers of Israel and Judah was both powerfully enduring ... [this depiction] functioned as a focus for ... religious solidarity and as a strategy for schooling a stubborn and recalcitrant monarch."[14] Despite these opportunities to incorporate biblical analogy into her study, Walsham has not included references to Elizabeth's post-mortem analogies. She has instead focussed on the Queen's omnipresent political force, which Walsham argues was manifested in ways such as the ringing of bells to commemorate her Accession Day, decades after she had died.

Walsham's groundbreaking work, *Providence in Early Modern England*, however, underlies much of my analysis here. Employing her definition of providentialism – "the belief that God was no idle, inactive spectator upon the mechanical workings of the created world, but an assiduous, energetic deity who constantly intervened in human affairs" – demonstrates that the analogies drawn for Elizabeth openly invoked the providential nature of the Queen's reign.[15] As Walsham notes, "pre- and post-Reformation forms ... suggests that the advent of Protestantism did not effect as sharp and radical a break with the past as much of the historiography of this subject has implied."[16] Elizabeth's biblical analogies therefore invoked providential favour as a means of transcending denominational boundaries, and as a continuation of God's interventionist interactions with humankind.

Susan Doran has explored the parallels with David and Solomon that were drawn during Elizabeth's reign. Her analysis of Elizabeth's analogies, however, ends at the Queen's death in 1603, claiming these parallels were drawn only "until the queen's death."[17] Nevertheless, Doran does acknowledge Elizabeth's enduring iconographic repr-

---

[11] The analogy between Josiah and Edward VI did enjoy a short resurgence after the Restoration. A clear example of this appears in James Duport's 1679 collection of sermons, where he reminds his audience that Josiah, Edward VI, and Charles I were unjustly "cut off, not only by the Sins and wickedness of a few cursed miscreant Rebels and Traytors, but even for the Sins and wickedness of the rest of his people" (*Three sermons preached in St. Maries Church in Cambridg, upon the three anniversaries of the martyrdom of Charles I, Jan. 30, birth and return of Charles II, May 29, gun-powder treason, Novemb. 5*, London: Henry Brome, 1676, 36). This resurgence, however, was specifically tied to the Restoration, and was not enduring like Elizabeth's analogies.

[12] Walsham, "'A Very Deborah?'," 144.

[13] Walsham, "'A Very Deborah?'," 162.

[14] Walsham, "'A Very Deborah?'," 162

[15] Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 2.

[16] Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 329.

[17] Susan Doran, "Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Alice

representation when she concludes her chapter by stating, "in the long run Elizabeth won the competition [for representation] hands down, for it was her preferred image of the Virgin Queen that became best known to posterity."[18] Doran has thus emphasised the fact that Elizabeth's image endured after her death, but she neither examines this continuation in the seventeenth century, nor incorporates an analysis of biblical analogy into her study.

I. Analogies at Elizabeth's death, and the succession of James I

Elizabeth's death was a prime opportunity for her supporters to highlight her status as a providential monarch. In a funeral verse for Elizabeth written in 1603, Samuel Rowlands described Elizabeth as a great Hebrew heroine:

> Give honour to the Queene of good-desartes:
> The reverent Lady, Nurse of all our Land,
> That sway'd a Sword like Judith's, in her hand.[19]

The reference to Elizabeth as the "nurse of all our Land" was an established iconographic device. Carole Levin has argued being depicted as a 'nurse' allowed the Queen to be "both no-one's mother and everyone's."[20] The "Sword like Judith's" not only references Judith's beheading of Holofernes, but it also invokes the memory of Elizabeth overcoming what John King described as the "militant Catholicism" she fought throughout her reign.[21] Rowlands continued:

> The Debora that judged Israel
> Whose blessed actions God did prosper well:
> She that did never purpose wrong to any,
> Though injuries to her, were done by many…[22]

This comparison to Deborah is taken from the Ballad of Deborah and Barak in chapter five of the Book of Judges, which concludes: "So let all thine enemies perish [i.e. the Canaanites at the hands of Deborah], O Lord: but let them that love him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might. And the land had rest."[23] The "injuries ... done by many" is likely a reference to the many plots, such as the Ridolfi (1571), Throckmorton (1583) and Babington (1586) plots made against the Queen – all of which she survived – because, like Deborah, she was under God's protection. Rowlands then concluded the verse:

> [And] within our marble armes we do enclose
> The Virgin Queene, the White and Red crown'd Rose,
> That rul'd this Realme so happy, fourtie fowre,
> As never Prince did raigne she like before.[24]

Hunt and Anna Whitelock (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 95-110 (95).

[18] Doran, "Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King," 108.

[19] Samuel Rowlands, *Ave Cæsar. God save the King. The joyfull Ecchoes of loyall English hartes, entertayning his Majesties late arrivall in England. With an Epitaph upon the death of her Majestie our late Queene* (London: W. F[erbrand] and G. L[oftus], 1603), Aiiij. The formatting of the original text has been preserved throughout this article.

[20] Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, 87.

[21] King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, 227.

[22] Rowlands, *Ave Cæsar,* Aiiij.

[23] Judges 5:31. All biblical references are taken from the King James Version.

[24] Rowlands, *Ave Cæsar,* B.v.

To stress the love the English had for their Queen, he wrote with "marble armes we do enclose," rather than simply writing that Elizabeth was buried. This is also an allusion to Elizabeth's depiction as a mother, as psychologists consider hugging someone to be a particularly motherly or feminine action.[25] But in this instance, the people of England are the ones hugging the Queen, demonstrating Rowlands believed in her depiction of Elizabeth as the mother of her people. The "Rose" Rowlands refers to is the Tudor rose – whose red and white components were made from the combining of the York and Lancastrian Roses – and also to the fact that Elizabeth was the last Tudor monarch.[26] He also noted Elizabeth ruled for forty-four years, similar to Deborah's forty years. With this analogy, Rowlands described Elizabeth as a providential monarch, who in her passing had become the archetypal monarch for all others to aspire to. By doing this, Rowlands reinforced the notion that the Protestant biblical analogies of Elizabeth had a political purpose that was every bit as potent as their religious intent.

