Introduction

In September 1575, Queen Elizabeth visited the royal residence at Woodstock in Oxfordshire as part of a lengthy journey through several English counties. As she entered the grounds, two men jousted before her, and a hermit welcomed her to the residence, currently kept by her lieutenant, Sir Henry Lee. With her entourage trailing behind her, Elizabeth dismounted her horse and walked with the hermit from the park entrance to the manor, as he delivered a chivalric tale about knights in love with women above their station or beyond their reach. When Elizabeth and the others approached the house, they admired the ivy, flowers, and "glimering" gold plate that covered the path and door, and they could see a crescent-shaped table just inside the house set with many "diuers" and "dainty" dishes.[1] At the manor entrance stood an oak tree covered with paintings featuring "men of great credite," many of whom "were in loue."[2] Seventeen years later, when Lee hosted Elizabeth at Woodstock and at his nearby Ditchley estate, he had these paintings appear once again. On this second occasion, a page claimed that the "charmed picturs" held "some secreats" that only the Queen could unlock.[3] No account of either performance describes the paintings in further detail, and the pamphlet of the earlier entertainment adds by way of explanation: "the Allegories are hard to be vnderstood, without some knowledge of the inuentors."[4]

Lee's indecipherable paintings serve as an apt metaphor for Elizabeth's entertainments at country houses. Little information has survived about many of them, and the meanings of an ephemeral performance designed for an "in crowd" at a specific political moment can easily elude us.

[1] *The Queenes Maiesties Entertainment at Woodstocke* (London, 1585; *STC* 7596), sig. B4r.
[2] Ibid., sig. B4v.
[3] I quote from Gabriel Heaton's newly edited text, "Sir Henry Lee's Entertainments for the Queen at Ditchley and Woodstock, 20–21 September 1592" in Elizabeth Goldring, et al., eds., *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources* (Oxford University Press, 2014), 3:687.
[4] *Woodstocke*, sig. B4v.

Additionally, as Lee's entertainments reveal, narrators of printed and manuscript accounts described only certain details. Curtis Breight has argued that these pageants "must be approached particularly, not monolithically; historically, not generically."[5] I propose that we need both at once – a methodology that analyzes the genre to understand better each individual instance of it. To unlock the secrets of a country house entertainment, we need to study its "inventors" and their political agendas, its language, its conventional features, and relevant archival materials to assess what that specific performance and its subsequent texts meant at those particular times. But to appreciate fully these entertainments' political interventions, we also need to analyze them as a group. This approach best enables us to examine their "social force and function" as their original audiences would have understood them.[6]

Although long unrecognized as a literary genre, the country house entertainment – the episodic pageantry performed at country estates during royal "progresses" – was practiced as one in Elizabethan England. Composed of historically specific conventions that grew out of "social contracts" and advanced social relations among multiple collaborators and audiences, this genre carried unique cultural and political functions.[7] Recent scholarship has shown increasing interest in individual Elizabethan country house performances as important events, but no one has yet analyzed the genre's features and development more fully.[8] By doing so, we gain new insights

[5] Curtis Breight, "Realpolitik and Elizabethan Ceremony: The Earl of Hertford's Entertainment of Elizabeth at Elvetham, 1591" in *Renaissance Quarterly* 45 (1992): 20.

[6] I take the phrase "social force and function" from Rosalie Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance*, ed. Barbara K. Lewalski (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 114.

[7] My definition of genre builds on Alastair Fowler's identification of literary kinds as historical and dynamic in *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982) and Frederic Jameson's description of genres as "social contracts" between writers and their audience in *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982), 106.

