
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Neighbors, Dustin M

Elizabeth I, Huntress of England: Private Politics, Diplomacy, and Courtly Relations Cultivated through Hunting

Published in:
The Court Historian

DOI:
[10.1080/14629712.2023.2173410](https://doi.org/10.1080/14629712.2023.2173410)

Published: 01/01/2023

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published under the following license:
CC BY

Please cite the original version:
Neighbors, D. M. (2023). Elizabeth I, Huntress of England: Private Politics, Diplomacy, and Courtly Relations Cultivated through Hunting. *The Court Historian* , 28(1), 49-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14629712.2023.2173410>

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=ycou20>

Elizabeth I, Huntress of England: Private Politics, Diplomacy, and Courtly Relations Cultivated through Hunting

BY DUSTIN M. NEIGHBORS 

Hunting at the court of Elizabeth I of England was not a peripheral activity, nor was it a solely male pursuit. Hunting was an important social and cultural practice that was pivotal for communication, gathering information, social intercourse and politics. At the same time, hunting was an informal and ephemeral activity that was secluded and offered degrees of privacy. Yet the study of hunting as a contextually and culturally driven phenomenon that straddled the public/private divide, as an activity where elite women were active agents and skilled huntresses, and how these dimensions impacted early modern sociability, court culture, politics, and diplomacy remains underexplored. To begin addressing this gap, this article demonstrates how Elizabeth I not only regularly engaged in hunting, but also maintained a dedicated hunting staff and utilised hunting as a tool to facilitate private politics and shape courtly behaviour.

In a 2013 special edition of *The Court Historian*, on courts and hunting, Simon Adams drew attention to this particular form of elite activity for Elizabeth I of England (1533-1604), who regularly participated in hunting throughout her reign. His conclusion was that hunting was ‘a matter of personal taste’ for the Queen.¹ It is certainly clear that Elizabeth enjoyed hunting as a recreational activity, but we should not downplay women’s involvement in hunting, nor overlook the extent to which hunting served as an important environment for private politics. This article seeks to build on Adams’ work and others by discussing the ways in which hunting functioned as a tool that Elizabeth employed in politics and diplomacy throughout her reign.² The pervasiveness of English hunting as more than mere recreation or ‘personal taste’ echoes the wider European context whereby hunting constituted a ‘performative sphere’ within court spaces,³ one in which the hunt was a social, economic, and cross-cultural activity.⁴

1 Most of the research presented in this article stems from the third chapter of my 2018 doctoral thesis, while also incorporating recent research related to political privacy. Upon the recommendation of my examiners, the original research is published here for the first time. I want to express my profound gratitude to Dr John Cooper and Dr Mark Jenner for their valuable guidance and support in the development of this research. I am also indebted to Dr Janet Dickinson for her vital feedback and Martin Stiles for his editorial expertise. See Dustin M. Neighbors, “‘With my ruling’: Agency, Queenship and Political Culture through Royal Progresses in the Reign of Elizabeth I”, (unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 2018). Simon Adams, “‘The Queenes Majestie ... is now become a great huntress’: Elizabeth I and the Chase”, *The Court Historian*, 18:2 (2013), p. 164.

2 Along with building on Adams’ work, this article also builds on Roger B. Manning’s work on the legal and social aspects of hunting; expands on Richard Almond’s work on medieval representations of female hunting; and contributes a nuanced study to Thomas Allsen’s overview of royal hunting. Roger B. Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England, 1485-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993). Richard Almond, *Daughters of Artemis: The Huntress in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2009). Thomas T. Allsen, *The Royal Hunt in Eurasian History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

3 Luc Duerloo, ‘The Hunt in the Performance of Archducal Rule: Endurance and Revival in Habsburg Netherlands in the Early Seventeenth Century’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 69 (2016), p. 117.

4 Kurt Lindner, *Jagdrakate des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 1959). David Dalby, *Lexicon of the Medieval German Hunt* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965), p. v. J.R. Christianson, ‘The Hunt of

As a pastime, a ritualised behaviour, and a means of survival that was embedded in early modern European culture and society, the practice of hunting was coded and performed according to the hunters' social position, ordering their actions and defining their relationships with the court, society, and the animals used and hunted.⁵ The hunt constitutes a nexus where interactions of and between the public and private, politics, sociability, diplomacy and environments intersected. In this regard, the coded, ordered, yet informal, royal and aristocratic practice of hunting held huge symbolic importance for the European elite, including Elizabethan courtiers. At the same time it was considered an 'ancient right' and a significant custom that non-elite inhabitants sought to protect in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁶ Yet, as Adams and others have noted, established scholarship has viewed pre-modern hunting as self-evident or a frivolous activity unworthy of analysis.⁷ Many scholars are, therefore, largely unaware of the functions of hunting within specific historical societies and cultures, masking its significance as a culturally driven and contextualised practice. The general scholarship on hunting history has restrictively focused on the period from the pre-historic age to the Middle Ages,⁸ while the few English hunting studies concentrate on the pre-Tudor period or the late-Stuart era, despite the religious, political, and cultural shifts of the Tudor age, which transformed early modern England.⁹ A few works deal with Tudor hunting in more detail, providing a foundation from which to examine the significance of hunting for Elizabeth I.¹⁰ None of these studies, however, provide an in-depth investigation on or critically compare the cultural practices of early modern English hunting with wider European hunting practices. Above all, they remain blind to the significance and nuances of gender, especially as women's participation in hunting practices is an important line of

King Frederik II of Denmark: Structures and Rituals', *The Court Historian*, 18:2 (2013), pp. 165-187. Josephine Baark, 'Fair Game: The Cross-Cultural Chase in Eighteenth-Century Denmark', *Art History*, (2020). Ulf Nyrén, 'Rätt till jakt: En studie av den Svenska jakträtten ca 1600-1789', (unpublished PhD thesis, Göteborgs Universitet, 2012), p. 215. The quote can be found in Dalby, *Lexicon*, p. v.

5 Clifford Geertz, 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', *Local Knowledge* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 124.

6 For discussions about riots and disorder over the rights to hunt in premodern Europe, see Nyrén, 'Rätt till jakt', p. 215; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers*, p. 64-66; Roger B. Manning, 'Unlawful Hunting in England, 1500-1640', *Forest and Conservation History*, 38:1 (1994), p. 22; Daniel C. Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 3; Dan Beavers, 'The Great Deer Massacre: Animals, Honour, and Communication', *Journal of British Studies*, 38:2 (1999), pp. 187-216.

7 Adams, "'The Queenes Majestie'", p. 144. Richard Almond, *Medieval Hunting* (Stroud: The History Press, 2011), p. vii. Allsen, *Royal Hunt*, p. 1.

8 For an overview of medieval hunting see Dustin M. Neighbors, 'The Study of Medieval Hunting', *Routledge Medieval Encyclopaedia Online* (forthcoming Spring 2023). Werner Rösener, *Jagd und höfische Kultur im Mittelalter* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1997). John Cummins, *The Hound and the Hawk: The Art of Medieval Hunting* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988). William Marvin, *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006). Eric J. Goldberg, *In the Manner of the Franks: Hunting, Kingship, and Masculinity in Early Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2021). Goldberg's work is the most recent and exemplary study of hunting in the Middle Ages.

9 Almond, *Medieval Hunting*. Dan Beavers, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). Donna Landry, *The Invention of the Countryside: Hunting, Walking, and Ecology in English Literature, 1671-1831* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001).

10 Along with Adams, there are other works to consider. First, although the focus is on the medieval period, there are a few notes about Tudor hunting, see Amanda Richardson, "'Riding like Alexander, Hunting like Diana": Gendered Aspects of the Medieval Hunt and its Landscape Settings in England and France', *Gender and History*, 24:2 (2012). James Jonathan Williams, 'Hunting in Early Modern England: An Examination with Special Reference to the Reign of Henry VIII' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 1998). Glenn Richardson, 'Hunting at the Courts of Francis I and Henry VIII', *The Court Historian*, 18:2 (2013). There is also a chapter by Emma Griffin that touches on the Elizabeth's royal hunts, however, it's a broad overview of hunting during the Queen's reign and primarily focuses on animals connected to the hunt. See Emma Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain since 1066* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 79-87.

research that is currently underexplored in early modern scholarship. Simultaneously, hunting straddled the public/private divide which contributed to its complex nature and ambiguous function in the early modern period. On the one hand, European hunting was a public spectacle that reinforced power and shaped relations between royal and princely courts, citizens and communities. Alternatively, hunting often functioned within the private sphere as a form of exercise, withdrawal, and personal recreation. Thus, hunting was private, not in the sense that the participant was completely alone, but private in that it was not always visible or accessible by the wider public and only involved a few close courtiers. However, it remains unclear how all of these dimensions of hunting related to one another and its significance. As a starting point for this research, this article seeks to answer the question: to what extent was the culture of hunting a form of political privacy that impacted gender and political relations in the reign of Elizabeth I?

Hunting at the Elizabethan court was not solely a male activity. Many of the Queen's own ladies-in-waiting and other female courtiers, to be discussed below, were well known to hunt. In fact, Elizabeth's own mother, Anne Boleyn (1501-1536), was an active participant in the hunt and was reported 'to shoot deer as they pass.'¹¹ Nevertheless, hunting was (and continues to be) seen as fundamentally masculine, despite the cultural salience and iconography of the huntress-goddesses personified throughout Europe, like Diana and her Greek counterpart Artemis, Skaði, or Mielikki.¹² Commonplace within European court cultures in the early modern period, including England, the rhetoric and depictions of female huntresses continue to focus on the duality of gender characteristics, or gender bending.¹³ As such, this rhetoric and the absence of female hunters in historical studies is on a continuum that focuses chiefly on 'male experience, education, and authorship.'¹⁴ To date, three scholars have engaged in dedicated studies on general female hunting in a historical context, and a further two scholars have specifically highlighted Elizabeth's participation in the hunt, but only to a limited extent.¹⁵ From the perspective of court and political culture, the study of women's experiences of and contributions to hunting practices can facilitate a better understanding of the cultural-political importance of hunting. More significantly, through analysing women's involvement in the culture of hunting, we uncover two interesting yet underexplored impetuses – the degrees of privacy that hunting offered participants and the innate courtly and political sociability of the hunt. These two conditions contribute a different perspective for this special journal issue, whereby hunting forged relations beyond the

11 21 July 1532, 'John Du Bellay, Bishop of Bayonne to Montmorency', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 5, 1531-1532*, ed. James Gardiner (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1880), pp. 520-521.

12 Rory McTurk, *A Companion to Old Norse-Icelandic Literature and Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), p. 131. Jenny Jochens, *Old Norse Images of Women* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), p. 62.

13 Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, *Beauty or Beast?: The Woman Warrior in the German Imagination from the Renaissance to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 112-144.

14 Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, p. 146.

15 Almond, *Daughters of Artemis*. Katharina Fietze, *Im Gefolge Diana: Frauen und höfische Jagd im Mittelalter, 1200-1500* (Köln: Böhlau Verlag GmbH & Cie, 2005). Jette Baagøe, *Diana's Dotre—kvindelige jægere dengang og nu* (Dansk Jagt- og Skovbrugsmuseum, 2011). For Elizabeth's hunting, see Adams and Richardson. It should be noted that while there several studies on early modern court cultures, particularly in France, Italy and Germany, highlighted women who hunted, they briefly mention and do not further analyse women's contributions and impact to the culture of hunting or engage with female hunting practices in a social, political, or cultural context. One exception is Valerio Zanetti's article on female riding culture through the activity of hunting. See Valerio Zanetti, 'From the King's Hunt to the Ladies' Cavalcade: Female Equestrian Culture at the Court of Louis XIV', *The Court Historian*, 24:3 (2019), pp. 250-268.

traditionally defined spaces and formal processes of the court, through the natural environments and informal activities of court that provided ephemeral and fluid degrees of privacy.

As a point of departure, this article examines how Elizabeth's engagement and employment of hunting, including the use and interactions with hunting personnel, facilitated politics and shaped courtly behaviour. There are two main dimensions to this research: 1) that Elizabeth's hunting pursuits had multiple functions and constituted a prominent department in the Queen's household that influenced courtly and diplomatic relations; and 2) that hunting constituted a sphere of private politics. These dimensions will be examined by employing an interdisciplinary approach and drawing on a range of source material including previously unused manuscripts from a neglected record class at The National Archives (TNA) in the United Kingdom.¹⁶ This new manuscript material reveals that hunting was not a casual activity, but a valuable and frequent pursuit that is significant to the study of Elizabethan courtly society, political culture, and queenship.

