

Queen Elizabeth I's Progress to Bristol— an examination of expenses.

Royal visits to provincial towns and cities were by no means a new phenomenon in the sixteenth century, though it was Queen Elizabeth who is most renowned for her annual progresses.¹ In terms of their principle function progresses were an opportunity for the development of an interactive discourse between the Queen and her subjects.² For the Queen it was chance to assert her authority while for the civic hosts it was regarded a privileged occasion, with an opportunity to strengthen ties to the Crown in hope of winning some favour.³ As a result, these progresses were used to open up a dialogue with the Crown and were usually accompanied by civic petitions.⁴ While Bristol did not include a petition, the entertainments themselves made an appeal to Elizabeth. The Queen was welcomed on the first day with speeches and subsequently entertained by an impressive three day mock battle. Orations during the artificial confrontation outlined an allegory of War, represented by the offensive force, in conflict with Peace, symbolised by the defending fort. The entertainments included a series of offences and even a naval pursuit with its conclusion orchestrated to have Elizabeth playing the role of adjudicator and administering over negotiations for a peaceful treaty.⁵ The message sent out was clear, an assurance of military strength and loyalty towards the Crown with a call for the Queen to maintain peace. With the city's wealth based on trade, an economy that thrives under peaceful conditions, it is understandable as to why such an allegory was conveyed.⁶ What has not been clear until now, are the lengths that were taken to develop the ceremonial dialogue for communicating this message to the Queen. The Mayor's Audit Books contain two original documents relating to this royal progress, receipts and expenses, both of which I have transcribed and will be examined to help understand how the city council, The Corporation, went about establishing this discourse. Before these sources are analysed it is necessary to look at the work carried out so far.

¹ D. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry 1558-1642*, (London, 1971), 10.

² M. H. Cole, 'Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses', in J. Archer, E. Goldring, and S. Knight (eds.), *The Progresses, Pageants, & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, (New York, 2007), 27.

³ C. E. McGee, 'Mysteries, Musters, and Masque: The Import(s) of Elizabethan Civic Entertainments', in J. Archer, E. Goldring, and S. Knight (eds.), *The Progresses, Pageants, & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, (New York, 2007), 108.

⁴ J. E. Archer and S. Knight, 'Elizabetha Triumphans', in J. Archer, E. Goldring, and S. Knight (eds.), *The Progresses, Pageants, & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, (New York, 2007), 3.

⁵ T. Churchyard, *The Firste Parte of Churchyardes Chippes, Containing Twelve Severall Labours*, (London, 1575), 215-236.

⁶ C. Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, (London, 1998), 192.

In the past historians who have written about Elizabeth's progress to Bristol have tended to use it as only as an example in broader studies, David Bergeron's book on civic pageantry is just one case.⁷ The only historian to look at Bristol in any detail is Sacks, although he, like all others writing on this topic, has only had Thomas Churchyard's record to address the topic.⁸ While a valuable primary source recording all the orations, and with additional notations regarding the visit, it does not enable historians to touch on issues regarding cost or funding. Only Mary Hill Cole has really addressed the finances involved hosting a royal visit, in *The Portable Queen* she briefly discusses the funding and costs of Elizabethan progresses, and while her work does not include the finances of Bristol's progress, it provides a useful framework for examining these sources.⁹ One of Cole's well supported conclusions, that royal visits did not have to incur great expense, immediately raises questions with the Bristol progress as the expenses reveal a total cost of over £1000.¹⁰ The examination of the receipts and expenses will explore how the Corporation came to spend so much.

First it is practical to examine the receipts account to gain an understanding of the funding of the Queen's entertainments. In the receipts account the majority of the money appears to be collected from various city districts, totalling £536 1s 7d of the £1120 17s 11d collected.¹¹ While it is not entirely clear how the money was raised, the division into wards suggests the Corporation taxed their citizens to fund the entertainments. While Cole's study includes the example of Ipswich, where a general tax was used to finance the Queen's visit, it is highlighted as rare method.¹² The likelihood is that it was raised through a special tax, assessing Aldermen at a higher rate than the rest of the citizenry.¹³ However, the significance of there being a taxation on all the wards and of the considerable sum collected, highlights how the whole city had a direct investment in the success of the occasion.

The receipts go on to record £200 from Thomas White's account and £250 from 'Barstaples Chest'.¹⁴ White was a prominent member of the Merchant Taylors in London, who upon his death in 1567 bestowed £2000 to the Corporation of Bristol so they could purchase land and use the income as a form of charity.¹⁵ 'Barstaples Chest' is most likely to have been a similar form of charitable donation used by the Corporation. The use of these two sources are worthy of note since the money from them is borrowed with the receipts making note on both occasions that these sums are to be

⁷ Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*, 28.

⁸ D. H. Sacks, *The Widening Gate: Bristol and the Atlantic Economy, 1450-1700*, (London, 1993), 187.

⁹ M. H. Cole, *The Portable Queen*, (Massachusetts, 1999), 103.

¹⁰ Appendix, 23.