[8] Examples of this recent interest include the newly edited texts of country house entertainments in *John Nichols's The Progresses*; Gabriel Heaton, *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson* (Oxford University Press, 2010); Janette Dillon, *The Language of Space in Court Performance, 1400–1625* (Cambridge University Press, 2010); Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, eds., *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford University Press, 2007); Rachel Kapelle, "Predicting Elizabeth: Prophecy on Progress" in *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 24 (2011): 83–105. In earlier studies, David Bergeron, Bruce R. Smith, and Michael Leslie each briefly approached country house entertainment as a distinct kind of drama, but they did not examine the genre's development, involvement of women, agendas in print, or specific insights into Elizabethan literature and culture. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558–1642* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1971); Smith, "Landscape with Figures: The Three Realms of Queen Elizabeth's Country-house Revels" in *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 8 (1977): 57–115; Leslie, "Something Nasty in the Wilderness: Entertaining Queen Elizabeth on her Progresses" in *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 10 (1998): 47–72.

into Elizabethan England's political trends, its theatrical genres, the functions of printed pageantry, and the collaborative nature of Renaissance authorship. This book places country house entertainment in two different and equally crucial contexts: as part of a performance genre and as printed texts that helped to form publishers' lists. The first half examines surviving records of a performance along with hosts' biographies, family papers, and other contextual materials to reconstruct what might have happened during that event. The second half examines how Elizabethan stationers made country house entertainments widely appealing in print. Although scholars have often misunderstood these entertainments as simple propaganda with limited cultural significance, they debated local and national politics in the guise of light-hearted praise. As Elizabeth's hosts used performances to lobby for personal gains, and publishers later used entertainment texts to develop their specialties, the genre intervened in political debates, including whether women made good politicians and what roles the church and local culture should play in definitions of England. This introduction defines the genre's features and functions, identifies the conditions in which it emerged, and considers how its engagement with related genres encourages us to look anew at Elizabethan politics.

Setting the Stage: Defining Country House Entertainment in Performance

Elizabethans described country house performances as "speeches," "pleasures," "dialogues," "spectacles," "devices," and "shows," but they most often used the word "entertainment" to encompass the range of revelry and hospitality that hosts extended to the Queen. This revelry included banquets, music, hunting, dancing, fireworks, and various spectacles and sports. All encoded political meanings, but the dramatic pageants announced the event's political stakes most directly. Each performance, designed and executed for a single event, was staged in the gardens, parks, and courtyards of a country estate. This aspect of the genre – its occasion-specific, site-specific location at country estates where people lived and worked – was its most crucial defining element.[9] A large country estate

[9] I use the term "site-specific" to highlight connections between my approach and contemporary performance studies, in which the term describes performances staged in spaces other than a standard theater. Some scholars of early modern theater have begun thinking about site-specificity in the English Renaissance, and my study shows that Elizabethan country house entertainment is an especially apt example. See especially Anna Birch and Joanne Tompkins, eds., *Performing*

signified a family's social status and power in local, regional, and national communities, and it became, on the arrival of the court, simultaneously provincial and courtly.[10] Audiences arrived with set ideas about the place and its inhabitants, and the performance exploited or rewrote that existing history as its hosts and audiences moved between the fictional world of the entertainment and the real world of the country estate.

A country house performance also required significant physical movement from its actors and audience as they performed and experienced a sequence of pageants consisting of songs, speeches, and dialogues in verse and prose. Elizabeth arrived on horse and was greeted at the gate by a poetic invocation that introduced her hosts and the performance's tone and agendas. As the pageantry progressed to new episodes, actors guided Elizabeth and the rest of the audience toward the manor, and Elizabeth typically stepped off her horse to walk with them. The country location inspired the use of elements from English popular pastimes and seasonal festivals such as feasts of misrule, morris dancing, and May Day festivities, while the presence of the monarch enabled the genre to employ and rework courtly praising conventions, especially pastoral and Petrarchan ones. Elizabeth met shepherds, porters, gardeners, and other characters whose presence highlighted the pastoral, domestic location. She also met figures from classical mythology and English lore who helped construct a narrative of Elizabethan England's cultural eminence. Once inside the house, she was treated to a grand feast. Other pageants might follow if she stayed for multiple nights and, at her departure, a final pageant bid farewell and mourned the loss of her presence.

