THE ENGLISH CORONATION, 1660-1821: ELITE HEGEMONY AND SOCIAL RELATIONS ON A CEREMONIAL OCCASION

By

GEORGE ANTHONY TRESIDDER, M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1989

MASTER OF ARTS (1989) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(History) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The English Coronation, 1660-1821:
Elite Hegemony and Social Relations On A Ceremonial Occasion

AUTHOR: George Anthony Tresidder, B.A. (Queen's University)
M.A. (University of Western Ontario)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Paul S. Fritz

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 116

ABSTRACT

The English coronation ceremony is an archaic and feudal remnant from the distant past that nevertheless holds the power to captivate and enthral citizens of the modern British state. Sociologists and anthropologists have examined this, and other forms of royal ceremonial, in the attempt to determine the nature of the relationship between the internal structure and symbolic meaning of ceremony, and the public's enthusiastic acceptance of both the medium and the message. The coronation has received little interest from the historical profession, however, and so there is a pressing need to examine the ceremony in relation to the historical context in which it was created.

In this thesis, the coronation ceremony is examined in relation to the context of the 1660-1821 period of British history, a time of change, conflict and crisis. It is demonstrated how the coronation was an important instrument of elite hegemony and reflected the nature and distribution of power in early modern English society. The form or structure of the coronation ceremony is explained in relation to the political and constitutional developments defining the relationship between the aristocracy and the monarchy in this period. Although this relationship was transformed due to shifts in the preponderance of power shared by these institutions, the coronation never ceased to be a conservative form of ceremonial which was resilient to change and continually celebrated the status, traditional authority and leadership of the rulers of a hierarchical society. The preparation and performance of the ceremony also served the needs of the ruling oligarchy: the coronation was an elite and private ceremony that helped define the solidarity of the rulers and, in all probability, contained little of significance for the middle and lower orders. The celebration of the coronation in English provincial centres also reveals the manner in which the coronation expressed the ideology of the civic elite and was meant to secure the acquiescence of the governed to the realities of elite hegemony. By the mid to late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, however, it appears that the nature and orientation of the coronation ceremony was being questioned by the middle and lower orders. The political, economic, and cultural transformation England underwent in this period undermined the traditional social relations between the rulers and the ruled, and the accompanying social tensions came to be expressed on Coronation Day. By the Reform Act, the coronation was an instrument of elite hegemony which increasingly came to be challenged by the elements of society seeking a share of political power.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Professor Paul Fritz suggested the topic, aided in the delineation of the major issues to be examined, and patiently guided me around the many pitfalls associated with producing a finished product in the shortest possible time. My thanks to a fine scholar and an exceptional gentleman.

A great many consummate professionals cheerfully answered my many pleas for their assistance. Carl Spadoni and the rest of the staff at Special Collections certainly made my task less onerous; they are undoubtedly pleased to learn that I will not have the occasion to trouble them again soon. Anne Pottier and her staff at Inter-Library Loan diligently searched for, and obtained, the vast majority of the materials I requested. Special thanks to Valerie Thomas who took an interest in my work and was instrumental in locating the more obscure references.

My heartfelt thanks to my wife, Gillian. Thank you so much for your love and encouragement at a very difficult and trying time.

Although I have incurred many debts in the course of researching and writing this thesis, I assume full responsibility for any errors and shortcomings it may contain.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Two books were published in 1988 which epitomize the two dominant modes of discourse concerned with understanding the role played by the monarchy in the modern British state. Tom Nairn's provocative work The Enchanted Glass: Britain and its Monarchy is the most recent addition to a long line of studies, from both the Right and the Left, which take as their subject the anomalous survival of a medieval and aristocratic institution well into the twentieth century.[1] The other book, John Cannon and Ralph Griffith's lively survey The Oxford Illustrated History of The British Monarchy, is a direct descendant of those works which offer histories of the institution, biographies of monarchs and other notable personalities, and narrative accounts of important events.[2] Rather less well-served by these types of studies of the British monarchy is the subject of royal ceremonial, a field of enquiry that has almost exclusively been the domain of sociologists and anthropologists.[3] British royal ceremonial and ritual has received considerable attention from members of these disciplines, so much so that familiarity with the methodology and the theoretical disposition of each school of thought is necessary for a greater understanding of the various dimensions of royal ceremonial.