¹¹ Appendix, 16.

¹² Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 105.

¹³ *Ibid*, 105.

¹⁴ Appendix, 16.

¹⁵ <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29272?docPos=1>

'repayed'.¹⁶ This borrowing of money gives indication that the Corporation were pushing their budget to the limit. This is supported by two of the other receipts for the sale of canvas that had been used for the High Cross and the two fortes.¹⁷ The receipts show that the combined amount received for this resale was a mere £3 4.s, this display of frugality here suggests the Corporation had stretched their finances. While the receipts do not totally clarify who was donating money they do indicate that the Corporation were accumulating the most they possibly could, with the borrowing of money from reserves and the resale of used canvas. With such a picture painted by the receipts one would expect there to be little wasted and so every expense can be scrutinised in detail.

Rather than dive straight into a detailed examination of the expenses account, the varying costs have been categorised to help develop a coherent analysis. In her study Mary Hill Cole divides the expenses into 'temporary' and 'permanent' costs, this method of categorisation will be adopted here although slightly modified.¹⁸ Cole's division sits naturally with progresses in general, with the majority of temporary expenditure being for the entertainments during the Queen's visit balanced against the permanent investments for more general city maintenance. However, the progresses used in Cole's study are of a more traditional nature, with the entertainment being made up of a series of small scale performances, and since her research is geared towards looking at trends in progresses it does not leave room for assessing the expenses in accordance with individual differences. As the visit to Bristol is dominated by a lengthy mock battle it is worthwhile annexing the militarisation costs from the rest of expenses as they overlap both 'temporary' and 'permanent' expenditure to form its own category. Initially though it will be the 'permanent' costs that will be considered.

When Cole wrote about these 'permanent' costs she defined them as investments in the city's future as they were necessary improvements, with the Queen's arrival merely setting a deadline.¹⁹ When looking at the expenses in Bristol it appears that the costs were indeed investments in the city's future, however, it appears as though the royal visit did not merely set a deadline but rather, the visit itself shaped the investment. The very first entry in the expenses is one of these maintenance costs.

In *primis paid* for charges of gilting & paynting the highe crosse and making newe benchys as by thaccompt – Lxvi.li xiii.s vii.d²⁰

¹⁶ Appendix, 16.

¹⁷ Appendix, 15.

¹⁸ Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 99.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 101.

²⁰ Appendix 17.

The payment here of over £66 is one of the largest in the expenses account and is the most expensive 'permanent' fee. From Churchyard's account it is known that, 'At the hie Crosse in a disguised manner stoed Faem'²¹ who delivered one of the recorded speeches. The significance here is that it was at these orations when the desired ceremonial dialogue was formed between city and monarch. As previously mentioned, establishing such a discourse with the Queen was a priority for this royal visit and it seems likely that it is for this reason that such a large sum was considered justifiable.

If we look at other maintenance costs a similar pattern seems to emerge.

Item *paid* for rowghcasting & playstring of Lafores gate on bothe sides, Newgate and both the frowme gates on bothe sides and for setting vp of scaffoldes & taking down the same as by thaccomp – ix.li xi.s i.d²²

Item *paid* for paynting and gilding the said gates *paid* to *John* Phypys and *John* Kirry painters – xxvi.li xiii.s iiii.d²³

While the cost is covering the maintenance of three gates, the sum of over £36 again is a significant cost. Although once more by looking at the locations in relation to the Queen's visit, the expenditure is clarified. It was at Lawford's gate where the Queen was greeted by Thomas Kelke, the Mayor of Bristol and New Gate, like the High Cross, was a location for one of the speeches.²⁴ While it is not known whether Frome Gate was also a chosen location for one of the orations, its proximity to St Bartholomew's School suggests it was an important location as the expenses highlight that Elizabeth was entertained at the 'stage at the schole dore.'²⁵ The choice to roughcast, plaster, paint and guild these specific gates again gives strong indication that the landmarks chosen for renovation were at those important contact points where the discourse between the city and Crown would be developed.

Even the smaller charges in the accounts reflect this pattern of contact points with the Queen dictating what work should be done.

Item *paid* for charge of pitching & repaying of the ways at Lafores gate – iiii.li xii.s viii.d²⁶

Item *paid* for pitching the streets as *apereth* by thaccompt – iii.li xviii.s x.d²⁷

²¹ Churchyard, *Chippes*, 215.

²² Appendix, 17.

²³ Appendix, 17.

²⁴ Sacks, *The Widening Gate*, 187.

²⁵ Appendix, 22; Millerd: Map of Bristol, BRO 43461/1.

²⁶ Appendix, 19.

²⁷ Appendix, 17.

As mentioned previously it is understandable that the Lawford's gate was a chosen location for 'pitching', the laying down of new cobble stones. Although what really stresses this selective expenditure is that the only other 'pitching' expense is not qualified by a location, suggesting that despite it being a lower cost, it is the charge for all other 'pitching' carried out in the city. The disparity between the expenditure for pitching just Lawford's Gate and the cost for laying cobbles through the rest of the city, epitomises the highly selective process of these payments.

