

JOSÉ IGOR PRIETO-ARRANZ

WHIGGISH HISTORY FOR CONTEMPORARY AUDIENCES
IMPLICIT RELIGION IN SHEKHAR KAPUR'S *ELIZABETH* AND
ELIZABETH: THE GOLDEN AGE

José Igor Prieto-Arranz

University of the Balearic Islands, Palma de Mallorca, Spain.

Email: jose-igor.prieto@uib.eu

Abstract: As James Chapman has famously put it in *National Identity and the British Historical Film*, historical films are “as much about the present in which they are made as they are about [the] past in which they are set.” This article discusses Shekhar Kapur’s aesthetically ground-breaking *Elizabeth* (1998) and its sequel *Elizabeth: The Golden Age* (2007) focusing on two main aspects, namely national identity issues and the representation of the enemy.

Kapur’s *Elizabeth* films will first be placed within the larger context of Elizabeth’s film and television appearances. Informed by Giroux’s critical methodology guidelines, in an attempt to “historize” the films under scrutiny and so foster “sane historical sense,” a semiotic analysis will then be offered. Largely inspired by the tenets of Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis and Kress and Leeuwen’s visual grammar, this will draw a parallel between the verbal and visual discourses in both films. Data will finally be discussed and the contention will be made that England’s (and even Britain’s) religious heritage has left indelible traces which remain latent in the English imagination, for which historical evidence will be presented.

The article’s ultimate aim will be to provide evidence suggesting that, in the English case, religious and national discourses merged from the late 16th century onwards, clearly influencing not only the perception that the English had of themselves but also and crucially the image they may still have of “Other” nations.

Key Words: Elizabeth I, historical film, implicit religion, national identity, otherness, Shekhar Kapur, Spain

Introduction

In a rather poignant way, Levin starts her review of Shekhar Kapur's *Elizabeth* (E, 1998) by comparing it to Kenneth Brannagh's *Henry V* and claiming the following: "*Henry V* works as both modern film and historical drama. *Elizabeth*, all too often, does not."¹ Levin's status as a historian brings to mind the difficult relations between the fields of film and history. As Chapman has aptly put it, "[t]he points of contention between historians and filmmakers often focus on the most pedantic details and the exchanges can be highly amusing [...], those feature films that challenge received wisdoms about the past [...] com[ing] in for the most severe criticism."² Indeed, from the standpoint of film studies, historians are widely perceived to be obsessed with "the accuracy of historical films in dealing with [the past in which they are set]."³

In this light, it is hardly surprising that Kapur's historically inaccurate production (see below) should have been the target of historians' diatribes. Yet, and irrespective of what historians might say on the matter, audiences worldwide may quite easily regard Shekhar Kapur's otherwise genre-defying⁴ *E* and its sequel *Elizabeth: The Golden Age* (TGA, 2007) primarily as historical films since not only are they "based, however loosely, on actual historical events or real historical persons" but they also rely on "historical verisimilitude,"⁵ which consists in "appear[ing] to [engage with historical issues] in a factual manner."⁶

What makes historical films interesting is that these are "as much about the present in which they are made as they are about [the] past in which they are set."⁷ In the light of this, this article will discuss Kapur's *Elizabeth* films following Giroux "critical methodology"⁸ guidelines, thus relating both films to not quite so much English or British history but "popular memory," national identity and their connection with "implicit religion."⁹ Thus, and considering the fact that audiences in much of the Western world "can justify their personal pursuit of spiritual satisfaction outside the walls of a religious institution,"¹⁰ the present article aims at making a contribution to the expanding yet still recent body of scholarship analysing the relationship between film and religion.¹¹

The growth of this field is hardly surprising. After all, the appeal and power of its visual component provides film with a potential to influence audiences which other media lack.¹² The study of film and religion is made to look even more natural by Wright, for whom "religion, like film, is in part an aesthetic discourse [...]. "[R]eligion is (amongst other things) a narrative-producing mechanism, and in this respect can be likened to both literature and the cinema."¹³

The growth of the field has also been linked to the rise of interdisciplinary approaches favoured by "new" branches of academic knowledge like cultural studies.¹⁴ There are even those that claim that religion

studies have taken a “cultural turn,”¹⁵ while film studies have most definitely also been affected by cultural studies. More specifically, the study of film developed under the umbrella of cultural studies no longer focuses on the analysis of the film text per se but also brings in two more variables: context (the circumstances surrounding the creation of the text) and audience (including the potential effect of the text on those that consume it).¹⁶

Inspired by cultural studies, my standpoint will differ from that of historians in that I shall not focus exclusively on “the accuracy of [these] historical films in dealing with early-modern Britain.”¹⁷ Yet this representation of the past remains important. As stated above, a characteristic of historical films as a genre is historical verisimilitude and, as a consequence, audiences “expect [them] to be accurate;”¹⁸ what is more important, historical films, unlike other media genres,¹⁹ do not commonly address historical theory issues, and yet remain “the primary medium by which people learn about the past.”²⁰

Thus, this article will first highlight the cultural relevance of Elizabeth I of England as a character in film, before providing an analysis of Kapur’s *E* and *TGA*. As will be seen in the discussion, this analysis points not to the historical figure but to the myth (or highly mediated image of) Elizabeth as the source of inspiration in both films, a choice with clear ideological implications which belie Kapur’s seemingly innovative visual approach.

Indeed, Elizabeth was an image-conscious queen that cultivated a highly recognisable “stage persona” (Deborah and Judith to “Protestant hopefuls”, Astraea, Gloriana, and, perhaps most notably, the Virgin Queen, among other incarnations) not only out of personal vanity but also and primarily out of “shrewd politics.”²¹ Elizabeth I’s mythic status has long been both an officially and popularly sanctioned fact that is continually reproduced in official and popular histories alike across a range of media.

As will be seen below, even if Elizabeth’s death did not occur at the peak of her popularity (an economic crisis, revolts, corruption scandals and even the work of some critical writers had somehow tarnished her aura), it can be safely stated that, largely thanks to the mythic status that she had cultivated during her reign, Elizabeth died a beloved queen. Yet the lacklustre nature of her successors, especially James I, crucially contributed to the magnification of her legend. She thus became “Good Queen Bess,” a myth that would be cultivated even further in the 19th century at the time of British imperial expansion.²²

Today, thanks to film and TV representations of her, Elizabeth seems to have the same heroic resonance. Equally important is the positive (almost hagiographical) view of the last of the Tudor monarchs. Indeed, after William Camden’s “strange chronicles” of the Elizabethan period, which were probably designed to help consolidate the figure of the never-too-popular James I,²³ came Camden’s English translators (Camden had

written in Latin) and “popularising” writers like Thomas Heywood. This set the trend for what Rushton (2001) would call the “Whiggish” version of English history, which invariably sides with Protestantism (and therefore the later Tudors) against Catholicism, and thanks to which Elizabeth came to be constituted as a “Protestant paragon” and a “national heroine.”²⁴ This, however, started during Elizabeth’s reign, since it is now clear that the episode of the Spanish Armada was to become central to her iconography, undoubtedly because this consolidated the Protestant Church of England and, most importantly, effectively linked religion and Englishness for forthcoming generations.

Such was the interest created around her figure that Collinson calculates that over 100 biographies of the Queen were published between 1890 and November 2002 alone.²⁵ Most of these use the laudatory tone mentioned above, thus consolidating the myth of good Queen Bess.

British Royal Appearances on Film: Elizabeth Tudor

According to Hackett, the myth persists that Elizabeth I was “one of the greatest rulers of all time,” somehow metonymic of the “pre-eminence of the British nation.”²⁶ Interestingly, although originally an English, (later British) myth, it has since been adopted by the United States. This is no trivial fact, given the country’s leading position as an exporter of popular culture. Hackett explores how the paths have crossed for two mythic English giants, namely Elizabeth I and William Shakespeare (also internationally adopted by the international English-speaking world as their own), analysing a wide range of materials starting in the 18th century, and culminating with 20th century fiction, and drama, film and TV productions from both sides of the Atlantic. These continue to secure Elizabeth’s mythic status. While each seems to present a slightly different Elizabeth, all these versions maintain the hagiographic tone and, if they do relate the figure of Elizabeth to their moment of production, this can only help to consolidate Elizabeth’s heroic aura across time.