Sociologists, led by Edward Shils and Michael Young,[4] initially undertook the study of the ceremonial aspects of the British monarchy by recording and interpreting the public's response, solicited through public opinion surveys, to the coronation of Queen Elizabeth in 1953. On the basis of that study, Shils and Young advocated that ceremonial occasions are

thoroughly communal experiences in which the collective sentiments and shared moral values agreed upon by society are upheld and reaffirmed in the course of a ritual honouring the central agent of society's value system, the Sovereign.[5] This interpretation of ceremonial occasions, influenced by the seminal work of Emile Durkheim,[6] has been supported by J.G. Blumler and his colleagues at the University of Leeds who studied the public's response to the Investiture of the Prince of Wales on 1 July 1969.[7] Their work suggests that a profound emotional commitment to the Monarchy, coupled with a general mood of good will, is generated by ceremonies such as the Investiture, creating an atmosphere in which certain fundamental social values - family solidarity and national pride - are reaffirmed.[8] Shils and Young, followed by Blumler et al, have championed a thesis maintaining that royal ceremonial has an integrative effect which negates the divisive forces existing in society.

Other sociologists have a less optimistic opinion of the effects of royal ceremonial. Steven Lukes,[9] for instance, criticizes Shils and Young and Blumler et al for employing too simple an interpretation of the Durkheimian thesis of social integration, an approach which ignores the possibility of socially-patterned divergences in the acceptance of allegedly "shared" moral values.[10] Condemning the neo-Durkheimian view of ritual as "one-sided and uncritical," Lukes proposes that ritual plays a cognitive role because it serves to "organize people's knowledge of the past and present and their capacity to imagine the future" and thereby "helps to define as authoritative certain ways of seeing society."

> I suggest, in short, that we should go beyond the somewhat simplistic idea of political ritual expressing-producing-constituting value integration seen as the essence of social integration (which is the banal but widely applied aspect of Durkheim's theory) and take up instead the fertile idea that ritual has a cognitive dimension (this being, in any case, the central and original part of Durkheim's theory), though placing it (as Durkheim did not) within a class-structured, conflictual and pluralistic model of society. I believe this to be a more illuminating way of interpreting rituals than that of the neo-

> Durkheimians: it suggests that such rituals can be seen as modes of exercising, or seeking to exercise, power along the cognitive dimension. On this view, the explanandum ceases to be some supposed value integration, but rather the internalization of particular political paradigms or *representations collectives...*[11]

Lukes is suggesting that royal ceremonial does not play an integrative role and projects an expression of social consensus, but that it is a crucial element of the "mobilization of bias" or set of beliefs and values which reinforce and perpetuate the dominant official models of social structure and interaction.[12]

The idea that ceremonial is a form of the "mobilization of bias" is one which anthropologists have recognized; their insistence upon studying ceremonial within its cultural context has led them to a more comprehensive understanding of pomp and power than that allowed for by the sociologists' decontextualized analysis of the rituals celebrating the British monarchy.[13] Perhaps the most influential anthropologist in this regard is Clifford Geertz. He has suggested that the symbolic representation of power and power itself are quite often very similar indeed:

> At the political centre of any complexly organized society... there is both a governing elite and a set of symbolic forms expressing the fact that it is in truth governing. No matter how democratically the members of the elite are chosen (usually not very) or how deeply divided among themselves they may be (usually much more than outsiders imagine), they justify their existence and order their actions in terms of a collection of stories, ceremonies, insignia, formalities, and appurtenances that they have either inherited or, in more revolutionary situations, invented. It is these - crowns and coronations, limousines and conferences - that mark the centre as centre and give what goes on there its aura of being not merely important but in some odd fashion connected with the way the world is built. The gravity of high politics and the solemnity of high worship spring from liker impulses than might first appear.[14]

The influence of Geertz's interpretation of the relationship between power and pomp permeates Ilse Hayden's anthropological study of the British monarchy (Symbol and Privilege: The Ritual Context of British Royalty (1987)), a work in which she asserts that

iconography and royal symbolism both reflects and serves to entrench a hierarchical social system. Hayden finds that royal symbolism is so potent because it is seductive; it elicits admiration and deference for the upper class from a much larger, potentially powerful but disadvantaged social group. The symbolism of ceremonial is not only one of the cosmetics of power, but is also an instrument of rule.[15]