Each performance was the collaborative enterprise of a collection of "devisers," an Elizabethan term for those who invented pageantry, all of whom contributed personal and political agendas.[11] These devisers typically included several members of the host family, writers, actors, composers, and musicians. Because Elizabeth often traveled with a large retinue, her hosts – sometimes a single male householder or female widow, but most often a

Site-Specific Theatre: Politics, Place, Practice (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2012); Susan Bennett and Mary Polito, eds., *Performing Environments: Site-Specificity in Medieval and Early Modern English Drama* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2014); Julie Sanders, *The Cultural Geography of Early Modern Drama, 1620–1650* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[10] Matthew Johnson, *Behind the Castle Gate: From Medieval to Renaissance* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 1–18.

[11] Court entertainments were often called "devices" in early modern England, and the Woodstock entertainment refers to its "deuisors" (sig. C3r). Modern performance studies also use the term to describe someone who invents and plans a performance, especially one generated collaboratively. See, e.g., Emma Govan, Helen Nicholson, and Katie Normington, *Making a Performance: Devising Histories and Contemporary Practices* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2007), 4–7.

husband–wife team – relied on many household servants and laborers to produce an entertainment, and some records highlight the contributions of food and supplies by neighboring gentry. Elizabeth's hosts served as lead devisers; they financed and supervised the event, including plans for meals, sleeping quarters, and entertainment. The Crown paid some expenses and a royal advance team traveled ahead to help secure supplies, but the hosting family generally bore the brunt of the cost and stress.[12] The entertainments at Kenilworth Castle in Warwickshire and at Harefield in Middlesex cost their hosts more than their households normally spent in a year.[13] In part, country house owners hosted the court because they had no choice. Elizabeth did not need to be invited; she and her advisors arranged the itinerary, called a "gest," and announced where they would travel. But householders who staged dramatic productions chose to do so because they hoped their investment would produce intangible rewards such as increased honor and favor. Hosts had the most to gain or lose from an entertainment's relative success, so their preferences and ambitions typically determined its content.

They collaborated with writers and players to produce this content. Surviving Elizabethan expense records include entries for food and other provisions, but none for writers, actors, costumes, or dramatic properties beyond gifts for the Queen, so we cannot be certain whether writers and players received monetary compensation.[14] Perhaps they were "paid" in meals, lodging, and the prospect of future patronage. A few hosts wrote pageants themselves; others commissioned writers or collaborated with courtly poets, who contributed verses in the hopes of royal preferment. All entertainment writers had the opportunity to lobby for royal favor and advertise their skill at penning courtly verse, as the few entertainment texts that mention writers demonstrate. But most hired writers primarily carried out their patrons' wishes. A letter from John Davies to his patron about a pageant draft exemplifies the typical writer–patron relationship in this genre: "I humbly beseech your honour to lett your eie passe a little over it; and to lett me know what your Judgment mislikes, and I shall quickly

[12] For more about preparations for royal visits, see Mary Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 41–6.

[13] See Chapters 1 and 3.

[14] Some records associated with Jacobean country house entertainments show payments to writers and other devisers. For example, Robert Cecil paid Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones sizable sums to devise entertainments at Theobalds in 1606 and 1607. But later practices do not necessarily indicate what happened in Elizabeth's reign. For more on the Cecilian expense records, see Scott McMillin, "Jonson's Early Entertainments: New Information from Hatfield House" in *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 1 (1968): 153–66.

correct it . . . I am not ambitios to be reputed the autor of a speech, but am zealous to have things donne according to your honours pleasure."[15] Most Elizabethan country house entertainments did not mention their writers but instead presented themselves as gifts poured directly from their hosts' hearts to the Queen. Each performance also showed off the host family's patronage of professional and amateur actors. Hosts sometimes employed traveling companies – the pageantry at Kenilworth and at Elvetham in Hampshire probably featured the hosts' own companies of players – and other times patched together casts of individual performers.[16] Elite members of the household regularly acted in entertainments. They sought political reward rather than payment, while professional actors and lower-ranking amateur performers from neighboring towns could receive monetary compensation from Elizabeth.[17] Some questions remain impossible to answer with certainty, including who assigned roles, selected costumes, and directed rehearsals.[18]