Elizabeth I is by far the British monarch that has most often been portrayed on stage, film or television. Her cinematic legacy has transcended the borders of Europe and translates as at least around two dozen films and just as many television productions, not to mention a wealth of other cultural materials including literary and musical works, stage plays and, most recently, videogames.

This prominence within the film and television medium needs to be considered within the wider framework of Tudor portrayals, which are again the most numerous among British royal appearances on film regardless of their actual historical achievements.²⁷ This suggests that the English 16th century occupies a special position in the English and even British imagiNation since “the British nation-state has been organized

symbolically by the ethnic codes of its core internal nation – of England [...].”²⁸ The special relevance of the mock-Tudor(bethan) style²⁹ in British “cultural geography”³⁰ further strengthens this argument and certainly goes a long way towards accounting for Elizabeth’s numerous film and television portrayals. A detailed account of the dates in which this queen has been systematically resurrected is well beyond the scope of this article³¹ but the fact that Elizabeth has appeared in at least four films,³² one stage play³³ and an astonishing seven television serials³⁴ in the last two decades alone serves to contextualise the cultural significance of the character around which the two films under analysis here gravitate. Again, all this seems to point to a mysterious yet unavoidable link between heritage cinema (perhaps most especially historical films) and national identity, the former serving to disseminate discourses for the latter.³⁵ This observation, which in turn highlights an under-researched field,³⁶ will indeed inform most of the discussion below.

Kapur’s *Elizabeth* (1998) and *Elizabeth: The Golden Age* (2007)

As stated above, the analysis of the films under study and the subsequent discussion will be very much inspired by cultural studies, an interdisciplinary field of knowledge which, through the study of all kinds of cultural materials and practices, aims at analysing the complex ways in which meaning and identity are constructed and circulated.³⁷ Thus, attention will first be paid to representation in the texts themselves, for which a semiotic analysis will be offered. This will be largely informed by Kress and Leeuwen’s *Grammar of Visual Design*,³⁸ originally developed to complement Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis.³⁹ Finally, this representation will also be “historised”, considering not only the context surrounding the production of both films but also the historical sources that seem to have inspired the films’ visuals and script.

Elizabeth (1998), the first English-language film by Indian-born Shekhar Kapur, was well received among cinema critics (not so much so by historians) and did remarkably well at the box office.⁴⁰ On his website⁴¹ Kapur claims to have been talked into making the film once he sensed the potential liberation of approaching the subject free from the conventions that the historical movie genre had developed in Britain, adding that his Indian roots played a substantial role in the filming of *E*, especially through the use of colour and melodrama. Indeed, his Indian origin was not lost on critics, who have still recently referred to *E* as a “startlingly stylish, post-colonial, Bollywood-inspired biopic of the Virgin Queen”⁴² with “remarkable cultural confidence and visual power.”⁴³

The film’s postcolonial stance may well lie in the fact that Australians were cast to play some of the main roles (including Elizabeth herself, played by Cate Blanchett, and Walsingham, played by Geoffrey Rush). *E*

went on to receive many international awards, and became a pivotal moment in the career of both its director and lead actress. For its part, *TGA*, which was twice as expensive to produce, did not match the critical and commercial success of its predecessor.⁴⁴ However, several years after its release, it has been screened on numerous television networks worldwide, and has therefore reached a global audience. In principle, both films will be the first two instalments of a planned trilogy.

It has been noted that the script, by Michael Hirst, clearly involved substantial research;⁴⁵ a view Kapur himself backs on his website. Accordingly, all deviations from historical fact may be safely assumed to have been made on purpose. These have been duly exposed in the literature. By way of example, *E* compresses events that took place in a 20-year period to fit a mere few years immediately before and after Elizabeth's succession to the throne.⁴⁶ What the audiences will surely remember most about *E* is that Kapur depicts the young Elizabeth Tudor as a ruler in constant peril whose only chance of survival lies in her unwillingly yet ruthlessly eliminating her many enemies (and this includes the fictional assassination of Mary of Guise at the hands of Francis Walsingham). But she is also presented as "a highly sexualised and sexually active queen"⁴⁷ when there is no recorded evidence that Elizabeth did not die a virgin. This might be in tune with what critics have seen as the director's postcolonial, slightly irreverent approach to his subject matter. Perhaps more importantly, this also stands in stark contrast to the constructed nature of her Virgin Queen persona, to great dramatic effect.

As for *TGA*, set in the years immediately before and after the Spanish Armada episode (1588), it differs substantially from *E* in that action is far less compressed. Indeed, Kapur himself has made it clear on his website that his approach here was quite different. As a result, the film does provide stunning visuals but far less sense of action. Yet, historians have been quick to point out Kapur's inaccuracies in this second portrayal of Elizabeth. These,⁴⁸ however, are again expectable since they serve to maximise either romantic or dramatic tension without substantially distorting what audiences know about such past times. It is precisely for this reason that such artistic liberties are not particularly relevant. There are others, however, which are far more intriguing.

What both *E* and *TGA* ultimately offer is a collection of images of "Merrie London," metonymic for "Merrie England," with "no paupers lying half-dead in the street."⁴⁹ This is especially relevant in *TGA*, which already enters the 1590s, a decade that was clearly marked by an overwhelming loss of confidence, and a severe agricultural and economic crisis.⁵⁰

This may be taken as indication that Kapur's apparently irreverent, postcolonial approach to Elizabeth and her reign may actually belie a far more traditional, conservative stance. Indeed, it will be my contention here that both *E* and *TGA* are nothing but two of the latest instalments of a

long textual tradition that largely stands for the so-called “Whiggish” version of English history,⁵¹ presenting Elizabeth as a “Protestant paragon” and a “national heroine.”⁵²

Indeed, Kapur’s Elizabeth films are very much about the opposition between Catholicism and Protestantism. Yet this is not a fight between equals. The semiotic analysis that follows aims at demonstrating that the narrative in both *E* and *TGA* is clearly partial, siding with (liberty-loving, rational, tolerant, Church of England) Protestantism at the expense of (tyrannical, irrational, bigoted, foreign) Catholicism. This is shown both verbally and, especially, non-verbally, mainly through the use of colour and light.

The anti-Catholic stance detected in Kapur’s Elizabeth films might not come as a complete surprise to international audiences. Indeed, Anti-Catholicism was also inherited by mainstream US culture, and this had its impact on film. Early representations of the Catholic religion like *Intolerance* (D. W. Griffith, 1916) still found it difficult not to associate some typically Catholic rituals like kneeling before images of the Virgin Mary to “ritualism and sexual repression.”⁵³ Even though US cinema has made an effort since the 1940s to assimilate Catholicism to mainstream US culture, Catholic ritualism has remained present with negative connotations in more recent productions, like *The Exorcist* saga.⁵⁴

E and *TGA* present a parallel structure, both opening with a syncretic (i.e. multimodal) sequence in which verballity prevails against a background of dramatic images. The opening is highly relevant in that it clearly sets up the discursive framework required for the audience to interpret the film, undoubtedly contributing to the construction of historical verisimilitude. In *E*, the audience is provided with the following message: “England 1554 / Henry VIII is dead / The country is divided / Catholic against Protestant / Henry’s eldest daughter Mary / A fervant [sic] Catholic is Queen / She is childless / The Catholics’ greatest fear is the succession of Mary’s Protestant halfsister / Elizabeth.” Worth commenting on here is not only the obvious deletion of Edward VI, Henry VIII’s only son, who actually succeeded his father on the throne, but the high modality used in this message, as seen through the systematic use of unhedged copulative constructions which clearly express affinity with the proposition or contents of the message.⁵⁵ This illusion of objectivity, characteristic of historical discourse, is strengthened by means of the supporting images. Apart from the highly symbolic use of colour red and crosses, already pointing to suffering and religion-based bloodshed, the audience also visualises historical characters as these are being verbally introduced. Not coincidentally, such images have not been especially devised for the film but are, on the contrary, visibly based on well-known portraits frequently featured in history textbooks, which further reinforces verisimilitude.⁵⁶

In the particular case of *TGA*, the technique used is similar yet even more sophisticated. Against a verbal message phrased with equally high modality (“1585 / Spain is the most powerful empire in the world / Philip of Spain, a devout Catholic / has plunged Europe into holy war / Only England stands against him / ruled by a Protestant queen”), images once again appear. However, this time such images have indeed been specifically designed for the film, and so the visual representations of the two historical characters who are being introduced — Philip of Spain and Elizabeth of England — are clearly based on the likenesses of the actor and actress that play such roles in the film, namely Jordi Mollà and Cate Blanchett, respectively. However, such images are clearly styled as if they were stained glass, which once again seems to sanction this message with the authority of historical objectivity. It can be therefore claimed that the introductory visual strategies used in both *E* and *TGA* signify high modality and thus perfectly complement the verbal message.