Historians have increasingly turned their attention to the examination of British royal ceremonial in recent years.[16] David Cannadine has emerged as the premier theorist and spokesperson for the discipline.[17] Cannadine finds that the function of royal ceremonial - whether the ritual creates consensus or conflict, community or hierarchy - cannot be determined without establishing the historical context in which the ceremony took place. Since the meaning of ceremony can change profoundly as the nature of the historical context itself changes, a strong sense of the particularities of the society and of the nature of the ceremonial's performance is required.[18] In regard to the context in which ceremony is produced, Cannadine recommends that historians devote their energies to the exploration of a reasonably long span of time in order to ascertain the evolution and development of ceremonial in relation to the changes in the political and social system of the society being studied. The historian's primary task must be to understand the working of ceremonial *in* society. Attention must also be given to the changing nature of the performance of royal ceremonial because, as Cannadine indicates, the substance and execution of ceremony must change to reflect the evolving nature and distribution of power *in* society.[19]

The type of British royal ceremonial which has received the most attention from sociologists, anthropologists and historians alike is, understandably, the august and ancient coronation ceremony. Characteristic of the work examining the coronation ceremony is a

disregard for the type of critical analysis advocated by Cannadine. Sociologists have generally neglected to interpret the impact of the ceremony in a historical context.[20] Anthropologists have fared a little better, but tend to examine the ceremony primarily in terms of its internal structure. The meaning of the coronation derived is necessarily a static and romanticized one: it is found to be a timeless and essentially unchanging ceremony, seemingly immune to the forces of historical change and agency.[21] Even the historians of the coronation favour the ceremonial aspects at the expense of historical context.[22] Exceptions to this tendency are Percy E. Schramm's A History of the English Coronation (London 1937) and B. Wilkinson's The History of the Coronation (London 1953), engaging and important initial studies that are, nevertheless, too cursory to adequately examine the coronation ceremonial in the manner envisioned by Cannadine. If it is to be interpreted fully, and its meaning best comprehended, the coronation ceremony must be investigated in relation to its specific political, constitutional, social, economic and cultural milieu. Attention must especially be given to both the elements of change and continuity within the coronation if we are to understand this ceremony in terms of its historical context, a context which demanded either the adaptation of, or strict adherence to, this traditional ceremony.[23]

I propose to initiate a redress of these deficiencies by investigating the context and development of the coronation ceremony from the Restoration of Charles II in 1660 to the coronation of George IV in 1821, a period of time in which Britain underwent considerable political, constitutional, economic, social and cultural transformation. In Chapter I, the evolution of the form of the coronation ceremony is examined in relation to the tumultuous political and constitutional developments of the period. Particular emphasis is placed upon

the changing nature of the relationship existing between the monarchy and the aristocracy,* and the manner in which the major elements of the ceremony were adapted to reflect the varying distribution of power in the ruling class. It is demonstrated how the coronation ceremony was, in fact, a very conservative form of royal ceremonial because it was remarkably resilient to change and adaptation and consistently celebrated the ideology, hegemony and solidarity of the ruling elite. We turn in Chapter II to the preparation, performance and significance of the coronation ceremony. The coronation is revealed to have been intended for an elite audience, ineptly executed, and of limited appeal to a wider public. The ruling oligarchy, which endeavoured to keep the coronation as private and as elite in nature as possible throughout the period, is found to have especially redoubled its efforts to maintain control of the ceremony once criticism of its preparation and performance of the ceremony intensified during the political, social and economic transformation beginning during the mid-eighteenth century. The contentious issue of whether or not the coronation was to be of significance to society in general can be discerned in the form and performance of the civic ceremonies held in celebration of the coronation. Chapter III, based on the study of coronation day celebrations in representative English towns, reveals how previously shared assumptions about the role ceremonial played in the forging of community relations became untenable once the social, economic and cultural gap between the patrician and plebian classes widened in the mid-eighteenth to early-nineteenth centuries. By 1821 it is evident that the ruling class was determined that celebrations of the coronation be employed only to reflect its power, authority, status and solidarity, and not acknowledge the status of the other social ranks in a realistic manner.

---

* By the term "aristocracy," I refer to both the peerage specifically, and the landed interest in English society. (For a discussion of the varying definitions of this term, see: John Cannon, Aristocratic century (Cambridge 1984), Chapter 1).

Through an examination of the form, preparation and performance of the coronation ceremony and coronation celebrations in their historical context, this thesis demonstrates the manner in which an entrenched ruling elite used ceremonial to communicate its hegemony and help preserve its position in the social hierarchy, and how dissatisfaction with this practice inevitably led the less-privileged ranks of society to use Coronation Day as an occasion on which to vividly dramatize the fissures, tensions and conflicts which underpinned English society in this period.

