

The Spanish Ambassador's Account of James I's Entry into London, 1604 [with Text]

The traditional ceremonial entry into London of a new monarch that followed James VI's accession to the English throne in spring 1603 was delayed due to a severe outbreak of plague, and as a result did not take place until 15th March 1604, some months after the low-key coronation the previous July and almost a year since the King of Scotland had set out on his journey south from Edinburgh.¹ By this time James and his queen, Anna of Denmark, had embarked on a policy that would define the entire reign. Bringing the war against Spain to an end was not only James's priority but a strategy upon which both his internationalist vision and the public image he wished to project depended. The Treaty of London would be duly signed at Somerset House in August 1604, and ratified at the court of Philip III in Valladolid the following year; in the preceding months the preliminary negotiations were carried out formally and informally, amidst not a little intrigue involving the Spanish and French ambassadors: not unnaturally Henri IV was concerned at the prospect of France's two main rivals reaching agreement. It is largely thanks to the dispatches sent back to Philip III by his ambassador extraordinary, Juan de Tassis y Acuña, Conde de Villamediana, that we know as much as we do about the role courtly entertainment played in promoting the negotiations.² The Spaniard also witnessed the royal entry into London of the new king, and dutifully conveyed what he saw to Philip. This hitherto unknown document offers a new account of the event and provides further insight into this remarkable episode in early modern diplomacy, of which this ceremony, through textual transmission, became a part. In this essay we present a transcription of the text with a fully-annotated translation, and situate the document in the context of the ongoing peace negotiations of spring 1604.

As all involved understood, royal ceremonial was of great symbolic significance politically, as well as culturally; in recent years it has received considerable attention from scholars.³ A royal entry featured two main components: a large-scale procession from a given starting point (usually the Tower of London) through the city to a destination (usually a royal palace), and along the designated route the installation of a series of pageants at fixed locations; a third component, unscripted, was the vast audience itself. It was a performance choreographed on a grand scale – the city itself the stage, the

central actor the most important figure in the land, the audience the population at large. Along with the monarch the court paraded its power and prestige, as did the city and religious authorities. It was a spectacle in which was enshrined the mutually-defining entities of people and sovereign. For many in 1604 this was the first such event they had experienced, the most recent previous instance being Elizabeth's entry into London in 1559. This occasion forty-five years later was particularly significant, since it introduced England's new 'foreign' ruler to his English subjects, following years of uncertainty over the succession that had continued right up to the queen's final hours, and in turn it gave the civic authorities an opportunity to proclaim their loyalty, as well as after months of delay welcome James VI and I formally. One measure of its perceived importance was the financial outlay – amounting to some £36,000, an enormous sum of money; in the city's conduits water turned into wine.⁴ All those who took part in the procession that departed from the Tower and moved westward through Fenchurch Street, Gracious Street, Cornhill and into Cheapside, past St Paul's and, via Fleet Street, to Temple Bar and finally Whitehall, were costumed, in many cases specially (and expensively) for the occasion. Several hundred, from the highest figures in the land to their lowly servants – who nonetheless were attired in elaborate cloths – formed what must have seemed a never-ending train. It was perhaps the supreme example in the medieval and early modern world of 'power on display'; it was also, in the choreographing of the order of the processional itself, a mobile inventory of social hierarchy, as texts such as the one with which this essay is concerned demonstrate.

For the 1604 entry eight arches were erected along the route, straddling each of the streets named above (Cheapside having two), beginning with Fenchurch Street, which the procession entered via Mark Lane, and ending in the Strand. All but three were provided by the city; one (the second, on Gracious Street) was contributed by Italian Merchants, another (the third, sited at the Royal Exchange in Cornhill) by the Dutch Mercantile community, and the last, a much less elaborate affair outside the city walls, was paid for by the citizens of Westminster. The procession passed underneath these arches, through either central or flanking passageways (or both), at each of which a pageant was performed, the speeches designed to complement the theme of each arch, bringing it to life as if a living emblem.⁵ From its beginning in the east to its arrival at the

palace at Whitehall two miles west, the procession took some hours. As Malcolm Smuts observes, during James's reign only the investiture of Henry as Prince of Wales in 1610 and the marriage of his sister Elizabeth in 1613 would offer examples of royal ceremonial on a comparable scale.⁶

Such displays have long been recognized as important features of the cultural life of early modern elites, and understandably scholars have tended to focus their attention on the artistic endeavours commissioned to realize them. Thus these elaborate festivities have come to be thought of conceptually as kin to the better-known theatrical activities that flourished at the same time. Indeed, the links between playwrights and pageant-devisers becomes clear in the seventeenth century, with Ben Jonson writing masques for the court and Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton scripting lord mayoral shows: three examples of dramatists who worked outside the playhouse, each of whom in fact also contributed to the 1604 royal entry. Yet these expensive, elaborate devices – far more sophisticated and on a grander scale than could be achieved in any playhouse – were but one part of these complex public events. The other was the procession itself, and this aspect of royal ceremonial has received considerably less attention, at least from literary scholars, partly because there is much less surviving evidence, compared to what remains of the literary and theatrical entertainments, that might support detailed scholarly investigation, and because these events have been 'recuperated' as subjects worthy of consideration precisely because of their literary/theatrical associations. The two elements were of course designed to be complementary parts of a greater whole. Yet the procession was of far greater importance, politically, than the ephemeral literature of the pageants. Although *our* eyes are trained on these literary devices, on such occasions all attention was on the monarch and the court. The theatre of these events was double-facing, for while the playwrights provided visual and aural pageants that were activated along the route as the monarch paused to hear the homilies delivered, the focal performance was the train itself, composed of the highest in the land and processing through the streets before the eyes of the spectators: it was the monarch people came to see. Our essay concentrates on this aspect of the entry. The Spanish ambassador's experience of the event, as recorded in the document we present here, makes clear where, like so many others no doubt, his interest principally lay. To make best sense of this new

material, however, it is first necessary to set out in broad terms the characteristics of the texts that currently provide the foundation for our understanding of James' entry into London.

The Texts of the 1604 Royal Entry

Scholars have been able to gain an appreciation of the scale and splendour of this event because texts produced by each of the three devisers of the city's part in the entry subsequently appeared in print, along with an account of a rather different nature, composed by an eyewitness present. Three men were commissioned by the city to design the civic reception of the king. Stephen Harrison was given responsibility for constructing seven arches situated along the route of the procession. It is thanks to the publication of *The Arches of Triumph*, later in the year, that we know what these ornate edifices were intended to look like and represent.⁷ At each of these stations a pageant was delivered. Ben Jonson devised the first and last of these, and they were published together with commendatory verses as *His Part of King James his Royall and Magnificent Entertainment*; the remaining five, and hence the majority of the scripted theatricals, were composed by Thomas Dekker (with one poem contributed by Thomas Middleton), and these survive in Dekker's *The Magnificent Entertainment*.⁸ Harrison must have worked closely with the city authorities; for example, the Dutch and Italian arches clearly reflected particular cultural and political elements local to the groups who sponsored them.⁹ There must therefore have been a high degree of coordination so that the constituent parts would cohere into a meaningful whole; but if such unity was achieved it was not reflected in the way this material was presented to the reader avid for a record or vicarious experience of what took place on 15th March. That these three collaborators elected to publish their efforts separately has been taken to signify tensions, at least between Jonson and Dekker, and this may well be right. As is well known, the two playwrights had previously quarreled; but it may be simply that each wished to fix in the public consciousness his own role in contributing to this momentous occasion, and if so it is perhaps not surprising that in seeking credit each sought to do so at the expense of the other.¹⁰ At any rate the two playwrights had their own contributions published, with slight reference to one another's, shortly after the event, which suggests both self-

promotion and anxiety that their own contribution might otherwise be written out of the record; neither treated the arches in detail, and this may have prompted Harrison to bring his text out later in the year. To these records of the designs for the 15th March may be added a printed account of a different order, one authored by a participant in the event rather than a deviser. Until recently neglected, the importance of Gilbert Dugdale's text, *Triumph of Time* has been urged by David Bergeron.¹¹ Together, all four are testament to the appetite for accounts of the event, as well as to its elaborate design. All are concerned, understandably, with the *entertainment* devised for an entity otherwise not present in these texts, except implicitly – the procession itself.¹²