This opening is then followed in both films by a first scene exposing what is presented as the Catholic / Spanish threat. In *E* this is a hyper-realistic portrayal of the infamous Marian burnings in *E*, wrongly contextualised in 1554, featuring both close shots of the heads of the victims being savagely shaved prior to their execution, and characteristic and tremendously effective crane shots of the burning itself which makes viewers almost feel the smoke. And then there also are the people witnessing the execution, clearly sympathising with the executed, their faces expressing anguish, fear, horror and disgust. It must be remembered, however, that Catholicism was still the religion of the majority and that Queen Mary enjoyed immense popularity in the early stages of her reign.⁵⁷

In *TGA*, the gloomy figure of Philip II of Spain is first seen approaching his infant daughter Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia (although she was already an adult in 1585) and boastfully claiming that “God has spoken to [him]”. In a similar vein, whilst exterior shots were truly filmed at the Escorial, the church interior shown here was actually filmed at London’s neo-Byzantine Catholic Westminster Cathedral.⁵⁸ The choice cannot have been coincidental, since this a strategy that clearly serves to orientalise and ultimately “other” Philip and all that he stands for.

Both films then develop along rather similar lines, with plots revolving around one central issue: the fight between good and evil, virtue and corruption, England and the foreign world, Elizabeth and Mary (in *E*) or Philip (in *TGA*). This is largely achieved visually. Grotesque Mary’s gloomy palace (Durham Cathedral) helps to create an overwhelmingly oppressive, suffocating atmosphere for the Marian court. Spaniards invariably cover their dark flesh in threatening black. Oppression and darkness dominate the grand Escorial interiors, while Philip’s church is orientalisised with Byzantine features and dense incense smoke. Always dressed in black, rosary beads in his hands, Jordi Mollà’s performance as Philip II can only be taken as a degrading caricature. Young Mollà’s creaky little

voice and walking antics succeed in turning what should have been the portrayal of an old-age man into an utterly ridiculous human being. Very much like Philip, Elizabeth is played by a much younger Cate Blanchett although this serves the opposite purpose, creating a sense of majesty and godliness clearly borrowed from the white mask of youth used in her official iconography⁵⁹ (see below).

On the other hand, colour and light are always present around Elizabeth, clearly pointing to life, passion and utter joy: Elizabeth's palace interiors in *TGA* were no longer shot in Durham but in Ely Cathedral, its light and spacious Lady Chapel serving as Elizabeth's presence chamber.⁶⁰ Even more interesting is the films' use of light, invariably signalling reason, purity, tolerance and divine protection.⁶¹ This is clearly seen in *E*'s proclamation, coronation, and Reformation Bill Parliament scenes,⁶² as well as the scene in *TGA* in which Elizabeth survives the Babington plot unharmed.

After similar climaxes (the crushing of Norfolk's rebellion in *E*, the defeat of the Armada in *TGA*), both films feature similar endings. In *E*, a transfigured Elizabeth emerges in her throne room as Gloriana as she solemnly says: "[...] I have become a virgin" — clearly pointing to the constructed nature of her virginity but also to the ultimate sacrifice she is making — "[...] I am married to England." Interestingly, Cate Blanchett's characterisation for this scene is clearly inspired by Gower's depiction of the Queen in his instantly recognisable Armada Portrait (1588), which may be seen to further sanction the discourse of *E* with the authority of historical objectivity. This is by no means an exceptional resource, as the coronation scene clearly borrows on the depiction of Elizabeth in her Coronation Portrait (c. 1600, copying a c. 1559 original).

In *TGA*, the Armada fiasco is largely portrayed as an army of crosses and rosaries drowning in the sea, out of which a mystically transfigured, statuesque Elizabeth emerges victorious. Her transfixed expression, open hands and aura inevitably remind the viewer of Catholic iconography, a glimpse of which is offered in the (entirely fictional) scene in which Elizabeth survives the failed Babington plot. Equally relevant is the fact that the visual representation of the virginal Elizabeth here seems to evoke her well-known "Procession" picture. This leads on to her last image in *TGA*, which is clearly reminiscent of the famous "Rainbow" Portrait generally attributed to Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (c. 1600-1603).⁶³ It can therefore be claimed that both *E* and *TGA* culminate with the use of similar visual strategies, arguably with a similar aim (more on this below).⁶⁴ The cult of the Virgin Mary is replaced by the cult of Gloriana, and Kapur contributes to making this cult relevant in the 21st century.

Discussion: Kapur's Mediated Elizabeth

Kapur's films may certainly add something new in presenting a far more sexual and therefore humanised Elizabeth so that the contrast with her Virgin Queen persona, always present in the Elizabeth film tradition,⁶⁵ is all the more effective. Undoubtedly, Kapur deals with this sub-theme, sexuality, far more explicitly than, say, Koster's 1955 *The Virgin Queen*, and this may be related to his penchant for unconventional hero(in)ic figures – Kapur's *Bandit Queen* (1994) had been based on the story of the ill-fated outlaw-come-politician Phoolan Devi.⁶⁶ What is more, Kapur may have drawn on *Bandit Queen* for inspiration as regards the identification of the female and the divine.⁶⁷ One of the main themes in *E* is the Queen's transformation into the Virgin Queen (Malone uses the term “angelized” to refer to his portrayal).⁶⁸ In *TGA*, this transformation is complete, momentarily questioned by Elizabeth herself when facing the uncertain outcome of the battle with Spain (who does God side with?) and finally restored after England's victory.

The unconventionality of the subjects Kapur chooses to explore may be further clarified in connection with the issue of the late Diana, Princess of Wales. Indeed, *E* was released the year after Diana's death, and critics were quick to see it as “the story of how a Diana Spencer ingénue can turn into a media-manipulating Margaret Thatcher.”⁶⁹ As Chapman suggests, it may indeed not be too fanciful at all to read Kapur's homage to the Virgin Queen as a piece of work encoded to honour the memory of Diana. This is a view endorsed by Collinson⁷⁰ and, in fact, Kapur himself has explicitly mentioned Diana as a source of inspiration, although more clearly in connection with *TGA*, *E* being, once again according to Kapur, inspired by the figure of Indira Gandhi.⁷¹

Even more importantly, it has been claimed that Kapur's Elizabeth films somehow capture the essence of the time they reproduce, in line with the latest historical research on the period.⁷² Caution is, however, required here, since Elizabeth is not simply one more historical character but an “icon of affinity”⁷³ whose importance remains unchallenged in the “cultural public sphere.”⁷⁴ Elizabeth, therefore, can be analysed as an iconic sign, paying special attention to both the images she sought to convey in her lifetime and those disseminated long after her demise. In fact, the main contention in the discussion below is that Kapur's apparently novel, almost irreverent portrayal of Elizabeth is, however, firmly rooted both in official propaganda sanctioned by the queen herself and later “resurrections” that cemented her position as a national heroine.