Notes

1. Other books belonging to this tradition of interpreting the monarchy include: Walter Bagehot, The English Constitution (first published in 1867); Kingsley Martin, The Magic of Monarchy (London 1937) and The Crown and the Establishment (London 1962); J.A. Thompson and Arthur Mejia, Jr., The Modern British Monarchy (New York 1971); Leonard M. Harris, Long to Reign Over Us?: The Status of the Royal Family in the Sixties (London 1966); Philip Ziegler, Crown and People (London 1978); and, Richard Rose and Dennis Kavanagh, "The Monarchy in Contemporary Political Culture," Comparative Politics 8 (1976): 548-76.

2. An example of this type of study is Philip Howard's The British Monarchy in the Twentieth Century (London 1977).

3. Some of the notable exceptions to this trend are: John Brooke-Little, Royal Ceremonials of State (London 1980); Roger Milton, The English Ceremonial Book: A History of Robes, Insignia and Ceremonies Still in Use in England (New York 1972); and, Margaret Brentnall, The Old Customs and Ceremonies of London (London 1975), especially Chapter 2. Refer also to the appropriate sections of Charles Knightly's The Customs and Ceremonies of Britain: An Encyclopedia of Living Traditions (London 1986).

4. "The Meaning of the Coronation," Sociological Review N.S. 1 (1953): 63-81.

5. Shils and Young, p. 67.

6. Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (New York 1915).

7. "Attitudes to the Monarchy: Their Structure and Development During a Ceremonial Occasion," Political Studies 19 (1971): 149-71.

8. Blumler et al, p. 170.

9. "Political Ritual and Social Integration," Sociology 9 (1975): 289-308. Also see: N. Birnbaum, "Monarchs and Sociologists: A Reply to Professor Shils and Mr. Young," Sociological Review N.S. 3 (1955): 5-23.

10. Lukes, p. 297.

11. Lukes, pp. 301-02.

12. Lukes, p. 305.

13. This observation is most clearly enunciated by David Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition,' c. 1820-1977," in The Invention of Tradition, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge 1983), pp. 104-05.

14. "Centres, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power," in Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics Since the Middle Ages, ed. Sean Wilentz (Philadelphia 1985), p. 15. Also see his The Interpretation of Cultures (New York 1973).

15. Hayden, pp. 159 and 166.

16. The literature is vast and growing steadily. For the Tudor and Stuart monarchy see: Sydney Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy (Oxford 1969); David M. Bergeron, English Civic Pageantry 1558-1642 (Columbia, S.C. 1971); and, Roy Strong, Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion (London 1973) and Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450-1650 (London 1973). Studies of royal ceremonial during the Restoration and eighteenth century include: Paul Fritz, "From 'Public' to 'Private': The Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1800," in Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death, ed. J. Whaley (New York 1981), pp. 61-79 and "The Trade in Death: The Royal Funerals in England, 1685-1830," Eighteenth Century Studies 15.3 (1982): 291-316; S.J. Gerard Reedy, "Mystical Politics: The Imagery of Charles II's Coronation," in Studies in Change and Revolution: Aspects of English Intellectual History, 1640-1800, ed. Paul J. Korshin (New York 1972), pp. 19-42; and Linda Colley, "The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation 1760-1820," Past and Present 102 (1984): 96-129. For the mid and late nineteenth century see: Jeffrey L. Lant, Insubstantial Pageant: Ceremony and Confusion at Queen Victoria's Court (London 1979).

17. See "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual," and "Introduction: divine rites of kings," in Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies, eds. David Cannadine and Simon Price (Cambridge 1987), pp. 1-19. Other scholars who have considered the historical approach to an understanding of pomp and power include: Sean Wilentz, "Introduction: Teufelsdrockh's Dilemma: On Symbolism, Politics, and History," in Rites of Power, pp. 1-10; Eric Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," in The Invention of Tradition, pp. 1-14.

18. Cannadine, "Introduction," p. 6 and "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual," p. 105.

19. Cannadine, "Introduction," pp. 6, 14 and 18.

20. The primary example is Shils and Young, "The Meaning of the Coronation." Even their most ardent critic N. Birnbaum ("Monarchs and Socialists"), failed to initiate a more contextually-centred debate.