Three surviving manuscripts provide information about the organization of the ceremonial procession. These manuscripts detail the order of persons in the entourage, as set out by the heralds (overseen by the Office of the Earl Marshal) whose task it was to choreograph the display and ensure that participants took their correct place according to rank. One of these copies is held in the British Library and used by John Nichols (who collated it with a copy owned by John Meyrick) to produce the first edition of 'The Precedence of his Majesty's Procession from the Tower to Whitehall', in *The Progresses, Processions and Festivities of King James I* published in 1828;¹³ the other, held in the National Archives, 'The True Order of his Majesty's Proceeding through London', is incorporated into the most recently edited text of the event included (on the strength of the authorship of the speech delivered by Zeal in the sixth pageant) in the Oxford Thomas Middleton.¹⁴ As will be shown in what follows, the Spanish ambassador's interest is wholly in the royal procession: like the heralds he is concerned principally with accurately representing the court, and getting right the details of placement and proximity; the devised entertainment that was, politically speaking, entirely ephemeral, was of negligible interest to him.

Perhaps understandably the three texts on which a documentary record of the city's commission depends have tended to be examined as discrete texts only by specialist scholars: the Harrison, Jonson, and Dekker texts, augmented by the Dugdale, have provided the basis for notional 'reconstructions' of the entertainment commissioned for King James in the form of 'composite' texts assembled from these designs, such as those that have appeared in recent years.¹⁵ While the aim of such endeavours is perfectly

defensible, to incorporate the earliest printed texts in a ‘blend’, even where (as with the Oxford Middleton) manuscript material detailing the processional order of the court is sutured into the text, is to replace the ‘contributory’ texts themselves in the quest for an idealized whole. Since this essay is concerned with interpreting a *single* text that is, historically-speaking, related to the others concerned with the royal entry, and given the nature of such an eyewitness account on the one hand and the scholarly imperative to maximize what can be understood about this event on the other, it is worth pausing to consider the kind of event that took place on 15th March 1604 and the question of textual representation.

The nature of such events complicates our understanding of how precisely these texts may be considered to *represent* the royal entry. No text can adequately stand in for performance – though of course in print that is precisely what such texts must attempt to do, or at any rate this must be their function for those who could not attend or indeed for those who did, for whom such texts served as a putative record of the event they experienced. With public ceremonial, however, this paradox is writ large, since the conceit of the printed text is exposed as a fallacy: the sheer scale of a royal entry and the complexity of its performance dynamics could only overwhelm attempts to capture and contain it on the page. As scholars have pointed out, hardly anyone – perhaps even including the king himself – could *fully* experience such events. These were boisterous, noisy occasions, so only those very close by could possibly hear the recitations scripted for each arch (assuming for the moment that *all* speeches were delivered as set down); for many, the vast majority indeed, the experience would have been primarily visual, with the spoken text taking place out of earshot, or for many in the procession behind or ahead of them.¹⁶ Add to this the behavior and responses of the many hundreds of spectators that was beyond any choreographer’s control and we must conclude that these printed texts offered no more than a fictional, vicarious experience of the event. Unlike theatre contained within a playhouse, on a stage, this performance event in a sense was always taking place elsewhere – it was simply too complex to take in all at once. It was theatre in the sense of performance, rather than of an unfolding dramatized narrative that could be grasped whole. As the editor of the most recent edition acknowledges, the composite text

presents a more cohesive and unified impression than any spectator could have achieved ... [e]ven James must have had trouble absorbing all the speeches and iconographical details amidst the noise and other distractions; spectators who tried to follow the procession on foot must sometimes have failed to get close enough to understand what was going on. Our text thus provides an ideal reconstruction, rather than an account of what anyone saw or heard on 15 March 1604.¹⁷

But a further qualification is needed, for in truth such texts – both the three originally printed in 1604 and modern composites – not only implicitly privilege the reader with a mobile vantage point that was putative and ideal, enabling him or her to see/hear everything, but also they place the reader in the surrogate role of monarch, inviting an otherwise unthinkable (and treasonable) substitution that nonetheless serves an ideological purpose. In a striking inversion of the actual these texts displace the monarch on whom all eyes rest, the reader seeing instead – *through* the king's eyes – an idealized and otherwise unrealizable scripted entertainment that in printed form serves, thus refracted, a propaganda purpose. Thus, conversely the experience of spectators is largely elided – the crowd, that is, is silenced.

The Harrison, Dekker, and Jonson texts and the modern composite editions all focus on the entertainment rather than on either the populace or the royal procession. Even Dugdale's text makes clear in which direction its interest lies, conveying the splendour of the entertainment rather than that of the mobile spectacle of the court that activated the pageants by turn, or the mass of spectators present on the streets of London. If these texts invite the reader to *imagine* the monarchical procession that was undoubtedly the sole focus for so many in the crowd, we must turn to other witnesses in our attempt to reconstruct the mobile train that made its way from east to west through the city. The manuscript evidence of the heralds' choreography is one source for such information, and this material can be usefully incorporated in composite editions, such as we find with the Nicholls and Smuts texts. What only the Spanish ambassador's text can add to our understanding of the royal entry, however, is an appreciation of the direction of the collective gaze, the object of that gaze, and the way in which it was *this* mobile performance, rather than the static arches, what articulated the theatre of the event.

Although Villamediana's concerns are largely political, as we discuss in detail below, in terms of documentary evidence of the entry his text also serves a valuable purpose for the historian. In addition, given the focus of this text, it draws our attention to the theatricality of monarchical display, and of the marvelous spectacle this courtly procession must have been. Prior to presenting an annotated translation of the document that precedes the transcription we consider firstly how the ambassador experienced the royal procession, and secondly the kind of text he produced as a result. In terms of how scholars weigh the evidence of texts as contributory to establishing a putative, post-facto record, texts such as this pose important questions. Once we think in terms of motive, rather than historical record, the apparent 'anomalies' between these texts – inevitable as they are – begin to make sense. Witnesses of a given event rarely agree in what they see; nor is it by any means always clear, particularly with accounts by people who are observers rather than participants, what is the precise provenance of the information represented. Jonson, Dekker, and Harrison each must have had their own manuscripts to work up into publishable form. The nature of eyewitness accounts always calls up questions of agency, and with those questions issues of provenance – in other words, what precisely is an eyewitness account, how is it made, and to what extent is it influenced by other texts that may be made available to the observer, either beforehand or subsequently? The Spanish ambassador's text of the 1604 royal entry offers an interesting opportunity to explore such questions. Bringing witnesses together serves one purpose, from the historian's point of view, which is to maximize our knowledge of the past; but treating individual witnesses on their own terms, as Bergeron has done with the Dugdale narrative, allows us to approach an event that *no*, single textual perspective can capture entire. Like the vast majority of spectators on 15th March 1604, Villamediana experienced the royal entry from a singular perspective, as the procession passed by him.

What the Ambassador Saw

If the Harrison, Jonson, Dekker, and Dugdale texts represent partial versions of the literary and theatrical entertainment devised for the entry, the reader of Villamediana's account – in the first instance Philip III of Spain – saw the event instead through his proxy's eyes, which is to say that he 'watched' the new court process in ceremonial

order. The decision to exclude the ambassadors from the procession, and thus avoid the customary disputes over precedence, gave Villamediana an opportunity instead to witness and record the event.¹⁸ The Spanish ambassador occupied a stationary position designed to show off to him and his fellow legates the splendour of the Stuart court; from this vantage point he could not see the arches or hear the speeches, which were not his concern: what he saw, and described, is what interested him – the Stuart court, the government with which he was negotiating the peace. Correspondingly he includes the briefest of detail, second hand, of the pageants. Unconcerned with what was *said*, to the monarch, which in any case he would not have been able to follow even had he been present, he ‘read’ and decoded the visual performance of the court, and it was this that he transmitted back to Valladolid.