Some of the expenses do appear to match up with Cole's suggestion that these 'permanent' costs were necessary, with the monarch's arrival merely setting a target date. The decision to affix the royal and civic coat of arms at the Guildhall, at a cost of over £10, would most likely have been necessary at some stage regardless of Elizabeth's progress.²⁸ However, the majority of these long term investment costs have shown that Cole's definition falls short of a full explanation. While all these charges were for the maintenance of the city, Cole's argument seems incomplete as the expenses indicate it was not just general civic upkeep but rather, a set of extremely selective improvements which were dictated by the contact locations with the Queen. So they were, as Cole suggests, long term investments but not just for city maintenance, instead they were investments in the city's relationship with the Queen as they were directed at providing an optimum setting for a discourse to develop between city and Crown.

The temporary costs were, according to the Cole those payments which were for entertaining the Queen and would be of no direct value to the city after her departure.²⁹ While the entertainments were dominated by the mock battle, as outlined earlier the payments for the shows militarisation will be examined separately. One of the recurring elements of the expenses appears to be for preparing the city to host the three day battle between Peace and War. Talled up the total spent on transporting, unloading and clearing the sand for the mock battle cost just under £40.

Item *paid* for sandyng the marshe, reryng of the growndes and levlyng the way –
viii.li xv.s ii.d³⁰

Item *paid* for setting vp of postes and rales & sandyng the way at St Austens Back –
vii.li i.s vii.d³¹

Item *paid* to the lighter men that brought 53 lighters of sand for the streets – vi.li
xix.s x.d³²

Item *paid* to the hallyeurs for halyng all the said 53 lighters of sand yt 960 fates at i.d
per fate – iiiii.li v.d³³

²⁸ Appendix, 17.

²⁹ Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 99.

³⁰ Appendix, 18.

³¹ Appendix, 18.

³² Appendix, 18.

Item to the fillers of the fates *with sand* – xv.s ii.d³⁴

The first three entries here show the cost of sanding three different areas, this division of payments is suggestive of a division of labour, unlike the payments for working on the gates. Additionally these entries are for a variety of roles; the first two are for the act of sanding, the following two for transportation of sand and the last for filling up containers for transportation. These numerous roles are compounded by the absence of names, perhaps implying a large number of labourers were used as the expenses account did tend to name recipients.³⁵ The segregation of payments here and the implication of multiple labourers illustrates how the civic preparations were a large scale operation. The financial and physical commitment made by using numerous labourers on what was essentially basic scenery for the battle, reinforces just how important the visit was regarded by the Corporation.

The significance attached to the visit is reinforced by the additional temporary payments made. These costs were unrelated to the mock battle but were purely for winning additional favour with Elizabeth I. One of the most costly of these supplementary payments was for erecting a gallery.

Item *paid* for setting vp a gallery in the marsh for the *Quenes Majesties* to se the tryumphes – xix.li iiiii.s iii.d³⁶

What is interesting about the creation of this gallery displaying triumphs of the city, is that it is not mentioned in any other texts regarding the Queen's progress. The reason there is no other record is debatable but it is probable that if it was intended to be an ostentatious element of the entertainment then it would have been recorded. The likelihood then is that the gallery played a minor role in the Queen's entertainments, this in turn reveals that they were willing to spend just under £20 for a side show. While there are always other possibilities, such as simply the Queen's indifference to the gallery, that could have resulted in there being no record, if this idea is correct then once again it underlines the resolute commitment to these entertainments. Once more such dedication and financial sacrifice strongly suggests that establishing a ceremonial dialogue was regarded as essential. While this instance is of a recorded cost not being mentioned in accounts of the royal visit, it must be noted that there were reverse discrepancies.

By looking at Churchyard's record it is possible to see some entertainments that one would expect to appear amongst the expenses. One such instance is mentioned within one of the speeches

³³ Appendix, 23.

³⁴ Appendix, 18.

³⁵ Appendix, 20.

³⁶ Appendix, 18.

describing how the Queen's arrival caused citizens 'to ryng their bels'.³⁷ Naturally one might presume bell ringing would incur additional costs to the expenses, however, there is no mention of this in the accounts. This instance exposes a limitation to the Mayor's Audit Books as a source, as it implies that either some of the entertainments were funded separately or simply not recorded at all. On this occasion it is most likely to have been paid for by the Churchwarden, since it has been shown that at other progresses the musicians and bell ringers were compensated in such a way.³⁸ Another occurrence is recorded within Churchyard's notes when he notes that, 'som fier works wear seen'.³⁹ Again this use of fireworks would be assumed to cause additional cost to the Mayor's accounts. With this instance there can be no assumed patron, suggesting either a private investor was involved or that the payment was simply not recorded, both possibilities again expose possible shortcomings of the source. However, these gaps in expenses can potentially be seen as evidence that the financial dedication to these entertainments was not restricted to the Corporation's raised funds but was widespread, with willing citizens fronting their own finances for the civic benefit of pleasing the Queen. While this assumes the fireworks were not simply forgotten from the expenses, it is by no means a wild supposition when considering the accounts of Churchwardens paying for musicians and bell ringers in other cities.⁴⁰ Until now the temporary expenses discussed, while far from being insignificant sums, have been dwarfed in comparison to some of the permanent costs examined earlier, this was certainly not the case with all the temporary expenses.