21. This interpretation is epitomized by the scholarship of Ilse Hayden, pp. 147-58.

22. Historical surveys of the coronation ceremony tend to coincide with the approach of the crowning of a new monarch. Examples of this type of scholarship which appeared this century include: Leopold G. Wickham Legg (ed.), English Coronation Records (Whitehall 1901); William Jones, Crowns and Coronations: A History of Regalia (London 1902); The Complete Ceremonies and Procedures Observed at the Coronation of the Kings and Queens of England (London 1902); Douglas Macleane, The Great Solemnity of the Coronation of a King and Queen According to the Use of the Church of England (London 1911); W.J. Passingham, A History of the Coronation (London 1937); Randolph S. Churchill, The Story of the Coronation (London 1953); Jocelyn Perkins, The Coronation Book or The Hallowing of the Sovereigns of England, 2nd ed. (London 1911) and The Crowning of the Sovereign..., 2nd ed. (London 1953); and, Lawrence Tanner, The Historic Story of the Coronation Ceremony and Ritual (London 1952) and The History of the Coronation (London 1952).

23. Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual," pp. 104-05.

CHAPTER I

THE FORM OF THE ENGLISH CORONATION CEREMONY: THE CORONATION AS A CONSERVATIVE CEREMONY

The English coronation has most often been interpreted in the twentieth century as an unchanging rite, descended from time immemorial, by which the authority of the sovereign is ritually legitimized by representatives of the Church and State. It confirms the monarch's place at the apex of society and the preeminent position granted the aristocracy and the Church in the social hierarchy. The coronation is believed to consecrate the monarchy's sovereignty and the aristocracy and the Church's privilege, underscoring the interdependence of the three groups and the principle of hereditary succession perpetuating their status as the traditional ruling elite.[1] This is, of course, a romanticized view of the coronation, one which does not recognize the dynamics of the struggle for power within the ranks of the elite nor the manner in which political institutions, and the ceremonial that celebrates them, are transformed in the process. Attention must be given to the historical context in which ceremonies such as the coronation were developed if the deepest levels of meaning are to be exposed and the slightest changes in the form of the ceremony understood.

The historical context of the coronation ceremonies of the Restoration and eighteenth century can be characterized as one of change, conflict and crisis. It will be demonstrated in this chapter how adaptation of the form, or the structure and arrangement of the component parts, of the coronation ceremony can be accounted for in this period by an

extremely dynamic historical milieu. The form of the coronation ceremony went through three distinct phases of development in this period, each phase reflecting the shifting constitutional basis underpinning the relationship between the monarchy and the aristocracy.[2] The first stage, as understood in the context of the restitution of the monarchy and the aristocracy in 1660, is characterized by a careful adherence to tradition as witnessed by the form of the coronation of Charles II in 1661. In attempting to emulate the coronations of the early Stuart monarchs, ceremonies based, in turn, on the form of the Liber Regalis of 1307, the form of Charles II's coronation is a genuine reflection and reinforcement of the stability and consensus characterizing the relationship between the monarchy and the aristocracy at the Restoration.[3] The second and third stages of development occur in the 1685-89 period, a time of rapid political and constitutional transition: the status quo of 1660 and 1661 is, in turn, upset by the absolutism* of James II and redefined by the aristocratic-sponsored establishment of constitutional monarchy in 1689. The different form of the 1685 and 1689 coronations reflect this shift in the balance of power from the monarchy to the aristocracy. The failure of the coronation to evolve beyond its 1689 form, despite the tremendous social, cultural and economic transformation of English society during the course of the eighteenth century, can be explained by the hegemony of the aristocracy in the aftermath of the Revolution of 1688. The form of the post-Revolution coronation ceremony was essentially unaltered until the consecration of William IV because it gave expression to the ideals of stability and hierarchy safeguarded by the political and constitutional arrangement between the aristocracy and the monarchy emanating from the Settlement of 1689. When studied in light of the evolving relationship existing between the aristocracy

---

* By the term "absolutism" is meant the sheer magnitude of power that the monarch employs in an attempt to rule independently of Parliament or of a dominant party prepared to support the monarch's policies. For a useful discussion of the definition of absolutism, see James Daly, "The Idea of Absolute Monarchy in the Seventeenth-Century," The Historical Journal 21.2 (1978): 227-50.

and the monarchy from 1660 to 1821, the coronation ceremony can be characterized as a conservative ceremony because its form continuously legitimized and celebrated the status quo forged between the two groups constituting the elite of Restoration and Eighteenth-century English society.