Villamediana recorded in detail what he saw before him, which had been meticulously planned by the heralds whose responsibility it was to place dignitaries in the correct order according to rank, which determined the relative proximity of nobles to their monarch, who naturally took the authority position in the centre of the procession. As comparison with ‘The True Order of his Majesty’s Proceeding’ shows, however, the Spaniard’s record and the heralds’ plan do not tally in all respects. The main discrepancies are noted and discussed in the notes to the edited text below. Since the heralds had access to all the information they required (drawing on both precedent and established protocol), and because it was their task to marshal the participants correctly, it is to these texts the scholar who wishes to understand how the procession was designed should turn. Villamediana’s record is shorter, which suggests that he focused on what was important, in his view. Nevertheless, his is – or purports to be – a record of *what happened*, rather than what *was to take place*, and so should be accorded the kind of authority David Bergeron has urged for Dugdale’s account. While the Dugdale text departs in some respects from the Jonson and Dekker texts, it must be remembered of course that the two playwrights saw into print designs that were *intended* to be performed, but which almost certainly were not realized in quite that fashion; Dugdale himself draws attention to a speech that (unmentioned by either Jonson or Dekker) was not in fact delivered.¹⁹ We must then maintain an open mind with respect to the divergent features of these texts. Just as no modern, composite text can lay claim to capturing the

events of the day in anything other than textual form, so we must be wary of according *plans* the status of *record*.

Of course, Villamediana was compiling the text for his own purposes: if he had any interest in accounting for the entire event that was purely secondary. What stands out is how he viewed the English court. His identification of certain figures is not a matter simply of accuracy. The procession was primarily, for him, an index of how the new monarch had established his court – one which, it is important to remember, now consisted of a number of aristocrats who had been out of favour under Elizabeth and, in some cases restored to titles that had been forfeited, had now been brought in from the cold. Correspondingly he identified and *placed*, implicitly through their position in relation to the king and his queen, those leading figures he understood to be important in terms of power and patronage – and hence the figures he should cultivate on behalf of his master. For this reason it would be a mistake to regard this text as a ‘historical record’ as such – as a resource for scholars, for which of course it was not intended. But Villamediana does provide interesting details otherwise not known to us, which in some cases indicates where his interest in the event lay.

The Spanish account begins with the King’s messengers on horseback, and ends with the king’s guard, which brings up the rear, and in general the ambassador is alert to the culturally-specific features of the procession as it unfolded, as well as recognizing the orthodox components that corresponded to European practice generally.²⁰ At a number of points Villamediana gives precise numbers. This is less important to Villamediana, however, than picking out the principal figures of the court. We know from his account of the masque at Hampton Court on 8th January that he had already identified the ladies who had the queen’s ear: that is, the ladies who were closest to Anna of Denmark. He had marked out those who in his view might be cultivated by Spain to influence the monarch’s innermost, decision-making circle. Of the eleven ladies who performed at Hampton Court with the queen, Villamediana identifies by name here six, all of whom would later be recommended to receive a pension from the king of Spain. Indeed, *all* of the English lords and most of the ladies he proposes for pensions he makes note of in the procession.²¹ (This rather surprised Juan Fernández de Velasco y Tovar, the Constable of Castilla, who upon seeing the list apparently noted in the margin, ‘it seems to be

something new to go about in this fashion giving pensions to women’.)²² This makes clear how, for the ambassador, these were important confidantes of the queen who might prove useful to Spain, both in the short term to promote the peace and subsequently. The attention paid to the significance of the queen’s entourage underscores recent scholarship on how Anna and her fostering of a courtly culture played an important role in how the Stuart regime saw and presented itself.²³ In terms of its function as a record of the ongoing peace negotiations, this information augmented the report Philip had received following the masque in January. The budding diplomat Dudley Carleton, who would accompany the earl of Nottingham on his embassy to Spain the following year, related that the Spanish ambassador enjoyed the company of the court ladies, but it is clear from the evidence that he was at least as interested in cultivating them politically – as indeed may have been their own rationale.²⁴ It may be significant that whereas the earls are lumped together in a prose list, the ladies are each given their own separate line. What is significant is that Villamediana’s focus on the ladies is in sharp contrast to the ‘True Order’: there the ladies are not identified by name at all.

In addition to his attention to the court ladies two examples to be found in this text are particularly interesting. Philip III was no doubt intrigued to learn that a potential alternative claimant to the throne was included in the procession, and indeed given a prominent position close to the queen. Lady Arabella Stuart was seated in a coach alongside another figure of particular interest to the Spanish king, the countess of Arundel. Lady Arabella Stuart was first cousin of James I and, having been born in England, she had in the eyes of some a legitimate claim to the throne. Excluded from Elizabeth’s court, her situation improved with James’s accession: she was made Carver to the queen. Her presence in the entry was a public sign of the new monarch’s favour. The inclusion of the Countess of Arundel, ‘la condesa de Arondel la vieja’, would have piqued the ambassador’s interest because his master hoped that one outcome of the peace negotiations would be greater toleration for English Catholics. James resisted these demands and the plot to blow up the king and his government in parliament the following year put paid to any such hopes for some time. The Countess of Arundel was a Catholic convert and, her first husband, Philip Howard, accused of treason and committed to the Tower, her estate was attainted and she was deprived of her livings under Elizabeth. It is

surely unlikely that Villamediana was unaware of her religious devotion and harbouring of fugitive priests. The pairing of Arabella Stuart and ‘la condesa de Arondel la vieja’ was a public statement of their restoration to favour by James that may well have been remarked by the Spanish ambassador. Villamediana’s account alone places them together, highly visible in a coach.

We learn from this account alone that the earl of Oxford, who had served as lord great chamberlain at the coronation in July the previous year and was (according to the herald’s order of procession) to perform the role of Lord Great Chamberlain, in fact was absent; this may well have been due to illness, as he was to die in July 1604. But in addition to recording the names of the principal court figures, what is most striking about this document is that Villamediana pays particular attention to the costume and attire of those he is most interested in, in some cases providing information we otherwise lack. His description of the lavish costumes worn by the court ladies personating the ‘twelve goddesses’ in the Hampton Court masque is not reprised here, but he does describe both the king’s and queen’s attire, and he notes whether dignitaries were on horseback or whether they carried swords. On occasion he does pay attention to important figures such as Cecil. Perhaps Cecil’s being adorned ‘con un capote bordado de perlas’ (‘with a cape embroidered with pearls’) was noteworthy for Villamediana not only because of his role in the peace, but because of what the ambassador had written of him in his letter to the Constable of Castile: ‘He has not done the harm that he could and was supposed to do. He wanted to walk clear and not be indebted to me although I wanted to give him a gift. It is better to leave him satisfied and satisfy whomever he desires. He is inclined to want the peace concluded’.²⁵ The detail given here of Cecil’s attire is a reminder of both the significance of clothing as a marker of status and of Villamediana’s concern with decoding, in effect, the actual status – that is, the financial needs or desires – of these key figures.

The Spanish Ambassador’s Text

What is particularly notable about the dispatch Villamediana sent to his master in Valladolid is its layout. The document held in the Simancas archives is a clean text. It is clearly a presentation copy made from a manuscript; but it is not a Spanish version of an

extant text produced by the Office of the Earl Marshall. As with the text of the Daniel masque a few weeks earlier, Villamediana seems to have had some assistance – possibly in the checking of details with regard to the procession itself, and certainly with the information about the arches and pageants, which he could not actually see – but it is otherwise presented as an eyewitness account, and likely it was compiled soon after the event.