In her study on progresses, Felicity Heal discusses how, while a traditional aspect of progress, it was during Elizabeth I's reign when gift giving became a fundamental aspect of hosting a royal progress.⁴¹ She argued that the importance became accentuated as people began to base gift exchanging on the Three Graces.⁴² The idea behind this was the proper exchange process involved giving graciously, receiving courteously and thirdly to requite thankfully.⁴³ This philosophy to giving and receiving gifts empowered the traditional civic gift as it implied reciprocation. Now when hosts presented their gift they were not just displaying loyalty but were simultaneously asking for the assurance of good lordship from the monarch in return.⁴⁴ This heightened significance of the gift is supported by Cole's work which underlines the gift as being the greatest expense when hosting a

³⁷ Churchyard, *Chippes*, 217.

³⁸ Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 100.

³⁹ Churchyard, *Chippes*, 227.

⁴⁰ Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 100.

⁴¹ F. Heal, 'Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress', in J. Archer, E. Goldring, and S. Knight (eds.), *The Progresses, Pageants, & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, (New York, 2007), 54.

⁴² *Ibid*, 48.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 48.

⁴⁴ Heal, 'Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress', 48.

royal visit.⁴⁵ With so much significance associated to the civic gift, it is worth exploring what record there is in the Audit Books.

Bristol's gift for Elizabeth followed traditional lines of money in a purse given to the Queen by the mayor. As can be seen in the accounts a silk purse was purchased at just over £1 which contained two hundred coins valuing at £100.⁴⁶ For a one off payment this is an enormous amount of money, Cole in her research discusses the value of gifts with examples of Northampton spending £26, Cambridge £16, and it is only the most lavish gift in her study, from Sandwich, that matches Bristol.⁴⁷ Given Bristol's prosperity, perhaps it is not such an outrageous cost, however, one must take into consideration the nature of this expense. Unlike the earlier large sums for painting and gilding, this was not a visible investment for the city, it was essentially the direct handover of £100. The willingness of the Corporation to pay such a large amount indicates it must have been considered worthwhile, suggesting there was an assumption of the Three Grace philosophy and so some form of reciprocation. With no petition it can be assumed that the desired reciprocation would be as the entertainments insinuated, maintenance of peace. At this stage it is worth noting that while a material gift to the monarch had become an integral part of hosting a progress, gift giving extended beyond this one offering.

In her study, Heal makes reference to Mary Ratcliffe, the keeper of the Queen's jewels, who in 1574 recorded two gifts given to Elizabeth, the first of which was a salamander and phoenix jewel from Sir John Young, and the other, a dolphin in mother-of-pearl decorated with gold from Sir John Sherington.⁴⁸ These gifts were not recorded in the Audit Books as they are most likely to have been privately funded, although unlike those compensating the bell ringers these individuals were probably solely searching for individual gain. Conversely in the expenses account there is record for commissioning a pearl encrusted scabbard.⁴⁹ In the other records there is no mention of such a scabbard so it is unknown whether or not it was an intended gift. The likelihood is that it was not a gift for the Queen, as such a gift would almost certainly have been recorded in other accounts, but could potentially have been a gift for one of her officers. In other records of Elizabeth's progress to Bristol there is mention of Lord Burghley receiving, a gallon of claret, two gallons of sack and a large sugar loaf weighing fifty pounds.⁵⁰ While by 1574 it was common practice to give additional gifts to important members of the Queen's retinue, in this instance the expenses contain no record of these

⁴⁵ Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 101.

⁴⁶ Appendix, 20.

⁴⁷ Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 103.

⁴⁸ Heal, 'Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress', 55.

⁴⁹ Appendix, 19.

⁵⁰ Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 102.

gifts.⁵¹ The absence of these costs from the accounts could be seen as similar to the absence of the additional gifts for the Queen, reinforcing this secondary layer to hosting a progress governed, not by the Corporation's ambitions, but by individuals seeking favour. It would be interesting to explore the extent individuals went to win favour during Bristol's progress, however, the nature of this source prohibits exploring this tangent further. In terms of gifts, the Corporation's expenses have shown the continued commitment to crafting an optimum setting for the ceremonial dialogue. However, while all other studies on progress expenses have seen the material gift as the most expensive outlay, this was not the case in Bristol.

As previously discussed the lack of a petition at the 1574 progress meant that the Corporation had to convey their aspirations for peace through the entertainments themselves. The expenses to be addressed now will illustrate what costs were involved to ensure the desired message was communicated, confirming military strength and loyalty. While the mock battle was not an original form of entertainment, at Bristol it was unlike its predecessors in that it was extended over three days, it was accompanied by speeches, had some form of a plot and even included audience participation.⁵² Having such an elaborate display would be expected to come with an elaborate price tag, but the cost for simply supplying the soldiers with food, drink, clothes, and ordnance was unprecedented.⁵³

In the expenses account there are five payments made for corn and serpentine powder, Elizabethan forms of gunpowder. These costs totalled just over £210 with one of the fees being the largest paid to any one individual in the whole account.