As suggested above, there is no doubt that the mythical image of Good Queen Bess, Gloriana or the Virgin Queen was born during her own reign.⁷⁵ Elizabeth's must be one of the earliest recorded cases of mediated imagery, largely helped by the introduction of the printing press and the

work of official or de facto court painters, whose portraits would eventually be copied and lead to countless other royal images distributed all across the country. Verbality, however, also played a role in the dissemination of the royal image,⁷⁶ especially through poetic and musical vehicles⁷⁷ which the Queen herself aimed to control.⁷⁸

But it was precisely her portraiture that contributed most effectively to her becoming a living myth, as Strong⁷⁹ has most extensively researched. Paralleling her iconicity in poetry and ballads, Elizabeth's portraiture does not become unique until around 1579, especially after the widespread reaction against the Anjou marriage plans. It then became increasingly evident that the Queen would never marry, and that confrontation with Spain would be inevitable. It was precisely around that time that Elizabeth's portraiture, with examples such as the Sieve portraits, developed its most recognisable features. Among these, the sophisticated symbolism linking the Queen's virginity to the country's stability and, ultimately, imperial claims deserves special mention. Remaining unmarried, Elizabeth not only rejected royal convention but, most importantly, flouted her own royal duty. As a woman, she was expected to marry and obey her husband. As a queen, she was expected to produce an heir. If up to 1579 it had been widely thought that the unstable situation of an heirless queen regarded as a heretic by Catholic Europe could only be solved by the Queen's marrying, the court now fired back by emphasising the Queen's virginity, making it clear to everyone that a foreign marriage would only have made England dependent on either Spain or France. In other words, what was extraordinary about her official portraiture (controlled and sanctioned by her) is that it somehow succeeded in presenting the setback of the Queen's single status (and the associated instability and uncertainty this could bring about) as a virtue the very existence of her realm had come to depend on.

Elizabeth's portraiture was also characterised by the frequent re-use of the queen's face pattern, which is itself good evidence of how appropriate it is to see Elizabeth's portraiture as a forerunner to the mass media: a youthful, two-dimensional face mask would be approved by the monarch and then distributed to several workshops which would re-use it against different backgrounds and with different clothes. The evidence available automatically places Elizabeth as a ruler with a powerful media-conscious mind. It is in this light that her later portraiture should be interpreted, including Hilliard's popular miniatures and, ultimately, the famous Ermine, Armada, Ditchley and Rainbow portraits, all of them contributing to the worship of the Virgin Queen, and many of these having in fact propped the visuals in Kapur's Elizabeth films.

Indeed, many of these pictorial works have directly inspired the visual representation of Elizabeth in both *E* and *TGA*, thereby somehow appropriating or even updating the queen's powerful symbolism as a virgin for contemporary audiences. Arguably, the features of Elizabeth's

official portraiture are even more applicable in the case of the latter film, which portrays a 50-plus-year-old queen as someone who has not aged a day if compared to the early Elizabeth in *E*. The updated message may well lie in the cunning, morally-doubtful way the character has of wading through political opposition, which somehow echoes the likes of Indira Gandhi (cited by Kapur himself as a source of inspiration for *E*) and, more recently, Diana, Princess of Wales (which, as seen above, has been noted by critics). Indeed, both Indira Gandhi and Diana may be seen to have manipulated the media so as to secure a positive public image. And it is worth highlighting that “purity, innocence and sainthood were undoubtedly the main features characterising Diana’s public image during her early years as a public figure, and even if her image would later develop, such discourse would never leave her altogether,”⁸⁰ not even after her marriage, maternity or , perhaps most importantly, extra-marital affairs and eventual divorce. The figure of Diana being still very much present for Kapur’s audiences, the portrayal of Elizabeth in both *E* and *TGA* as a highly sexualised woman and definitely not a virgin (having consummated his relationship with Robert Dudley) does not really tarnish her semi-divine aura. On the contrary, it may be seen to humanise her, bringing her closer to late 20th and 21st-century audience sensibilities, and presenting her “performed” virginity as a metaphor of the sacrifice she is making for her country.

Thus seen, Kapur’s filmic character of Elizabeth is effective. Probably, just as effective as official Elizabethan propaganda proved to be: in terms of religion and allegiance to the Queen, Catholics were still numerous in the 1560s⁸¹ but this soon began to change: only about one third of the population remained Catholic in the middle years of Elizabeth’s reign.⁸²

It is quite clear that, among other factors,⁸³ the Armada episode proved crucial in the consolidation of a Protestant English identity. The surprising English victory left the country with a sense of tremendous achievement and hope for the future,⁸⁴ was widely interpreted as the triumph of English freedom over Spanish tyranny, and certainly demonised the Catholic cause.⁸⁵ By the end of Elizabeth’s reign, Catholics roughly represented 2% of the population.⁸⁶ Behind this success lay, among other factors,⁸⁷ the conjunction of religious allegiance and national identity, especially in the aftermath of the Armada episode.⁸⁸ The “State’s autobiographical performance,”⁸⁹ one of the true pillars of her regime, was immediately set in motion through court-sanctioned pamphlets, music, poetry and royal portraiture, encouraging the cult of the Virgin Queen.

Elizabeth’s final years were, however, difficult. War with Spain continued (with results often favouring Spain) and involved costly campaigns both in Ireland and abroad. This led to tax rises and, ultimately, Essex’s rebellion in February 1601. His case fuelled criticism of her capricious monopoly-granting policy,⁹⁰ which was the focus of her final Parliament later that year. The people’s discontent made propaganda all

the more necessary and the 1601 Parliament gave her the opportunity to display all the power of her charismatic persona in her famous “Golden speech,” denying all responsibility for the abuse of monopolies, in “a kind of rhetorical ‘love-in’ between Elizabeth and her subjects.”⁹¹

It was precisely thanks to her mediated stage persona that Elizabeth may be said to have died “mostly loved by her people.”⁹² Consequently, the burden of the Elizabethan myth must have been too heavy for her inarticulate successor, James Stuart, to bear. Indeed, it is widely agreed that the new king attempted to erase “his cousin from historical memory,”⁹³ refusing to attend her funeral,⁹⁴ and having her re-buried less prominently.⁹⁵ William Camden’s *Annales* (1615, 1625), as well as the work of well-known playwrights (including William Shakespeare and John Fletcher’s *Henry VIII*), are now widely seen in connection with James’s attempt,⁹⁶ clearly mixing historical fact with cleverly crafted fabrications.⁹⁷ The new Stuart monarch’s efforts, however, were all in vain, since the memory of the Virgin Queen was quickly revived and even strengthened in the 17th century, which might not have happened “had the Stuarts been more able monarchs.”⁹⁸

This “resurrection” of the Virgin Queen was not based on historical fact but mostly on her mediated, mythical persona, turning Elizabeth into a far more “anti-Catholic,” “pro-Parliamentary” queen than she had actually been,⁹⁹ and crucially setting the trend for what Rushton¹⁰⁰ would call the “Whiggish” version of English history, which invariably sides with Protestantism against Catholicism. It is in this light that the full dimension of the Elizabethan myth, the Protestant paragon, national heroine, and ultimately Kumar’s appropriation of this myth, can be fully appreciated.

17th century Elizabethan revivals were used to either sanction England’s Protestant alliances¹⁰¹ or else to oppose what was perceived as the Stuarts’ pro-Catholic policy.¹⁰² This nationalistic approach to religion was strong enough to be the driving force behind the 1688 Glorious Revolution, with which the natural course of the succession was averted, as well as the passing of the Act of Settlement (1701), which still makes it impossible today for a Catholic to succeed to the British throne.