The Significance of Hunting

Queen Elizabeth reigned over a period of cultural and political vitality between 1558-1603. She cultivated a courtly society centred around spectacle, patronage, representation, chivalry, and personal rule, and was determined to connect with her people both at court and throughout the kingdom.¹⁷ The primary mode used to forge these connections, to ensure cooperation with the localities, and regulate the court through personal politics, status, pageantry and honour, was the Queen's royal progresses. These travels amounted to forty-five progresses consisting of over four hundred visits in the course of Elizabeth's forty-four year reign.¹⁸ The study of royal progresses has highlighted the points of contact through which Elizabethan culture and politics were shaped and defined, demonstrating how progresses constituted a mobile platform from which Elizabeth engaged in dialogues, politics and diplomacy, and exercised agency.¹⁹ Although studies of Elizabeth, her regime and Elizabethan court spectacles have become extensive and seemingly exhaustive, there is one activity of her reign closely connected to progresses that has largely been ignored or peripherally noted in passing comments: the culture of hunting. Yet nowhere is the activity of hunting frequently recorded or more visible than on Elizabeth's progresses, shedding light on how hunting impacted social interactions, accommodated gender and contributed to the complex system and mechanics of Elizabethan political culture and diplomacy.²⁰

16 Neighbors, "'With my ruling'", pp. 69-70 and 163-164.

17 Natalie Mears, 'The Personal Rule of Elizabeth I: Marriage, Succession, and Catholic Conspiracy, c. 1572-c. 1582' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2002), p. 22. See also Natalie Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse in Elizabethan Realms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 47.

18 Mary Hill Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999).

19 Neighbors, "'With my ruling'", pp. 37-38. See also Dustin M. Neighbors, 'The Performativity of Female Power and Public Participation through Elizabethan Royal Progresses,' *Liminalities*, 18:1 (2022), pp. 118-175.

20 The collection of John Nichols, an antiquarian, contain primary sources collected, catalogued, and published in 5 volumes. In 2017, the collection was finally published as an updated and edited collection. The edited John Nichols collection is hereafter referenced with the volume number and page number together (i.e., 1:001). My doctoral research is the first known study to utilise the newly edited collection. John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of Early Modern Sources, Volumes 1-5*, eds. Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). For key studies on Elizabethan political culture and diplomacy, see Anne McLaren, *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I: Queen and Commonwealth, 1558-1585* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). Mears, 'Courts, Courtiers, and Culture in Tudor England', *Historical Journal*, 46:3 (2003), pp. 703-722.

In an article on the masculinity of hunting for Francis I of France (1494-1547) and Henry VIII of England (1491-1547), Glenn Richardson makes two interesting points. First, Richardson summarises women's participation in the hunt as having either 'followed the King at the chase or awaited his arrival [...] at the hunting lodge [...], readying to meet the King's other physical needs after the hunt.'²¹ This conclusion reinforces early modern perceptions that connected hunting with sex, masculinity, and violence, but it overlooks the salience of women's active participation, knowledge and skills of hunting. Secondly, Richardson points out that the hunt was a means 'to communicate different messages about the two kings' views [Francis and Henry] of each other and a useful way to build rapport.'²² This crucial point illuminates how hunting was fundamentally social and fostered politics and diplomacy, whereby the building of rapport and personal relationships secured political alliances and peace, and ephemeral spaces enabled the exchange of counsel and cultivation of diplomacy. As a courtly activity, hunting provided recreation, points of contact, sociability, and, as we will see, employment. More crucially, hunting was an informal activity and secluded space that created moments of access to Elizabeth. This access was important for courtly dialogues between the monarch and her courtiers and highlights the 'forms of access' and negotiation of power and influence.²³ Thus, the Queen's pursuit of hunting was not a passive auxiliary activity, but a repetitive cultural practice and ritual that characterised Elizabeth's queenship and politics, influenced court culture, forged diplomatic interactions, and facilitated political privacy.²⁴

As outlined in the introduction of this special issue, political privacy stems from instances where 'normal and formal political processes were exchanged through informal tactics, personal or exclusive spaces, or ephemeral interactions'. Thus, political privacy is considered to be 'the informal, unseen, unheard actions and interactions of monarchs, courtiers, diplomats, and familial intermediaries' that have consequences.²⁵ In this study of early modern hunting, we focus on the 'private politics' lens of the model presented in the introduction – 'private interactions/situations that have political significance'.²⁶ The types, stages, and specific acts of hunting were also intimate and restricted, such as the chase which often involved a few people in pursuit of an animal on horseback. As such, the hunting environments and spaces fostered degrees of privacy, especially with the creation or designation of hunting spaces (e.g., parks, gardens, and forest areas). These were once public spaces used by elite and non-elite inhabitants, but increasingly these natural environments were enclosed. These spaces became 'very private abodes, walled, mysterious, and closed to outside scrutiny' to preserve hunting environment(s) for royal use.²⁷ The practices and environments of hunting reinforced this royal majesty and aura of mystery because hunting operated 'between the two spheres, the public and the private', making it the ideal vehicle for private politics.²⁸

21 Richardson, 'Hunting at the Courts', p. 129.

22 Richardson, 'Hunting at the Courts', p. 137.

23 Dries Raeymaekers and Sebastian Derks (eds.), *Keys to Power?: The Culture of Access in Princely Courts, 1400-1750* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), p. 6-7. The negotiation of power included influence, which Adamson confirms that 'Access and intimacy did not equate with political power', see John Adamson, 'The Tudor and Stuart Courts, 1509-1714', in *The Princely Courts of Europe, 1500-1750*, ed. John Adamson (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1999), p. 109.

24 Neighbors, 'Performativity of Female Power', p. 12.

25 Dustin M. Neighbors, 'Privacy and the Private within European Court Culture', *The Court Historian*, 27:3 (2023).

26 Neighbors, 'Privacy and the Private'.

27 Allsen, *Royal Hunt*, p. 34.

28 Allsen, *Royal Hunt*, p. 34.

As a public spectacle, hunting was an important part of image making and status as an extension of the social ceremony, rituals and meaning, and majesty of monarchical rule and court culture – the hallmarks of Tudor royal power and propaganda.²⁹ At the Elizabethan court, hunting embodied and displayed the ideals of courtly behaviour and culture – chivalry, power and strength – because it was a form of military practice to hone martial skills and performance of physical strength. These elements added to the fundamental criteria for monarchical power – the visual demonstration of effective martial leadership and monarchical authority (authority over land, animals, estates and people). For Elizabeth, the culture and practice of hunting, along with the royal progresses, was a key medium through which to exhibit her royal authority and identity, specifically a performance of female power in a male dominated activity, and court politics that emphasised the Queen's royal authority, martial skills and hunting expertise.

At the same time, the close bonds, personal relations and crafted narratives that emerged from the less visible moments of hunting enhanced this image making and royal identity. As such, the personnel, environments and buildings, and animals (both used and hunted) of hunting added to the 'artistic and architectural patronage' of these spectacles and further enhanced the display of royal power and facilitated court advancement.³⁰ Additionally, hunting reinforced, yet also expanded, the culture of status, rank and sociability at court. The personnel and administration of hunting, including the forest and game offices, constituted another, though scholarly neglected, patronage and apprenticeship system and kinship network.³¹

Women and Hunting

Traditionally, hunting and military activities have been viewed as very gendered areas, given that each demanded physical strength, linked to warfare and politics, and rooted in knightly and male honour within the evolving chivalric culture of the Tudor period.³² Based on these perceptions, with a few culture-specific exceptions, women were expected to adhere to their gender roles and were excluded from participating in military operations, and by extension the "combat" of politics. However, the exclusion of women from public participation and the expectations for women to maintain their gender roles, came into conflict, as studies have increasingly shown, when women, like Elizabeth, became queen regnant or took on other political, dynastic, or diplomatic responsibilities.³³ This conflict is due to the fact that

29 Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

30 J.P.D. Cooper, *Propaganda and The Tudor State: Political Culture in the Westcountry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), p. 210. See also John Cooper, 'Centre and the Localities', in *The Elizabethan World*, eds. Susan Doran and Norman Jones (Abdington: Routledge, 2014), pp. 130-146.

31 Manning, *Hunters and Poachers*, p. 29. Neighbors, "'With my ruling'", p. 239. For apprenticeship processes for the royal stables, see Simon Adams, 'Providing for the Queen: The Stables Under Elizabeth I', *The Court Historian*, 26:3 (2021), p. 216. See also David Cressy, 'Kinship and Kin interaction in Early Modern England', *Past and Present* 113:1 (1986), pp. 38-69. Patrick Wallis, 'Apprenticeship and Training in Premodern England', *The Journal of Economic History* 68:3 (2008), pp. 832-861. Paul S. Seaver, 'Work, Discipline, and the Apprentice in Early Modern London', in *Wellsprings of Achievement: Cultural and Economic Dynamics in Early Modern England and Japan*, ed. Penelope Gouk (Aldershot, 1995), pp. 159-79. Alexandra Shepard, *Accounting for Oneself: Worth, Status and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 210.

32 Janet Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex, 1589-1601* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012), pp. 5-23. Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth* (London: Pimlico, 1999). Marco Nievergelt, 'The Chivalric Imagination in Elizabethan England', *Literature Compass*, 8:5 (2011), pp. 266-279.

33 To note a few: Elena Woodacre, *The Queens Regnant of Navarre: Succession, Politics, and Partnership, 1274-1512* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). Helen Matheson-Pollock, Joanne Paul, and Catherine Fletcher, *Queenship and Counsel in Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018). Katrin Keller,

women utilised informal interactions, domestic spaces and ephemeral cultural activities, such as hunting, to engage, negotiate, manipulate or influence multifarious aspects within, what has been traditionally identified as the public sphere.³⁴ Thus, hunting provided an informal environment and informal degrees of access that enabled women to not only engage in courtly sociability,³⁵ but to also shape politics, diplomacy, and dynastic relations. The study of female hunting highlights how contemporary gendered expectations were the ideal and not necessarily the reality. While women were often noted as spectators of their husband's hunting activities, the historical reality is that the medieval and early modern periods contain numerous instances of royal and noble women actively engaged in hunting. Within Europe, Electress Anna of Saxony (1532-1585), Catherine de Medici (1519-1589), and Christina of Sweden (1626-1689) were well-known female hunters.³⁶ Elizabeth's own female courtiers were exceptional hunters and hunted with the Queen, including Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke (1561-1621), Lettice Knollys, Countess of Essex (1543-1634), and Blanche Parry (1507-1590).³⁷ Additionally, Catherine Howard, Lady Berkeley (1538-1596) was considered an expert and avid hunter. She and her husband, Henry Berkeley, 7th Baron Berkeley (1534-1613), spent so much on the pursuit of hunting that they were brought to the point of financial destitution.³⁸ Yet Lady Berkeley engaged in the chase, 'delighting her crossbowe' with a noteworthy group of hounds. She was also fond of falconry, so much so that she was often found with falcon droppings on her dresses.³⁹

Kurfürstin Anna von Sachsen (1532-1585) (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2010). Gemma Allen, 'The Rise of the Ambassadors: English Ambassadorial Wives and Early Modern Diplomatic Culture', *The Historical Journal*, 62:3 (2019), pp. 617-638.

- 34 Discussions regarding the outdated or traditional understanding of the public sphere, see Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998); Dena Goodman, 'Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime', *History and Theory* 31:1 (1992), pp. 1-20.
- 35 Tom Rose provides an interesting analysis of hunting and sociability, including women's involvement or not, as a means of exclusion. However, Rose dismisses elite women's involvement as they 'did not participate in the hunt' (p. 169), using gendered tropes minimising women's roles. He uses literary and artistic representations of female hunting, which often were not an accurate portrayal of the reality. More importantly, Rose focuses on how women were only spectators who were used to foster 'friendships that contributed to a family's political and social standing.' (p. 172) Yet this research does contribute good insights into the connection between hunting and sociability. See Tom Rose, 'Hunting, Sociability, and the Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion in Early Seventeenth-Century England', in *Negotiating Exclusion in Early Modern England, 1550-1800*, eds. Naomi Pull and Kathryn Woods (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021), pp. 161-178.
- 36 Anna's active participation is intimately bound to her husband, August's activities, but are detailed extensively in records at the Dresden archives as highlighted by Karl von Weber, *Anna Churfürstin zu Sachsen geboren aus Königlichem Stamm zu Dänemark* (Leipzig: Verlag von Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1865), p. 245. Catherine de Medici's proactive engagement with the hunt is recorded by a courtier, Pierre de Bourdeille, seigneur de Brantôme, and illustrated by the survival of Catherine's crossbow. Both of these references are highlighted in Susan Broomhall, 'The Game of Politics: Catherine de Medici and Chess', *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 12:1 (2017), pp. 106 and 108. For Christina's 'hunting parties [...] signaled her skill', see Jacques Lacombe, *The history of Christina, Queen of Sweden. From the French of M. Lacombe* (Printed for George Kearsly, in Ludgate-Street, MDCCLXVI [1766]), in *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, p. 175.
- 37 Kent History and Library Centre, De L'Isle Manuscripts, U1475/E93, f. 6-8. Also known as the Kenilworth Game Books, the women listed in the manuscript are explicitly named as having hunted with the Queen during the Kenilworth visit in 1575, according to the Kenilworth gamekeeper.
- 38 William A. Sessions, *Henry Howard, The Poet of Surrey: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 205. See also Retha Warnicke, *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983), p. 102.
- 39 John Smyth of Nibley, *The Berkeley Manuscripts: The Lives of the Berkeleys, Lords of the Honour, Castle, and Manor of Berkeley, in the County of Gloucester, from 1066 to 1618, Volume 2*, ed. John Maclean (Gloucester: John Bellows, 1883), 285 and 363. See also Landry, *Countryside*, pp. 145-146.