Country house performances were as interactive as they were collaboratively prepared. Because Elizabeth walked with performers and spectators more often than she sat apart from or above the action, she mingled with subjects on their level and at their homes. She and other audience members were not passive spectators; they interacted, responded, and moved in ways that shaped the performance. A single entertainment produced numerous meanings for multiple audiences. Because the lowest ranking guests were excluded from indoor areas, banquets, and certain gated outdoor spaces, they experienced the performance differently from those with

[15] Davies to Robert Cecil, Hatfield House Archives, Cecil Papers, 90/69. Qtd. in Heaton, *Writing and Reading*, 101.

[16] We lack direct evidence that Leicester's Men performed at Kenilworth or that Hertford's Men performed at Elvetham, but there is also no evidence that either company was elsewhere during these performances. See E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), 1:88–9, 1:117; Sally-Beth MacLean, "Tracking Leicester's Men: The Patronage of a Performance Troupe" in Paul Whitfield White and Suzanne R. Westfall, eds., *Shakespeare and Theatrical Patronage in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), 263–4; MacLean, "Adult Playing Companies, 1583–1593" in Richard Dutton, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 49.

[17] Printed accounts of the Kenilworth and Elvetham entertainments reveal that Elizabeth gave actors money for their performances. *A Letter Whearin Part of the Entertainment vntoo the Queenz Maiesty at Killingwoorth Castl in Warwik Sheer in this Soomerz Progress 1575 is Signified* (London, n.d.; *STC* 15190.5), sig. E4v; *The Honorable Entertainement Gieuen to the Queenes Maiestie in Progresse, at Eluetham in Hampshire by the Right Honorable the Earle of Hertford. 1591* (London, 1591; *STC* 7583), sig. D2r.

[18] Only one record mentions rehearsal; it describes an unperformed pageant as "being prepared and redy (euery Actor in his garment) two or three dayes together." "A Briefe Rehearsall, or Rather a True Copie of as Much as Was Presented before Her Maiesties at Kenelworth" in *The VVhole Woorkes of George Gascoigne Esquyre* (London, 1587; *STC* 11638), sig. C2v.

greater access and proximity to the Queen. Likewise, audience members might interpret the same pageant differently, depending on their education, gender, social rank, and the "horizon of cultural and ideological expectations" they brought to the performance.[19]

To please their most demanding and powerful guest, devisers carefully choreographed nearly all aspects of an entertainment. When Elizabeth hunted, deer appeared in her sightline.[20] When she stayed overnight, she often slept in newly built or renovated apartments. When she ate, she enjoyed exquisite banquets. When she walked or rode into new spaces, she encountered pageants and music. But devisers' carefully laid plans often needed to be altered at the last minute in response to two sources of unpredictability: the weather and the Queen. Parts of several entertainments were canceled or postponed owing to wet conditions, and the Harefield entertainment included an entire pageant about the nuisance of persistent rain. The comments and corrections of the vocal guest of honor also affected the content of pageantry, and even more uncertain was whether and when she would arrive. Her gests often show multiple possible paths because court business, infections, food shortages, fears about her security, and her own changing preferences could all alter the plan, and several letters complain about the frustrating lack of "certayntie" about her progresses.[21] Hosts, writers, and performers prepared as well as they could, improvised when needed, and hoped in all cases to present themselves as accommodating and clever.

The genre's defining elements – its provincial landscape setting, episodic and mobile structure, characters and tropes from courtly and popular literature, collaborative authorship, and interactive and somewhat improvised performance – combined to enable public negotiations among senior courtiers and Elizabeth. With the exception of Woodstock, a royal residence, the genre's performance sites were estates managed by aristocrats but officially owned by the monarch. This space, together with the interaction central to the genre, offered heightened opportunities for shared and contested authority. During a country house entertainment, Elizabeth was more accessible than usual, and her hosts took advantage of these

[19] Susan Bennett, *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 1990), 107.