Item paid to Robert Robynson for xxvi C 36 lb of corne and serpentyne powder at
13.d per lb – iCxLii.li xv.s viii.d⁵⁴

The sum here of £142, to be spent solely on gunpowder, easily surpasses the value of the Queen's gift and this was not even for the full supply. There are another four instances in the accounts of such a purchase with one of them being for, 'dyverse grocers'.⁵⁵ The spread of these payments over numerous traders is accompanied by a significant range in cost, from the £142 fee already mentioned to as low as the £1 and 10 pence paid to William Newton.⁵⁶ The combination of multiple retailers and diverse sums paints a picture of the Corporation buying up all the gunpowder resources

⁵¹ Cole, 'Monarchy in Motion', 31.

⁵² Archer and S. Knight, 'Elizabetha Triumphans', 29.

⁵³ Cole, *The Portable Queen*, 103.

⁵⁴ Appendix, 20.

⁵⁵ Appendix, 22.

⁵⁶ Appendix, 21.

available, such a large sacrifice of both resources and capital illuminates how paramount the success of the mock battle was.

Gunpowder was just one aspect of the costs to militarise the civic display. There were also charges for various types of ordnance. The accounts show purchases of 'Arcabouzes',⁵⁷ small portable guns, of 'morters of Brasse' and of pistols.⁵⁸ By displaying such a variety of weaponry it is likely that the Corporation were hoping to demonstrate to the Queen the extent of their military powers. This desire to exhibit military prowess is reinforced by the funding that went into the soldiers uniforms. There are several payments for new garments, such as "Souldwer capps",⁵⁹ but the main cost here came with the purchase of various materials, exemplified here.

Item paid to mr Randall hassall, to Thomas pyttes & John hort for red cloth for the pike mens Gasskyns – xxvii.li xvi.s vi.d⁶⁰

This significance here is that the Corporation are forking out another £27 just to ensure all the pikemen are wearing red breeches. Not only would the pristine garments add to the professional military display but the use of the Queen's colours would have been another means to exemplify their loyalty.

The decision to pour money into a three day mock battle rather than the more traditional pageantry was by no means random. The Corporation will have chosen this option to appeal to the Queen because they will have been extremely aware of Elizabeth's potentially fragile position. Having had to overcome both the Ridolfi plot and Northern Rebellion already and with Pope Pius V not only excommunicating her but encouraging the Catholic powers of Spain and France to depose of her, Elizabeth's reliance on a loyal and powerful military was patently clear.⁶¹ It is understandable then why the Corporation dedicated the majority of their budget on militarizing their entertainments.

Another large payment can be seen with reference to the ships used.

Item paid to Thomas Symons for furnyshing the galleys, Barges and other charges – xCi.li v.s ii.d⁶²

Having spent so much on arming the soldiers with various weapons and dressing them in attire, one might question the expense of £91 to furnish the galleys of ships. However, with the intended message being of extensive and loyal military resources, the Corporation would have regarded the

⁵⁷ Appendix, 18.

⁵⁸ Appendix, 19.

⁵⁹ Appendix, 21.

⁶⁰ Appendix, 22

⁶¹ McGee, 'Mysteries, Musters, and Masque', 113.

⁶² Appendix, 19.

display of Bristol's naval capabilities essential. Elizabeth would have been well aware of the role Bristol ships played in cooperating with the royal navy and helping her father war with France three decades earlier.⁶³ Indeed it is likely that the reason the cost to furnish the ships was so high was because these were merchant ships and so had to be militarized to communicate the desired message to the Queen. The accounts go on to record the 'ballesting the ffox', most likely to be the forty five ton ship captained by Richard White.^{64,65} Putting the Queen face to face with three armed ships in hot pursuit of one another would have undoubtedly been a spectacle not easily forgotten, an ideal method to impress Elizabeth. These costly expenses highlight just how carefully planned and how significant the mock battle was to the Corporation, it was their only chance of appealing to the Queen and so the cost was considered worth it. The remaining payments for the mock battle reveal another important aspect of the accounts.

By organising such an elaborate mock battle the Corporation incurred a number of expenses payable to significant individuals. One of the greatest beneficiaries appears to be Dominic Chester who for, 'his charge of the ii fortes' and some other business received £81.⁶⁶ What is of note with these costs is that while Dominic Chester was himself an Alderman of Bristol, this was not the case with all the recipients.⁶⁷

Item paid to Captaigne Shute for his travaile who was generall of all the armye – xvi.li
xiii.s iiiii.d⁶⁸

The payment here is for a Captain John Shute, a soldier of the Crown.⁶⁹ Considering the desired message to Elizabeth was regarding Bristol's military expertise it does at first appear incongruous to employ an outsider to function as the general of all the army. What must be realised is that during Elizabeth's reign displays of loyalty had moved on from the days of Henry VII when civic hosts stressed their antiquity and independence.⁷⁰ By 1574 there had been a shift in attitude with there no longer being a focus on the abilities of the local community but instead a culture focused on how the local incorporates within, and subordinates itself to, the centre.⁷¹ It was this culture of loyalty through subordination that is most likely to have inspired the employment of John Shute as it certainly was not out of convenience since the accounts record having to finance, 'riding to the court

⁶³ E. Jones, 'The Bristol Shipping Industry in the Sixteenth Century', (PhD Thesis, Edinburgh, 1998), 101.