The text consists of the order of the procession, set out chronologically, and then follows a paragraph of prose. We may surmise that he considered this to be the best way of presenting the information he recorded, and that the *mise-en-page* design made the procession readily understandable for the Spanish monarch. But another explanation suggests itself. In his report of the Hampton Court masque two months previously, the text Villamediana enclosed in his dispatch to Philip is laid out as a performance-text, detailing the scenario, the procession of the twelve ‘goddesses’ (presented by the queen and eleven of her ladies), and concluding with a paragraph of prose.²⁶ The ambassador was aware that the Habsburg monarch had a particular interest in the arts, and in both cases the form of presentation reflects his understanding of this.

The comparison with the earlier episode is relevant too because in each case the ambassador’s text corresponds to the conventions of the Spanish *relación*, which was a commemorative record of an important event, such as a public festival or civic entertainment.²⁷ In following this model Villamediana was using a template with which he and his monarch were familiar. But what distinguishes the *relación* from the English texts is its status as a record of a *past* event. That is, these *relaciones* are not ‘ideal’ texts of what was *intended* to take place, written before the event, setting out the design, and then published afterwards as putative records of what *supposedly* had taken place; such texts typically take no account of any deviations from the original plan or acknowledge glitches in the performance or reception. As eyewitness report this Spanish genre lays claim to accuracy in ways that their English counterpart does not, though not of course without presenting further complications.

If this returns us to the thorny question of what *did* take place on 15th March, and how accurate the English texts may be considered to be, it also of course invites us to enquire into the accuracy of this *relación*. As we have seen, the nature of the text he

produced was determined by the fact that Villamediana was present in his capacity as ambassador, and thus he saw the event through the eyes of an official interested primarily in political intelligence. But he also recognized that the splendour of the procession itself signified, and he had an eye on his master's aesthetic interest in such ceremonials. That his account departs from the manuscript evidence of how the composition and order of the procession was *intended* to be carried out leaves us with a range of explanations. As noted earlier, conceivably Villamediana missed details, and/or was not supplied with them, either before or afterwards: and we may assume that he (and probably his cousin, Juan Bautista de Tassis, who worked as his secretary and knew English) *was* given assistance in some way, not least because information is included which the ambassador could not see directly himself, as the final part of the *relación* indicates. What may be concluded is that the Spaniard noted what he considered important, and that everything he recorded *did* take place, with the caveat that, like any eyewitness, he must have made errors; but the principal information – the identity of the central figures at court, those whom he recognized and understood to be important and in some cases potentially useful to Spain – was carefully recorded, and no doubt noted by Philip.

The Spanish ambassador did not therefore *omit* material we otherwise find in the Jonson, Dekker, Harrison, and Dugdale texts: he was not present for much of the entry these artists designed, and in any case he is carefully selective; and as with the Hampton Court masque he is drawn to (and able to decode) the visual, rather than the linguistic, most of which in any case takes place out of his earshot. The way the procession signified to him and his king was as a public performance of the new court. As was touched on in the previous section, as a diplomat wholly conscious of the conventions of protocol and proxemics Villamediana was alert to the symbolic placement of dignitaries, and specifically their closeness or distance from the monarch and his queen. This was the focus of his attention, from his vantage point towards the end of the route. But nonetheless he uses his direct experience of the entry, as it reaches its conclusion below him, to conceptually reorientate his viewpoint to take his reader – the King of Spain – back to the beginning of the event. The second half of the *relación*, in the form of a paragraph of prose, provides a seemingly cursory account (in keeping with the title Villamediana gives his narrative, 'Relación sumaria') about how the procession began,

and reduces the efforts of the three devisers to ‘ocho Arcos triunfales, que tenian echos la ciudad y las naciones, con diversas figuras, cifras y epítetos, y musica, y adonde al pasar dezian algunas cosas en loa de su entrada’ (‘eight triumphal arches that the city and the nations had done with diverse figures, cyphers and epithets and music, and whereon passing some things were said in praise of the entry’). Yet this serves sufficiently to articulate the meaning of the event to the Spanish ambassador: the significant detail Villamediana gives (echoing the expression of royal favour towards him he relayed following the masque in January) is the king and queen’s apparently ostentatious greeting, which could only mean in the context their public promotion of the peace negotiations with Spain.²⁸

The content and structure of the *relación*, culminating in the royal bestowal of favour on the Spaniard, as Villamediana presents it, offers a narration of the entry that is explicitly expressed in terms of the peace moves behind the scenes. As our notes to the text below indicate, of particular significance are the figures the ambassador identified. This information was undoubtedly of more than passing interest to Philip, and the intelligence would be useful again when, the following year the Spanish court made preparations to receive the English embassy sent to Valladolid. Although the contemporary political import of the document cannot be disentangled from the text (and event) in terms of its aesthetics, it is precisely for this reason that the form of the *relación* was designed to capture a sense of the procession, which, decoded, laid bare for the Habsburg king the new power structures at the heart of the Stuart court.

Annotated Translation of the Spanish Ambassador’s Account²⁹

‘Abbreviated relation of the way in which the accompaniment to the King and Queen of England marched on the day they made their public entry into the city of London on the 25th day of March of 1604’³⁰

First some messengers of the King’s Chamber on horseback³¹

Four Kings of Arms.³²

The chaplains of the King’s chapel

The deacons of the Chapel

The Master of the Queen's memorials
The sergeants and Lawyers of the criminal Council
The Chancery officers
Four doctors in civil law
A certain number of Knights and gentlemen
The secretaries of the Queen and of the Council of state
The Bailiffs of the King's chamber
A certain troop of private gentlemen
Judges of the Admiralty, and financial Officers
Masters of the accounts Chamber
Fourteen trumpets of the King with their Corporal at the front holding a mace
The Vice-admiral Sir Robert Mansel and other knights very gallant and embroidered³³
The Knights of the Bath that walked one after the other in number of 32
The dean of the King's chapel³⁴
The President of Justice³⁵
The main Provost of the King's house³⁶
Baron Quouls Treasurer of the King's house³⁷
Baron Woutton controller³⁸
Baron Seroser of the order of the Garter and many other Barons³⁹
Baron Cecil with a cape embroidered with pearls⁴⁰
The Bishops and Archbishops that were twenty
The son of the Admiral⁴¹
Baron Montegel⁴²
The Count of Northampton⁴³
The Count of Herford⁴⁴
The Count of Devenchier⁴⁵
The Counts of Betforf, Essex, Penbrocq, Sussex, Roteland, Suffolq, Comberland, Darbie, Jerosbery, and Northomberland, the Marquis of Winchestre, and the great Treasurer and Count of Dorset, all dressed with brocades and pearls and the harnesses and gear of the horses as well⁴⁶

Ten of the King's mace bearers

The mayor of London with a mace in his hand accompanied by the city Magistrates⁴⁷

The high Admiral Nottingham that was taking the office of high Constable⁴⁸

Fifty gentlemen that they call Pensioners or wards of the King, each with their arms in the form of golden halberds on foot

The Prince of Wales the King's eldest son⁴⁹

The Count of Woester that was holding the King's sword⁵⁰

The King under his canopy that was held by 16 gentlemen of the King's private chamber, he was very richly attired with pearls and stones embroidered, and the horses' gear as well⁵¹

The Count of Southampton taking the office of master of the king's horse⁵²

A horse of the King that was brought spare

The vicechamberlain of the King⁵³

The chamberlain and vicechamberlain of the Queen⁵⁴

The Queen sitting on a silver and crimson open litter dressed in white with grand Jewels.⁵⁵

The Countess of Oxford on horseback⁵⁶

The Countess of Jerosbery⁵⁷

The Countess of Arbie⁵⁸

The Countess of Winchestre⁵⁹

A King's carriage of golden velvet where Madam Arbela and the Countess of Arondel the old came⁶⁰

The Countess of Suffolq on horseback⁶¹

The Countess of Betford⁶²

The Countess of Hertford⁶³

The Countess of Nottingham⁶⁴

The Queen's ladies in waiting

Madam Rica the Baroness⁶⁵

Some other ladies, daughters of important gentlemen

The Captain of the Guard Tomas Asquin with 150 halbardiers of the King's guard, with their emblems and liveries.⁶⁶

In this fashion they came out of the Tower of London where the King and Queen had spent two days, because it is traditional to depart from there in such public entries, and they went marching very slowly across the streets where there were eight triumphal arches that the city and the nations had done with diverse figures, cyphers and epithets and music, and whereon passing some things were said in praise of their entry, and they arrived at their palace quite late because as the place⁶⁷ is big there is a great distance from the Tower to the Palace: the ambassadors were placed at some windows that the King ordered to be made available for this purpose to avoid differences of precedence in the procession, and when they passed the place where the said ambassadors were, the King and Queen made salutations, and in front of the windows where the Spaniard was, they stopped for a while and upon arrival and departure they greeted him with great courtesy and demonstration, and more particularly the Queen, who rose from her chair in the litter three times, with a laughing face and kissing the hands many times, and at night there were fireworks by the River with which this entry ended. On the 29th⁶⁸ of the above month the General Parliament will commence and they say that after that there will be a Royal Tournament.