Elizabeth's analogies were employed to compare James' succession with Solomon's succession of David. In 1603, an anonymous pamphlet called *A Lamentation, for the losse of our late Soveraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, with joy and exultation for our High and Mightie Prince, King James, her lineall and lawfull Successor* was published in London. It presented the succession of James as a parallel for Solomon's succession:

> But when David died and Salomon was installed, there was a continuance of joy, because he continued true religion as his fathers did before. And so, though God hath taken away Queene Elizabeth our late and loving Nurce-mother, yet the succeeding of that mightie and godly Prince, King James, our new and renowned Nurce-father.[27]

The author considered James' succession to be a continuation of Elizabeth's religious program. As Ralph Houlbrooke says of the succession, "guided by Queen Elizabeth's actions, ... James, like Solomon was happy in his life [and] reign."[28] By casting James as Solomon, the anonymous author of the pamphlet also described Elizabeth as David, implying that the succession was not only political, but also religious. Solomon was not David's eldest child: rather, he was appointed by David (at God's behest) to succeed the throne in his will.[29] Elizabeth had laid the groundwork for a Protestant nation, and had attempted to neutralise the Roman Catholic threat. With his succession, James continued the royal supremacy, bringing with him his Scottish Reformation ideals.[30] Linda Shenk has observed that these analogies to Solomon "were published to call English subjects to rally behind Crown and country."[31] She also notes that "Solomon bows to no earthly power (such as a pope)," and that unlike other biblical figures who possessed authority over a single group of people, Solomon's "decidedly international status" enhanced the power of the analogy – particularly important given the uniting of the two kingdoms.[32]

The reference to Elizabeth as the "loving Nurce-mother" echoed the prominent

---

[25] Phyllis Erdman and Kok-Mun Ng, *Attachment: Expanding the Cultural Connections* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 59.
[26] Sydney Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992), 89-90.
[27] *Weepe with Joy*: *A Lamentation, for the losse of our late Soveraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, with joy and exultation for our High and Mightie Prince, King James, her lineall and lawfull Successor* (London: V.S., 1603), 1.
[28] Ralph Houlbrooke, "James's Reputation, 1625-2005," in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 169-190 (169).
[29] I Kings 1:30.
[30] Christopher Durston, *James I* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 1-2.
[31] Linda Shenk, "Queen Solomon: an International Elizabeth I in 1569," in *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England,* eds. Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 98-125 (99).
[32] Shenk, "Queen Solomon," 99, 101.

images of the Queen as both the nurse of her people, and the mother of Protestant England, who appointed James as her successor.[33] Various sources refer to Elizabeth in these roles during her life, including Thomas Norton's 1569 description of Elizabeth as "the most loving mother and nourse [sic] of all her good subjectes [sic]," and Anthony Marten's 1588 depiction of the Queen as "sent from above, to nurse and protect the true Christian Common weale."[34] As Louis Montrose observes: "by fashioning herself into a singular combination of Maiden, Matron, and Mother, the Queen transformed the normal domestic life-cycle of an Elizabethan female into what was at once a social paradox and a religious mystery."[35] To underscore the author's claim that James was Elizabeth's rightful successor, the pamphlet continues this established "nurce-mother" concept by depicting James as England's "nurce-father." With this highly political analogy, the author was attempting to pre-empt any questions surrounding the legitimacy of James succession, following a trend Mary Villeponteaux has noted: "posthumous panegyrics for Elizabeth were often combined with celebrations of James ... [who] was depicted as the sun following the moon, just as the day follows the night."[36] By comparing the Elizabeth/James succession with the David/Solomon succession, the author highlighted the divine approval of the succession: just as the Davidic Elizabeth had enjoyed providential favour, so would the Solomonic James.

II. Analogies after death

Analogies drawn for Elizabeth could serve a dual political and religious purpose. Christopher Lever's 1607 pamphlet, *Queene Elizabeths Teares*, is a prime example of this. Lever compared Elizabeth to Daniel the Prophet in an attempt to paint Elizabeth as a providential monarch who was under God's protection. In the aftermath of the Roman Catholic Gunpowder Plot of November 1605, however, the pamphlet also served as a rallying call for the English people to stand firm behind their Protestant monarch. Lever equated James' protection from the assassination attempt with Elizabeth's protection from the interrogation at the hands of Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, during the reign of Mary. Thus, according to Lever, God had blessed Elizabeth because of her religion, and James would experience the same blessings if he followed his predecessor's example. The pamphlet is written in verse, and the 'story' alternates between a narrator and Elizabeth herself. By doing this, Lever gave himself the widest possible audience – families with children could read the pamphlet aloud, instead of it being restricted to adult readers. Lever sets the scene with Elizabeth left in a cell, where she begins praying to God, comparing herself to Daniel:

> O thou eternall eie,
> That sees the very secrets of my hart:
> I doe report me to thy Majestie,
> ... Thou art my comfort, and my Judge thou art.
> Sith heere on earth no justice will be given,
> I for my justice will resort to heaven ...

---

[33] Levin, *Heart and Stomach of a King*, 195n52.

[34] Thomas Norton, *To the Quenes Majesties poore deceyved subjectes of the north countrey, drawen into rebellion by the Earles of Northumberland and Westmerland* (London: L Harrison, 1569), Biv.v; Anthony Marten, *An Exhortation, to Stirre up the mindes of all her Majesties faithfull Subjects, to defend their countrey in this dangerous time, from the invasion of Enemies* (London: John Windet, 1588), C3.

[35] Louis Montrose, "'Shaping Fantasies:' Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture," *Representations*, vol. 2 (Spring 1983), 61-94 (80).

[36] Mary Villeponteaux, *The Queen's Mercy: Gender and Judgments in Representations of Elizabeth I* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 133.

> For Daniel and the Lyons be with us.[37]

Here, Lever has Elizabeth compare her captivity to Daniel's. The "justice" is a reference to Daniel's response to King Darius: "the lions ... have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency [sic] was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt."[38] Lever has Elizabeth say God knows all "secrets of my hart," which will prove her innocence by preserving her through this ordeal. Elizabeth then continues in prayer:

> Both I, and Daniel have like holy cause;
> As I my selfe, so Daniel hath withstood
> To yeelde obedience unto wicked Lawes; [39]

The passage references the "wicked Lawes" both Daniel and Elizabeth were subject to. As Daniel was subjected to a law that required him to pray to King Darius instead of God, Elizabeth was subjected to the laws of the Roman Catholic Church of England under Mary – a church that Brett Usher describes as undermining the Protestant belief in the "paramountcy [sic] of the Bible," and placing the Pope above "God in all things."[40] This idea is expanded on later in the story:

> Daniel and I are envied both, because
> We give that honour to the King of heaven,
> Which other unto Images have given.[41]

This section goes further than the "wicked Lawes;" it accuses the Roman Catholics of worshipping idols – a direct reference to the religious icons and statues that played an important role in Roman Catholic worship.[42] Lever was comparing Daniel's not worshipping of King Darius with Elizabeth's not worshipping idols.