One of the key figures utilised in spectacles and festivals throughout the sixteenth century was Diana, the goddess of the chase, with which Elizabeth's identity was commonly associated. The identity of the huntress Diana was constructed by both the Queen and her courtiers; with her courtiers staging pageants, writing letters, composing poems, and singing songs that publicly proclaimed Elizabeth as 'the living embodiment of the Divine [...] Diana', given how alike in modesty and virtues that two women were. As such, the appropriation of Diana (and its mythological variations Artemis and Cynthia) as an acceptable female champion for Elizabeth was the court's 'Renaissance idealization of hunting [that was] based around Diana.'⁴⁰ This is reinforced by the literary devices of the period, including one description at the end of her reign where Elizabeth is heralded as 'Queen and Huntress, chaste and faire'.⁴¹

From recreation to symbolic communication and representation, the various ways in which the culture and practice of hunting was evident in early modern society demonstrates that it was not a peripheral activity, but an active, everyday enterprise that affected social and political relations and the negotiation of power. Within gender relations, hunting continues to be a debate between how 'masculinity could be extended to include powerful women',⁴² or restricted to 'gender-specific roles and rituals associated with the noble hunt'.⁴³ For Elizabeth, the former is certainly evident.

Logistics of the Queen's Hunt

As highlighted by Adams, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (1532-1588) wrote to Thomas Radcliffe, Earl of Sussex (1525-1583) that Elizabeth had 'become a great huntress and doth follow it daily from morning till night.'⁴⁴ This statement, along with the other contents of the letter, reveals two crucial pieces of information. First, hunting within Elizabeth's court was an elite ritual and cultural practice that was a pivotal for communication, gathering information, and conducting social relations. This social intercourse element of hunting is evident in the fact that courtiers often discussed the Queen's hunting activities. Second, the length of time that the Queen engaged in hunting was considerable, it therefore required planning, preparation and most likely a dedicated staff. Thus, we can deduce that Elizabeth's participation in the hunt was not a passing recreation or rare occurrence. To understand the significance, frequency and intimacy of hunting for Elizabeth and her court, this section will examine the logistics and practicalities of the royal hunt in the Elizabethan period.

Elizabeth was an enthusiastic and knowledgeable huntress, given the contemporary literature and correspondence that portrays her as such. Therefore, the Queen would have capitalised on the seasons and natural environment in England that bound the hunt and royal progresses together. The summer months, particularly between May and September, were best for hunting bucks, harts and roe.⁴⁵ Hares and rabbits were more available than other game most of the year. Hunting with falcons or hawks was also possible most of the year. Alternatively, the hunting of boars was best from September to the end of November, while

⁴⁰ Richardson, "'Riding Like Alexander, Hunting Like Diana'", p. 253.

⁴¹ Ben Jonson, 'Cynthia's Revels' (1601), in *The Poems of Ben Jonson*, eds. Tom Cain and Ruth Connally (London: Routledge, 2021), p. 19.

⁴² Edward Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 36.

⁴³ Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, p. 285.

⁴⁴ British Library (BL), Cotton MS, Titus B XIII, f. 17r. See also Adams, "'The Queenes Majestie'", p. 143.

⁴⁵ Edward of Norwich, *The Master of Game*, pp. 35-37.

fox hunting was best between January and March.⁴⁶ Over ninety percent of the Queen's progresses occurred between July and August, which was the heart of hunting season.⁴⁷ Along with the availability of game during the summer season, hunting happened on progresses because these travels allowed the monarch to escape the confines and formalities of the court in London, for the relaxed, ad hoc ventures combining recreation and elements of governance (i.e., counsel, diplomacy, and deal making). Table 1 also illustrates the frequency of Elizabeth hunting while on progress and highlights the specific times and locations where she hunted.

The table further reveals that Elizabeth visited and hunted in several places more than once. Epping Forest/Wanstead, Hatfield, Enfield, Kenilworth, Theobalds, Eltham, Hanworth, and Waltham Forest were specific locations that had established and dedicated hunting parks and chases, as well as a hunting lodge in Enfield.⁴⁸ Enfield hunting lodge was situated in Enfield Chase, a royal park that stretched across three counties: Hertfordshire, Middlesex and Bedfordshire,⁴⁹ and functioned as a stand in which the second floor was open, providing an unobstructed view of the surrounding forest and fields.⁵⁰ Hatfield, Enfield, Eltham and Hanworth were all royal residences. The table highlights that 17.5% of the Queen's visits on progresses involved hunting. Of the 17.5%, 20% of the hunting excursions occurred at the homes of her Privy Councillors and nobles. This figure suggests Elizabeth enjoyed the visits to the homes of her advisors because they provided an opportunity to combine the pursuit of hunting and conducting business. Furthermore, it is possible that these visits to the homes of her chief advisors and nobles allowed Elizabeth to re-establish her authority by displaying her hunting abilities to her courtiers, while also policing her courtiers. The exercising of royal authority to police and castigate was undoubtedly the case in the incident at Berkeley Castle in 1574, which is highlighted below.⁵¹

Kenilworth and Theobalds were residences owned by the Earl of Leicester and William Cecil, Lord Burghley (1520-1598), respectively Elizabeth's favourite courtiers. At Theobalds, Burghley developed the hunting park when he started building up the estate, in the 1570s, to host the Queen while on progress. The hunting park, also utilised by Burghley, created opportunities for Elizabeth to engage in her favourite pastime.⁵² In fact, as Table 1 shows, Elizabeth hunted five different times at Theobalds in the 1570s, where she had hunted on two previous occasions prior to 1570. At Hatfield, the Queen's childhood home, the hunting parks had been in existence since Elizabeth was a child. With the Queen's accession, Hatfield House became a royal residence, where Elizabeth frequently visited and hunted. In fact, throughout Elizabeth's reign, Hatfield was usually the first stop on her progresses to the surrounding counties of Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Warwickshire, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex. The prominence of

46 Edward of Norwich, *The Master of Game*, pp. 38-40.

47 Cole, *The Portable Queen*, pp. 180-202.

48 The Queen Elizabeth I hunting lodge. See <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/things-to-do/green-spaces/epping-forest/where-to-go-in-epping-forest/queen-elizabeths-hunting-lodge>

49 Buchanan Sharp, 'Rural Discontent and the English Revolution', in *Town and Countryside in the English Revolution*, ed. R.C. Richardson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), p. 267.

50 London Metropolitan Archives (LMA), Queen Elizabeth I Hunting Lodge, CLA/07704/31, No. 11 and 12.

51 The incident is based on Nichols' narrative from the Berkeley MSS. Nichols, *Progresses*, 2:196.

52 Hatfield House Archives (HHA), MS Cecil Papers—Misc., 2:153. I want to express my gratitude to The Most Hon Marquess of Salisbury PC KVC DL Hatfield House, Lord Salisbury and archivist Vicki Perry for allowing me access to the Cecil Papers and for sharing the information and insights pertaining to the records. See also Ian Dunlap, *The Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I* (London: The Trinity Press, 1962), p. 176.

Hertfordshire as a royal hunting ground, particularly at Hatfield, was evident during the 1590s as it was the focus of several disputes. Conflict emerged when specific hunters, for example John Stileman, encroached on the Queen's chases and were arrested for 'disorderlie hunting'.⁵³ Hunting crimes (i.e., trespassing and/or poaching) reflected the laws that preserved the chases, hunting forests, and game for royal use, and maintained royal rights over hunting.⁵⁴

The Queen's Hunting Staff: New Financial Records

The differences between hunting at the royal palaces within the Thames valley and hunting on progresses are summed up in two main points: the organisation of hunting staff and the time committed to hunting. The hierarchy and departments of the royal household, including its various deviations across time, has been well documented, yet a brief review is necessary to place the hunting office and its accounting records within the broader structure of the household and court. The Elizabethan household was divided into three 'Departments': the 'above stairs', 'below stairs', and the Master of the Horse.⁵⁵ The hunting staff and the care of the hunting animals fell under the domain of the Master of the Horse, since it was responsible for royal activities outside the palaces. This would certainly make sense during Elizabeth's reign given that the Earl of Leicester was not only the Queen's Master of the Horse, but, as we shall see below, he was also Master of the Buckhounds.⁵⁶ However, the royal hunt also required pre-planning and travel, 'equippage', and food for the animals,⁵⁷ as well as being organised around the Queen's progresses and the entertainments arranged for her. Therefore, the administration of the hunting office came under the purview of both the Lord Chamberlain and Lord Steward. As such, the financial accounting and records were maintained under the great chamber 'with the assistance of the Treasurer of the Chamber'.⁵⁸ While Adams notes that the 'Chamber is the most poorly documented [...] section of the Tudor court', particularly with regards to identifying the hunting personnel during Elizabeth's reign,⁵⁹ we now have access to new information. With the discovery of previously unused financial accounts of the Queen's chamber expenses, we are able to achieve a new degree of insight into the positions of the hunting staff, as well as who they were.⁶⁰ The obscure AO 3 collection suggests a further method of sixteenth-century record keeping besides

53 HHA, Cecil Papers 58/83.

54 Manning, *Hunters and Poachers*, pp. 34-35.

55 Arthur F. Kinney and Jane A. Lawson, *Titled Elizabethans: A Directory of Elizabethan Court, State, and Church Officers, 1558-1603* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 13. David Loades, *The Tudor Court* (London: Headstart History, 1992), pp. 38-42. Adams, 'Providing for the Queen', pp. 210-211. See also *A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, made in Divers Reigns from King Edward III to King William and Queen Mary*, Society of Antiquaries (London: John Nichols, 1790).

56 TNA, AO 3

57 Adams, 'Providing for the Queen', p. 212.

58 Retha Warnicke, 'The court', in *A Companion to Tudor Britain*, eds. Robert Tittler and Norman Jones (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), p. 63. Kinney and Lawson, *Titled Elizabethans*, p. 13.

59 Adams, "'The Queenes Majestie'", p. 147.

60 Through reviewing the printed (as distinct from electronic) catalogues of the various collections at TNA, I discovered a collection of unexploited manuscript. The AO records, labelled as Auditors and the Imprest and Successor Accounts, are listed as being 'particulars of accounts, vouchers and other documents subsidiary to the declared accounts to the Auditors of the Imprest and Commissioners of Audit and the Exchequer and Audit Department and frequently contain considerably more detailed information.' It is my conclusion that the Chamber records were produced first by the Treasurer of the Chamber, John Mason, of which most were destroyed by a fire at the Public Record Office in 1661. The accounts were copied and served as the auditor's account. A third copy formed the Exchequer records. This method of copying would explain why more details existed in the auditor's accounts. I want to sincerely thank Adrian Ailes at the TNA for the information and his insights into this record class.

the Exchequer accounts and the accounts of the Lord Chamberlain and Lord Steward.⁶¹ Although the AO 3 folios do not cover the entire Elizabethan period, they do provide a wide sample across Elizabeth's reign. Where possible, comparisons have been made with related Exchequer records, enabling the details in this record class to be verified and supplemented.⁶² While some of the information contained within the AO records is also recorded in the Exchequer accounts, the accounts, compiled by the Treasurer of the Chamber, include more information with regards to additional names of staff members and their positions, types of hunting animals used, deceased individuals, and details of the various locations that the household staff made 'readye' for the Queen's visit.⁶³ This unique source expands our understanding of sixteenth-century administration and contributes more information about the Queen's great chamber and her court more generally. While a significant portion of this collection has been transcribed, these records have not yet been published.⁶⁴ These records were analysed alongside printed sixteenth-century hunting manuals; references to the Queen hunting while on progress in the newly edited Nichols collection (see footnote 20); the Cecil Papers at the Hatfield House archives; the state papers at the TNA; letters from various courtiers preserved at the British Library and other local archives; and relevant letters from the Bibliothèque nationale de France.⁶⁵

Based on new information gleamed from these chamber accounts and other manuscript materials, we can construct a basic understanding of how the hunting staff was organised, and how they coordinated the Queen's hunting activities both on progress and close to London. Hunting throughout the Thames River valley occurred at the palaces that had dedicated hunting parks: Greenwich, Richmond, Nonsuch and Hampton Court.⁶⁶ Just as preparations were made for the Elizabeth's arrival when she moved between the London palaces, the hunting parks connected to royal residences or to the homes of courtiers were also prepared by her hunting staff. This process would mean that the royal stables, which housed the Queen's hunting animals at each location, would have been on alert, the animals groomed, and ready for any occasion in which she wished to hunt.⁶⁷ However, on the extra-London progresses, the hosts co-organised hunts for the Queen, with her hunting staff, primarily the Master of the Hunt. As hunting was an expensive and dedicated pursuit, those who co-organised the hunts would have had expert knowledge of hunting and their own hunting establishment. This point is evident in the case of Lord and Lady Berkeley who were known to have regularly hunted with a large retinue of hunting staff.⁶⁸

61 The two TNA collections (AO 3/127 and AO 3/128) contain eleven bound folios and each are written in sixteenth-century handwriting. AO 3/127 has six folios dating from 1560 to 1570. AO 3/128 has five folios dating from 1570-1598. However, only the years 1560, 1561, 1562, 1563, 1564, 1576, 1586, 1588, 1590, and 1595 are accounted for. Each folio details the financial expenditure of the various household positions, from the wardrobe to the musicians.

62 TNA, Exchequer (E) 351/541.

63 TNA, AO 3/127, f. 23; E 101/417/5.

64 These records are in the process of being developed for publication. While I have transcribed a significant portion of the folios in the collection, I need to complete the rest of the transcriptions. They will be published along with an article in due course.