Relation of the Entry into London of the King of England

To be sent to his Majesty

Transcription of the Spanish Ambassador's Text

'Relacion sumaria de la manera que fueron marchando los que acompañaron el Rey y Reyna el dia que hicieron su entrada publica en la ciudad de Londres a los 25 de marzo de 1604'⁶⁹

Primeramente algunos mensajeros de la Camera del Rey a caballo.

Quatro Reyes de Armas.

Los Capillanes de la capilla del Rey

Los dyacones de la Capilla

El Maestro de los memoriales de la Reyna
Los sargentos y Avogados del Consejo criminal
Los oficiales de la Chancilleria
Quatro Doctores de leyes civiles
Cierta numero de Cavalleros y gentileshombres
Los secretarios de la Reyna y del Consejo de estado
Los Alguaciles de la camera del Rey
Cierta tropa de gentiles hombres particulares
Jueçes del Almirantazgo, y Comissarios de finanças
Maestres de la Camera de quantas
Catorce trompetas del Rey con el Cabo dellos que yva delante con una maça.
El VizAlmirante sir Robert Mansel y otros caballeros muy galanes, y bordados.
Los Cavalleros del Baño que caminaron uno tras otro en numero 32.
El dean de la capilla del Rey
El Presidente de la Justicia
El Prevoste mayor de la casa del Rey
El baron Quouls Thesorero de la casa del Rey
El Baron Woutton contralor
El Baron Seroser de la orden de la Jarretera y otros muchos Barones
El Baron Çeçil con un capote bordado de perlas
Los Arçobispos y Obispos que eran veynte
El hijo del Almirante
El baron de Montegel
El Conde de Northampton
El Conde de Herford
El Conde de Devenchier
Los Condes de Betford, Essex, Penbrocq, Sussex, Roteland, Suffolq, Comberland,
Darbie, Jerosbery, y Northomberland, el Marques de Winchestre, y gran
Thesorero, y Conde de Dorset, todos con vestidos de brocados y perlas, y las
gualdrappas y guarniciones de los caballos tambien
Diez mazers del Rey

El Mayor de Londres con una maça en la mano acompañado con los del Magistrado de la ciudad

El gran almirante Nottingham que hazia officio de gran Condestable

Cinquenta gentiles hombres que llaman Pensionarios, o entretenidos del Rey cada uno con sus armas en forma de alabardas doradas a pie

El Principe de Gales hijo mayor del Rey

El Conde de Woester que traya el estoque del Rey

El Rey de baxo de su Palio que llevavan 16. gentiles hombres de la Camera privada del Rey, que era vestido riquissimamente con bordadura de piedras y perlas, y los adereços del caballo también.

El Conde de Southampton haziendo officio de Cavallerizo mayor.

Un cavallo del Rey que se traya de diestro

El vicecamerero del Rey

El camerero y vicecamerero de la Reyna

La Reyna sentada en una litera abierta de plata, y encarnada vestida de blanco con grandes joyas.

La condesa de Oxford a cavallo

La condesa de Jerosbery

La Condesa de Arbie

La Condesa de Winchestre

Coche del Rey de terciopelo colorado en el qual venia madama Arbela, y la Condesa de Arondel la vieja.

La Condesa de Suffolq a cavallo

La Condesa de Betford

La Condesa de Herford

La Condesa de Nottingham

Las damas de la Reyna

Madama Rica Baronessa

Algunas otras damas hijas de señores principales

El Capitan de la Guarda Tomas Asquin con 150. alabarderos de la guarda del Rey, con sus insignias, y librea.

En esta forma salieron de la Torre de Londres adonde habia dos dias que los Reyes estaban, por ser costumbre salir de alli en semejantes entradas publicas, y fueron marchando muy de espacio por las calles adonde havia ocho Arcos triunfales, que tenian echos la ciudad y las naciones, con diversas figuras, cifras y epítetos, y musica, y adonde al pasar dezian algunas cosas en loa de su entrada, y llegaron a su palacio algo tarde porque como el lugar es largo, ay muy gran distancia de la Torre al Palacio: los embaxadores estuvieron en ventanas que el Rey les mando dar para este effeto, por excusar diferencias de precedencias en el acompañamiento, y al pasar por donde estaban los dichos embaxadores, los Reyes los saludaron, y delante de las ventanas donde estuvo el de españa estuvieron parados un rato, y al llegar y partir le saludaron con gran cortesia y demostracion, y en particular la Reyna que se levanto de la silla en la litera tres veçes, con la cara de risa, y besando la mano muchas veçes, y a la noche hubo fiestas de fuego en el Rio, con que se acabaron las desta entrada. A los 29 del dicho se empeçara en Parlamento General, y luego dizen que havra una Justa Real.

Relacion de la entrada en Londres del Rey de Inglaterra.

Para embiar a su Magestad

Notes

* We would like to thank the archivists at the Archivo General de Simancas and the National Archives, London, for their help and assistance; research for this article was funded by the Spanish government, MINECO FFI2015-66847-P: 'Exilio, diplomacia y transmission textual: redes de intercambios entre la Peninsula Ibérica y las Islas Británicas en la Edad Moderna'.

1. Elizabeth I died on 24 March and her funeral in Westminster Abbey was held on 28 April; James' coronation was held in Westminster Abbey on 25 July 1603. Ordinarily the entry took place first, the coronation following the next day; Dillon, *The Language of Space*, 36. That this did not happen on this occasion has sometimes led to confusion among scholars. On this ceremony see Jack, "A Pattern for a King's Inauguration", 67-91.

2. Juan de Tassis y Acuña was appointed Conde de Villamediana y Correo Mayor (Count of Villamediana and Postmaster General) in 1603. He is not to be confused with his rather more famous son, Juan de Tassis y Peralta, the second Count of Villamediana who was a poet and playwright. On the ambassador's dispatches from James's court see two essays