> God sends his Angells to this holy man,
> And bindes the force of Lions for his sake;
> If God restraine, what envie is there than,
> That can from any any [sic] little take?
> The eie of providence doth ever wake.
> The sith[43] that we so like to Daniel are,
> God will as well for us as Daniel care.[44]

In this section of the story, Elizabeth prays to God that he protect her from the "force of the Lions." As Daniel said to Darius in the Lion's Den, "My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me," Elizabeth prays too that she will be spared from Queen Mary in the same way.[45]

> This apprehension of anothers griefe,

---

[37] Christopher Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares: or, Her resolute bearing the Christian Crosse, inflicted on her by the persecuting hands of Steven Gardner Bishop of Winchester, in the bloodie time of Queen Marie* (London: V[alentine] S[immes], 1607), F3.
[38] Daniel 6:22.
[39] Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares*, F3.v.
[40] Brett Usher, "New Wine into Old Bottles: The Doctrine and Structure of the Elizabethan Church," in *The Elizabethan World*, eds. Susan Doran and Norman Jones (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 203-221 (205).
[41] Lever, Queen Elizabeths Teares, G.
[42] John Craig, "Parish Religion," in *The Elizabethan World,* eds. Susan Doran and Norman Jones (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 222-237 (232).
[43] Archaic form of 'since'.
[44] Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares*, G.
[45] Daniel 6:20.

> Doth somewhat ease the furie of her owne;
> And she from Daniel can receive reliefe,
> Because to him such favour God had showne:
> She knowes that God hath all her sorrowes knowne.
> And He that could the furious Lions tame,
> Will favour her that suffers for his name.[46]

Elizabeth, knowing she is innocent, takes comfort from the fact that like Daniel, she "can receive releife" from her imprisonment. She also clings to the idea that if God can save Daniel from "the furious Lions," he can rescue her from her imprisonment. It would be highly unlikely that a reader of this story could ignore the violent terms with which Lever describes the lion's den. But by phrasing his story in a specific way – such as writing, God "bindes the force of Lions for his sake" – Lever also includes figurative lions in his analogy. Lions had long been a symbol of monarchy. Elizabeth and Mary's father, Henry VIII, included a lion in his coat of arms, and they were used in heraldic displays at Elizabeth's funeral.[47] In the case of Daniel, the lions were his executioners. For Elizabeth, had her interrogators found evidence of her involvement in the Wyatt Rebellion against Mary, or induced a confession out of Elizabeth, Mary – the lion – would probably have sentenced her to death.[48] Despite the fact Elizabeth had been dead for four years, Christopher Lever still saw the Queen as an important model. She epitomised a providential monarch who was under divine protection, and he claimed that other monarchs who emulated Elizabeth's religious devotion could also gain this protection. But by using such a strong analogy with Daniel, Lever was making a political statement. The threat of Catholicism, especially in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, prompted Lever to highlight Elizabeth's dealings with Roman Catholics, and how the Queen had not suffered divine displeasure for her actions. Elizabeth, who herself was the embodiment of the prophet Daniel, was thus a model for James to emulate.

As had occurred during Elizabeth's reign, analogies were drawn that appear to serve no purpose other than to compare Elizabeth with a biblical figure. These analogies do, however, reinforce the prevailing opinion that Elizabeth was a providential monarch who was blessed like the famed characters of the Old Testament. An example of this type of analogy is William Leigh's 1612 three-part sermon entitled, *Queene Elizabeth, paraleld in Her Princely vertues, with David, Jos[h]ua, and Hezekia*. Many of the parallels Leigh drew between David and Elizabeth focussed on Elizabeth's life under her half-sister Mary. Leigh provided a long list of similarities between the two monarchs:

> David [was] persecuted from his youth, so was Elizabeth ... Saul a King persecuted David, Marie a Queene was wroth with Elizabeth ... David declared his innocencie unto Saul, so did Elizabeth unto her sister, Much was suspected by David which they laid unto his charge, things which he never thought, and they ever failed in the proofe. So was it with Elizabeth, her hand yet witnesseth to the innocencie of her soule, which she left as a constat of her loyall hart ... Much suspected by me: nothing proved can be, quoth Elizabeth prisoner.[49]

Of all the analogies that compare David and Elizabeth – both during, and after, her reign

---

[46] Lever, *Queen Elizabeths Teares*, G.
[47] Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship*, 103.
[48] David Loades, *Elizabeth I* (London and New York: Hambledon and London, 2003), 99-100.
[49] William Leigh, *Queene Elizabeth, paraleld in Her Princely vertues, with David, Josua, and Hezekia* (London: Arthur Johnson, 1612), 46-47.

– this is the most overt in its comparison. Leigh's sermon clearly demonstrates that the analogies, while appearing on the surface to be religious in nature, still had an overtly political purpose in depicting Elizabeth as a providential monarch. In employing these biblical analogies, Leigh used biblical examples to argue that Elizabeth had indeed been the legitimate ruler of England – because God had blessed her in the same way he blessed the kings in the Old Testament – which meant James, as her lawful successor, was the legitimate king.

This highly political undercurrent became typical of Elizabeth's post-mortem biblical analogies: an undercurrent that depicted Elizabeth as the archetypal Protestant monarch for her Stuart successors to emulate. A prime example of this is Andrew Willet's sermon, *A Treatise of Salomons Mariage* [sic]. Willet, an English clergyman and a prolific writer of religious treatises, published the sermon in celebration of the marriage between King James' daughter Elizabeth, and Frederick V, Count Palatine of the Rhine (and later King of Bohemia), in 1613.[50] In the sermon, Willet provided the reign of Queen Elizabeth as an example of how a Protestant monarch should behave. He also believed England's peace was providential:

> As Salomons raigne was peaceable, his clemencie, equitie and pietie at the first procured peace: so hath the Gospell brought peace to this land, now full 55. yeeres: all Queene Elizabeths raigne: ... God make them equall to Salomons peaceable raigne, and to exceed them, under the raigne of our Salomon.[51]

To Willet, Elizabeth had reigned as a modern-day Solomon: rewarded by God for her judicial clemency, her religious piety, and reforming zeal. But unlike Solomon, who the Bible is described as committing "evil in the sight of God" near the end of his reign, Elizabeth stayed true to her faith.[52] By staying true, God rewarded Elizabeth and to rule for forty-four years – four more than Solomon's "forty years."[53] In the sermon, however, Willet wrote that Elizabeth reigned for fifty-five years, instead of the forty-four she did. This extra eleven years either includes the eleven years James had ruled by this time (which reinforces the notion that Willet considered James to be Elizabeth's political and religious successor), or it reflects Willet's belief that Elizabeth had transformed from being the Queen of England, to now reigning as the Queen of Heaven.[54] By modelling Elizabeth, Willet trusted that James would experience the same providential peace Solomon had.

Another analogy that depicted Elizabeth as an archetypal monarch was John Tay-

---

[50] Durston, *James I*, 46.