⁶⁴ Appendix, 22.

⁶⁵ <http://rose.bris.ac.uk/dspace/handle/1983/1305>.

⁶⁶ Appendix, 20.

⁶⁷ M. Stanford, *The Ordinances of Bristol 1506-1598*, (Gloucester, 1990), 37.

⁶⁸ Appendix, 21.

⁶⁹ <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25484>.

⁷⁰ Sacks, *The Widening Gate*, 187.

⁷¹ McGee, 'Mysteries, Musters, and Masque', 105.

to wyndsor & sending for captaigne Shute'.⁷² This means of displaying loyalty was reflected by the mock battle itself, not just by having Elizabeth as the peace maker, but also by having the turning point in the mock siege coming about after some of the Queen's officers help the forts defence.⁷³ The significance of using the Queen's officers is heightened by the £32 charge, reinforcing the idea that their inclusion was a means to add to the ceremonial dialogue that Bristol was not an independent force but simply part of the national defence under the Queen's authority.⁷⁴

The most patent instance of the Corporation using the employment of outsiders, as a means of confirming loyalty through subordination, is with the very organisation of the entertainments. The employment of Thomas Churchyard, the soldier poet and member of Elizabeth's retinue, was by no means conventional. Civic hosts usually employed local schoolmasters to organise entertainments for important events and the Corporation were sending a strong message of subordination to the Crown by outsourcing their writing and direction.⁷⁵ Churchyard's account even recalls how some of the intended orations were not spoken because the schoolmaster, 'envied that any stranger should set forth these shoes.'⁷⁶ The accounts reflect this decision by the Corporation to prioritise the outsider Churchyard over the local Mr Dunne.

Item paid to mr Churchyard for his travayle bothe in the ffortes and concernyng oracions – vi.li xiii.s iiiii.d⁷⁷

Item paid to mr Dunne Scholemaster of the Barthilmews toward his charges of his stage at the schole dore – i.li vii.s vi.d⁷⁸

Here it is possible to see that it was Churchyard who was employed to deal with the fortes and orations while Dunne was paid only for his stage at the school. Not only is Dunne only paid a fifth of Churchyard's fee, possibly another motivation behind his sabotage, but his payment makes no reference to him organising a performance, suggesting that he was paid literally just for his stage. This stark contrast between Churchyard's role and Dunne's, epitomises the tactic exploited by the Corporation of displaying loyalty to the Crown through subordination to it.

The receipts and expenses accounts recorded in the Mayor's Audit Books reveal how the Corporation stretched their physical and fiscal resources to ensure their success as civic hosts to the Queen. The full scale commitment to the entertainments gives strong indications of how important it was to establish a ceremonial dialogue between the city and Crown. The importance of which can

⁷² Appendix, 18.

⁷³ Churchyard, *Chippes*, 227.

⁷⁴ Appendix, 21.

⁷⁵ McGee, 'Mysteries, Musters, and Masque', 111.

⁷⁶ Churchyard, *Chippes*, 236.

⁷⁷ Appendix, 21.

⁷⁸ Appendix, 22.

be transferred to the significance of their message, confirming military prowess and displaying loyalty through subordination, balanced by an appeal for Elizabeth I to maintain peace. The simple statistic that Bristol's expenses for the whole quarter was £1126 with £1053 of it going towards Queen Elizabeth's progress, typifies just how total a commitment was made.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Appendix, 23.

Appendix. Mayor's Audit Book 9 BRO/F/AU 1/10

The Layout is reproduced as accurately as possible.

The transcription follows the spelling, capitalisation and punctuation of the original document, which is contained within the mayor's audit books. Reconstructions of suspensions are in italics, e.g. '*paid*' for 'p'd'.