65 Nichols, *Progresses*. HHA, MS Cecil Papers 58/83. HHA, MS Cecil Papers—Misc., 2:153. Translations of French letters from the Bibliothèque nationale de France (hereafter BnF) were completed with the assistance of Estelle Paraneque. BnF, MS. Fr. 17932, f. 10r°. BnF, Cinq Cents Colbert, n° 24, f. 98r°.

66 For the best information relating to the London palaces see the works of Simon Thurley, particularly, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven: Yale University Press for the Carnegie Mellon Centre, 1993). See also Susan Doran and Robert J. Blythe, *Royal River: Power, Pageantry, and the Thames* (Greenwich: Scala Publishers LTD., 2012).

67 Adams, "'The Queens Majestie'", p. 147. Adams identifies that each palace had a stable, or royal mews, housing the hunting animals, under the control of the Master of the Horse.

The use of a host's hunting staff did not replace the Queen's hunting staff; the former were just utilised as needed. Most likely, the hosts' equipment, animals (e.g., hounds, hawks and falcons), and staff would have been supplemented with those of the Queen, mirroring how the household was organised and functioned logistically on progresses.⁶⁹

Another indication that hunting was supplemented is based on the fact that the Queen's Privy Councillors, Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon (1526-1596) and Leicester often attended the Queen on progress and were also listed among the Queen's hunting staff.⁷⁰ It is clear that they would have been responsible for making sure the Queen's hunting equipment and animals were transported, and her hunting preferences (i.e., favourite hound or horse, preference for a specific hunting weapon) were met. This is reinforced, as previously highlighted by Leicester's letter to the Earl of Sussex when he mentioned the Queen's preference for 'her geldings, whom she spareth.'⁷¹ Additionally, Privy Council members and courtiers went on these hunts with the Queen for a variety of reasons, but primarily their presence provided an extra level of protection for her, especially during the secluded moments when Elizabeth was moving in pursuit of her quarry or out of view of the reduced itinerant court.

With the symbolic prominence of hunting, Elizabeth's hunting activities required the very best of the Queen's court in terms of those courtiers that were skilled and experts at both riding and hunting. These courtiers included individuals, as previously mentioned, such as Leicester, Hunsdon, and Burghley, who were also skilled huntsmen, as evidenced by a letter where Burghley remarked that the hound 'maketh my huntyng very certen.'⁷² Additionally, Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland (1532-1585), Thomas Sackville, Earl of Dorset (1536-1608), Thomas Wilson (1521-1581), and Nicholas Bacon (1510-1579) all hunted with the Queen.⁷³ The proximity of these courtiers to the Queen during the hunt and the amount of time that the hunt took up, suggests that these occasions provided opportunities for Elizabeth and her councillors to informally and privately discuss matters of state outside of London.

The other difference between hunting in London and on progresses was the amount of time spent hunting, evidenced by many references from Elizabeth's courtiers and ambassadors, such as Leicester's remark that the Queen hunted 'from morning till night' while they were on Elizabeth's progress to Hampshire.⁷⁴ All-day hunting would have had some logistical problems, particularly in terms of the heat, and the condition and endurance of the animals used for hunting. This complication would have been addressed with the use of deer standings that were constructed within deer parks.⁷⁵ While hunting on progress was a day-long affair,

⁶⁸ Cole, *Portable Queen*, p. 64.

⁶⁹ Cole alludes to the assembling of 'people, equipment and animals' as part of the planning for progresses. She makes the case that the Wardrobe department would have supplemented staff where required. See Cole, *Portable Queen*, Cole, *Portable Queen*, pp. 41 and 72-73.

⁷⁰ The accounts related to the Queen's progresses do not list payments for expenses, like meals. As they were both members of the court on progress, they would have been included in the numbers for meals that were provided for the court indicated in the household ordinances. Cole refers to the Bouche of Court and Book of Diet that laid out the rules and regulations for which members of court would dine with the Queen and the costings. Cole, *Portable Queen*, p. 43.

⁷¹ BL, Cotton MS, Titus B XIII, f. 17r.

⁷² TNA, SP Domestic 12/141, f. 94.

⁷³ Editor's annotations note the gamekeeper's records at Kenilworth provided information that these individuals hunted with the Queen during her visit in 1575. Nichols, *Progresses*, 2:298.

⁷⁴ BL, Cotton MS Titus B XIII, f. 17.

⁷⁵ Adams, "'The Queens Majestie'", p. 146. The best known and surviving deer stand is known as the Queen's Hunting Lodge at Enfield (Figure 1). LMA, CLA/07704/31.

hunting in London utilised only part of the day. With the Queen in London, the court was at full capacity and only a partial day of hunting was possible given that interruptions and urgent affairs of state would have taken precedence over the pursuit of the hunt, especially if Parliament was in session.⁷⁶ Furthermore, hunting would have been organised for the afternoon due the requirements for hunting specific animals and game.⁷⁷

The intense nature and organisational complexity of hunting activities is reflected by Elizabeth's expansive and well-established hunting staff, as shown in Table 2. The central positions were the 'Falconers, Spannyell keeper, Hunters, Harryers, Leashe, Crossbowe, and Toyles'.⁷⁸ Many men were employed to attend the Queen on the various hunts, and a number of them were members of the royal court. Elizabeth's hunting staff formed a hierarchical system with specific roles and duties such as 'the Master of the Buckhoundes, yeoman of the leashe, children of the leashe,' Master of the Crossbows, and, depending on the type of hunt, perhaps falconers.⁷⁹ Notably, the 'spannyell keeper' and handlers of the 'buckhoundes' were listed together. The huntsmen consisted of a core group who assisted the Queen in finding the target while she hunted and would have been utilised for Elizabeth's hunts while on progress. Although the huntsmen were paid members of staff, their positions required them to be well trained and have hunting expertise. They were given annual livery—summer and winter livery—that included a 'redd cote' that would signify the royal hunt and helped with visibility in the hunting environs.⁸⁰ Hunting required a great deal of trust, familiarity, and loyalty, thus, we can assume that Elizabeth's hunting staff was given profound trust due to their proximity to the Queen, especially as this closeness provided opportunities to harm her. As such, the majority of the hunting staff were employed for the duration of their life, which is evident in the accounts provided in Table 2. While there was no instance where the Queen was actively targeted during a hunt, there was one occasion where the hunt proved to be a hazard and exposed the potential threat of hunting practices. In July 1575, a letter indicated that while the Queen was hunting at Kenilworth, 'a traitor shot a cross-bow at her.' However, in a subsequent letter, it was believed that the person was not an assassin, but merely a huntsman who was 'only shooting at the deer, and meant no harm' having, unfortunately, missed his aim.⁸¹ This occasion reinforces the importance of the hunting staff and their loyalty.

The chamber accounts also reveals that from 1561-1598 the hunting staff consisted of, for the most part, the same people throughout Elizabeth's reign. As shown in Table 3, the various positions of the Queen's hunting staff maintained steady numbers. In 1560-61, there were nineteen falconers, and this number was consistent throughout the Queen's reign. The 'Spannyell keeper' had one person employed in the position, Robert Craggye, who served in the position until 1576. After Craggye's death, no one else was listed in this position until 1586, when John Wilchin assumed the role of the Queen's 'Spannyell keeper' and occupied the position until 1591.⁸² Huntsmen averaged about seven to eight members in the position from 1560 to 1590. However, in 1576, there are fewer people listed in this position than all other years. There is

76 Cole, *Portable Queen*, p. 19.

77 George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venery* (London: Imprinted by Henry Bynneman, 1575), p. 36.

78 TNA, AO 3/127-128.

79 TNA, AO 3/127.

80 TNA, AO 3/127; TNA, AO 3/128.

81 18 July 1575, 'Antonio de Guaras to Zayas', in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain (Simancas), Volume 2, 1565-1579*, ed. Martin A S Hume (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1894), pp. 495-500. Hereafter CSP—Simancas.

82 TNA, AO 3/127; TNA, AO 3/128.

no clear answer to account for the decrease. It is possible that there was a restructuring of the hunting staff due to deaths of specific individuals. This restructuring was evident by the increase in the numbers after 1576 and illustrated by the fact that various individuals moved to different positions.

The position of the ‘toyles’ was not consistently recorded in the chamber accounts, as the years 1561, 1562, 1564, 1576, and 1590 do not list payments. Given the uncommon nature of the position and what they were responsible for, which was setting up the nets to herd or guide the game to a specific location, it is possible to conclude that this was not a common type of hunt used by the Queen.⁸³ This is reinforced by the information in Table 2 which only lists three individuals that maintained the positions of the ‘toyles’.⁸⁴ The ‘toyles’ were a minor hunting position and only made up a tiny fraction of the forty-three staff members Elizabeth retained in the hunting department. Comparatively, the Queen employed between seventy-nine to eighty-three servants in the stable, consisting of stable hands, riders, and others to look after as many as ninety-eight horses at one time.⁸⁵ These high numbers reinforce the importance of this activity, while revealing the extravagance of hunting. The extensive staff also highlights the fact that Elizabeth was a ‘model hunter’ through:

owning kennels and stables, together with their requisite equipment and specialized staff, and possessing, as they do, a demonstrable knowledge of the seasons, vocabulary, and customs proper to the hunt, including highly ritualized breaking of carcasses.⁸⁶

This investment and use of the royal hunt signalled Elizabeth’s huntress status, which Catherine Bates asserts was distinguished, ‘in visible and unmistakable terms.’⁸⁷

There were always a steady number of seven men in the ‘harryers’, while the ‘leashe’ maintained a minimum of five men. The post of the crossbow maintained two to three men after 1560 given the frequency of Elizabeth’s hunting excursions and use of the crossbow while on progress. By having several crossbow staff members, the Queen not only had one at her disposal to assist with preparing the crossbow in London, but also had others available for the extra-London progresses. The ‘Master of the Crossbowe’ had a unique role because the use of the hand-drawn crossbow required an individual to pull back on the bow to lock it in place and then hand it to the Queen. The specific position of ‘Master of the Crossbowe’ was regularly listed in the chamber accounts, which further reinforces the previous point that the crossbow was a prominent hunting weapon used by Elizabeth. The Queen’s preference for the crossbow is also reinforced by the fact that the New Year’s gift rolls lists several instances where the crossbow was given as a gift to Elizabeth. These gifts acknowledged her

⁸³ Griffin, *Blood Sport*, pp. 81-82.

⁸⁴ TNA, AO 3/127 and 128.

⁸⁵ Joan Thirsk, *Rural Economy* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984), p. 377. Thirsk references two sources for this figure, the first is the ordinances of the royal household and the other is a letter in the State Papers. For a more up-to-date discussion of the stable department, see Adams, ‘Providing for the Queen’, pp. 210-228. Although Adams provides an important analysis of the organisation and purpose of the stables and the horses, he does not discuss the connection, or lack thereof, between the hunting department and the stables, especially since he has previously published a study of Elizabeth’s hunting (see Adams, “‘The Queens Majestie’”). There is only a single mention of hunting related to Mary, Queen of Scots (p. 226) in the article on the stable. Given how close these two departments worked, this surprising and certainly should be explored further.

⁸⁶ Catherine Bates, *The Masculinity and the Hunt: Wyatt to Spencer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 24-25.

⁸⁷ Bates, *Masculinity and the Hunt*, pp. 24-25.

ability and skills to hunt, as gift-giving required intimate knowledge of the individual receiving the gift.⁸⁸

The crossbow was an interesting weapon that demanded strength, hardiness, in-depth knowledge of the weapon and animal(s) being hunted, and energy to handle the mechanisms of the weapon to be effective and efficient.⁸⁹ Furthermore, the efficiency of the crossbow coupled with the thrill of the hunt (whether chasing a stag or another animal), and encounters with structures like the ‘dens built by foxes and badgers’, made hunting environments like ‘military fortifications and [...] tactical problems’, simulating the exercise and practice of war.⁹⁰ Hunting ‘par force’, or hunting with strength, was a type of hunting that was much more demanding on the hunter and was done on horseback.⁹¹ Along with having a dedicated hunting staff, the fact that Elizabeth used the crossbow and engaged in parforce hunting demonstrates that she was not a mere spectator of the hunt but an invested and skilled competitor.⁹²

As a spectacle and a cultural ritual, each type of hunting was important and had distinct functions and meanings. The hunt ‘demanded specific forms of knowledge, comportment, and performances in terms of courtliness, sociability or martial valour.’⁹³ For example, hunting on a stand as deer ran past functioned as a spectacle and display of the sovereign’s aim and accuracy, whereas hunting on horseback with hounds served as a physical exercise and displayed strength and power that combined weapon deployment while riding and maintaining an accurate aim to kill the target. The very sight of the Queen armed, in readiness for the deer in her hunting stand or on horseback, and then shooting the animals, surrounded by members of the court and diplomats, would have been a spectacle that displayed Elizabeth’s expert skills and power. The spectacle would have also reinforced her martial prowess that could not be demonstrated on the battlefield, thus bolstering her reputation as a vigorous, knowledgeable, and powerful monarch. As such, the hunting staff played a crucial role in the delivery and display of these smaller and less visible spectacles and rituals.