[51] Andrew Willet, A *Treatise of Salomons Mariage, or, a congratulation for the happie and hopefull mariage betweene the most illustrious and noble Prince Frederike the V. Count Palatine of Rhine ... And the most gratious and excellent Princesse, the Ladie Elizabeth, sole daughter unto the High and Mighty Prince James, by the grace of God, King of great Britaine, France and Ireland* (London: F [elix] K[ingston], 1613), F.v.

[52] I Kings 11:6.

[53] I Kings 11:42.

[54] Elizabeth herself first mooted this concept, in a prayer, written in Greek that was published as part of the booklet *Christian Prayers and Mediations* (London: John Daye, 1569). The prayer (as translated by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose in *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*) concludes: "With all these things, omnipotent Lord, favour me, and after death my kingdom will be the kingdom of heaven" (163). While the book does not have an author indicated, the editors of the collection, and Jennifer Clement in her article, "The Queen's Voice: Elizabeth I's Christian Prayers and Meditations," *Early Modern Literary Studies,* vol.13.3 (January 2008), agree that the collection was written by Elizabeth herself. Marcus, Mueller, and Rose's assertion comes from their linguistic analysis: "within the volume, gendered self-references are feminine throughout, and the frequent anglicisms [sic] are characteristic of Elizabeth's habitual practice" (144).

lor's *Memorial of all the English Monarchs*, published in 1622. The pamphlet contained a small biographical verse of every monarch from Britain's first king, Brute, up to James I.[55] The biography of Elizabeth described her as:

> A Deborah, a Judith ...
> Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise, and Chaste,
> With Heavenly, Earthly gifts, adorn'd & grac'd
> Victorious, glorious, bounteous, gracious, good,
> And one whose vertues dignifi'd her bloud,
> ... Amongst all Queens, proclaim'd her Queen of harts.[56]

Taylor likened Elizabeth's intelligence, wisdom, and piety to Deborah, and her courage and chastity to Judith. This positive assessment of the Queen, however, fails to broach the negative events of Elizabeth's reign, such as the trade disputes with Philip II of Spain in The Netherlands in the late 1560s and early 1570s; the unpopular removal of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal, in 1577; the disastrous war in Ireland during the late 1590s; the rising tax burden instigated to fund her wars in the Netherlands and in Ireland; and the particularly unpopular granting of monopolies to her favourites as a way of raising revenue without Parliament in the late 1590s and early 1600s.[57] Instead, Taylor chose to focus on Elizabeth religious devotion and just government as a way to call for both the ageing King James, and the future Charles I, to emulate Elizabeth.[58]

III. The English Deborah

After a break in the appearance of Elizabeth's biblical analogies due to the English Civil War, their use was renewed with the re-establishment of the monarchy in 1660.[59] After 1660, however, in addition to the continued drawing of biblical analogies for Eliza-

---

[55] Brutus, or Brute, is considered by Geoffrey of Monmouth to be the first King of England. The grandson of Aeneas (the Trojan soldier who founded Rome), Brutus travelled around Europe after being exiled for killing his father. After fighting the Gauls, he sailed to Britain—then called Albion—renaming the island after himself when he declared himself king. There is no evidence to suggest that Brutus was a historical figure, and historians generally agree that he is a mythical character.

[56] John Taylor, *A Memorial of All the English Monarchs, being in number 150, from Brute to King James* (London: [Nicholas Okes], 1622), F5v. The work was reissued in 1630 to commemorate the accession of Charles I, but the only changes to Elizabeth's entry were that "Deborah" became "Debora," and "whose" became "who'e."

[57] Susan Doran and Norman Jones, "Introduction," in *The Elizabethan World*, eds. Susan Doran and Norman Jones (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 1-16 (9-10); Christopher Haigh, Elizabeth I (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 149, 197.

[58] David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989), 133-134.

[59] Further research needs to be undertaken to establish why this gap exists—research that is well beyond the scope of this article. It could simply be that the publications making these links simply do not survive: but I suspect it is more complex than that. I would offer two potential explanations for this gap, which are certainly only part of the entire answer. Firstly, Cromwell was clearly the focus of the Commonwealth—not a long dead monarch. As Laura L Knoppers has successfully argued in *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645-1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), publications both criticising and praising the government focussed on Cromwell himself. The Commonwealth was clearly an environment that was not conducive to biblical analogies—but with the Restoration, it is perhaps unsurprising that royalists returned to the Elizabethan analogies they knew had been successful in cementing royal authority. Secondly, the accession of Charles I would no doubt have seen an increase in the analogies drawn for James I—largely at the expense of Elizabeth's analogies. It is reasonable to assume during Charles' reign, his father was used as the model monarch—in much the same way James was exhorted to rule like his Protestant predecessor Elizabeth. An example of this can be found in a 1642 collection of saying and speeches, edited by Andrew Willet, called *King James: His Judgment by way of counsell and advice to all His loving Subjects*. Willet wrote: "King James was a wise and judiciall King, whose Princely writings doe give him the preheminence before all his predecessors. Another Salomon, a King" (A1).

beth, writers conflated the Queen with Deborah the Judge. Many publications simply referred to Elizabeth as the "English Deborah," with minimal explanation concerning the connection between the two women. John Watkins states that this conflation was intended to "continue their biblical predecessor's work of protecting the godly against their murderous and idolatrous enemies."[60] George Swinnocke's pamphlet from 1660, *Men are Gods, or the Dignity of Magistracy, and the Duty of the Magistrate,* was the first to employ this new analogy. In it, Swinnocke provided a history of justice, from the classical world up to the end of James' reign. In his section on the virtues of clemency, Swinnocke said:

> Our English Deborah, Queen Elizabeth, did not without cause exceedingly prize Seneca's first book of Clemency, because it treated of that which is so needfull to a Prince.[61]

Clemency – both in the granting of pardons and reducing punishments (such as commuting the punishment from a traitor's death to instead being beheaded) – was considered one of a monarch's most important responsibilities. According to Krista Kesselring, Elizabeth and her predecessors "used the act of pardon to portray themselves as beneficent rulers who governed by the time-honored, God given rule that mercy must accompany justice."[62] Clemency as a virtue was discussed often during Elizabeth's own life. The martyrologist John Foxe had written to Elizabeth in 1575 describing clemency as a divine gift: "the clemency of God himself in ordaining that those brute and lowly creatures which were formerly made ready for sacrifice should not be committed to the flames before their blood poured out at the foot of the altar."[63]