The traditional form of the coronation of Charles II foreshadowed later developments in the process of restoration which eventually reestablished the institutions of State and Church to their former position of preeminence. On both counts the role of Charles's statesmanship proved to be instrumental. Although he is reputed to have been disinterested in ideological and religious issues, Charles was prudent enough to realize that the stability of his reign depended upon a gesture of loyalty to the Anglican establishment.[4] This, coupled with his proclivity for religious toleration, allowed for the reestablishment of the Church of England as the State Church without the rampant persecution of Catholics and Dissenters.[5] Similarly, the manner in which Charles asserted himself at Breda insured that sovereignty was unconditionally restored to the Crown.[6] Charles's considerable prerogative powers made him "the centre of power, the fountain of liberty and privilege, the source of favour," a position of authority relished by a monarch who believed he ruled his subjects by divine right.[7] In addition, the reestablishment of personal rule ensured the restoration of the aristocracy to their hereditary place as the leaders of local and national life.

> Through the prerogative, England was to return to its settled and "natural" course of government, in the hands of its natural rulers the king was once again at the apex, and in a spreading pyramid of power which neatly mirrored the nation's social structure, nobles and gentlemen once again sat in parliament, officiered the lieutenancies and staffed the commissions of the peace.[8]

The great enthusiasm for the return of the King in 1660 demonstrated the political nation's acceptance of the restoration of the monarchy, the House of Lords and the Anglican Church

and the return to a stable and harmonious state of affairs after the strife and uncertainty of the Interregnum.

The unique circumstance of the Restoration, the return of the Stuart line and its supporters to power after a period of banishment, demanded that the coronation ceremony of Charles II on 23 April 1661 be as traditional in form as possible.[9] A thorough examination of the form of the coronation of Charles II will reveal how the ceremony celebrated the legitimacy of the ruling order through imagery communicating the superiority of society's traditional hereditary rulers and of the hierarchic system they led.[10]

That the 1661 coronation was planned according to precedent is immediately apparent in the revival of the progress or cavalcade from the Tower of London to Whitehall the day before the coronation.[11] This aspect of the coronation ceremonies, first established by Richard II,[12] was significant for two distinct reasons. First of all, the progress through the streets of London and Westminster displayed the sovereign to his people.[13] Long stripped of its former semi-ecclesiastical character, the late seventeenth-century cavalcade to Whitehall was a triumphal royal progress which appears to have exemplified the new monarch's power, the splendour of his Court and his preeminence in society.[14] Secondly, the progress afforded an occasion during which the uppermost degrees of the social hierarchy were made clearly distinct.[15] Members of the social elite who accompanied Charles on his progress included representatives of the royal household, the peerage, and the judiciary, and the Great Officers of State, the Princes of the Blood and the newly created Knights of the Bath.[16] The very magnificent and well-received progress revived by Charles II was rendered all the more effective and popular due to its contrast with the austerity of puritan rule.[17]

The ceremony of Coronation Day began the next morning with the elevation of the king in Westminster Hall. The ceremony commenced as the nobility and members of the royal household, the judiciary and representatives of the City of London filed into the Hall, according to degree.[18] Once the King had been ushered in, attended by the four Great Officers of State, the Garter King at Arms and Black Rod, the ceremonial elevation took place.[19] The elevation signified the assent of the Lords temporal to the choice of the sovereign to be consecrated that day.[20] Only after the election has occurred, performed by the Great Officers of State and witnessed by representatives of the social elite, may the ceremonial proceed with the delivery of The Swords and Spurs.[21]

The religious counterpart to this secular ceremony was the delivery of the regalia by the Dean and Prebends of Westminster Abbey. After the presentation of The Swords, the procession bearing the regalia from the Abbey was conducted through the main entrance of the Hall. Three reverences were observed during the solemn procession up the Hall to the throne. Upon reaching the foot of the throne, each Prebendary, on bent knee, surrendered his piece of regalia to the Dean who delivered it to the Lord High Constable. When all of the regalia had been laid on the table before the King by the Lord Great Chamberlain, the Dean and Chapter of Westminster retired to the lower end of the Hall.[22]

Support of the new sovereign on the part of the Church and State was signified by the procession that then formed and departed for the coronation ceremony in the Abbey.[23] Immediately after the delivery of the regalia, appointed representatives approached the throne to receive the regalia for transference to the Abbey.[24] The procession then set out with great fanfare, watched by the people of London who thronged the route.[25] Whereas

the progress from the Tower was secular in nature, the coronation procession was very solemn and religious; the coronation service itself "may be said to have begun when the procession starts on its way to the Abbey."[26] Of particular interest is the social standing of the participants who took part in the procession. They constitute a veritable cross-section of the social elite because among them were representatives of the King's household, the City of London, the judiciary and the exchequer, the Privy Council, the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey and other representatives of the Anglican Church, and the peerage. Also taking part were the members of the College of Arms (Pursuivants, Heralds, Provincial Kings and the Earl Marshall), the Lord Great Chamberlain, the Lord High Steward and the *Lord High Constable, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, the Barons of the Cinque* Ports bearing their canopy and the Gentlemen and the Grooms of the Bed Chamber.[27] The position of this elite as the traditional and hereditary leaders of English society was demonstrated to the people as they watched the well-adorned and colourful participants pass by in the presence of the new sovereign.