There is evidence, therefore, that “‘religion’ may exist outside the forms of the churches.”¹⁰³ As Lyden has put it, “there is no absolute distinction between religion and other aspects of culture.”¹⁰⁴ This, in turn, demonstrates how apt Bailey’s¹⁰⁵ concept of “implicit religion” is: although contemporary Western societies are increasingly secular(ised), many of their members are largely unaware of the extent to which their centuries-old religious legacy permeates their everyday life.¹⁰⁶ In particular, and crucially for the purposes of this article, religious heritage may have left indelible traces which remain latent in the English *imagiNation*. An article in *The Times* as recently as 1980 stated that, should the Prince of Wales decide to marry a Catholic, a sizeable minority in both England and Wales might object to it, and that the vast majority simply hoped “that the

matter should not be raised.”¹⁰⁷ It is in the light of this, as well as Chapman’s statement that historical films are “as much about the present in which they are made as they are about [the] past in which they are set,”¹⁰⁸ that Kapur’s Elizabeth films may be interpreted.

The myth of Elizabeth seems to be as alive today as ever, as evidenced by the 100-plus mostly laudatory biographies of the Queen that have been published in the course of the last century and, last but not least, her multiple resurrections for the stage, cinema and television. As in the 17th century, many of these appeared at critical times to rescue “watershed moments” and “significant individuals” that were perceived to summarise the country’s glory.¹⁰⁹ It seems reasonable, therefore, that Kapur’s *E* and *TGA* should also be interpreted along the same lines.

In this regard, reference has been made to the parallels between the Elizabeth story and that of Diana, Princess of Wales, who, after her death in 1997, became an integral part of New Labour’s “Cool Britannia” project. Additionally, Westbrook¹¹⁰ interprets *TGA* in the light of 9/11 paranoia, drawing parallels between the fanatical, Catholic, Spanish cowards depicted in the film and a lenient queen in yet another binary opposition between tolerance and progress, on the one hand, and bigotry and backwardness, on the other.

Thus seen, Kapur’s Elizabeth films seem to seal the union of national and religious identity discourses in England. In so doing, they continue and, to some extent, update a centuries-old tradition, since “religions have often [...] demonized all others as incomprehensible in their difference and hence evil [...]”¹¹¹ In this regard, they may be seen as exceptional among other British mainstream releases in the 1990s and 2000s, since few of them “have directly engaged with spiritual experience,”¹¹² according to Andrew Tate, although he might have reached a different conclusion had he analysed historical film.

The myth of Elizabeth has played a substantial role in the covert dissemination of this joint identity discourse, mediating not only the perception that the English had (and to some extent may still have) of themselves but also, and crucially, the image they had (and may still have) of Other nations, in this case, Spain.

Further evidence that Kapur’s *E* and *TGA* should be read within this tradition has been provided by Wofford (2007), who persuasively argues that the primary source in Kapur’s *E* was not history itself but earlier instances within this long tradition, notably John Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments* (1563, better known as the *Book of Martyrs*) and Thomas Heywood’s stage drama *If You Know Not Me, You Know No Bodie* (1605). The latter, as the author makes clear, stands among those widely popular plays that, by presenting a highly idealised version of Elizabeth, could have been read as veiled criticism of her successor. Interestingly, Heywood’s play may be seen as a close dramatisation of Foxe’s work, an account of Christian martyrs placing special emphasis on the sufferings of Pro-

testants in England before the advent of Elizabeth I. This may well have inspired the shocking opening scene in *E* (the historically inaccurate and anachronistic burning of Protestant martyrs too early in Mary I's reign) and the overall tone of the films, which invariably link Catholicism with bigotry, superstition, backwardness, ignorance, corruption, treason and abuse of power, as seen above.

The link between Kapur and the Protestant interpretation of Tudor history does not end here. It has already been discussed that both *E* and *TGA* unarguably resort to Elizabeth's official iconography and use it to endow the audiovisual text with high modality, thus creating an illusion of historical objectivity. However, this may also be seen to further reinforce the Whiggish tradition of British historiography. Thus, her Coronation portrait, which props the coronation scene in *E*, presents young Elizabeth as the sun-dressed woman from the Book of Revelation (as opposed to the Babylonian whore that stood for the Catholic Church in Protestant pamphlets of the time).¹¹³ Equally significant is her Armada portrait, which presents her as the divinely-inspired commander of the winds that destroyed the Spanish fleet. It has already been noted that this portrait clearly inspires *E*'s closing transfiguration scene and its message is verbalised in *TGA*'s scene with the Spanish ambassador: "I, too, can command the wind, sir! I have a hurricane in me that will strip Spain bare if you dare to try me." Such borrowings are especially evident in *TGA*: the supernatural connotations of the Ditchley portrait are used in the battle preparation scene; finally, the Rainbow portrait hangs over Walsingham's deathbed, clearly replacing Marian imagery, and is cleverly brought to life by a trick of the camera.

Conclusion

Kapur's *E* was received as a distant, exploratory rather than laudatory work on Englishness.¹¹⁴ Yet evidence has been provided that *E*'s, and perhaps especially *TGA*'s, underlying structure and references, are not really so exploratory but conservative and reactionary. Thus interpreted, especially in the light of the evidence provided illustrating Kapur's use of Elizabeth's officially sanctioned iconography, as well as what may be a plausible analysis of the semiotics of the films in connection with Wofford's identification of Foxe and Heywood as primary sources, it is possible to draw the following conclusions: (1) Kapur's Elizabeth films may not be based on history but on the largely mediated myth of Elizabeth; (2) consequently, Kapur's films may be seen to further sustain the discourse disseminated by the aforementioned myth; (3) this discourse results from the merger of religious and national identity discourses that took place in the late 16th century, becoming instrumental in the view that the English have since had of both themselves and, crucially, Other nations.

As a result, even if the ultimate aim of the director might have been to encourage the audience to draw a parallel between the past as represented in the film and the present, it is the image of Spain and the Spanish that is at stake here. Ample evidence could be provided of the effects that the English/British religious-national discourse has had on the English imagiNation throughout the centuries as far as the image of Spain and the Spanish is concerned, although this is way beyond the scope of this article. What *can* be done here, in order to bring this discussion to a close, is hint that this image still seems to be applicable today, probably as a consequence of the perpetuation of related discourses in the different media.¹¹⁵ Needless to say, the implications of this go beyond the merely anecdotal, since it may play a role in both Anglo-Spanish relations in general, the perception of Spain as a tourist destination on the part of British tourists and, considering the worldwide distribution of both *E* and *TGA*, the overall image of Spain to be derived by the international community.

Notes

¹ Carole Levin, "Elizabeth: Romantic Film Heroine or Sixteenth-Century Queen?", *Perspectives on History* 37, 4 (1999): 1.

² James Chapman, *Past and Present. National Identity and the British Historical Film* (London and New York: IB Tauris, 2005), 5.

³ Thomas S. Freeman, "Introduction: It's Only a Movie," in *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (London: Palgrave, 2009), 5.

⁴ Belén Vidal Villasur, "Classic Adaptation, Modern Reinventions: Reading the Image in the Contemporary Literary Film." *Screen* 43 (2002): 13. See also Christopher Haigh, "Kapur's *Elizabeth*," in *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (London: Palgrave, 2009), 125.

⁵ Chapman, *Past and Present*, 2-4.

⁶ Freeman, "Introduction," 3.

⁷ Chapman, *Past and Present*, 319.

⁸ Henry A. Giroux, *Disturbing Pleasures. Learning Popular Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), 120.

⁹ Edward Bailey, *Implicit Religion: An Introduction* (London: Middlesex UP, 1998).

¹⁰ Eric M. Mazur, "Introduction," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Film*, edited by Eric M. Mazur (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011), xix.

¹¹ In doing this, the present article substantially expands on the issues already explored in two earlier works by the author, namely "Images of English Purity. A Comparative Study of Elizabeth I and Diana, Princess of Wales," *Identity, Self & Symbolism* 1, 2 (2006): 116-128; and "Durability or Transience? Englishness and the Legacy of the Church of England," *The University of Bucharest Review. A Journal of Literary and Cultural Studies* XI, 1 (2010): 109-117.

¹² William L. Blizek, "Introduction," in *The Continuum Companion to Religion and Film*, edited by William L. Blizek (London: Continuum Books, 2009), 1.