[20] In *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study* (Cambridge University Press, 2001), Edward Berry notes that Elizabeth's progress hosts often used either bow-and-stable hunting, where they brought deer before Elizabeth, or coursing, a spectator sport (1–37). Both were carefully arranged in advance to ensure success in hunting.

[21] I quote from Gilbert Talbot's letter to Shrewsbury on July 6, 1576, LPL, Manuscript 3197, f. 157. For an example of a gest with multiple paths, see BL, Lansdowne Manuscript 19.

circumstances to advance their own ambitions and to negotiate the roles of monarch and advisor, of region and nation, and of men and women. These political negotiations were rooted in personal relationships and goals. Elizabeth sought pleasure, productive alliances with her elite subjects, and the opportunity to monitor and solicit her subjects' obedience. Likewise, her hosts sought enhanced status, court positions or successful marriages for their children, and heightened influence over policy-making. As entertainments questioned policies and proposed new ones, they offered advice about how Elizabeth might best manage the poor, Catholic recusants, her advisors, foreign policy, and especially her gender.

Setting the Type: Defining Country House Entertainment in Print

Devisers and audience members recorded aspects of these ephemeral performances in printed and manuscript texts. These texts allow us to access the genre in performance, but they also carried new agendas. Of the seventeen entertainments I have identified, nine survive as printed books, five as manuscripts, and three in both forms (see Appendix 1). Elizabethans shared manuscript texts of country house pageantry either as separates, which letter-writers enclosed in correspondence for those who could not attend, or as small pamphlets that served as keepsakes for the hosting family or Elizabeth. In both formats, manuscript copies include pageantry dialogue but few to no narrative descriptions of the actors' movements or audiences' responses. Gabriel Heaton has analyzed the manuscript circulation of various kinds of Elizabethan pageantry at length.[22] *The Elizabethan Country House Entertainment* focuses on the less studied printed texts, which brought country house entertainments to wider audiences and which reveal how contemporary publishers and later readers encountered and exploited the genre.

These printed accounts appeared as pamphlets, in poetry anthologies, and as part of authorial collections. All formats mixed narrative description with pageantry dialogue. Some examples include only a short header declaring the performance occasion and focus on literary devices, while others offer detailed narration of the event's sights and sounds. In print the genre retained several of its defining features, including central tropes, collaborative authorship, and a fragmented structure. The miscellanies that print fragments of entertainments reveal that the genre was an excellent example of *genera mixta* because it derived from several other literary

[22] Heaton, *Writing and Reading*, 1–116. He discusses some printed pamphlets but does so briefly (93–100).

kinds – pastoral lyric, encomia, dramatic comedy, songs, and eclogues – but carried its own unique combination of elements and utilities.[23] Scholarship on Elizabethan pageantry still tends to treat these texts mostly as windows onto the performances they describe, but readers experienced printed country house entertainment differently from those who saw the performances.[24] The contributions of eyewitnesses, scribes, editors, and publishers altered an entertainment's meaning, and printed accounts removed the pageantry from its original location and hosts' individual concerns to place it in new contexts. Sometimes a narrator's prose even instructs readers how to interpret aspects of the pageantry. Because the printed records involved new devisers and reached even more diverse audiences, they carried new functions.

Contrary to popular assumption, the Crown did not commission these texts as official propaganda. There is no evidence that the Queen, her advisors, or her royal printer had a hand in any of the publications I examine.[25] Instead, publishers – the lead "devisers" of printed entertainments – invested money in their production because they identified existing markets for them. Entertainment hosts might have occasionally helped finance these publications in order to advertise widely their own wealth and status, but even the books that might have been subsidized by hosts show evidence of their publishers' involvement and aims. In this way, printed country house entertainment differs from several other kinds of Elizabethan pageantry. Printed Lord Mayors' shows, for example, were financed by companies and printed hastily on demand, but publishers identified country house entertainment as attractive to wider audiences.[26]

[23] Colie identifies *genera mixta* as typical of many Renaissance works in *Resources of Kind*, esp. 76–102.