-
- by the present authors: 'The Spanish Ambassador and Samuel Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*', 223-57, and 'Between Courts', 93-110.
3. See for example Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*; Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*; Mulryne and Shewring, eds., *Theatre and Government*; Bevington and Holbrook, eds., *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*; Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen*; Archer, et al, eds., *The Progresses, Pageants and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*; and Butler, *The Stuart Court Masque*.
 4. The guilds contributed a further £4,100. See Smuts, ed., *The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment*, 219-279; 219.
 5. This is the case with the first seven arches, for which the designs have survived; it is not clear whether the lesser, eighth arch was similarly elaborate since no image of it exists. In his contribution Ben Jonson describes it as a rainbow between two pyramids, seventy feet high: *Ibid.*, 273 (Pageant 8, 255-58).
 6. *Ibid.*, 223.
 7. Harrison, *The Arches of Triumph*.
 8. Jonson, *His Part of King James*, and Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment*; Dekker's text was also issued in Edinburgh, and with translations of the Latin speeches was reprinted in London the same year. *The Magnificent Entertainment* incorporated material originally conceived for performance in 1603, which the plague prevented; see Lancashire, 'Dekker's Accession Pageant', 39-50.
 9. On the Dutch contribution, see Hood, 'A Netherlandic Triumphal Arch', 67-82.
 10. Jonson and Dekker were on opposing sides in the so-called 'war of the theatres', in which some playwrights mocked one another in plays staged during the years 1599-1601.
 11. See Bergeron, 'Gilbert Dugdale,' 111-25.
 12. The printing of these four texts is treated in Smuts' essay in Taylor and Lavagnino, gen. eds., *Thomas Middleton*, 498-501.
 13. Nichols, *The Progresses*, 325-28.
 14. See Smuts, ed., *The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment*, 2122-81.
 15. See for example Dutton, ed., 'The Magnificent Entertainment,' 19-115, and Smuts, ed., 'The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment', 219-79. Dutton's edition includes two of Stephen Harrison's designs for the arches, Smuts' edition all seven.
 16. Such was the case with the annual inauguration of the new Lord Mayor; see for example Bromham, 'Thomas Middleton's *The Triumphs of Truth*, 1-25; 4-5.
 17. Smuts, ed., *The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment*, 219. The component parts are laid out in Smuts' companion essay in *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture*, 499.
 18. As Villamediana records, 'los embaxadores estuvieron en ventanas que el Rey les mando dar para este effeto, por excusar diferencias de precedencias en el acompañamiento' (the ambassadors were placed at some windows that the King ordered to be had for this purpose to avoid differences of precedence in the procession).
 19. Bergeron, 'Gilbert Dugdale and the Royal Entry of James', 116-117; thanks to Dugdale we can infer that a speech that was going to be omitted was in fact delivered.
 20. Villamediana ignores, or does not 'see', the twelve members of the acting troupe designated the King's Men on 19 May 1603 and parading as members of James's household, alongside their counterparts the Queen's Men and Prince's Men: all of these

low-ranking members of the royal household marched at the beginning of the procession; see Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Festivities of King James I*, 325.

21. Of the twenty-five Villamediana identifies as worthy of a Spanish pension five were Scottish, and they did not participate in the procession. Seven were women. The only exception is the daughter of Robert Sidney, who is recommended for a jewel in the letter to Castilla but no specific mention of her is made here.

22. See Loomie, *Toleration and Diplomacy*, 54. See also Ungerer, 'Juan Pantoja de la Cruz', 59-78.

23. See for example McManus, *Women on the Renaissance Stage*.

24. Lee, Jr., ed., *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain*, 56.

25. Loomie, *Toleration and Diplomacy*, 52.

26. See Cano-Echevarria and Hutchings, 'The Spanish Ambassador and Samuel Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*'.

27. *Ibid.*, 241-42.

28. In the performance of the Daniel masque Villamediana similarly records the queen's special favour; see Cano-Echevarria and Hutchings, 'The Spanish Ambassador and Samuel Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*', 247.

29. For ease of comparison we give the corresponding detail in the Oxford Middleton, unless stated, together with information on the office and office-holders given there. In most cases the biographical entries draw on the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

30. The dating is Continental Style, that is, ten days ahead of the English calendar.

31. PRO SPD 14/6, 97 (Oxford Middleton, 226n) does not state the messengers rode on horseback.

32. Possibly the 'Heralds at Arms' given in PRO SPD 14/6, 97 (Oxford Middleton, 226n), though if so Villamediana places them rather earlier in the procession than do other witnesses. Perhaps the ambassador conflated the 'Pursuivants at Arms' with the 'Heralds at Arms': in both cases these officials escorted the procession along the flanks.

33. Sir Robert Mansel (1573-1656). Served under Essex at Cadiz in 1596, when he was knighted, and the following year went with Essex on the Azores expedition. In 1602 he took part in the victory over Spain in the Battle of the Narrow Seas, and in 1604 was appointed Treasurer of the Navy. He was a member of the English embassy sent to Valladolid to ratify the peace the following year.

34. James Montague, titular head of the staff of chaplains (Oxford Middleton, 227n).

35. Sir John Popham, Chief Justice of the King's Bench (Oxford Middleton, 227n).

36. Possibly Sir Edward Curry, Official Keeper of the King's Jewels (Oxford Middleton, 227n).

37. William Knollys (1545-1632). Knighted during service in the Low Countries, he became comptroller of the household and a member of the Privy Council in 1596, and was elevated to Baron Knollys of Greys by the new monarch in 1603.

38. Lord Wotton. Edward Wotton (1548-1628), created first Baron Wotton of Marley by King James on 13 May 1603. Not identified in PRO SPD 14/6, 97 (Oxford Middleton). Villamediana includes him on the list sent to the Constable of Castilla of personalities that Spain needed to keep contented: 'He is a member of the Council and has been in Spain. I believe he has desired the peace.' As a diplomat fluent in Spanish Wotton played

a not insignificant role in the peacemaking, escorting the Duke of Frias, Constable of Castilla when he came to England to sign the peace; his eldest son, Pickering Wotton, was a member of the reciprocal English embassy to Valladolid, where following his conversion to Catholicism he died in October 1605. Wotton was an advisor on the planned Spanish Match from 1617, and later in life it emerged he was himself a recusant (*ODNB*).

39. Edmund Sheffield (1565-1646), third Baron Sheffield. Served under his uncle, Charles Howard, against the Armada in 1588 and in 1593 was made a member of the Order of the Garter. James appointed him lord lieutenant of Yorkshire in August and then president of the council of the north in September 1603.

40. Robert Cecil (1563-1612). Appointed to the Privy Council in 1591, Cecil became Secretary of State five years later. He was one of the most important figures in the peace negotiations, as Villamediana recognized.

41. Sir Charles Howard, second son of the earl of Nottingham. Along with his elder brother, Lord Howard of Effingham, he accompanied his father on the embassy to Spain the following year.

42. William Parker (1574/5-1622), fifth/first Baron Monteagle. Served with and was knighted by Essex in 1599, and was involved in the 1601 rebellion, which resulted in imprisonment and a hefty fine. His situation at court was not helped by his Catholic sympathies, which led him to help Thomas Winter's mission to Spain in 1602, but his fortunes improved with the new reign, and he was rewarded by James for discovering the Gunpowder Plot.

43. Henry Howard (1540-1614), first earl of Northampton. A Catholic who was imprisoned five times, he was in receipt of a Spanish pension during the years 1582-84. Having played a key role as intermediary between James and Cecil in the years leading up to the succession he was made a member of the Privy Council on 4 May 1603, and a month prior to the royal entry into London was created baron of Marnhull, Dorset and earl of Northampton, thus restoring the Howard family to its fortunes. He was appointed one of the five peace commissioners to negotiate with Spain, and as warden of the Cinque Ports he greeted the Constable of Castilla on his arrival at Gravesend; his role in the peacemaking is commemorated in the 'Somerset House' group portraits, and from 1604, following Villamediana's recommendation, he received a Spanish pension. Villamediana reported of him, 'He has served me well in this negotiation and assisted me throughout'. At the end of his life he opposed a French alliance for Prince Charles in favour of a Spanish match, and through the agency of the Spanish ambassador, Don Diego Sarmiento (later Count of Gondomar), with whom he was in regular contact, was received into the Catholic Church (*ODNB*).

44. Edward Seymour (c.1539-1621), first earl of Hertford. Created Baron Beauchamp and earl of Hertford in 1559; upon James' accession he was made *custos rotularum* of Wiltshire in June 1603, and in April 1605 he went to Brussels as ambassador extraordinary to ratify the Treaty of London.

45. Earl of Devonshire. Charles Blount (1563-1606), knighted during service in the Low Countries, he inherited the title of Baron Mountjoy in 1594, and was created Earl of Devonshire by King James (whose candidacy for the succession he had clandestinely supported) on 21 July 1603. He was appointed to the commission negotiating the peace

with Spain in May 1604, and features in the so-called ‘Somerset House’ group portraits that commemorated the Treaty of London signed in the August. In Villamediana’s list of those who should receive pensions it is said of him, ‘He takes pride in having Spanish blood as his grandmother was the Señora Ayala, who came to this kingdom with the Queen, Lady Catherine. He is more devoted to us than to the French, and although interested in the war, he has not showed himself disaffected in the matter of peace’.