To Foxe, a monarch should follow the example of God when "exacting punishments, no matter how just, rigour should not bear sole sway, but clemency should temper the harshness of rigour."[64] The "Seneca" Swinnocke refers to is the Roman Stoic philosopher Seneca the Younger. One of his most well-known works (despite its incompletion), *On Clemency*, had been a gift to the Emperor Nero in 55/56CE.[65] Elizabeth's clemency can be found at the execution of the conspirators of the Babington Plot: those executed on the second day were hanged until dead before being disembowelled. While Judith Richards notes this may have been the result of "the crowd's [negative] reaction to the live disembowelling the first day," she also states that the Queen's supporters claimed this "clemency was at Elizabeth's command."[66] This 'behind the scenes' clemency typified Elizabeth's approach to mercy, and was in stark contrast to James'. As Mary Villeponteaux has observed, "Elizabeth's reluctance to execute harsh judgement was usually carried on behind the scenes ... [whereas James] cast a court of law as an embodiment of personal monarchy."[67] A potentially lesser known, but more acute, example of Elizabeth's clemency occurred in 1580. Elizabeth was sailing on the Thames with a representative of

---

[60] John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 28.
[61] George Swinnocke, *Men are Gods, or the Dignity of Magistracy, and the Duty of the Magistrate: As it was presented in a Sermon at the Assize holden at Hertford for that Country, on August 2. 1653* (London: R.W., 1660), 251-252.
[62] K.J. Kesselring, *Mercy and Authority in the Tudor State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 67.
[63] John Foxe, "To the Queen on Behalf of Two Dutch People to be Burnt for Their Opinion," in V. Norskov Olsen, *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 198-199.
[64] Foxe, "To the Queen on Behalf," 199.
[65] Elaine Fantham, Miriam T. Griffin and Leightob Durham Reynolds, "Annaeus Seneca, Lucius," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, eds. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 96-97 (96).Clemency was considered one of the most important virtues for an Emperor to possess. A 'bad emperor' was one who did not employ clemency in his judgments. See Suetonius' *Life of Nero*, 10.
[66] Judith M Richards, *Elizabeth I* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012), 130.
[67] Villeponteaux, *The Queen's Mercy*, 155.

the Duke of Anjou, who was attempting to convince Elizabeth to marry his master, when a gun was fired from the bank. The bullet missed the Queen (hitting one of her bargemen instead), and the shooter was captured. The man vigorously denied that he had intended to harm the Queen. Elizabeth was moved by the man's appeal, and ordered that he be "let goe;" reminding those who had demanded he be executed that "shee could beleeve nothing of her Subjects, that Parents would not beleeve of their Children."[68] This event in particular links her to Deborah, who God placed "in judgment ... over the nobles among the people ... [and] over the mighty."[69] Like the Old Testament Judge, Elizabeth rendered her judgement (which included issuing a pardon) after careful consideration, once she had made certain all the facts had been ascertained. Swinnocke, in this analogy, thus merged the political and religious power of Elizabeth's biblical analogies. By creating the "English Deborah," Swinnocke highlighted his belief that the two cannot be separated. Thus, this analogy demonstrates that in the years after her death, Elizabeth was still being compared to biblical characters for political reasons. The reason for choosing this particular moment to make this connection may relate to the passage of the *Indemnity and Oblivion Act* of 1660. The Act, with the exception of certain crimes (such piracy and witchcraft), and those involved in the regicide of Charles I, pardoned all crimes committed during the Interregnum.[70] Swinnocke therefore chose this analogy – despite no reference existing in the Bible to Deborah's clemency – because he could safely assume it would resonate with his readers.

Elizabeth's analogies, particularly after the Restoration, became an integral part of the Queen's image in the popular conscious. Edward Leigh's 1661 pamphlet, *Choice Observations of all the Kings of England from the Saxons to the Death of King Charles the First*, emphasises this development. As part of his "observations," Leigh provides a narrative of England's split from Roman Catholicism:

> As he [King Henry VIII] cast out the Pope, so did his children Edward the sixth, and Queen Elizabeth cast out Popery out of England, and so freed us from his spiritual bondage ... May their memory be therefore still precious amongst us, as the Reformations we enjoy chiefly by their means ... Let [Elizabeth be] our English Deborah, on whom those Verses were made, Spains Rod, Romes Ruin, Netherlands Relief.[71]

Here, the English Deborah defeats the Roman Catholics, as Deborah the Judge defeated the Canaanites. The "verses" Leigh references come from a commemorative monument to Elizabeth in the Church of All Hallows the Great in Dowgate. The date of the monument's erection is unknown, and the church was destroyed in the Great Fire of London in 1666. James Elmes, however, described the monument in his *Topographical Dictionary of London and Its Environs*, as being "erected, probably by the parish, to the memory of our illustrious if not amiable Queen Elizabeth."[72] "Spains Rod" is likely a reference to the defeat of the Spanish Armada. "Romes Ruin" almost certainly alludes to the failure of all the plots to assassinate the Queen and return England to Roman Catholicism. "Netherlands

---

[68] William Camden, *Annales, the true and royall history of the famous empresses Elizabeth Queene of England France and Ireland* (London: George Purslowe, 1625), 392.
[69] Judges 5:10,13.
[70] "Indemnity and Oblivion, Act of," in *A Dictionary of British History*, ed. John Cannon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 232 (232).
[71] Edward Leigh, *Choice Observations of all the Kings of England from the Saxons to the Death of King Charles the First* (London: Joseph Cranford, 1661), B2v.
[72] James Elmes, ed. *A Topographical Dictionary of London and Its Environs: Containing Descriptive and Critical Accounts of All the Public and Private Buildings ... in the British Metropolis* (London: Whittaker, Treacher and Arnot, 1831), 10.

Relief' refers to Elizabeth's involvement in the Dutch Revolt of the 1560s, in which Elizabeth supported the Dutch Protestants' bid for independence from the Roman Catholic Philip II of Spain.[73]

Then, in 1663, Edward Leigh published *Fœlix Consortium; or, a Fit Conjucture of Religion and Learning*. The pamphlet was designed to give a short biography of people "Eminent for Religion or Learning." Leigh's entry on Elizabeth states:

> Queen Elizabeth, a Learned Queen, and our English Deborah. She Translated out of Greek into Latine, Isocrates his Oration to Nicocles ... She translated also the Meditations of the Queen of Navarr, out of French into English.[74]

In employing this analogy, Leigh linked intelligence with divine favour, which in turn derived from religious piety. Elizabeth was a "Learned Queen," and should thus be seen as a providential ruler like Deborah. Of all the works listed, the reference to the "Meditations of the Queen of Navarr" is particularly noteworthy. The Queen is Margaret of Navarre, consort of Henry II. Margaret was an influential patron of many reformers and humanists (her daughter Jeanne would become known as the mother of French Huguenots). The "Meditations" Leigh refers to is the poem, *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* ("Mirror of the Sinful Soul"). Elizabeth translated this poem from French into English as a present to her stepmother, Catherine Parr, when she was twelve years old.[75] The works of Isocrates have no religious connotations, which means they fall under the "Learning" category for Leigh.