[24] The few scholars who have considered certain Elizabethan entertainment texts (especially those about Kenilworth) as unique rhetorical projects include Heaton, *Writing and Reading*, 1–116; Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 111–67; Elizabeth Goldring, "'A mercer ye wot az we be': The Authorship of the Kenilworth *Letter* Reconsidered" in *English Literary Renaissance* 38.2 (2008): 245–69; and Sandra Logan, *Text/Events in Early Modern England: Poetics of History* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 93–183.

[25] Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly identifies Continental festival books as official, usually commissioned accounts of pageantry in "The Early Modern Festival Book: Function and Form" in J. R. Mulryne, Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, and Margaret Shewring, eds., *Europa Triumphans: Court and Civic Festivals in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 1:3–18. Several scholars have assumed the same is true in England. See, e.g., Axel Stahler, "Imagining the Illusive/Elusive? Printed Accounts of Elizabethan Festivals" in Christa Jansohn, ed., *Queen Elizabeth I: Past and Present* (Munster: Lit Verlag, 2004), 65–7; Jean Wilson, *Entertainments for Elizabeth I* (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980), 10. Heaton determines in *Writing and Reading*, as I have, that this was not the case in England (96–100).

[26] Tracey Hill is probably right to speculate that printed Lord Mayors' shows served as programs or souvenirs because their lack of narrative detail implies a knowing audience familiar with their performances. Hill, *Pageantry and Power: A Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585–1639* (Manchester University Press, 2011), 220, 232–3.

Furthermore, unlike some Continental festival books that were published in advance to be distributed at performances, Elizabethan country house entertainments were printed after the performances they describe.[27] The only example included in the Stationers' Register was the Elvetham pamphlet, which John Wolfe entered on October 1, 1591, shortly after the late September performance.[28] Elizabethan entertainment pamphlets typically offer titles that indicate past action, such as *Speeches Delivered to Her Maiestie This Last Progresse* (1592), refer to weather conditions and other occurrences that could not have been predicted, and describe audience reactions.

Drawing on evidence of early readers and owners, I demonstrate that printed country house entertainments served many functions for multiple audiences: they were collected as part of an emerging national literature, helped define regional culture, offered court gossip to the elite insider, functioned as news for the common reader, and were sometimes treated as literary works that helped define authorial identity. Printed entertainments tended to highlight the genre's negotiations of regional and national identities – a feature present in performance but accentuated in the printed texts. Entertainments used the words "nation," "country," "empire," and "English" – all unstable concepts in the Elizabethan period. As these terms merged discourses of localism, royal loyalty, and emerging nationalism, the genre debated to what extent England should be defined by and centered on its monarch.[29]

The Emergence and Development of Country House Entertainment

Like other genres, country house entertainment developed gradually and evolved over time, and although it shared certain features with earlier, adjacent, and later genres, there was nothing else exactly like it. It grew

[27] Watanabe-O'Kelly, "Early Modern Festival Book," 1:9.

[28] *Stationers' Register: A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640, A.D.*, ed. Edward Arber (1875; reprint, New York: Smith, 1950), 2:596. Because no entries survive from 1571 to July 1576, we do not know whether anyone entered texts about the 1570s entertainments at Theobalds, Kenilworth, or Woodstock.

[29] Country house entertainment underscores that Elizabethans did not consistently differentiate between the state (royal authority) and the nation (the people and the land) and supports Andrew Hadfield's claim that various conceptions of the nation coexisted in this period. Building on studies by Hadfield, Richard Helgerson, Claire McEachern, and other literary scholars who identify the beginnings of a national rhetoric in Tudor England, this book treats Elizabethan royal patriotism as a kind of early nationalism. Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), esp. 1–3; Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (University of Chicago Press, 1992); Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590–1612* (Cambridge University Press, 1996).