46. Earl of Bedford: Edward Russell (1572-1627), third earl of Bedford. Married Lucy Harrington in 1594, and was briefly imprisoned following the Essex rebellion in 1601. Like other courtiers who had fallen from favour under Elizabeth his fortunes were restored with James’ accession to the throne, aided significantly by his wife’s securing a position in the queen’s bedchamber.

Earl of Essex: Robert Devereux (1591-1646), third earl of Essex. Following his father’s disgrace he faced an uncertain future but he was appointed to bear James’ sword before him at both the new monarch’s arrival in London in April 1603 and at the coronation in July; the king subsequently restored him to his titles. In the entry the king’s sword is carried by the Earl Marshal, the Earl of Worcester, as Villamediana records.

Earl of Pembroke: William Herbert (1580-1630), third earl of Pembroke. Tutored by Samuel Daniel, Pembroke is best known as the foremost patron of the arts of the period. Due to a court scandal he incurred the queen’s displeasure, but he was restored by James, who welcomed him among the nobles who travelled north to meet the new monarch in spring 1603, stayed twice at the Pembroke seat, Wilton, that year and appointed him to offices including the privy chamber.

Earl of Sussex: Robert Radcliffe (1573-1629), fifth earl of Sussex. Sent to Scotland to represent Elizabeth at the baptism of Prince Henry in 1594, Sussex took part in the Essex expedition in 1596. In August 1603 James had made him lord lieutenant of Essex.

Earl of Rutland: Roger Manners (1576-1612), fifth earl of Rutland. Served on Essex’s Azores expedition in 1597 and under the earl in Ireland, and subsequently in the Low Countries in 1600; as a result of his involvement in Essex’s treason he was imprisoned in the Tower for some months. James’ visit to Belvoir Castle, the Rutland seat, in April 1603 on his journey south to take up the crown was followed by a commission to confer the Order of the Garter on Christian IV and attend the royal baptism, after which he was appointed lord lieutenant of Lincolnshire and steward of the new queen’s manor at Grantham.

Earl of Suffolk: Thomas Howard (1561-1626), first earl of Suffolk. Cousin of Charles Howard, earl of Nottingham and lord Admiral, he captained the *Golden Lion* in the action against the first Spanish Armada in 1588 and at Calais later that year, and was a vice-admiral in the 1596 attack on Cadiz, as well as taking part in the Azores expedition the following year. On his way south in 1603 James made him lord chamberlain, a member of the privy council, and in July he was created earl of Suffolk. In Villamediana’ list it is said of him that ‘He is a man very well affected to the peace and in his service he has always tried to satisfy me’.

Earl of Cumberland: George Clifford (1558-1605), third earl of Cumberland. Made queen’s champion in 1590, Cumberland was a privateer who served on the *Elizabeth Bonaventure* against the Armada in 1588 and financed and/or accompanied a number of expeditions against Spanish and Portuguese ships in the quest for lucrative prizes, with at

best mixed success. One of the English nobles to ride north to greet the new king in 1603, he was appointed a member of the privy council by James. Villamediana reports of him that 'He does not want peace with us for no more than that, in so far as he knows war, it is more useful to him than anything in the world. I believe it will be suitable to leave him in some way under obligation'. According to the Constable's memorandum of accounts he was given a jewel of three thousand ducats.

Earl of Derby: William Stanley (1561-1642), sixth earl of Derby. He acceded to the title following the mysterious death of his brother, Ferdinando, best known as the patron of Lord Strange's Men (with whom Shakespeare was associated in the early 1590s), in 1594.

Earl of Shrewsbury: Gilbert Talbot (1552-1616), seventh earl of Shrewsbury. Made privy councillor in 1601, Shrewsbury was cupbearer at Elizabeth's funeral and entertained James at Worksop during his journey to London.

Earl of Northumberland: Henry Percy (1564-1632), ninth earl of Northumberland. Made a Knight of the Garter in 1593, Northumberland was appointed to the privy council by James in April 1603 and to command of the king's bodyguard in May. ODNB records that he was suspected of being the source for the French ambassador's reports of discontent with the new monarch. He was soon banished from court, albeit temporarily, when he offended the king in July 1603, and would suffer a much longer exile when he became caught up in the Gunpowder Plot. Villamediana records in his list that 'He is not a friend of this peace as he believes the king will have greater need of him in other circumstances. He is considered a man of importance. I believe he is no more devoted to France than to us. I would consider it suitable to leave him under obligation so that he would be inclined to do more harm to them than to us.'

Marquis of Winchester: William Paulet (>1560-1629), fourth Marquis of Winchester; he succeeded to the title in 1598.

Earl of Dorset: Thomas Sackville (c.1536-1608), first earl of Dorset. Trusted diplomat and councillor under Elizabeth, he was made lord treasurer for life by James in April 1603, and a year later created earl of Dorset. He was the leading negotiator of the peace with Spain (he features in the 'Somerset House' portraits) and received a pension from Philip III, on Villamediana's recommendation.

47. Sir William Bennett. Dugdale gives detail of his 'crimson velvet gown'; PRO SPD 14/6, 97 (Oxford Middleton, 228n). The mayor had already joined the procession, prior to passing before the ambassador's vantage point.

48. Charles Howard (1536-1624), lord admiral. Howard had commanded the naval force that defeated the armada in 1588 and the expedition to Cadiz in 1596; appointed lord chamberlain and made a member of the Privy Council in 1584, a year later he became lord admiral. He was elevated to the earldom in 1597 and led the embassy to the court of Philip III at Valladolid in 1605; like the other principal figures involved his role in the peacemaking is commemorated in the group portraits purporting to depict the negotiations. Villamediana reported that 'He was deeply involved in the war against us and despite this he is collaborating with the peace'. 'The True Order' also identifies the Lord High Constable in a prominent position in the procession between the Prince and the King; accompanied by the Earl Marshall and the Lord Great Chamberlain, these three are identified in the Oxford Middleton as Nottingham, Worcester and Oxford.

Villamediana, however, presents Nottingham as preceding the Prince and Worcester preceding the King, while Oxford is not mentioned – presumably because he was not present, as noted above.

49. Henry Frederick (1594-1612), first-born son of James and Anna. In fact he was not installed as Prince of Wales until 1610. His early death was probably due to typhoid. From the outset James and Anna's design was that he would marry the Spanish Infanta, and thus secure and promote the peace through dynastic marriage. In the event his brother, Charles, embarked on a clandestine mission to Madrid in 1623 that was a fiasco, and marked a severe decline in Anglo-Spanish relations.

50. Edward Somerset (c.1550-1628), fourth earl of Worcester. He was appointed master of the horse in January 1604 and earl marshal at the coronation and entry into London. In September 1605, after the signing of the Treaty of London the previous month, he was appointed to a commission overseeing the expulsion of the Jesuits. Villamediana writes: 'They say he is a Catholic and not unfriendly to us and the peace. He is a man of ability yet he has done nothing for the peace. Still he has not strenuously opposed it, so he ought to be given a present and something for his wife'.

51. Harrison's account (Sig. k) says that the canopy was borne by eight knights.

52. Henry Wriothesley (1573-1624), third earl of Southampton. He was part of Essex's expedition to Cadiz in 1596, and was caught up in the rebellion that saw Essex executed in 1601: he was sentenced to life imprisonment, from which the new monarch released him in April 1603, and restored him to his earldom on 18 April 1604, three days after the entry into London in which he participates. The Spanish Ambassador's designation of Southampton is not strictly accurate but reflects the restoration of the title. Southampton was a steward at the entertainment to celebrate the signing of the Treaty of London on 19 August 1604 (*ODNB*). The account in PRO SPD 14/6, 97 (Oxford Middleton, 228n) does not indicate that the earl marshal, earl of Worcester, in appearing earlier in the procession cannot also be 'leading a spare horse' (i.e. the king's): the Spanish ambassador makes clear that Southampton took over this duty.