Receiptes of suche moneys collectyd for the Quenes Majesties enteirteignement

In primis received of Trinitie warde the sume of – iC-iiii.li vii.s

Item received of Alhalon warde the sume of – iC lxxiii.li x.s

Item received of St mary porte warde the sume of – (91li 4s 7d) – xCi.li iiiii.s vii.d

Item received of Redclyf warde the sume of – Lxxi.li ii.s iiiii.d

Item received of St Ewens warde the sume of – xCiiii.li xvii. viii.d

Item received of mr pary of the colledge towardes the raling and sanding of the way at st Austens Back and owenyng the ground sume of – v.li

Item sold the canvas that was left *which* coveryd the highe crosse when it was in gilting and payntyng wherof half was rotton & *part* of it stollon for the sume – xxiiii.s iii.d

Item received for the canvas that was left *which* coveryd the ii ffortes yt 159 ells – i.li xix.s ix.d

Item received of Thomas Symons for bordes & the rest of *william* Salterns accompt – iiiii.li iiiii.s vi.d

Moneys borrowed of Sir Thomas Whites accompt for the vse above said to be repayed to the said accompt

In *Primis* borrowed out of *Sir Thomas Whites* accompt the sume of 200.li *which* was appoynted for corne as *apereth* by his accompt of ii last yeres past *which* money is to be repayed to the same accompt as *spedelie* as *convenyentlie* may be *amounteth* – iiC.li

Item *received* owt of *Barstaples Chest* owt of a bag of 250.li *which* money is to purchase land, *which* also is to be repayed and returned to the said chest the sume of – iiCL.li

Sume of this side – CMXCvii.li x.s i.d

Suma total of of fvnes and casualties of the old jury and of collected and of moneys borrowed amounth to the sume of – 1/M C xx.li xvii.s xi.d

**The Charges of the Queenes Majesties enterteignement
to the cite of Bristoll as ffolowith**

In *primis paid* for charges of gilting & paynting the highe crosse and making newe benchys as by thacompt – Lxvi.li xiii.s vii.d

Item *paid* for rowghcasting & playstring of Lafores gate on bothe sides, Newgate and both the frowme gates on bothe sides and for setting vp of scaffoldes & taking down the same as by thacomp – ix.li xi.s i.d

Item *paid* for paynting and gilding the said gates *paid* to *John* Phyypps and *John* Kirry painters – xxvi.li xiii.s iii.d

Item *paid* for pitching the streets as *apereth* by thacompt – iii.li xviii.s x.d

Item *paid* for setting vp the Quenes Armes & the towns Armes in Frestone in the yeld hall wall – x.li xiii.s i.d

Item *paid* for setting vp a Scaffold at the highe crosse for the Oracion - [blank].li viii.s iii.d

Item *paid* for rowghecasting the walls of the s yeld halles *withowt* and washing *within* the halles – v.li viii.s xi.d

Item *paid* for riding to the court to wyndsor & sending for captaigne Shute – iii.li xv.s

Item *paid* for the purse of gold, Sylver and Silk whoerin the 200 angelettes was presented – i.li xii.s

Item *paid* for sandyng the marshe, reryng of the growndes and levlyng the way – viii.li xv.s ii.d

Item *paid* for setting vp of postes and rales & sandyng the way at St Austens Back – vii.li i.s vii.d

Item *paid* for setting vp a gallery in the marsh for the Quenes Majesties to se the tryumphes – xix.li iiiii.s iii.d

Item *paid* to the lighter men that brought 53 lighters of sand for the streets – vi.li xix.s x.d

Item to the fillers of the fates *with* sand – xv.s ii.d

Item *paid* for mending the way in magdalen lane where the Erle of Lyncoln lay – [blank].li vi.s viii.d

Item *paid* for charges upon Arcabouzes & drumes & for an Enseigne *with* a white crosse – v.li vii.s vi.d

Item *paid* for charge of pitching & repaying of the ways at Lafores gate – iii.li xii.s viii.d

Item *paid* for ffees and charges to the Quenes clerk of the market & to the yoman of ye bottells – v.li

Item *paid* for making the quenes way thrughe Temple mede at her goyng away – blank.li xiiii.s iii.d

Item *paid* for newe making and dressing the Scabbard with pearles – iii.li ix.s x.d

Item *paid* to mr Dowting mr Swordberer and to Edward chester for charge riding to ye court at Gloucester – ii.li i.s v.d

Item *paid* for 26 small barrills for 26 C of corne & serpentyne powder – blank.li xix.s vi.d

Item *paid* for the nete charges of casting of 7 morters of Brasse & making of pestells – iii.li iii.s iii.d

Item *paid* to Edmond Robertes John hopkyns and to John Sachfiels Captaignes as by their accompt –iCLxxiii.li x.s xi.d

Item *paid* to Thomas Symons for furnyshyng the galleys, Barges and other charges – xCi.li v.s ii.d

Item *paid* to mighell pepwell for corne powder for calyvers flaskes & towchis as by his accompt – xvii.li i.s iii.d

Item *paid* to mr John Brown for chages of drume players and for capps for soldiers as by his accompt – xxv.li i.s

Item *paid* to henry Robertes for capps, vitayles & drynck for Souldiors – vi.li [illegible].s viii.d

Item *paid* to Robert Robynson for xxvi C 36 lb of corne and serpentyne powder at 13.d per lb – iCxLii.li xv.s viii.d

Item *paid* to mr domynock Chester for charges of the ii fortes with other busynes as by his accompt – Lxxxi.li viii.s iii.d

Item *paid* to John ffield for his paynes in dressing the marsh – i.li

Item *paid* to mr Richard Cole for bockeram and canvas 230 yardes and 138 elles for souldiers dublettes – xiii.li viii.s vi.d