The final analogies that were drawn for Elizabeth during the late seventeenth century were clearly religio-political. An example of this is James Salgado's 1680 pamphlet, *A Song upon the Birth-day of Queen Elizabeth*. The pamphlet equated Elizabeth's birth with the establishment of Protestantism in England:

> Let Protestants with thankful hearts remember
> This Royal day, the seventeonth [sic] of November.
> This is the day wherein that Glorious Star
> Did first in Englands Horizon appear:
> When Englands Deborah drew her first breath,
> Whose Life was life to Protestants, and death
> To Popish Rebels.[76]

By invoking Deborah, Salgado compared the Israelites' defeat of the Canaanites under the command of Deborah, to Elizabeth's defeat of the Roman Catholics – particularly the Spanish Armada. The verse also appears to be a veiled attack on Mary I's return to Roman Catholicism: Elizabeth's reign was "life to Protestants" because the "Popish Rebels" had been allowed to take hold in the Church of England. Salgado may also have been referencing the hysteria that had swept across the British Isles as a result of the Popish Plot, a fictitious plot devised by Titus Oates that saw at least twenty-two Roman Catholics executed for supposedly planning to kill the King: a literalisation of the "death to Popish Rebels."[77] The reference to Elizabeth as "that Glorious Star" is also biblically significant, as a

---

[73] Paul E.J. Hammer, "The Catholic Threat and the Military Response," in *The Elizabethan World*, eds. Susan Doran and Norman Jones (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 629-645 (638-639).
[74] Edward Leigh, *Fœlix Consortium: or, a Fit Conjucture of Religion and Learning* (London: Charles Adams, 1663), 185. Nicocles was a fourth century BC king of Cyprus.
[75] Susan Snyder, "Guilt Sisters: Marguerite de Navarre, Elizabeth of England, and the Miroir de l'âme Péchresse," *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 50 (Summer 1997), 443-458 (443).
[76] James Salgado, *A Song upon the Birth-day of Queen Elizabeth, the Spanish Armado; the Gun-Powder-Treason, and the Late Popish Plot* ([London, 1680]), 1.
[77] John Pollock, *The Popish Plot: a Study in the History of the Reign of Charles II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1944), xx-xxv, 84.

star is used throughout the Bible to guide people to important religious events – such as the star that guided the Wise Men to Jesus in Bethlehem.[78] As Elizabeth's reign marked a return to Protestantism, the reference to the star in the analogy draws on a prophecy of Daniel: "they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness [shall shine] as the stars for ever and ever."[79] Salgado invoked this prophecy, as the "turn many to righteousness" directive had surely been accomplished when Elizabeth 'converted' the entire country to Protestantism. Finally, the "seventeonth of November" was Elizabeth's accession day. This analogy, therefore, was highly politicised. Deborah was a Jew – invoking her has little to do with actual religion, but rather with the political power her image wielded. Salgado used a biblical event to legitimise Elizabeth's actions: as Deborah led the Israelites in their fight for freedom from the Canaanites, Elizabeth led her people out from the Pope's oppression.

IV. Biblical analogies and the Exclusion Crisis

In the century after Elizabeth's death, events in her life continued to be celebrated. Bells were rung to commemorate her Accession Day, and plays re-enacted the English victory over the Spanish Armada. During the Exclusion Crisis (1679-1681), this legacy saw providential moments from Elizabeth's reign offered as reasons to avoid a Roman Catholic succession. An example of this is an anonymous pamphlet published in 1680, called *The Jesuites Ghostly Wayes*. The pamphlet recounted two failed assassination attempts against Elizabeth. The first, planned by the Member of Parliament (and secret Roman Catholic) William Parry, involved shooting the Queen while she was out riding. After speaking out against the *Act Against Jesuits and Seminary Priests* (1585) in Parliament, Parry was arrested, and in addition to admitting his Catholicism, he confessed to the planned assassination.[80] He claimed that he was using a fake murder in order to catch would-be assassins. His argument failed to convince the Court or the Queen, and he was found guilty of treason. Parry was hanged, drawn, and quartered on 2nd March 1585.[81]

The second attempt on the Queen's life recounted by Parry involved a Roman Catholic named Edward Squire, who worked in the Queen's stables.[82] He was tasked with rubbing poison on the pommel of Elizabeth's saddle:

> assuring himself that the Queen must of necessity lay her hand on that, and then [she would] in all probability at one time or another bringing up her hand to her mouth, or to some part of her face, the poison would get such access to her, as most certainly to be her death ... [And as] the poison would not do its work under some length of time, and it should have its operation during his absence, he might not be any way suspected.[83]

---

[78] Matthew 2:2.

[79] Daniel 12:3.

Given his position in the royal stables, he was tasked with assassinating the Queen by poison. The attempt was unsuccessful, and he was convicted of treason. He was executed on 23rd November 1598.

[80] Julian Lock, "Parry, William (*d.* 1585)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/21437>.

[81] Richards, *Elizabeth I*, 122-123.

[82] Squire had joined an expedition of Sir Francis Drake's to the New World, but his ship was captured by the Spanish. He was taken prisoner, and handed over to the Inquisition. Under torture, he converted to Roman Catholicism.

[83] *The Jesuites Ghostly Wayes to Draw other Persons over to their Damnable Principle, of the Meritoriousness of destroying Princes; Made clear in the two barbarous attempts of William Parry, and Edward Squire on our late Gracious Soveraign Elizabeth of ever blessed Memory* (London: Will[iam] Bowtel, 1679), 22-23.

The poison, however, did not affect Elizabeth, and the author jubilantly compared Elizabeth's safety to Daniel's protection from the lions:

> But it pleased the Almighty, who had already delivered her from manifold dangers, to continue still his wonted and wonderful protection to her, keeping her in safety under the shadow of his wings ... [as] yet was she unhurt; and as God shut up the mouths of the Lyons that they should not touch Daniel, ... so had he ordered that poison, otherwise so strong and powerful, not to have the least vertue which was proper to it. She remained as well as ever.[84]

This analogy to Daniel, appearing over 120 years after Elizabeth compared herself to the Old Testament prophet at her coronation procession, is testament to the enduring and pervasive nature of Elizabeth's analogies. It is also significant to note the original account of the assassination attempt, published during Elizabeth's life, and contained in Francis Bacon's *A Letter ... containing a true Report of a strange Conspiracie*, does not make any reference to Daniel. Unlike Bacon's account of the assassination attempt, however, the 1680 pamphlet was most likely promoting a political agenda, published as it was in the midst of the debates of the Exclusion Bill. Furthermore, the author was also drawing his audience's attention to Elizabeth's providential protection: if God had wanted the Roman Catholics to succeed, and to rule England, he would have let the Protestant Elizabeth be killed.[85] In the height of the Exclusion Crisis, the author of the pamphlet sought to equate the dangers of a Catholic succession with the troubles Elizabeth faced. This religio-political point could have been made in a completely secular manner, but the author realised invoking these important religious figures would bring extra weight to his claim.