53. Sir John Stanhope (c.1540-1621). Appointed to the post in 1601, he was made Baron Stanhope of Harrington in 1605.

54. Sir Henry Sidney was the Queen's lord chamberlain; PRO SPD 14/6, 97 (Oxford Middleton, 229n). Villamediana says that 'although he is of the French party still, for the sake of the Queen, a jewel ought to be given to his daughter.' The Vicechamberlain was Sir George Carew (c.1556-1612). Knighted by James on 23 July 1623, he was appointed ambassador to France in 1605.

55. Anna of Denmark (1574-1619), married James VI of Scotland in 1589. Dugdale also comments on the beauty of the chariot and remarks on the queen's constant salutations.

56. Elizabeth de Vere, née Trentham (?-1612/13), Countess of Oxford. Second wife of Edward de Vere, earl of Oxford, they married in 1591.

57. Elizabeth Talbot, née Hardwicke (1527-1608), Countess of Shrewsbury (better known as 'Bess of Hardwicke'). George Talbot, sixth earl of Shrewsbury (1522-90), whom she married in 1567 and from whom she separated in 1584, was her fourth husband. Her daughter from her second marriage, Elizabeth Cavendish, married Charles Stuart, and in 1575 gave birth to Arabella Stuart.

-
58. Alice Stanley, née Spencer (1559-1637), Countess of Derby. Widow of Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange (who briefly became the fifth earl of Derby before his mysterious death in 1594), the countess married Sir Thomas Egerton in 1600. A patron of drama (Lord Strange's Men became for a short time the Countess of Derby's Men in 1594), she took the part of Proserpine in the performance at court of *The vision of the Twelve Goddesses*.
59. Lucy Cecil (1568-1614), daughter of Robert Cecil. She is also included as a recipient of "some present" in Villamediana's memorandum.
60. Lady Arabella Stuart (1575-1615). Related to both the Tudor and Stuart royal houses, Arabella Stuart's status determined her treatment under both Elizabeth and James. Her public appearance in the royal entry may have seemed at the time to hint at an improvement in her fortunes, but in the longer term suspicions regarding her hopes remained, and under her kinsmen James she fared no better than she had under Elizabeth. Villamediana wrote: 'For Lady Arbella a jewel of some importance because of her position'.
- Anne Howard, née Dacre (1557-1630), countess of Arundel. A convert to Catholicism, she was married to Philip Howard, who died in the Tower in 1595, the same year the priest Robert Southwell, who had been living in the countess's house in Spitalfields and ministering to both, was captured and executed.
61. Katherine Howard, née Knyvett (c.1564-1638), countess of Suffolk. She was perceived to be the most significant supporter to Spain and to Catholics, and to have influence over Cecil; on this basis she would receive the biggest pension to be given to a woman on the recommendation of Villamediana, who wrote: 'Although the total is 68 thousand ducats and the services that she and her husband have done are not considered by us to be so great, still in every way she has tried to keep Cecil well disposed. We must therefore keep her satisfied for anything different would be dangerous now and in the future'. She performed with the queen in the masque *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* in January 1604.
62. Lucy Russell, née Harrington (c.1581-1627), countess of Bedford. As for other courtiers who fell from favour under Elizabeth, the new reign offered an opportunity to restore their fortunes, and the countess was one of the ladies who journeyed north to greet the new monarch and queen on their journey south. She soon became close to Queen Anna, being appointed to the bedchamber. Skilled in Italian, French, and Spanish, she was probably responsible for the choice of Daniel's masque *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, which was dedicated to her and in which she performed, and may well have aided Villamediana in producing the text he sent to Philip III. She is on de Villamediana's list of recipients of presents.
63. Frances Seymour, née Howard (1578-1639), Countess of Hertford. Her second marriage in 1601 to Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford was also his second marriage. Included in de Villamediana's list, she would later go to Brussels for the ratification of the Peace Treaty with the Archdukes.
64. Margaret Stewart (?-1639), countess of Nottingham. The earl of Nottingham lost his first wife in February 1603. Katherine Howard, née Carey (1545x1550-1603), was buried three days before the queen she had served for some forty years, since her appointment as

a gentlewoman of the privy chamber in 1560. Nottingham married Margaret Stewart in the late summer or autumn of 1603. She took the role of Concordia in Daniel's masque.

65. Penelope Rich, née Devereux (1563-1607), Lady Rich. Though married to Lord Rich she was the lover of the Earl of Devonshire. She is included in Villamediana's list: 'She has been cordial to us and will be more so in the future. She ought to be given a good present'.

66. Sir Thomas Erskine; PRO SPD 14/6, 97 (Oxford Middleton, 229n). In his memorandum Villamediana remarks, 'As he is well received by the king and it is believed that he is going to be a member of the Council, he should be given a present'.

67. I.e. city.

68. I.e. 19th March.

69. We have preserved the spelling, punctuation, and orthography of the original document.

Bibliography

Anglo, Sydney. *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* [1969] 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Archer, Jayne Elizabeth *et al*, eds., *The Progresses, Pageants and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Bergeron, David M. *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1971.

Bergeron, David. 'Gilbert Dugdale and the Royal Entry of James', *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13 (1983), 111-25.

Bevington, David and Peter Holbrook, eds., *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Bromham, A.A. 'Thomas Middleton's *The Triumphs of Truth* in 1613', *The Seventeenth Century* 10.1 (1995), 1-25.

Butler, Martin. *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Cano-Echevarría, Berta and Mark Hutchings, 'The Spanish Ambassador and Samuel Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*: A New Document [with text]', *English Literary Renaissance* 42.2 (Spring 2012), 223-57.

Dekker, Thomas. *The Magnificent Entertainment*, London: 1604.

Dillon, Janette. *The Language of Space in Court Performance 1400-1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Dutton, Richard, ed., 'The Magnificent Entertainment by Thomas Dekker and Ben Jonson', in *Jacobean Civic Pageants*. Keele: Keele University Press, 1995. 19-115.

Harrison, Stephen. *The Arches of Triumph*. London: 1604.

Hill Cole, Mary. *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.

Hood, Gervase. 'A Netherlandic Triumphal Arch for James I', in Susan Roach, ed., *Across the Narrow Seas: Studies in the History and Bibliography of Britain and the Low Countries*. London: The British Library, 1991, 67-82.

Hutchings, Mark and Berta Cano-Echevarría, 'Between Courts: Female Masquers and Anglo-Spanish Diplomacy, 1603-05', *Early Theatre* 15.1 (Summer 2012), 93-110.

Jack, Sybil M. "'A Pattern for a King's Inauguration": The Coronation of James I in England', *Parergon* 21:2 (2004), 67-91.

Jonson, Ben. *His Part of King James his Royall and Magnificent Entertainment*. London: 1604.

Lancashire, Anne. 'Dekker's Accession Pageant for James I', *Early Theatre* 12:1 (2009), 39-50.

Lee, Jr. Maurice, ed., *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 1603-1624: Jacobean Letters*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1972.

Loomie, Albert J. *Toleration and Diplomacy: The Religious Issue in Anglo-Spanish Relations, 1603-1605* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 1963).

McManus, Clare. *Women on the Renaissance Stage: Anna of Denmark and Female Masquing in the Stuart Court, 1590-1619*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Mulryne, J.R. and Margaret Shewring, eds., *Theatre and Government Under the Early Stuarts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Nichols, John. *The Progresses, Processions and Festivities of King James I, his consort, family, and court, collected from manuscripts*. London: 1828.

Smuts, R. Malcom, ed., *The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment*, in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, gen. eds., *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. 219-79.

Taylor, Gary and John Lavagnino, gen. eds., *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture: A Companion to The Collected Works*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007.

Ungerer, Gustav. 'Juan Pantoja de la Cruz and the Circulation of Gifts', *Sederi* 9 (1998), 59-78.