Hawking and falconry were another form of early modern hunting that Queen Elizabeth engaged in, despite Adam’s conclusion,⁹⁴ as evidenced by the chamber accounts with annual payments to the ‘Falconers’.⁹⁵ These new hunting records also reveal the connections between the hunting activities, court advancement, patronage, kinship, as well as becoming part of the Queen’s household which reinforces the ‘politics of intimacy’.⁹⁶ For example, Henry Carey, also cousin to Elizabeth, was promoted to first Baron Hunsdon in January 1559, and later appears in the 1560 Chamber accounts as ‘Master of the Hawkes’.⁹⁷ The

88 The evidence for this gift is located in two collections. Nichols, *Progresses*, 1:251. The surviving New Year’s Gift rolls have been catalogued, transcribed, and annotated by Jane A. Lawson. The notation of the crossbow given to the Queen was listed in the 1562 gift rolls. Jane A. Lawson, *The Elizabeth New Year’s Gift Exchanges, 1559-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 63.

89 David S. Bachrach, ‘Crossbows for Kings: The Crossbow during the reigns of John and Henry III of England’, *Technology and Culture*, 45:1 (2004), p. 102.

90 Beavers, ‘The Great Deer Massacre’, p. 191.

91 Richardson, “‘Riding Like Alexander, Hunting Like Diana’”, p. 258.

92 The idea of Elizabeth being a competitive hunter is illustrated in the example of her hunting excursion at Berkeley where she killed 27 stags. Nichols, *Progresses*, 2:196.

93 Beaver, ‘The Great Deer Massacre’, p. 192.

94 Adams, “‘The Queens Majestie’”, p. 156.

95 TNA, AO 3/127, f. 2.

96 David Starkey, ‘Innovation and Intimacy: The Rise of the Privy Chamber, 1485-1547’, in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, eds. David Starkey, D.A.L. Morgan, John Murphy, Pam Wright, Neil Cuddy, and Kevin Sharpe (London: Longman, 1987), p.100.

97 TNA, AO 3/127, f. 2.

Master of the Hawks was responsible for the maintenance and training of the royal hawks, along with taking care of the hawks that the Queen received as gifts. The training of hawks consisted of transforming the hawk from a wild bird of prey to a trained bird of prey, ‘shape the manner in which the bird of prey chases quarry’ consistently, and to return to the point of departure, especially after it had hunted.⁹⁸ Taming, training, and hunting with a falcon or hawk was a ‘serious and skilled business’, requiring a dedicated expert, as well as financial investment and maintenance, given that these types of hunts were ‘grand social occasion[s] requiring [...] vast tracts of land’.⁹⁹ Alternatively, the Master of the Hawks served as a ceremonial middleman between the Queen and foreign visitors when hawks were used in intimate diplomatic hunting excursions.¹⁰⁰ Hunsdon’s role as Master of the Queen’s hawks and his position on Elizabeth’s Privy Council positioned him perfectly for the task of serving as the “middleman”, a position Hunsdon held until his death in 1596.

The importance and value of the hunting staff and the pervasiveness of Elizabeth’s participation in the hunt is evident in the payments made to hunting staff. In analysing Table 3, the annual finances reveal that the Queen maintained the use of hunting staff relatively consistently from the beginning to the end of her reign. The hunting department’s combined annual expenditure was extremely high, averaging between £400-600, except for 1586 when the expenditure nearly doubled to a staggering £1047, 2s and 8d.¹⁰¹ Interestingly, the second highest annual expense of £828, occurred in 1588: the year of the Spanish Armada, prompting us to consider connections between the threats of war and Elizabeth’s martial practices through hunting. Comparatively, the average wage earner earned 4d per day, while courtiers such as Dudley earned an average of £200 annually.¹⁰² These earnings included Dudley’s wages from his position as Master of the Horse and ‘M[aster] of her Ma[jes]t[ies] Buckehounde’ for which he was paid ‘£33 per A[nnu]m.’¹⁰³ In analysing the increase in the 1586 hunting finances, the two tables (Table 2 and 3) are compared together, revealing a few peculiarities. First, the nineteen falconers were paid more than the average wage earner in a single year.¹⁰⁴ This disparity illustrates not only the value placed on hunting and the hunting staff, but also the regularity with which the hunt and types of hunting occurred. The table indicates that in 1586 the falconers were utilised to a greater degree than the other hunting personnel, which contributed to the rise in the hunting expenses in 1586. Next, while the ‘toyles’ were not used as often, they feature prominently in the 1586 accounts when they were paid more than any recorded year.¹⁰⁵ Finally, another explanation for the significant jump in annual finances of 1586 is due to the fact that Elizabeth hunted not only during her summer progresses, but also in the extra progresses she took in October and November 1586. Furthermore, the high use of the ‘toyles’ could be accounted for by an atypical pattern where Elizabeth hunted in two prime hunting locations that year – Enfield and

98 Helen Macdonald, *Falcon* (London: Reaktion Books, 2006), p. 87.

99 Macdonald, *Falcon*, pp. 69 and 75.

100 Richard Grassby, ‘The Decline of Falconry in Early Modern England,’ *Past and Present*, 157 (1997), p. 42.

101 TNA, AO 3/128, f. 2.

102 Francis Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, BL, 10-21. The figures within this particular source by Francis Peck, an eighteenth-century antiquarian, were a compilation of various antiquarian sources.

103 TNA, AO 3/128, f. 2.

104 This figure is based on the annual figure paid falconers £352 and 17s (Table 3) in 1560, divided among the 19 falconers that were known to be employed (Table 2); indicating that that were paid £18 for the year. Despite not working every day of the year, if we then divided the £18 by 365, the falconers earned 5d per day, which was higher than the average wage earner.

105 TNA, AO 3/128, f. 2.

Waltham Forest. There are no other indications of Elizabeth having visited either of these locations within a singular progress.¹⁰⁶ Given the frequency of the hunt, the sheer size and financial investment for the royal hunt, we can conclude that the hunt contributed significantly to the Elizabethan patronage and personnel system, and played a vital role in the cultural sociability of early modern England by bringing diverse groups of people together.

Hunting and Private Politics

The prominence of hunting and its significance for Elizabeth was clear and visible in her coronation procession through the city of London in 1558. The Queen's procession train included 'Children of Leashe' that were listed and paid in the wardrobe accounts.¹⁰⁷ The positions connected to the 'leash' (i.e., Groom of the Leash or Children of the Leash) refer to dedicated handlers of the hunting dogs in various situations.¹⁰⁸ 'Children of the Leash' were basically young hunting apprentices and usually responsible for getting the hounds ready, holding them before the hunt, collecting them after the hunt and caring for them. The notation of the 'Children of the Leash' is intriguing because royal processions, as well as the coronation ceremony and rituals, were very carefully planned; every component had meaning. Each member and every element of the procession symbolised a certain prominence and status within the court hierarchy or reflected what was important to the sovereign. Thus, from the inception of Elizabeth's reign, hunting was a featured part of the Queen's household and contributed to her early royal image and reputation as a huntress. As a result, hunting enhanced Elizabeth's royal magnificence, strengthening the legitimacy of her queenship by associating the Queen with 'princely sportes', and displayed her chivalric character to the royal court, foreign diplomats, and ordinary subjects.¹⁰⁹ More importantly, the display of hunting personnel during a significant ceremony and ritual, distinguished the new Queen's royal prerogative and personal rule. The personal and intimate elements of royal and princely rule in England and throughout Europe were central to the 'politics of intimacy' and, as highlighted in the introduction, political privacy.¹¹⁰

The Queen's hunting excursions functioned as a vehicle for the exchange of dialogue and counsel that shaped the relationships between Elizabeth, her courtiers and Privy Council. It is safe to surmise that Burghley occasionally joined Elizabeth on the hunt because he was present on the Queen's progresses most of the time and served as the point of contact for the affairs of state. He was also personally close to Elizabeth and, most likely, bonded with her over the hunt within the hunting parks across Hertfordshire (considered prime hunting

106 The explanation for the 'toyles', or toils, high finances expenditure was compared with Cole's tables, which revealed the progresses in the autumn months and the use of Enfield and Waltham Forest. Cole, *Portable Queen*, pp. 194-195.

107 TNA, E 101/429/5.

108 The position of the leash consists of two ways of managing the hunting dogs. One way consisted of individuals who handled a group of hounds intended to be used during the hunt or collected them after the hunt. The other way was through a specific hunting practice whereby hunting hounds, usually greyhounds, 'were set in leashes of two or, preferably, three' to 'wait in a position to which game was driven', at which point the groom would 'release the greyhounds as [the game] went past.' See Cummins, *Hawk and Hound*, p. 13-16. The position of the leash is described in Gaston Phoebus' *Livre de Chasse*, but is interpreted by Cummins. David Dalby also identifies the leash practices in his comparison of English and German hunting terminology and language. See Dalby, *Lexicon*. One example of Dalby's distinction of the leash is found on p. 87.

109 The occasion where the Queen was described as hunting with the Earl of Leicester is detailed in *The Black Book of Warwick*. Copy text, ed. Gabriel Heaton in Nichols, *Progresses*, 2:38. The original manuscript of *The Black Book of Warwick* is located at Warwickshire County Record Office, CR 1618/WA19/6.

110 Political privacy aims to build on Starkey's idea of 'politics of intimacy', see Starkey, 'Innovation', p. 100.

country), including hunting at Theobalds.¹¹¹ Burghley's correspondence often documented the regularity of hunting as demonstrated in a letter to his son, Robert Cecil, in 1595, where he mentioned that he had been out 'hunting a stag' before writing the letter.¹¹² The context of Burghley's connection to the hunt is important because as the Principal Secretary, head of the Privy Council, and later Lord Treasurer, he was essentially the Queen's gatekeeper, responsible for executing Elizabeth's personal rule, for mediating between and 'coordinating the activities of the Queen's foreign secretaries and ambassadors', and maintaining state finances.¹¹³ Therefore, his presence with Elizabeth on the hunt and on progresses suggests that these activities functioned as a private medium for informal communication and counsel between the Queen and her councillors. These instances of informal meeting and personal counsel were common occasions that occurred outside the formal protocols, ceremony, and boundaries of physical court spaces, such as the Privy Chamber and great hall of the principal palaces throughout the Thames river valley.¹¹⁴ These episodes illustrate how the Queen and her courtiers cultivated informal processes of politics such as discussing important matters of state, to persuade ambassadors, or obtain Elizabeth's decisions.¹¹⁵ Conversely, hunting also aided the Queen in dealing with politics, even reprimanding, or demanding loyalty from certain courtiers. During Elizabeth's progress to Bristol in 1574, for example, she hunted at Berkeley Castle which resulted in a situation that saw the death of twenty-seven stags, which can be interpreted as an intended message to Lord Berkeley about his disloyalty. This interpretation stems from the contemporary evidence in which the situation was described in barbaric terms as the 'slaughter' of deer, which created a 'havoked' environment that angered Berkeley, particularly because Elizabeth hunted in his park while Berkeley was away, resulting in an 'ugly atmosphere' that culminated in 'bloody insults.'¹¹⁶

Hunting, in some ways, reinforced or enhanced the boundaries established by physical structures and protocols of the court in London that regulated the proximity and access to the Queen's person. Accordingly, the ephemerality and undefined boundaries of hunting enabled Elizabeth to control admittance to her presence by granting or denying access herself. Hunting on progress contributed to the negotiation of and for power, which Elizabeth actively pursued and mediated informally in intimate spaces and the private moments of hunting. These intimate environment(s) and practices of hunting were also recognised as opportunities by diplomats and courtiers to gain access to rulers by engaging in personal counsel or advancing advance political agendas, free from the pressure of outside interference, and unseen or obscured from the wider public, diplomats, and courtiers. For example, in 1575, the Queen visited Leicester's home, Kenilworth Castle, and stayed for over two weeks. During the visit, the Privy Council met 'regularly' with the Queen, despite

111 There were 11 progresses to or through Hertfordshire. Yet there were 13 occasions where the Queen visited Burghley's estate, with 10 between 1572 and 1597. See Stephen Alford, *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 209.

112 TNA, SP Domestic 12/253, f. 129.

113 Kinney and Lawson describe the Principal Secretary's role. See Kinney and Lawson, *Titled Elizabethans*, p. 5. Wallace T. MacCaffrey, 'Cecil, William, first Baron Burghley (1520/21-1598)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

114 Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse*, pp. 47-54. Angela Andreani, *The Elizabethan Secretariat and the Signet Office: The Production of State of State Papers, 1590-1596* (London: Routledge, 2019), pp. 24-26.

115 Cole, *The Portable Queen*, p. 1.

116 This description comes from the narrative provided by Nichols. However, he explicitly notes that the incident is recorded in the Berkeley MSS. Nichols, *Progresses*, 2:196. Cole suggests that this disloyalty and 'displeasure' stemmed from the legal battle with Robert Dudley, the Queen's favourite. Cole, *Portable Queen*, p. 149.

travelling with a reduced court, which was typical for Elizabeth's progresses.¹¹⁷ Meanwhile, the Queen hunted at least six different times, where on one occasion she killed eight deer using various forms of the hunt – hunting with hounds and the parforce hunt on horseback 'with her bow'.¹¹⁸ On these hunting excursions Elizabeth did not have a large retinue of courtiers, instead she engaged a small hunting party of no more than twenty participants, which included a few hunting personnel.¹¹⁹ This select group highlights one aspect of the intimate and less visible nature of hunting. However, the Kenilworth visit exemplifies how courtiers recognised that hunting provided a means of informal access, both physically and mentally, to engage with rulers.