Although it is primarily a solemn religious service, the coronation ceremony has both religious and secular significance: it is a "service of election, of confirmation of the people's choice, and of consecration and dedication of the sovereign to the service of god and his peoples."[28] Accordingly, it is possible to note in its general structure the representation of the relationship between the sovereign and the civil and ecclesiastical polity of England.[29] In examining the major sections of the ceremony - the Introduction (the recognition and the Oath); the Anointing; the Investment; and, the Enthroning and the Homage[30] - it will be revealed how the traditional form of the 1661 coronation service served to suggest the legitimization of the co-existence and interdependence that characterized the consensual relationship between the monarchy, the aristocracy and the

Anglican Church after the Restoration.

The first part of the Introduction, the Recognition, consists of the proclamation and presentation of the sovereign by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Great Chamberlain, the Lord High Constable and the Earl Marshall.[31] The recognition, expressing both the people's ratification of the sovereign's prior election and their voluntary allegiance to the new ruler, functions as a check on the sovereign's claim to his hereditary right to the throne.[32] In 1661 Charles was presented as "the rightful Inheritour of the Crown of this Realm" and the people were asked if "they were willing to do their Homage, Service and Bounden Duty to Him." Only after the people had "signified their willingness, by Loud Shouts and Acclamations"[33] did the Archbishop have the authority to proceed to hallow, invest and crown the new sovereign.[34]

The second phase of the Introduction is the Oath, whereby the sovereign commits himself to a relationship with his people through the pledging of a solemn and binding promise.[35] Ashmole records that the 1661 Oath sworn to by Charles II was "the usual Oath of his Progenitors,"[36] an indication of the conscious attention to detail and precedence exercised by his coronation committee. The Oath encapsulated the nature of the status quo at the Restoration. Charles II swore he would:

> confirm the Laws of the People, and Namely the Franchises granted to the Clergy by Saint Edward the Confessor; to maintain the Gospel established in the Kingdom; to keep Peace; execute Justice, and grant the Commons their rightful Customs.[37]

Together, the Oath and the Recognition were an acknowledgement on the part of the monarchy, and the aristocracy and the Church, of the mutual responsibilities and privileges defining the relationship into which they were entering.

The second major division of the ceremony is the Anointing, arguably the most sacred step in the sovereign becoming the monarch.[38] Both the religious and civil significance of this rite can be noted. On the one hand, the Anointing has great religious significance because it sets the sovereign apart and sanctifies him; he "becomes the privileged recipient of the special gift of the Holy Spirit."[39] On the other hand, through the Anointing the sovereign receives God's sanction to rule justly, a sentiment which echoes the coronation Oath:

> Kings have a heavy duty entrusted by God, demanding and deserving His especial grace; *but a monarch's duty is still that of serving God through service to His people*; it is not, and never can be, the expression of absolute power.[40]

Unction is another act which helps define the consensual relationship celebrated by the coronation ceremony.

Immediately following the Anointing, the sovereign is invested with the symbols of the kingly office. Although each item of the regalia symbolizes a certain aspect of kingship, every one in some way contributes to the outward assumption of the royal dignity.[41] The most significant piece of the regalia is St. Edward's Crown, and the crowning of the sovereign, accompanied by the peers placing their coronets upon their heads, symbolizes that the elite has given their sanction to the consecration of the monarch.[42]

Next, the monarch is enthroned and receives the Fealty and Homage of his ecclesiastical and civil subjects accordingly.[43] It is crucial to note that in no way do the acts of fealty and homage represent the submission of the subject to the monarch. This is apparent in the kiss the prelate or noble bestows upon the monarch's cheek, a symbol of the state of union and agreement they have entered into with their lord.[44] This pledging of

allegiance to the monarch indicates that the prelates and peers support the monarchy, that they have an important stake in the responsibility for the welfare of the State that the monarch has assumed.[45] The acts of Fealty and Homage are therefore another aspect of the coronation ceremonial legitimizing the interdependence of the monarchy and the elite in the management of the nation.