With the analogies openly serving religio-political purposes, it is perhaps unsurprising that some of the negative events of Elizabeth's reign were reconsidered, and given biblical parallels. In 1693, *The Character of Queen Elizabeth*, by Edmund Bohun, was published. A section of the work focussed on Elizabeth's dealing with Mary Queen of Scots. Bohun offered King David as a biblical example for Elizabeth's treatment of Mary:

> Many have endeavoured to blacken this Act of the Queen's [arresting and executing Mary], and other to defend and excuse it; but for my part, I think the Character God gave of King David, may be applied to Queen Elizabeth here; David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from any thing that he commanded him.[86]

David's son Absalom had rebelled against his father's rule, which had caused Israel to descend into civil war. When Absalom was defeated and killed, David was distraught. David's commander Joab, however, reminded him that Absalom had broken the law of the country, and that his death was God-sanctioned justice for his actions.[87] This biblical example was cited as justification for Elizabeth's actions against Mary Queen of Scots: it was Mary who had broken the divine order by rebelling against a God-anointed sovereign, not

---

[84] *The Jesuites Ghostly Wayes*, 23-24.
[85] Hammer, "The Catholic Threat and the Military Response," 629; Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 240.
[86] Edmund Bohun, *The Character of Queen Elizabeth. Or, A Full and Clear Account of Her Policies, and the Methods of Her Government both in Church and State* (London: Ric Chiswell, 1693), 125.
[87] II Samuel 19:1-7.

Elizabeth in executing a treasonous rebel.[88] Published ninety years after Elizabeth's death, and 106 years after Mary's execution, the pamphlet demonstrates that Elizabeth's actions were still considered a model for subsequent Protestant monarchs.

The last biblical analogy of Elizabeth appeared in 1699, and it also superimposed religious justification on Elizabeth's reign.[89] In a sermon preached by John March in 1692 (and published in 1699), he offered a history of the Reformation across Europe, before coming to Elizabethan England:[90]

> If we pass on to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, our English Deborah, we shall find Anger, and Wrath, and Rage enough. Indeed, for well nigh eleven years, they [the Roman Catholics] were pretty quiet, hoping to gain Queen Elizabeth by their politick flatteries: But ... these failed, ... And now the Popes Bulls begin to roar, the Queen is Excommunicated, her Subjects absolved from their Oaths ... [But] God by his good Providence does over-rule and govern the Wrath and Rage of Wicked Men, so as may be for his own Glory and his Peoples Good.[91]

The "Popes Bulls" refers to *Regnans in Excelsis*, the Papal Bull issued in 1570 that saw "the Queen ... Excommunicated" and "her Subjects absolved from their Oaths." The "eleven years" refers to the time between Elizabeth's accession (1558) and the first major rebellion against her reign by Roman Catholics, the Northern Rebellion of 1569.[92] March highlights this delay in military action was because the Roman Catholics engaged in "politick flatteries" – that is, they attempted to subvert the Elizabethan Religious settlement through parliament and by not adhering to the *Act of Uniformity* (1558/9). By the time of the Northern Rebellion, all of the English episcopal sees had new incumbents, and several hundred priests had either been imprisoned or deprived of their licenses due to their lack of conformity – removing the option of "politick flatteries."[93] This entry also indicates that according to March, Elizabeth held the Catholics at bay as Deborah had waged war against the Canaanites. But not only that, both women were spared rebellion and assassination by God's intervention because of their religious devotion. The analogy's primary purpose was thus to highlight Elizabeth's providential reign, and the blessings her people enjoyed because of the divine favour. Preached near the end of the Nine Years' War (a War fought by England, Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Dutch Republic against Roman Catholic France), and after the major naval victory of the Grand Alliance in May 1692, March's sermon sought to show that Catholic expansionism always ended in "Wrath and Rage," and that Elizabeth's reign was proof God was on the side of the Protestants.

---

[88] Sarah Duncan, "'Most godly heart fraight with al mercie': Queens' Mercy during the Reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth I," in *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, eds. Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 31-50 (42-43).

[89] As yet, no research has been undertaken to explain why this was the last of Elizabeth's analogies. Soon after this publication appeared, Queen Anne ascended the throne. While the succession of a female Protestant monarch could have prompted a return to Elizabethan analogies, the passing of the *Act of Succession* in 1701 had (finally) put to bed the question of Roman Catholic succession. The vast majority of Elizabeth's analogies had included a Roman Catholic threat in some way—and without a similar political context, their usefulness appears to have ceased.

[90] March's publisher may have seen the negotiations over the Second Partition Treaty (officially called the Treaty of London) as an opportune time to remind readers of the dangers Roman Catholic rulers.

[91] John March, *Sermons Preach'd on several Occasions, by John March, BD. Late Vicar of Newcastle upon Tine. The last of which was Preach'd the Twenty Seventh of November, 1692. Being the Sunday before he Died* (London: Robert Clavell, 1699), 74-77.

[92] K.J. Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics, and Protest in Elizabethan England* (London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 1-3.

[93] Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion: 1558-1603* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 15-16.

V. The analogies continue

Despite the gap in the historiography regarding their presence, it is clear that biblical analogies were still drawn for Elizabeth for almost a century after her death. Elizabeth post-mortem "was more heroic, if less complex, than the original woman," and therefore the continuing analogies served two fundamental purposes.[94] Primarily, they sought to depict Elizabeth as a providential monarch – and in doing so, positioned her as a model for other Protestant monarchs to emulate. The analogies also served an overtly religio-political purpose. Roman Catholic expansionism and the various assassination attempts on the Stuart monarchs were compared to situations in Elizabeth's reign, and these situations were given biblical parallels in order to show how providence would help the Protestant monarch, and indeed nation, to overcome them. Events in Elizabeth's reign were also compared with similar biblical events, and these analogies were offered as a potential way to deal with similar contemporary political issues. This article has identified multiple primary sources that demonstrate Elizabeth's influence over England did not end with the death of her physical body. Carole Levin's observation: the "body politic ... was held to be unerring and immortal," is exemplified in Elizabeth's enduring legacy.[95]

---

[94] Levin, "Elizabeth's Ghost," 15.
[95] Levin, *Heart and Stomach of a King*, 122.

Bibliography

A kind congratulation between Queen Elizabeth, and the late Queen Mary II of ever glorious memory. London: R. Smith, 1695.

Anglo, Sydney. *Images of Tudor Kingship*. London: Seaby, 1992.

Bohun, Edmund. *The Character of Queen Elizabeth. Or, A Full and Clear Account of Her Policies, and the Methods of Her Government both in Church and State*. London: Ric Chiswell, 1693.