From the moment the Queen arrived at Kenilworth on the 9 July 1575, she was presented with numerous hunting excursions, pageants, poems and songs about the hunt or featured hunting figures and representations, which almost always occurred when Elizabeth was departing or returning from a hunt. Why was Leicester going overboard with the hunting theme? Given his close bond with the Queen, as well as his position as Master of the Horse and Buckhounds, Leicester would have first-hand knowledge of Elizabeth's love and preference for hunting and planned accordingly. However, the sheer scale in which Leicester deliberately employed not only the activity of hunting, but also exploited the theme and environments of hunting, suggests that he had a specific motive for Elizabeth's visit. This motive becomes clearer when we look at what was happening politically at the time of the visit and examine the contents of the pageants presented to the Queen. Throughout the Spring and Summer of 1575, the marriage negotiations with Francis, Duke of Alençon (1555-1584) were revived (though a formal proposal was received in September).¹²⁰ Like many of his fellow countrymen, Leicester was opposed to a foreign marriage because the union would bring an outsider who would have influence over the realm, particularly in matters of religion. As such, through the devised pageants, Leicester sought to offer counsel to the Queen about the marriage negotiations with the Duke of Alençon. One of the more important planned pageants served to act out Leicester's proposal to be a marriage suitor for Elizabeth. However, the pageant was cancelled due to the weather.¹²¹ Yet, this did not stop Leicester, who quickly asked for a new pageant to be created that would contain the same message for the Queen.

In the final farewell pageants, Leicester, in the guise of Sylvanus, 'God of the woods, and meeting' the Queen 'as she went hunting' proclaimed: 'I begin to declare the distresses wherein some of them doe presently remayne. I could tell your highnesse of sundry famous and worthy persons, whome shee hath turned and converted into most monstrous shapes and proportions.'¹²² Leicester almost seems to be alerting the Queen to those she has put

117 Nichols, *Progresses*, 2:297, see footnote 477, where the editor confirms that the Privy Council met regularly through the Records of the Privy Council.

118 De L'Isle Manuscripts, U1475/E93, f. 6-8.

119 Nichols, *Progresses*, 2:297, again see footnote 477. Elizabeth Goldring, the section editor of the Kenilworth entertainments in the Nichols collection, has provided a sparse, though valuable, list of courtiers that were present during the Kenilworth visit. More specifically, she includes a separate, yet succinct list of courtiers who went hunting with Elizabeth. Goldring compiled both lists using a variety of manuscript material. The small number of hunting personnel that were used for the Queen's hunt is evident in the hunting tables and hunting treatises from the period. For further discussion of the number of hunting personnel that went with Elizabeth, see Griffin, *Blood Sport*, p. 82.

120 Susan Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I* (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 142-143.

121 In an oration given by the character of the Savage man, he engaged with Eccho and the dialogue between these two characters emphasised the topic of 'true love'. When the Savage man enquires as to Eccho's true love, she identifies 'Dudley'. This explicit reference was most likely Dudley's declaration to the Queen regarding the true nature of his feelings. Nichols, *Progresses*, 2:297-304.

122 George Gascoigne, 'Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth Castle', in *The Complete Works*, volume 2, ed. John W. Cunliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), p. 125.

into positions of power and elevated within the court, who have now become dangers to her and her government.¹²³ The Kenilworth progress, pageants, and hunting excursions provided an intimate, or private, opportunity for Leicester to share his thoughts and concerns with Elizabeth in an informal setting. It served as unofficial, informal, yet personal counsel. It turns out that the piece displeased the Queen and she cut her stay short.¹²⁴ By leaving, the Queen, in turn, gave Leicester a symbolic response to his pageants: that she would not entertain the idea of marriage with him.¹²⁵ Therefore, as this example illustrates, an analysis of privacy through hunting influenced Elizabethan politics and diplomacy exposes the intersections, or heuristic zones, and overlaps that demarcate instances of political privacy.¹²⁶

Diplomatic correspondence provides numerous examples of how hunting facilitated private politics. In a 1590 'letter written from her Majesty to the French Ambassador [Beauvoir]', it was indicated that the letter's contents were provided with instructions given 'by her Majesty at Oatlands upon Wednesday night after her coming from hunting.'¹²⁷ This instance suggests that the Queen's hunting activities provided opportunities for her to consider and contemplate political matters in private or seclusion. Furthermore, the explicit remark of 'instructions being given' to one of Elizabeth's secretaries after the hunt could also indicate that counsel was given or a response to counsel was conceived during the hunt, further reinforcing the role of hunting in private politics. This assertion is confirmed when we look at the preceding and subsequent correspondence to this letter. Beauvoir sends the initial letter on 3 August 1590 asking for the details about the case of a young French Protestant merchant, whose family was connected with the 'king [his] master.'¹²⁸ The merchant broke the law because he did not know the local rules, and Beauvoir was seeking mercy on his behalf. Elizabeth considered the request because her response was issued at Oatlands as she came back from hunting, where she advised Beauvoir to speak to her Privy Council. This prompted Beauvoir to write to the Privy Council requesting a resolution of the case.¹²⁹ Along with the preceding examples and based on the epistolary exchange, it is clear that hunting was an environment through which politics progressed and offered occasions where counsel was not only given *to* the Queen, but also provided *by* the Queen.

One of the best examples of hunting excursions involving political discussion, thus, highlighting private politics, is a letter dated 15 June 1564, in which the Queen wrote to the Master of the Hawks (Carey) that she '[c]aused M. De Gonnorre and the Ambassador to dine with her [...] to see certain pastimes of [...] hunting, and killing three stagges [...]'.¹³⁰ This passage might seem trivial at first; however, the individuals mentioned and the context surrounding the letter reveals a more interesting situation. Artus de Cossé-Brissac, Monsieur de 'Gonnorre' (1512-1582) was a nobleman at the French court who was part of a

123 This same allusion was frequently espoused throughout the final pageants. It was widely known that Dudley had opposing views to, and difficulties with, certain members of her Privy Council, and was often outnumbered when it came to specific topics and discussions regarding the Queen and her realm.

124 Gillian Austen, *George Gascoigne* (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008), p. 117.

125 Mary Hill Cole, 'Ceremonial Dialogue between Elizabeth I and Her Civic Hosts,' in *Ceremony and Texts in the Renaissance*, ed. Douglas Routledge (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 84-85.

126 Developed at PRIVACY, the heuristic zones model is an analytical tool to examine and identify historical privacy. Mette Birkedal Bruun, 'Towards an Approach to Early Modern Privacy: The Retirement of the Great Condé', in *Early Modern Privacy: Sources and Approaches* eds. Michaël Green, Lars Cyril Nørgaard, and Mette Birkedal Bruun (Leiden: Brill, 2021), pp. 22-23.

127 TNA, SP Foreign 78/21, f. 322.

128 TNA, SP Foreign 78/21, f. 298.

129 TNA, SP Foreign 78/21, f. 304.

130 TNA, SP Foreign 70/72, f. 81.

special envoy on a visit to England in 1564 to facilitate marriage negotiations.¹³¹ The ambassador indicated in the letter was Paul de Foix (1528-1584), who was sent as ambassador to England in 1561, where he served for four years. These two individuals played a crucial role in facilitating discussions between Elizabeth and the French royal family, led by Catherine de Medici in the 1560s.

Early in 1562, Elizabeth focused on two specific issues: assisting the Huguenots in France who were being persecuted and trying to reclaim Calais, lost in the reign of her sister, Mary I of England (1516-1558). In September 1562, Elizabeth sent troops to France 'to protest the persecution[s]'; they landed and took possession of the port of Le Havre-de-Grace (modern-day Le Havre).¹³² The French royal family did not respond well to this martial act, viewing Elizabeth as an enemy and a military threat. Ambassador de Foix and Monsieur de Gonnorre mediated discussions with Catherine de Medici about Le Havre, of which Catherine shared her martial response by expressing 'I do not see any likelihood that we could take back le Havre-De-Grace from the hands of the English by any other means than force.'¹³³ In 1563, Catherine wrote to de Foix stating 'in giving her back the said Calais, she will restore to us the said Havre-de-Grace, which we disagree on.'¹³⁴ It is clear from the letters that Catherine, acting on behalf of her son, King Charles IX of France (1550-1574), was displeased with Elizabeth's actions. By 1564, both Monsieur de Gonnorre and de Foix were received at Elizabeth's court to help conduct peace between the two quarrelling kingdoms. With this context of martial posturing by Elizabeth and Catherine, the significance of the June 1564 letter becomes clearer. At the very core of this exchange is a diplomatic dialogue that appears to have taken place during the hunt, which acted as a private space masking the unseen or obscure interactions, and resulted in Elizabeth's instructions to Hunsdon, her Master of the Hunt.

A further indication of the politicisation of hunting and engagement in private politics is noted by Elizabeth's instructions in the same June 1564 letter, where she 'appointed the Marquis of Northampton, her secretary, [John] Mason and [also Nicholas] Wotton, to hear these matters, who (because on Saturday the French departed to London) could not confer with them before Sunday,'¹³⁵ regarding the movement of 'com[m]odities into [th]e low co[un]trys [...] by [th]e way of Fra[un]ce' to the Huguenots.¹³⁶ The diplomatic meeting and instructions given after the hunt in 1564 reinforces the argument that Elizabeth engaged in private politics through hunting to deal with the situation in France.

131 The original letter gives the spelling of 'Gonnorre'; however, it has also been spelled as 'Gonnor' and 'Gonnord' in other secondary literature. See C. Edward McGee, 'The English Entertainment for the French Ambassadors in 1564', *Early Theatre*, 14:1 (2011), pp. 79-100. For the marriage negotiations, see Estelle Paranke, *Elizabeth I of England Through Valois Eyes: Power, Representation and Diplomacy in the Reign of the Queen, 1558-1588* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), p. 36.

132 Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Foreign Policy, 1558-1603* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 21.

133 Catherine of Medici to Monsieur de Gonnor, 27 April 1563. BnF, Cinq cents colbert, n° 24, f. 98r°. The original text in French is: 'Monsieur de Gonnor, pour ce que je ne voy pas grande apparence que nous puissions recouvrer le Havre-de-Grace des mains des Anglois par autre moyen que celluy de la force.'

134 Catherine of Medici to Paul de Foix, Ambassador at the English court, 17 May 1563, BnF, MS. Fr. 17932, f. 10r°. The original text in French is: 'en luy rendant ledict Calais, elle nous restituera ledict Havre-de-Grace, chose à quoy nous ne sommes pas pour entendre.'

135 TNA, SP Foreign 70/72, f. 81. See footnote 57 for information on Mason's various positions. Alternatively, Nicholas Wotton was a Privy Councillor and one of the Queen's chaplains. He was utilised in foreign relations to handle legal issues, like the trade disputes in the Netherlands. Michael Zell, 'Wotton, Nicholas (c. 1497-1567)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2018). See also Kinney and Lawson, *Titled Elizabethans* for further details of these various roles these men had.

136 TNA, SP Foreign 70/72, f. 82.

The articulation of Elizabeth's instructions, 'to see [...] certain pastimes of hunting and killing of three stagges', illustrate three key points.¹³⁷ First, the statement identifies the Queen exercising agency regarding the display she wanted the French diplomats to witness, and their participation in the hunt. Second, Elizabeth's invitation for de Gonnorre and de Foix to join her on the hunt would have been a customary and familiar activity to engage the French diplomats, given that hunting was an intrinsic part of the French court. The hunt, therefore, was an ideal opportunity for the Queen to demonstrate her hunting ability and emphasise her martial presence; to address issues of Huguenot persecutions, Calais, and Havre-de-Grace; and reassert her political power. Finally, this hunting episode demonstrates how the hunt was an informal arena that cultivated private politics.

Letters of course were also key in facilitating private politics and detailed the intimate and personal lives of the writer.¹³⁸ Elements of the hunt that were described in the diplomatic letters between Elizabeth and her European peers chronicle the intimate details of the personal bonds and private activities. These details not only contributed to the construction of the Queen's reputation and the characterisation of her queenship, but also provided useful information for diplomats to personally connect with Elizabeth. In the summer of 1572, Elizabeth was depicted as being an equal to the French king, Charles IX, when his ambassador Bertand de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénélon (1523-1589) described a moment when Elizabeth's power and strength were exhibited as she was 'riding a horse [...] return[ed] from hunting.'¹³⁹ Fénélon's reference to Elizabeth's hunting activities reveals two facets. First, the Queen's martial identity and royal authority were magnified through hunting given that '[t]he inclusion of these masculine activities in the French diplomatic reports helped depict the English queen's manliness and asserted Elizabeth as Charles's equal', as well as acknowledged the Queen's legitimacy as a ruler.¹⁴⁰ Second, the mention of Elizabeth engaged in her favourite activity afforded Charles with knowledge that could be used to open communication channels or establish bonds with Elizabeth, since he too was a proficient hunter. This was certainly of use to Charles, who was trying to engage with the Queen considering that she was 'disgusted [with Charles...] over the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre' and had ceased 'marriage negotiations with [his] younger brother [...] the Duke of Alençon.'¹⁴¹

The interconnectedness of hunting and diplomacy also highlights the cross-cultural transfer and exchange that were commonplace in the reign of Queen Elizabeth and across Europe. In 1584, Johann Georg, Margrave of Brandenburg (1525-1598) wrote that he has 'learnt that [Elizabeth] was pleased with the falcons he then sent her, now dispatching six more [...] so] that she may have much pleasure and recreation by means of them.'¹⁴²

¹³⁷ TNA, SP Foreign 70/72, f. 81.