¹³ Melanie J. Wright, *Religion and Film. An Introduction* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 4.

¹⁴ John C. Lyden, *Film as Religion. Myths, Morals and Rituals* (New York: New York UP, 2003), 1.

¹⁵ Melanie J. Wright, "Religion, Film and Cultural Studies," in *The Continuum Companion to Religion and Film*, edited by William L. Blizek (London: Continuum Books, 2009), 103.

¹⁶ Wright, *Religion and Film*, 25-26.

¹⁷ Freeman, "Introduction," 5.

¹⁸ Freeman, "Introduction," 7.

¹⁹ See Kate Warner, "Talking about Theory of History in Television Dramas," *Continuum* 23, 5 (2009): 723-734.

²⁰ Freeman, "Introduction," 12.

²¹ David Loades, *Elizabeth I. The Golden Reign of Gloriana* (Kew: The National Archives, 2003), 81-101.

²² Loades, *Elizabeth I*, 101.

²³ Patrick Collinson, "Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History," *Historical Research* 76, (2003): 475-476. See also Patrick Collinson, "William Camden and the Anti-Myth of Elizabeth: Setting the Mould?," in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, edited by Susan Moran and Thomas S. Freeman (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 79-98.

²⁴ Collinson, "Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History," 479.

²⁵ Collinson, "Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History," 470.

²⁶ Helen Hackett, *Shakespeare and Elizabeth. The Meeting of Two Myths* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009), 4-6.

²⁷ Ronald Hutton, "Why don't the Stuarts get Filmed?," in *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (London: Palgrave, 2009), 248.

²⁸ Bill Schwarz, "Britain, America, and Europe," in *British Cultural Studies*, edited by David Morley and Kevin Robins (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001), 161.

²⁹ James Duncan, "Elite Landscapes as Cultural (Re)Productions: The Case of Shaughnessy Heights," in *Inventing Places: Studies in Cultural Geography*, edited Kay Anderson and Fay Gale (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1992), 41.

³⁰ Kay Anderson and Fay Gale, eds., *Inventing Places: Studies in Cultural Geography* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1992).

³¹ For an in-depth study of the major film and television appearances of Elizabeth I, see Bethany Latham, *Elizabeth I in Film and Television. A Study of the Major Portrayals* (Jefferson: McFarland & Co., 2011).

Other interesting works include the following: Thomas Betteridge, "A Queen for All Seasons: Elizabeth I on Film," in *The Myth of Elizabeth*, edited by Susan Moran and Thomas S. Freeman (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 242-259. Judith Richards, "Lady in Waiting: Young Elizabeth Tudor on Film," in *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (London: Palgrave, 2009), 106-120. Brett Usher, "Shakespeare in Love: Elizabeth as *Dea ex Machine*," in *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (London: Palgrave, 2009), 178-189. Vivienne Westbrook, "Elizabeth: The Golden Age: A Sign of the Times?," in *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (London: Palgrave, 2009), 164-177. Andrew Higson, *English Heritage, English Cinema. Costume Drama since 1980* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003), 194-256. Last but not least, Chapman, *Past and Present*, 299-318.

³² *Orlando* (Sally Potter, 1993), *Elizabeth* (Shekhar Kapur, 1998), *Shakespeare in Love* (John Madden, 1998), and *Elizabeth: The Golden Age* (Shekhar Kapur, 2007).

³³ *Elizabeth Rex* (Timothy Findley, 2000), which received rave reviews upon its premiere in Canada and has since been exported to the USA and French-speaking Canada.

³⁴ *Mentors* (Josh Miller, Canada, 1998-2002), *Henry VIII* (Peter Travis, ITV, 2003), *Gunpowder, Treason & Plot* (Gillies MacKinnon, BBC, 2004), *The Virgin Queen* (Coky Giedroyc, BBC, 2005), *Elizabeth I* (Tom Hooper, Channel 4, 2005), *Doctor Who* (BBC, 1963-1989; 2005-); *The Tudors* (Michael Hirst, TV3 Ireland/Showtime/BBC/CBC Television, 2007-2010).

³⁵ Christine Geraghty, "Crossing Over: Performing as a Lady and a Dame," *Screen* 43 (2002): 43-44.

³⁶ Belén Vidal Villasar, "Review of *English Heritage, English Cinema: Costume Drama since 1980*, by Andrew Higson," *Screen* 44, 3 (2003): 351.

³⁷ Wright, "Religion, Film and Cultural Studies," 103, 108.

³⁸ Gunther Kress and Theo van Leeuwen, *Reading Images. The Grammar of Visual Design* (revised edition), (London: Routledge, 2006). See also Theo van Leeuwen, *Introducing Social Semiotics*, (London: Routledge, 2005).

³⁹ Norman Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998).

⁴⁰ Chapman, *Past and Present*, 298-300.

⁴¹ <http://shekharkapur.com/blog/>.

⁴² Tristram Hunt, "Tucking into History," *History Workshop Journal* 66 (2008): 240-241.

⁴³ Chapman, *Past and Present*, 299.

⁴⁴ Westbrook, "Elizabeth: The Golden Age," 165.

⁴⁵ Haigh, "Kapur's Elizabeth," 126.

⁴⁶ For a full discussion of E's historical inaccuracies, see Haigh, "Kapur's Elizabeth," 125-127.

⁴⁷ Susanne Wofford, "Is there Any Harm in That?: Foxe, Heywood and Shekhar Kapur's Elizabeth," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007), 261.

⁴⁸ For full details, see Westbrook, "Elizabeth: The Golden Age," 170-175.

⁴⁹ Usher, "Shakespeare in Love," 181.

⁵⁰ Usher, "Shakespeare in Love," 181.

⁵¹ Neil S. Rushton, "Monastic Charitable Provision in Tudor England: Quantifying and Qualifying Poor Relief in the Early Sixteenth Century," *Continuity and Change* 16, 1 (2001): 9-44.

⁵² Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants. The Church in English Society 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 479.

⁵³ Rodger M. Payne, "Catholicism," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Film*, edited by Eric M. Mazur (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011), 107.

⁵⁴ Payne, "Catholicism," 109, 113-114.

⁵⁵ Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 137-168.

⁵⁶ This is a strategy also used elsewhere in the film, and it even applies to TGA, as will be seen below.

⁵⁷ Haigh, "Kapur's Elizabeth," 133.

⁵⁸ Westbrook, "Elizabeth: The Golden Age," 170.

⁵⁹ Roy Strong, *Gloriana. The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Pimlico, 2003).

⁶⁰ Westbrook, "Elizabeth: The Golden Age," 168.

⁶¹ Richard Dyer, *White* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 122.

⁶² Chapman, *Past and Present*, 313.

⁶³ These are not the only obvious borrowings from Elizabeth's official iconography, as will be seen below.

⁶⁴ Again, these are not the only instances in which visual inspiration is drawn from Elizabeth's official portraiture. By way of example, the coronation scene, one of the key moments in *E*, is clearly modelled on Elizabeth's Coronation Portrait, while the stunning visuals in the scene in *TGA* in which Elizabeth is planning the military strategy to fight off the Spanish Armada (which has her stand on a map of the British Isles and Western Europe) are to be clearly related to the well-known "Ditchley" Portrait (c. 1592).

⁶⁵ Usher, "Shakespeare in Love," 184.

⁶⁶ Richards, "Lady in Waiting," 113.

⁶⁷ "When Phoolan Devi beats her former husband in revenge for his treatment of her as a child bride, she claims to feel the kind of peace that comes from going on a pilgrimage. When she finally loses all options and is about to be arrested, she feels that the goddess must be angry with her." Cybelle Shattuck, "Hinduism," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Film*, edited by Eric M. Mazur (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO), 217-218.

⁶⁸ Peter Malone, "Catholic Movies," in *The Continuum Companion to Religion and Film*, edited by William L. Blizек (London: Continuum Books, 2009), 139.

⁶⁹ Chapman, *Past and Present*, 309.