Item *paid* to mr *william* Gittons for a piece of brasse for drumes & planckes as by his accompt – iii.li x.s

Item *paid* to mr Thomas kelke for 200 Angelettes that he presented to the Quenes majestie – iC.li

Item *paid* to mr kelke for *certeign* ffees that he *paid* to the *quenes officers* as by his *accompt* – xxxii.li

Item *paid* to *william* Newton *grocer* for *certeign* *corne powder* *delyverid* to John *Sachefield* – i.li x.d

Item *paid* to mr *phillip* Langley for *vytlyng* of *vi* *gonners* and *losse* of *armour* as by his *bills* – xiii.li iii.s viii.d

Item *paid* to *william* Byny for *vitling* of *souldiors* *goyng* and *retournyng* *form* the *camp* as by his *bill* – i.li

Item *paid* to *Captaigne* Shute for his *travaile* who was *generall* of all the *armye* – xvi.li xiii.s iiiii.d

Item *paid* to mr *Churchyard* for his *travayle* *bothe* in the *ffortes* and *concernyng* *oracions* – vi.li xiii.s iiiii.d

Item *paid* to *william* Saltern & *Thomas* *deconson* for *charges* of the *grete* *ordynance* as by their *accompt* – ix.li xv.s vi.d

Item *paid* to *harry* *Robertes* and *John* *Saunders* for *Souldwer* *capps* as by *thaccompt* – iiiii.li xix.s

Item *paid* to *Lxxxv* *pyoners* who *wrought* at the *ffortes* – iiiii.li v.s

Item *paid* to mr Dunne Scholemaster of the Barthilmews toward his charges of his stage at the schole dore – i.li vii.s vi.d

Item *paid* to *John* Amorgan for vi barrills of bere and vi dozen of ale to vityale souldiors – i.li x.s

Item *paid* to *dyverse grocers* for vii C Lii lbs ½ of cornepowder as by their bill *amounteth* 752 lb ½ – xLix.li ix.s x.d

Item *paid* for ballesting the ffoxe and for clensing of harnesse – [blank].li xii.s iii.d

Item *paid* to mr mayer Sergeantes towards their paynes – i.li vi.s vii.d

Item *paid* to mr Randall hassall, to *Thomas* pyttes & John hort for red cloth for the pike mens Gaskyns – xxvii.li xvi.s vi.d

Item *paid* to mr Aldworth for loss vpon light Angelettes who was the generall Receyvor – [blank].li xi.s

Item *paid* to mr Snygge for losse of planckes and for occupieng of his grete orndnaunce & reparacion therof – ii.li x.s

Item *paid* to the lighter men for lighterage of 53 lighters at half lighterage *which amounteth* to 15.li 6.s – vii.li xvi.s xi.d

Item *paid* to the hallyeurs for halyng all the said 53 lighters of sand yt 960 fates at i.d *per* fate – iii.li v.d

Item *paid* to the Rakar for haling 35 dd fates of sand owt of the stretes after her *majestie* was gone – iii.li x.s

Item *paid* to mr stone for losse of angelet iii.s for a barrill of bere iii.s – [blank].li vii.s

Item *paid* to Edward Chester for a bill of *parcells* silkes and *ffrenghe* for the men of war at mr Recorders apoyntment – iii.li i.s vii.d

Item *paid* to harry Robertes for the rest of *Accompt* of charges that he layed owt as by mr kelkes *accompt* – vi.li i.s viii.d

Suma totles of all the charges of the Quenes *majesties* enterteignement – 1/M Liii.li xiiii.s xi.d

Suma total of the *paymentes* of the fowrthe quarters with the charges of the Quenes *majestie* – 1/M Cxxvi.li iii.s iiiii.d

Bibliography

Primary Sources

BRO F/AU/ 1/10 – Mayor’s Audit Book 9.

BRO 43461/1 – Millerd: Map of Bristol.

Churchyard, T., *The Firste Parte of Churchyardes Chippes, Containing Twelve Severall Labours*, (London, 1575).

Secondary Sources

Archer, J. E., Goldring, E., and Knight, S. (eds.), *The Progresses, Pageants, & Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, (New York, 2007).

Bergeron, D., *English Civic Pageantry 1558-1642*, (London, 1971).

Cole, M. H., *The Portable Queen*, (Massachusetts, 1999).

Haigh, C., *Elizabeth I*, (London, 1998).

Jones, E. T., ‘The Bristol Shipping Industry in the Sixteenth Century’, (PhD Thesis, Edinburgh, 1998).

Sacks, D. H., *The Widening Gate: Bristol and the Atlantic Economy, 1450-1700*, (London, 1993).

Stanford, M. (eds.), *The Ordinances of Bristol 1506-1598*, (Gloucester, 1990).

Internet Sources

Ireland-Bristol Trade in the Sixteenth Century - <http://rose.bris.ac.uk/dspace/handle/1983/1305> .

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography - <http://www.oxforddnb.com>.