¹³⁸ Dustin M. Neighbors and Natacha Klein Käfer, 'Zones of Privacy between Women of Power: Elizabeth I of England and Anna of Saxony', *Royal Studies Journal* 9:1 (2022), pp. 60-89. See also Michaël Green, Lars Cyril Nørgaard, and Mette Birkedal Bruun, eds., *Privacy in Early Modern Correspondences* (Brepols, forthcoming in 2023).

¹³⁹ 28 August 1572, 'De la Mothe-Fénélon to Charles IX, 27th Report', in *Correspondence diplomatique de Bertrand de Salignac de la Mothe Fénélon, ambassadeur de France en Angleterre, de 1568 à 1575*, Tome V, Années 1572 et 1573 (Paris et Londres: Archives du Royaume, 1840), p. 99. Translated from the French: 'monstant à cheval [...] elle s'en retournoit en chassant'.

¹⁴⁰ Paranke, *Through Valois Eyes*, p. 83.

¹⁴¹ Nate Probasco, 'Queen Elizabeth's reaction to the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre', in *The Foreign Relations of Elizabeth I*, ed. Charles Beem (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 77.

In 1592, the French ambassador, Seigneur de Beauvoir, Jean de La Fin (1520-1586), wrote to William Cecil, Lord Burghley expressing ‘with thanks for hunting at Enfield.’¹⁴³ In 1601, John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carleton, ambassador to the Hague, reporting that the Queen had feasted with the Muscovy ambassador after having ‘been hunting’ with him.¹⁴⁴ Given Elizabeth’s age and declining health by 1601, the strenuousness of the hunt would have been considered and most likely occurred from a deer stand. The exchange of knowledge and giving of gifts between monarchs, or their courtiers, was an act of acknowledging a monarch’s power, legitimacy and authority, but it also established or reaffirmed common bonds between them. For example, in 1578, Johann Casimir, Count Palatine of Simmern (1543-1598), wrote to Thomas Wilson (1523/4-1581),¹⁴⁵ a Privy Councillor and diplomat to the Queen, thanking him for the greyhounds and asked Wilson ‘to show the Queen my desire to serve her, I have undertaken to hunt other game than deer or hares.’¹⁴⁶

The letter, seemingly ordinary, is packed with nuances that upon further analysis reflects a close bond between Casimir and Elizabeth and her courtiers. First, the gift of greyhounds illustrates how hunting was a cross-cultural activity that functioned as an instrument of political sociability to forge and maintain political bonds and personal relationships, which is confirmed in Casimir’s statement that Wilson was ‘so well disposed towards [him] as to give [him] hope’.¹⁴⁷ Another example of personal hunting gifts used to strengthen personal-political bonds with Casimir happened in 1579 after the Queen invested him with, and personally attached, the Order of the Garter. Leicester gave him a series of hunting items as a parting gift. The gift included ‘geldings, hawks and hounds [...] falcons, horns, cross-bows, and [...] broad cloth fit for hunting garments, both for winter and summer, for he delights greatly in hunting and can chase his winter deer very well.’¹⁴⁸ Second, Casimir’s mention of serving Elizabeth and the hunt was a dual reference that reflected the shared interest in the hunt that bonded Casimir and the Queen together. At the same time, the reference alludes to the fact that Casimir had been described as ‘Elizabeth’s hunter’ earlier that Spring.¹⁴⁹ This description was used because he was hunting and mustering troops with the funds provided by the Queen, which clarifies why he was engaged ‘to hunt other game’.¹⁵⁰ On the surface this may have just been a matter of ‘diplomatic good will’, however, the letter also reflects an important diplomatic and political bond. Casimir was not only a proposed suitor to Elizabeth, the German prince was also a key ally in the formation of the Protestant League.¹⁵¹

142 TNA, SP Foreign 81/3, f. 133.

143 TNA, SP Foreign 78/28, f. 294.

144 TNA, SP Domestic 12/278, f. 37.

145 Susan Doran and Jonathan Woolfson, ‘Wilson, Thomas (1523/4-1581)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004).

146 TNA, SP Foreign 81/3, f. 140.

147 TNA, SP Foreign 81/3, f. 140.

148 13 February 1579, ‘Gilbert and Mary Talbot to the Earl and Countess of Shrewsbury’, in Edmund Lodge, *Illustrations of British History, Biography, and Manners in the Reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I*, volume 2 (London: John Chidley, 1838), pp. 140-142. See the *Calendar of the Shrewsbury and Talbot Papers in Lambeth Palace Library and the College of Arms*, volume 2, ed. Catherine Jamison (London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1966), p. 104. See also Marion Colthorpe, ‘The Elizabethan Court Day by Day’, *Folgerpedia* (Folger Shakespeare Library, 2017), accessed 22 December 2022, https://folgerpedia.folger.edu/The_Elizabethan_Court_Day_by_Day.

149 Linda Shenk, *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth in Politics and Poetry* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 60-62.

150 TNA, SP Foreign 81/3, f. 140.

151 Adams, “‘The Queens Majestie’”, p. 158.

In 1585, Frederick II of Denmark (1534-1588) wrote to the Queen stating:

[s]o much was I pleased with them [the hounds] that I should delight to have more, and as your Majesty is, I know, very fond of the hunt, and has no doubt, a great number of hounds of all kinds, especially staghounds, I should be very glad if you would be pleased to send me some.¹⁵²

In this context, Frederick's request functioned as a personal connection, which he indicated by connecting his private interests with Elizabeth's as she was 'fond of the hunt'. These personal connections of hunting were important in private politics because these exchanges had potential political significance, such as strengthening and maintaining Frederick and Elizabeth's alliance against the Spanish and Catholicism, and their partnership in urging August of Saxony to join the Protestant League.¹⁵³ These personal and diplomatic exchanges connected the private with the public and reinforced friendships, familiar bonds, and political relationships.¹⁵⁴

As previously demonstrated, Elizabeth's affinity and skills of the hunt were illustrated through the comments and reports of foreign monarchs and dignitaries, including Francis II of France (1544-1560) and the Spanish ambassador, Bernardino de Mendoza (1540-1604). In February 1560, as Adams has highlighted, Francis II asked Throckmorton, the ambassador to England, at the French court, 'whether you [Elizabeth] loue hawking or hunting, I [Throckmorton] told him [...] that you [Elizabeth] liked the pastimes of both well.'¹⁵⁵ Later in 1560, Francis II again asked about Elizabeth's interest in hunting, and asked if 'the Queen in her progress did not go hunting,' to which Throckmorton replied, 'yes' that she would 'now do so more at her pleasure.'¹⁵⁶ However, what Adams does not expand upon is the fact that in February 1560, the French court was dealing with the Amboise conspiracy and the security of the French forces positioned in Scotland. Francis' inquiry into the Queen's personal interest in hunting appears to be a tactic to establish friendly relations in a diplomatic context, and we see once again the heuristic boundaries between the public and private overlap.

The Queen's progresses were very much about the control of access, especially given the practice of changing locks at the homes of Elizabeth's hosts on progress.¹⁵⁷ Similarly, Elizabeth granted access to diplomats on the hunt while also denying access. In October 1581, Mendoza wrote to his master, Philip of Spain, that he was unable to meet with the Queen because she was hunting at Nonsuch, but hoped to meet with her when she moved to Richmond. Furthermore, Mendoza stated, 'it was difficult for me to attend to your Majesty's interests here under such circumstances as these.'¹⁵⁸ Mendoza's comments on 'such circumstances' clearly indicated his frustration of not having access to the Queen,

¹⁵² TNA, SP Foreign 75/1, f. 116.

¹⁵³ Paul Lockhart, *Frederik II and the Protestant Cause: Denmark's Role in the Wars of Religion, 1559-1596* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 146-177. Walther Kirchner, 'England and Denmark, 1558-1588', *Journal of Modern History*, 17:1 (1945), p. 12.

¹⁵⁴ Neighbors and Käfer, 'Zones of Privacy', pp. 73 and 81.

¹⁵⁵ The original letter does not exist. There are two printed versions of the letter: 1) 27 February 1560, 'Throckmorton to Elizabeth', in *Calendar of State Papers Foreign: Elizabeth, Volume 2, 1559-1560*, (ed.) Joseph Stevenson (London, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1865), pp. 394-403, hereafter *CSP—Foreign Elizabeth*; 2) Patrick Forbes, *A Full View of the Public Transactions in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, Volume 1* (London, 1740), p. 341. See also Adams, "'The Queens Majestie'", p. 156.

¹⁵⁶ 22 August 1560, 'Throckmorton to the Queen', *CSP—Foreign Elizabeth*, 3:246-260.

¹⁵⁷ For information on changing the locks on Elizabethan progresses, see Neighbors, 'Performativity of Female Power', p. 129.

¹⁵⁸ 1 October 1581, 'Bernardino de Mendoza to the King', *CSP—Simancas*, 3:175-185.

whereby Mendoza explicitly attributes his failure to Elizabeth's hunting pursuits and confirms the salient role of the hunt in personal politics and diplomacy. Moreover, the fact that Elizabeth was hunting and not meeting with Mendoza signalled that the Queen denied Mendoza access and did not give him audience. The denial of access demarcates a level of inaccessibility and not being visible, thus highlighting a form of private politics, which signals that withdrawal from 'political space[s] of conflict' to hunt had political significance.¹⁵⁹

Conclusion

Given the general scholarly disregard for the subject of hunting, especially female hunting, there remains a great deal of potential, and in particular interdisciplinary avenues, to further investigate how the practice of hunting was a contextually driven phenomenon and impacted early modern sociability, court culture, politics, and diplomacy. Consequently, this article has demonstrated how the study of hunting provides a lens to discern the extent to which royal women pursued or engaged with the hunt; how hunting facilitated private politics; and the importance of hunting as a social and diplomatic tool in early modern England.

Hunting in early modern England was a commonplace and hierarchical activity with a dedicated personnel and administrative structure that had political, social, and cultural significance. This has been demonstrated by analysing previously unexploited Privy Chamber accounts discovered at the TNA that detail the extensive hunting personnel employed by the Queen, the close connections of the hunting staff with the court, and the frequency of Elizabeth's hunting indicated by annual payments. The research clearly illustrates that Elizabeth's hunting activities encompassed so much more than 'personal taste': it functioned as a tool, a platform, and a shield. Although the Queen loved to hunt and was a skilled huntress, evidence suggests she used hunting to escape the formal and restrictive boundaries of politics and diplomacy, and fostered personal bonds and pursued private politics via the ephemeral and informal spaces of hunting. She used the hunt as a door through which people were granted and denied access. Most importantly, the practice of hunting gave Elizabeth the ability to exercise her own agency, whereby the Queen decided when to hunt, what to hunt and hunt with, where to hunt, and with whom. By examining Elizabeth's hunting activities, it becomes clear that the culture of hunting is one particular aspect of her reign that has been overlooked or dismissed, thus ignoring a crucial aspect of Elizabeth's social and cultural pursuits, and rulership.

The dynamics of and interplay between Elizabeth and her subjects, courtiers, Privy Councillors, and diplomats through hunting and political privacy offers scholars and enthusiasts of Elizabeth I and court studies with a potential model and new perspectives for research. These perspectives shed new light on the political culture of Elizabeth's reign and the central role that she played in it, and how hunting was used to facilitate private politics by the Queen and those around her. By exploring Elizabeth's use of the hunt, we can no longer ignore her active participation and agency, defining the politics and diplomacy of her reign, and that of other premodern royal and noble women. This study on the significance of hunting expands our understanding of the interplay and relationship between sovereign and various groups of people, and the process through which hunting contributed to the dynamics and development of early modern political and court culture.

159 Mette Birkedal Bruun, Sven Rune Havsteen, Kristian Mejrup, Eelco Nagelsmit and Lars Nørgaard, 'Withdrawal and Engagement in the Long Seventeenth Century: Four Case Studies', *Journal of Early Modern Christianity*, 1:2 (2014), pp. 281-284.

ORCID

Dustin M. Neighbors  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2430-5004>

Dustin M. Neighbors

Dustin M. Neighbors is a postdoctoral researcher for the Fashion History Lab at Aalto University and a visiting researcher at the University of Helsinki. He completed his PhD at the University of York in 2018, under the supervision of Dr. John Cooper. A historian of early modern English and northern European history, Dustin specialises in the history of monarchy and court culture, with an emphasis on the performativity of gender, political culture, elite practices and activities (i.e., hunting) and utilising digital methods of analysis. He is lead co-editor on a forthcoming edited collection with Amsterdam University Press entitled *Notions of Privacy at Early Modern European Courts: Reassessing the Public / Private Divide, 1400-1800*.