⁷⁰ Collinson, "Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History," 470.

⁷¹ Westbrook, "Elizabeth: The Golden Age," 165.

⁷² Haigh, "Kapur's Elizabeth," 131.

⁷³ Ian Ward, "Fairyland and its Fairy Kings and Queens," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 14, 1 (2001): 14.

⁷⁴ Jim McGuigan, "British Identity and 'the People's Princess'," *The Sociological Review* 48, 1 (2000): 5.

⁷⁵ Steven W. May, "'Tongue-Tied our Queen?': Queen Elizabeth's Voice in the Seventeenth Century," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP), 48.

⁷⁶ Natalie Mears, "Love-Making and Diplomacy: Elizabeth I and the Anjou Marriage Negotiations, c. 1578-1582," *History* 86 (2001): 442-466; see also Loades, *Elizabeth*, 86-87.

⁷⁷ Sally Harper, "A Dittie to the Tune of Welsh Sydannen: A Welsh Image of Queen Elizabeth," *Renaissance Studies* 19, 2 (2005): 201-228.

⁷⁸ Leslie C. Dunn, "Re-Sounding Elizabeth in Seventeenth-Century Music: Morley to Purcell," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007), 240.

⁷⁹ Strong, *Gloriana*.

⁸⁰ José Igor Prieto-Arranz, "Images of English Purity. A Comparative Study of Elizabeth I and Diana, Princess of Wales." *Identity, Self & Symbolism* 1, 2(2006): 123. 116-128.

⁸¹ Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion 1558-1603* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 49.

- ⁸² Garrett Mattingly, *La Armada Invencible* (Madrid: Turner, 2004), 31; see also Maurice Howard, *The Tudor Image* (London: Tate Gallery, 1995), 11.
- ⁸³ See Duncan Townson, *Breve historia de Inglaterra* (Madrid: Alianza, 2004), 153.
- ⁸⁴ James A. Williamson, *The Tudor Age* (Harlow: Longman, 1979), 414.
- ⁸⁵ Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*, 43.
- ⁸⁶ Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*, 48.
- ⁸⁷ See Jean Delumeau, *La reforma* (Barcelona: Editorial Labor), 262-263; Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*, 48-50; 52; Mattingly, *La Armada Invencible*, 31-32; Townson, *Breve historia de Inglaterra*, 153.
- ⁸⁸ Townson, *Breve historia de Inglaterra*, 155.
- ⁸⁹ Michael J. Shapiro, "National Times and Other Times. Re-Thinking Citizenship," *Cultural Studies* 14, 1 (2000): 84.
- ⁹⁰ Katherine Duncan-Jones, "'Almost Always Smiling': Elizabeth's Last Two Years," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP), 39-40.
- ⁹¹ Duncan-Jones, "Almost Always Smiling", 40.
- ⁹² Tom MacFaul, "Review of *Elizabeth I: Always her Own Free Woman*," edited by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves." *Notes and Queries* 52 (2005): 249.
- ⁹³ Elizabeth H. Hageman, "Introduction," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007), 19.
- ⁹⁴ Jonathan Baldo, "Forgetting Elizabeth in Henry VIII," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007), 133.
- ⁹⁵ Hageman, "Introduction," 17-18; Peter Hyland, "Re-Membering Gloriana: *The Revenger's Tragedy*," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007), 86.
- ⁹⁶ Baldo, "Forgetting Elizabeth," 135; 144-145.
- ⁹⁷ Collinson, "Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History," 475-476; See also May, "Tongue-Tied our Queen?," 50-52.
- ⁹⁸ May, "Tongue-Tied our Queen?," 48.
- ⁹⁹ May, "Tongue-Tied our Queen?," 50.
- ¹⁰⁰ Rushton, "Monastic Charitable Provision in Tudor England," 10.
- ¹⁰¹ Georgianna Ziegler, "A Second Phoenix: The Rebirth of Elizabeth I in Elizabeth Stuart," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007), 119-120.
- ¹⁰² Hyland, "Re-Membering Gloriana," 84-87; see also Erika Mae Olbricht, "'Take from me First the Softness of a Woman': Rewriting Elizabeth's Execution of Mary Stuart during the Seventeenth-Century Succession Crisis," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007), 220-238; Elizabeth Pentland, "'Elizian' Fields: Elizabeth, Essex, and the Politics of Dissent in 1624," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007), 149.
- ¹⁰³ Keith Robbins, *History, Religion and Identity in Modern Britain* (London and Rio

Grande: The Hambledon Press, 1993), 82.

¹⁰⁴ Lyden, *Film as Religion*, 2.

¹⁰⁵ Bailey, *Implicit Religion*.

¹⁰⁶ An insightful religion-based analysis of representative popular culture manifestations can be found in Andrada Fătu-Tutoveanu and Corneliu Pintilescu, "Religious 'Avatars' and Implicit Religion: Recycling Myths and Religious Patterns within Contemporary U.S. Culture," *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* 11, 33 (2012): 182-205.

¹⁰⁷ Robbins, *History, Religion and Identity in Modern Britain*, 85.

¹⁰⁸ Chapman, *Past and Present*, 319.

¹⁰⁹ Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*, 88. Examples include *Fire over England* (William K. Howard, 1937), which invites audiences to draw parallels between the tyrannical Spain of the 1500s and the Fascist axis of the 1930s, with England / Britain (represented by Elizabeth) standing for freedom and tolerance; and *The Sea Hawk* (Michael Curtiz, 1940), which drew "an unmistakable comparison between Elizabeth's England threatened by the Armada in 1588 and Churchill's Britain about to be attacked in the Blitz." Significantly, Elizabeth-themed productions resurfaced in the 1950s, which may have been related to the widespread belief in a new prosperous era under the new queen, Elizabeth II (Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*, 92; 95; 99).

¹¹⁰ Westbrook, "Elizabeth: The Golden Age," 167; 172.

¹¹¹ Lyden, *Film as Religion*, 5.

¹¹² Andrew Tate, "Britain," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Film*, edited by Eric M. Mazur (Santa Monica: ABC-CLIO, 2011), 88.

¹¹³ Leticia Álvarez Recio, *Rameras de Babilonia. Historia cultural del anticatolicismo en la Inglaterra Tudor* (Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2006), 97-99.

¹¹⁴ Chapman, *Past and Present*, 311-312.

¹¹⁵ A field studied by Roberto A. Valdeón, "The Armada is Coming: Editoriales Strategies in Economic Comment Columns," *RAEL*, Extra 1 (2007): 69-81; and José I. Prieto-Arranz and Mark E. Casey, "The British Working Class on Holiday. A Critical Reading of ITV's *Benidorm*," *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change* 12, 1 (2014): 68-83.

References

Álvarez Recio, Leticia. *Rameras de Babilonia. Historia cultural del anticatolicismo en la Inglaterra Tudor*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2006.

Anderson, Kay, and Fay Gale eds. *Inventing Places: Studies in Cultural Geography*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1992.

Andreu, Luisa, J. Enrique Bigné, and Chris Cooper. "Projected and Perceived Image of Spain as a Tourist Destination for British Travellers." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*. 9, 4 (2001): 47-67.

Bailey, Edward. *Implicit Religion: An Introduction*. London: Middlesex UP, 1998.

Baldo, Jonathan. "Forgetting Elizabeth in *Henry VIII*." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*. edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 132-148. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Blizek, William L. "Introduction." In *The Continuum Companion to Religion and Film*. edited by William L. Blizek, 1-5. London: Continuum Books, 2009.

Chapman, James. *Past and present. National Identity and the British Historical Film*. London and New York: IB Tauris, 2005.

Collinson, Patrick. *The Religion of Protestants. The Church in English Society 1559-1625*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Collinson, Patrick. "Elizabeth I and the Verdicts of History." *Historical Research*. 76, 194 (2003): 469-491.

Delumeau, Jean. *La reforma*. Barcelona: Editorial Labor, 1973.