Camden, William. *Annales, the true and royall history of the famous empresses Elizabeth Queene of England France and Ireland* (London: George Purslowe, 1625).

Craig, John. "Parish Religion." In *The Elizabethan World*, edited by Susan Doran and Norman Jones, 222-237. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

Cressy, David. *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989.

Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Religion: 1558-1603*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Doran, Susan. "Elizabeth I: An Old Testament King." In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, edited by Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock, 95-110. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Doran, Susan and Norman Jones, "Introduction." In *The Elizabethan World*, edited by Susan - Doran and Norman Jones, 1-16. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

Duncan, Sarah. "'Most godly heart fraight with al mercie': Queens' Mercy during the Reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth I." In *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, edited by Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz, 31-50. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

Durston, Christopher. *James I*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Elmes, James, ed. *A Topographical Dictionary of London and Its Environs: Containing Descriptive and Critical Accounts of All the Public and Private Buildings, Offices, Docks, Squares, Streets, Lanes, Wards, Liberties, Charitable, Scholastic and Other Establishments, with Lists of Their Officers, Patrons, Incumbents of Livings, &c. &c. &c. in the British Metropolis*. London: Whittaker, Treacher and Arnot, 1831.

Erdman, Phyllis and Kok-Mun Ng. *Attachment: Expanding the Cultural Connections*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Fantham, Elaine, Miriam T. Griffin and Leightob Durham Reynolds. "Annaeus Seneca, Lucius." In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, 96-98. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Foxe, John. "To the Queen on Behalf of Two Dutch People to be Burnt for Their Opinion." In V. Norskov Olsen. *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Haigh, Christopher. *Elizabeth I* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014).

Hammer, Paul E.J. "The Catholic threat and the military response." In *The Elizabethan World*, edited by Susan Doran and Norman Jones, 629-645. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

Houlbrooke, Ralph. "James's Reputation, 1625-2005." In *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, edited by Ralph Houlbrooke, 169-190. Aldershot, HA and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.

"Indemnity and Oblivion, Act of," in *A Dictionary of British History*, ed. John Cannon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Kesselring, K.J. *Mercy and Authority in the Tudor State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Kesselring, K.J. *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics, and Protest in Elizabethan England*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

King, John N. *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

King, John. "The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography." *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (Spring 1985): 41-84.

Leigh, Edward. *Choice Observations of all the Kings of England from the Saxons to the Death of King Charles the First*. London: Joseph Cranford, 1661.

Leigh, William. *Queene Elizabeth, paraleld in Her Princely vertues, with David, Josua, and Hezekia*. London: Arthur Johnson, 1612.

Leigh, Edward. *Fœlix Consortium: or, a Fit Conjucture of Religion and Learning*. London: Charles Adams, 1663.

Lever, Christopher. *Queen Elizabeths Teares: or, Her resolute bearing the Christian Crosse, inflicted on her by the persecuting hands of Steven Gardner Bishop of Winchester, in the bloodie time of Queen Marie*. London: V[alentine] S[immes], 1607.

Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Levin, Carole. "Elizabeth's Ghost: The afterlife of the Queen in Stuart England." *Royal Studies Journal* 1 (2014): 1-16.

Loades, David. *Elizabeth I*. London and New York: Hambledon and London, 2003.

Lock, Julian. "Parry, William (d. 1585)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/21437. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

March, John. *Sermons Preach'd on several Occasions, by John March, BD. Late Vicar of Newcastle upon Tine. The last of which was Preach'd the Twenty Seventh of November, 1692. Being the Sunday before he Died*. London: Robert Clavell, 1699.

Montrose, Louis. "'Shaping Fantasies:' Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture." *Representations* 2 (Spring 1983): 61-94.

Norton, Thomas. *To the Quenes Majesties poore deceyved subjectes of the north countrey, drawen into rebellion by the Earles of Northumberland and Westmerland*. London: L Harrison, 1569.

Pollock, John. *The Popish Plot: a Study in the History of the Reign of Charles II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1944).

Richards, Judith M. *Elizabeth*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.

Rowlands, Samuel. *Ave Cæsar. God save the King. The joyfull Ecchoes of loyall English hartes, entertayning his Majesties late arrivall in England. With an Epitaph upon the death of her Majestie our late Queene*. London: W. F[erbrand] and G. L[oftus], 1603.

Salgado, James. *A Song upon the Birth-day of Queen Elizabeth, the Spanish Armado; the Gun-Powder-Treason, and the Late Popish Plot* ([London, 1680]).

Shenk, Linda. "Queen Solomon: an International Elizabeth I in 1569," in *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, eds. Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz, 98-125. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

Snyder, Susan. "Guilt Sisters: Marguerite de Navarre, Elizabeth of England, and the Miroir de l'âme Péchresse." *Renaissance Quarterly* 50 (Summer 1997): 443-458.

Swinnocke, George. *Men are Gods, or the Dignity of Magistracy, and the Duty of the Magistrate: As It was presented in a Sermon at the Assize holden at Hertford for that Country, on August 2. 1653*. London: R.W., 1660.

Taylor, John. *A Memorial of All the English Monarchs, being in number 150, from Brute to King James*. London: [Nicholas Okes], 1622.

The Jesuites Ghostly Wayes to Draw other Persons over to their Damnable Principle, of the Meritoriousness of destroying Princes; Made clear in the two barbarous attempts of William Parry, and Edward Squire on our late Gracious Soveraign Elizabeth of ever blessed Memory. London: Will[iam] Bowtel, 1679.

Usher, Brett. "New Wine into Old Bottles: the doctrine and structure of the Elizabethan church." In *The Elizabethan World*, edited by Susan Doran and Norman Jones, 203-221. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

Villeponteaux, Mary. *The Queen's Mercy: Gender and Judgments in Representations of Elizabeth I* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Walsham, Alexandra. "'A Very Deborah?' The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch." In *The Myth of Elizabeth*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, 143-168. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Watkins, John. Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Weepe with Joy: A Lamentation, for the losse of our late Soveraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth, with joy and exultation for our High and Mightie Prince, King James, her lineall and lawfull Successor. London: V.S., 1603.

Willet, Andrew. *A Treatise of Salomons Mariage, or, a congratulation for the happie and hopefull mariage betweene the most illustrious and noble Prince Frederike the V. Count Palatine of Rhine, Elector of the Sacred Romane Empire, and Arch-Sewer, and in the vacancie thereof Vicar Generall: Duke of Bavaria, &c. Knight of the most noble order of the Garter. And the most gratious and excellent Princesse, the Ladie Elizabeth, sole daughter unto the High and Mighty Prince James, by the grace of God, King of great Britaine, France and Ireland. Joyfully solemnized upon the 14. day of Februarie, 1612. In the Kings Pallace of White-hall in Westminster.* London: F[elix] K[ingston], 1613.