Appendix

TABLE 1 Queen Elizabeth I Hunting on Progress

The following table compiles all of Queen Elizabeth I's hunting excursions while on progress, including when and where she hunted. Although not exhaustive, this list was compiled through examining various manuscripts, notating the locations of hunting parks with corresponding hosts. The list was then cross-referenced with Mary Hill Cole's table (180-201) in *The Portable Queen* (1998) and/or John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I* (2014). The sources listed in the "Source" column indicates instances that mentions or highlights the hunting activities of the Queen. In reading the table, the notation of "Cole" refers to the table provided between pages 181-202. Any other pages listed are additional references of the hunting occasion that is used within the source. The notation of Nichols indicates references to Elizabeth hunting within the relevant volume. The following abbreviations are used:

LMA—London Metropolitan Archives

SP—State Papers (The National Archives or State Papers Online)

MS CP—Cecil Papers Manuscripts located at Hatfield House Archives

CSP—Calendar of State Papers (Simancas)

Year	Location/Host	Source
1559 August	Eltham (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. I
1561 July	Wansted/Epping Forest	LMA; Cole
1561 September	Hatfield (royal residence)	MS Cecil Papers; Cole
1561 September	Enfield (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. I
1564 June	Hampton Court/Queen	SP 70/72 f.81
1564 June	Richmond/Queen	SP 70/72 f.81
1564 July	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1564 July-August	Enfield (royal residence)	MS CP; Cole
1566 July	Hatfield (royal residence)	MS CP; Cole
1566 August	Kenilworth/Robert Dudley	Cole; Nichols, Vol. I
1568 July	Enfield (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. I
1568 July	Hatfield (royal residence)	MS CP; Cole
1571 August	Flitcham	MS CP
1571 August	Hatfield (royal residence)	MS CP; Cole
1571 September ??		SP 12/80/21; Cole-152

1571 September	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1572 July	Enfield (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. II
1572 July	Hatfield (royal residence)	MS CP; Cole
1572 August	Kenilworth/Robert Dudley	Nichols, Vol. II, 38 & 41
1572 August	Berkeley Castle/Lord Berkeley	Nichols, Vol. II, 43
1573 February	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1574	Berkeley Castle/Lord Berkeley	Cole, 149
1575 May	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1575 June	Hatfield (royal residence)	MS CP
1575 July	Kenilworth/Robert Dudley	Nichols, Vol. II; Cole
1576 June	Hatfield (royal residence)	MS CP; Cole
1576 June	Eltham (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. II
1576 August	Hatfield (royal residence)	MS CP; Cole
1577 February	Wansted/Epping Forest	LMA; Cole
1577 May	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1577 September	Hanworth (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. II
1578 May	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1578 May	Wansted/Epping Forest	LMA; Cole
1578 August	Cotessy	Dovey, 76 (Cross ref. Cole and Nichols)
1578 September	Horseheath	Dovey, 121 (Cross ref. Cole and Nichols)
1578 September	Horham Hall	Dovey, 126 (Cross ref. Cole and Nichols)
1578 September	Roodwood Hall	Dovey, 140 (Cross ref. Cole and Nichols)
1578 September	Wansted/Epping Forest	LMA; Cole
1579 September	Wansted/Epping Forest	LMA; Cole
1581	Nonsuch	CSP (Simancas), 1580-86, 175-176
1581 June	Eltham (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1581 July	Wansted/Epping Forest	LMA; Cole
1581 September	Eltham (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1583 May	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1585 May	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1587 July	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1587 July	Enfield (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1587 July	Waltham Forest	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1588 May	Wansted/Epping Forest	LMA; Cole
1590 June	Waltham Forest	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1590 August	Oatlands (royal residence)	SP 78/28 f. 322
1591 May	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1591 May	Eltham (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1592 July	Enfield (royal residence)	SP 78/28/ f. 294
1592 August	Hanworth (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1594 June	Theobalds	MS CP; Cole
1594 June	Eltham (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1597 July	Enfield (royal residence)	MS CP; Cole
1597 July	Enfield Chase (royal park)	MS CP; Cole
1597 August	Waltham Forest	Cole; Nichols, Vol. IV
1597 September	Waltham Forest	Cole; Nichols, Vol. III
1598 July	Eltham (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. IV
1600 September	Hanworth (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. IV
1601 February ??	SP 12/278 f. 37	
1601 July	Eltham (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. IV
1601 July	Hanworth (royal residence)	Cole; Nichols, Vol. IV
1602 May	St. James Park	Cole; Nichols, Vol. IV
1602 July	Harefield	Cole; Nichols, Vol. IV
1602 September	Chertsey/'in the forest'	Cole; Nichols, Vol. IV

TABLE 2 Queen Elizabeth I's Hunting Staff

	1560/1	1562/3	1563/4	1564/5	1576/7	1586/7	1588/9	1590/1	1595/6
<i>Falconer</i>	John Garrett	Sir Henry	Sir Henry Cary	Sir Henry Cary	Sir Henrie	Sir Henry	Sir Henry	Sir Henry	Sir Henry
	Rafe Appowell	Carye (M)	(M) George	(M) George	Carewe (M)	Carye (M)	Carye (M)	Carye (M)	Cary (M)
	Edward	George	Throgmerton	Throckmorton	George	George	George	George	George
	Shepherd Peter	Throgmerton	Peter Sherdley	Peter Sherdley	Throckemarton	Throckmerton	Throckmorton	Throckmorton	Throckmorton
	Sherdley John	John Garrett	John Brode Sr	John Brode Sr	Peter Sherdley	John Michell	Henry	Henrye	George
	Broode John	Peter Sherdley	John Brode Jr	John Muchell	John Michell	Henry Dobbins	Dobbins	Dobbins	Garrett
	Machel John	John Broodes	John Michell	Edward	Henrie Dobbins	Simond	Simond	George	Fraunces
	Talbot	John Mychell	Edward	Sheppard	Symonde	Baggett George	Bagott George	Garrett	Brigham
	Wylliam	Rawlfe	Sheppard	Henry	Baggott George	Garrett	Garrett	Fraunces	Richard Prince
	Bramyngberry	Apowell	Henry	Dobbye John	Garrett William	Thomas Cross	Fraunces	Brigham	Thomas Taylor
	Henry Berd	Edward	Dobbys	Brode Jr (D)	Bramyngburie	Fraunces	Brigham John	William	Gregory
	Clement	Shepherd	Wylliam	Symond Bagget	William	Brigham	Mychell (D)	Gregory	Harbottell
	Harlestone	Wylliam	Bramyngberry	Wylliam	Beaumont	Gregorie	Greogrye	Harbottle	George
	Henry	Bramyberry	Clement	Bramyngberry	Gregorie	Harbottle	Harbtlle Lewis	Lewys Griffith	Wilchin John
	Horwoode	Clement	Harleston John	Clement	Harbottell Lewis	Lewys Griffith	Griffith	William	Baxter
	John Wheler	Harleston	Talbott	Harleston John	Griffith William	William	William	Harpham	Thomas Sawle
	Willian	John Talbott	William	Talbott	Harpeham	Harpham	Harpham	George	Richard
	Beaumont	William	Beaumont	Wylliam	Walter Thomas	Walter Thomas	Walter	Wilchin John	Edmondes
	William Seton	Beaumont	John Wheler	Beaumont John		George Wilchin	Thomas	Baxter	Humfry Flinte
	John Harrys	John Wheler	Henry Bearde	Whealer Henry		John Baxter	George	Thomas Ganll	William Graye
	Robert	Henry Berd	Thomas	Bearde Thomas		John Harris	Wilchin John	Richard	Henry
	Craggye	Thomas	Horwoode	Horwood		(D)	Baxter	Edmondes	Jenninges John
	Thomas	Horwoode	Wylliam	Wylliam Seaton			William Craye	William Craye	Neale
	Farnall	William	Seaton John	John Harrys			William	Richard	Christopher
	Christopher	Seaton John	Harrys	Thomas			Seaton (D)	Prince John	Berwick
	Wallysone	Harrye	Christopher	Farnall Robert			Thomas Saull	Michael (D)	William
	Robert Hayes		Wallysone	Hayes			Christopher		Easton (D)
			Robert Hayes				Staplehill (D)		

Continued

Continued

TABLE 2 *Continued*

	1560/1	1562/3	1563/4	1564/5	1576/7	1586/7	1588/9	1590/1	1595/6
<i>Leashe</i>	John Trewchilde Lawrence Waystaffe George Attcewyn John Whealer John Streate	John Trewchildes Lawraunce Wagstaffes George Aldewynne John Whelor John Streaton John Cox	John Trewchild Lawraunce Wagstaffe John Wheler John Strete John Cox	John Cox	Thomas Clarke John Cox (D) Edward Hollowes Lawraunce Wagstaff John Wheler John Streate Sr John Streate Jr	Edmond Hampshire Edward Helwys John Strete (CoL) Abraham Avelin (CoL) Thomas Cow (CoL) John Lavedaie (CoL)	Edmond Hampsher Edward Helwys John Streate (CoL) Abraham Avelinge (CoL) Thomas Cowper (CoL) John Loueday (CoL)	Edmond Hampsher Edward Hewisse John Street (CoL) Abraham Avelin (CoL) Thomas Cooper (CoL) John Loueday (CoL)	Edward Helwys John Strete (CoL) Abraham Avelm (CoL) Thomas Cowy (CoL) John Loueday (CoL)
<i>Crosshowe</i>	Gylee Churchyll	N/A	Robert Children Thomas Swayne	Robert Children Thomas Swayne	Robert Children Thomas Swaine	Robert Children Thomas Swaine	Robert Children Thomas Swayne	N/A	Humfrey Broughton John Carter
<i>Toyles</i>	John Thomworth (M) Thomas Hall William Stanlake	N/A	John Thamworth (M) Thomas Hall William Stanlocke	N/A	N/A	Henry Sackford (M) Thomas Hall Giles Haynes	Henry Sackford (M) Thomas Hall Richard Nelson	N/A	Henry Sackford (M) Thomas Hall Richard Nelson

The information above was transcribed and compiled using the AO 3 (Auditors of the Imprest and Successor Accounts). The Queen's hunting staff were mentioned by name in this particular record. These records were cross referenced with the E 101 records to confirm the names. However, the AO 3 records were more detailed than the E 101 records. Some names appear in the AO 3 but not in the E 101 records. The information is divided by year and includes the positions and all of the individuals that served in that position for the year. The notation of 'N/A' signals that between the AO 3 and E 101 records there was no name, yet there was the annual sum for these positions indicated in [table 3](#). (M—Master of the position; S—Sergeant of the position; D—Died during the year of which they were serving; f—Individual noted to be “fewmishers”—having to inspect the animal feces; CoL—Individuals who were listed specifically as “Children of the Leasshe”)

TABLE 3 Queen Elizabeth I's Hunting Staff Annual Finances

This table was compiled from the transcriptions of the UK National Archives (TNA) AO 3 manuscripts (Auditors of the Imprest and Successor Accounts). These financial records document the payments made to Queen Elizabeth I's hunting staff. These figures were then crossed referenced with E 101 at the TNA. Finally, the amounts paid to each individual were then added together to get the annual figures listed below.

	1560/1			1561/2			1562/3			1563/4			1564/5			1576/7			1586/7			1588/9			1590/1			1595/6		
<i>Falconers</i>	352li	17s	—	365li	12s	10d	385li	12s	11d	403li	7s	1d	395li	12s	10d	421li	17s	6d	452li	8s	—	551li	12s	1d	373li	6s	10d	183li	19s	1d
<i>Spannyell Keeper</i>	16li	2s	8d	47li	9s	—	30li	6s	9d	37li	8s	3d	39li	3s	—	—	—	—	29li	4s	—	29li	4s	—	29li	4s	—	14li	13s	4d
<i>Hunters</i>	101li	1s	—	97li	1s	—	83li	19s	4d	67li	7s	10d	114li	—	—	—	—	—	17li	2s	—	133li	5s	4d	175li	17s	7d	70li	11s	9d
<i>(Huntsmen)</i>																														
<i>Harryers</i>	7li	17s	6d	12li	17s	6d	7li	17s	6d	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3li	7s	6d	3li	7s	6d	22li	—	6d
<i>Leashe</i>	10li	—	—	18li	6s	8d	13li	6s	8d	13li	6s	7d	3li	6s	8d	14li	—	—	14li	—	—	14li	3s	4d	21li	11s	—	5li	7s	6d
<i>Crossbowe</i>	22li	13s	2d	—	—	—	40li	11s	1d	21li	19s	8d	30li	3s	4d	23li	9s	10d	25li	18s	—	9li	5s	—	23li	11s	—	7li	12s	9d
<i>Toyles</i>	107li	1s	6d	—	—	—	—	—	—	99li	15s	3d	—	—	—	—	—	—	354li	10s	8d	87li	17s	4d	—	—	—	94li	18s	3d

li = Latin for 'libra'; notation for pounds s = shillings; derives from Latin 'solidus' d = Latin for 'denarius'; notation for pence/pennies

Total Annual Finances:

**All hunting positions calculated together*

1560/1	617li	14s	4d
1561/2	541li	11s	6d
1562/3	554li	14s	3d
1563/4	643li	4s	8d
1564/5	581li	5s	10d
1576/7	459li	7s	4d
1586/7	1047li	2s	8d
1588/9	828li	14s	7d
1590/1	626li	17s	11d
1595/6	399li	3s	2d