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

Duncan, James. "Elite Landscapes as Cultural (Re)Productions: The Case of Shaughnessy Heights." In *Inventing Places: Studies in Cultural Geography*. edited Kay Anderson and Fay Gale. 37-51. Melbourne, Longman Cheshire, 1992.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine. "'Almost Always Smiling': Elizabeth's Last Two Years." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*. edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 31-47. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Dunn, Leslie C. "Re-Sounding Elizabeth in Seventeenth-Century Music: Morley to Purcell." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*. edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 239-260. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Dyer, Richard. *White*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998.

Fătu-Tutoveanu, Andrada, and Corneliu Pintilescu. "Religious 'Avatars' and Implicit Religion: Recycling Myths and Religious Patterns within Contemporary U.S. Culture." *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*. 11, 33 (2012): 182-205.

Freeman, Thomas S. "Introduction: It's Only a Movie." In *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. 1-28. London: Palgrave, 2009.

Geraghty, Christine. "Crossing Over: Performing as a Lady and a Dame." *Screen*. 43 (2002): 41-56.

Giroux, Henry A. *Disturbing Pleasures. Learning Popular Culture*. New York and London: Routledge, 1994.

Hageman, Elizabeth H. "Introduction." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 15-30. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Haigh, Christopher. "Kapur's Elizabeth." In *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. 122-134. London: Palgrave, 2009.

Harper, Sally. "A Dittie to the Tune of Welsh Sydannen: A Welsh Image of Queen Elizabeth." *Renaissance Studies*. 19, 2 (2005): 201-228.

Howard, Maurice. *The Tudor Image*. London: Tate Gallery, 1995.

Hunt, Tristram. "Tucking into History." *History Workshop Journal*. 66 (2008): 237-242.

Hutton, Ronald. "Why don't the Stuarts get Filmed?". In *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. 246-258. London: Palgrave, 2009.

Hyland, Peter. "Re-Membering Gloriana: *The Revenger's Tragedy*." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 82-94. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen. *Reading Images. The Grammar of Visual Design*. revised edition. London: Routledge, 2006.

Latham, Bethany. *Elizabeth I in Film and Television. A Study of the Major Portrayals*. Jefferson (NC): McFarland & Co., 2011.

Leeuwen, Theo van, *Introducing Social Semiotics*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Levin, Carole. "Elizabeth: Romantic Film Heroine or Sixteenth-Century Queen?". *Perspectives on History*. 37, 4 (1999): 1-6.

Loades, David. *Elizabeth I. The Golden Reign of Gloriana*. Kew: The National Archives, 2003.

Lyden, John C. *Film as Religion. Myths, Morals and Rituals*. New York: New York UP, 2003.

MacFaul, Tom. "Review of *Elizabeth I: Always her Own Free Woman*, edited by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves." *Notes and Queries* 52 (2005): 248-249.

Peter Malone. "Catholic Movies." In *The Continuum Companion to Religion and Film*. edited by William L. Blizek. 137-147. London: Continuum Books, 2009.

Mattingly, Garrett. *La Armada Invencible*. Madrid: Turner, 2004.

May, Steven W. "'Tongue-Tied our Queen?': Queen Elizabeth's Voice in the Seventeenth Century." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*. edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 48-67. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Mazur, Eric M. "Introduction." In *Encyclopedia of Religion and Film*. edited by Eric M. Mazur. xvii-xix. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011.

McGuigan, Jim. "British Identity and 'the People's Princess'." *The Sociological Review*. 48, 1 (2000): 1-18.

Mears, Natalie. "Love-Making and Diplomacy: Elizabeth I and the Anjou Marriage Negotiations, c. 1578-1582." *History*. 86 (2001): 442-466.

Olbricht, Erika Mae. "'Take from me First the Softness of a Woman': Rewriting Elizabeth's Execution of Mary Stuart during the Seventeenth-

Century Succession Crisis.” In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*. edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 220-238. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Payne, Rodger M. “Catholicism,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Film*. edited by Eric M. Mazur. 107-115. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011.

Pentland, Elizabeth. “‘Elizian’ Fields: Elizabeth, Essex, and the Politics of Dissent in 1624.” In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 149-167. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Prieto-Arranz, José Igor. “Images of English Purity. A Comparative Study of Elizabeth I and Diana, Princess of Wales.” *Identity, Self & Symbolism*. 1, 2 (2006): 116-128.

Prieto-Arranz, José Igor. “Durability or Transience? Englishness and the Legacy of the Church of England.” *The University of Bucharest Review. A Journal of Literary and Cultural Studies*. XI, 1 (2010): 109-117.

Prieto-Arranz, José Igor, and Mark E. Casey. “The British Working Class on Holiday. A Critical Reading of ITV’s *Benidorm*.” *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*. 12, 1 (2014): 68-83.

Richards, Judith. “Lady in Waiting: Young Elizabeth Tudor on Film.” In *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*. edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. 106-120. London: Palgrave, 2009.

Robbins, Keith. *History, Religion and Identity in Modern Britain*. London and Rio Grande: The Hambledon Press, 1993.

Rushton, Neil S. “Monastic Charitable Provision in Tudor England: Quantifying and Qualifying Poor Relief in the Early Sixteenth Century.” *Continuity and Change*. 16, 1 (2001): 9-44.

Schwarz, Bill. “Britain, America, and Europe.” In *British Cultural Studies*. edited by David Morley and Kevin Robins. 157-169. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.

Shapiro, Michael J. “National Times and Other Times. Re-Thinking Citizenship.” *Cultural Studies*. 14, 1 (2000): 79-98.

Shattuck, Cybelle. “Hinduism.” in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Film*. edited by Eric M. Mazur. 214-220. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Strong, Roy. *Gloriana. The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. London: Pimlico, 2003.

Tate, Andrew. "Britain." In *Encyclopedia of Religion and Film*. edited by Eric M. Mazur. 85-91. Santa Monica: ABC-CLIO, 2011.

Townson, Duncan. *Breve historia de Inglaterra*. Madrid: Alianza, 2004.

Usher, Brett. "Shakespeare in Love: Elizabeth as *Dea ex Machine*." In *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*. edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. 178-189. London: Palgrave, 2009.

Valdeón García, Roberto A. "The Armada is Coming: Editoriales Strategies in Economic Comment Columns." *RAEL*. Extra 1 (2007): 69-81.

Vidal Villasur, Belén. "Classic Adaptation, Modern Reinventions: Reading the Image in the Contemporary Literary Film." *Screen*. 43 (2002): 5-18.

Vidal Villasur, Belén. "Review of *English Heritage, English Cinema: Costume Drama since 1980*, by Andrew Higson." *Screen*. 44, 3 (2003): 351-354.

Ward, Ian. "Fairylend and its Fairy Kings and Queens." *Journal of Historical Sociology*. 14, 1 (2001): 1-20.

Warner, Kate. "Talking about Theory of History in Television Dramas." *Continuum*. 23, 5 (2009): 723-734.

Westbrook, Vivienne. "Elizabeth: The Golden Age: A Sign of the Times?." In *Tudors and Stuarts on Film. Historical Perspectives*. edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. 164-177. London: Palgrave, 2009.

Williamson, James A. *The Tudor Age*. Harlow: Longman, 1979.

Wofford, Susanne L. 2007. "Is there Any Harm in That?: Foxe, Heywood and Shekhar Kapur's *Elizabeth*." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*. edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 261-277. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.

Wright, Melanie J. *Religion and Film. An Introduction*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2007.

Wright, Melanie J. "Religion, Film and Cultural Studies." In *The Continuum Companion to Religion and Film*. edited by William L. Blizek, 101-112. London: Continuum Books, 2009.

Wu, Duncan. "Introduction." In *Renaissance Poetry*. edited by Duncan Wu. 1-12. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Ziegler, Georgianna. "A Second Phoenix: The Rebirth of Elizabeth I in Elizabeth Stuart." In *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*. edited by Elizabeth Hageman and Katherine Conway. 111-131. Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007.