Following Holy Communion and the conclusion of the service, the newly consecrated monarch was conducted back, by procession, to Westminster Hall for the Banquet and Challenge.[46] These ceremonies were chiefly feudal in origin and served, like the procession from the Tower and the Coronation Procession, to express the social supremacy of the elite. The concern for hierarchy is apparent in the seating arrangements (the King sat at an elevated table with the peerage, ecclesiastical officials and other dignitaries seated below, according to degree) and in the ceremonial of serving the first course (the feast was carried in, by participants ranked according to degree, by procession, while the honour of waiting upon the monarch was granted to the most senior members of the elite and to those who held various hereditary offices to perform specific services).[47] The privilege to attend the banquet and to perform a service was jealously guarded and coveted.[48]

Although the 1661 ceremony primarily served, like previous coronations, to consecrate the power and authority of the monarch, it was also a ceremony emphasizing the role played by the aristocracy and the Church in defining the status quo of the Restoration. On the one hand, then, the monarchy's status at the apex of English society was celebrated by the progress from the Tower, the grace God bestowed upon him through the Anointing, and his secular supremacy as signified by the coronation itself. On the other hand, the

position of the elite as the traditional rulers of society was demonstrated by the aristocracy's elevation of the monarch in Westminster Hall, their participation in the coronation procession and attendance at the banquet, and their role in the coronation service, and by the ecclesiastical officials' performance of the solemn coronation rites. What is truly significant about the 1661 coronation ceremony, however, is the emphasis placed, throughout the ceremonial, on the solidarity and consensus of the ruling elite and the monarchy and the validity of hierarchy. We see this especially in the Recognition, where the elite, on the behalf of the people, confirm the election of the new sovereign; in the Oath, where the monarch swears to rule all his people justly; and, in the swearing of fealty and homage, where each party pledges to assist the other in the maintenance of the nation. The coronation ceremony did not, therefore, only legitimize the authority of the monarch, but also legitimized the privilege of the elite to share in this responsibility. Charles II's coronation in 1661 primarily achieved this statement of the interdependence of the monarchy and the elite by employing traditional ceremonial dating to the fourteenth century, ceremonial which had always expressed the social superiority of the elite and their right and obligation to participate in the maintenance of the nation's stability and security.

Charles II, who allowed the Cavalier Parliament to sit for most of the early part of his reign, and then ruled without Parliament after the Exclusion Crisis, demonstrated that the late Stuart monarchs were very powerful if they used their remaining prerogative powers to good effect.[49] It seems that James II came to his throne determined to make royal authority absolute. He believed he could accomplish this goal: he was a diligent monarch with a high standard of personal conduct, and because, according to his autocratic temperament, he believed that the monarchy was a sacred institution solely entrusted with the conduct of government.[50] Events of the early months of his reign proved James's convictions right; his

reign began on a secure basis for his first Parliament voted him a revenue of £2 million per annum (more than any previous Stuart monarch) and because the country was essentially peaceable, still fearful of any renewal of civil war.[51] James used his hold on power to promote his dearest cause, Catholicism. A devout Catholic since 1669, James saw the promotion of Catholicism as a sacred trust best fulfilled through the kingly office. Hoping, at the very least, to reestablish Catholicism on an equal footing with Anglicanism, James used his prerogative powers as a means to an end.[52] The consensus of the Restoration was destroyed because James exercised his prerogative powers at the expense of Parliament and the aristocracy, and because he threatened the security of Anglicanism through his zealous promotion of the Church of Rome.

James's abuse of his prerogative powers and his guardianship of Catholicism were not tolerated for long. The unprecedented abuse of the monarchy's suspending and dispensing powers, the maintenance of a standing army without Parliament's consent and the purging of the Lord-Lieutenancies, the commissions of the peace and the borough corporations in order to create a hand-picked and subservient Parliament represented a far more serious threat to the balance of power between the monarchy and the aristocracy than was foreshadowed by the closing years of Charles's reign or by the convictions James held when he assumed the throne.[53] The Revolution of 1688 is now commonly interpreted by historians to have been a conservative, reactionary rearguard action mounted by an aristocracy opposed to a "radical" monarch whose extension of royal power came at the expense of traditional aristocratic liberties and privileges.[54] James's assertion of Catholicism should not, however, be underestimated as a motivating factor for what transpired in 1688. W.A. Speck has recently claimed that the issue of James's religious policies worried many of his subjects to the same extent as his absolutism.[55] Both issues deserve equal

consideration because the restriction of the monarchy's power in favour of the preponderance of power held by Parliament and the aristocracy, and the reassertion of Anglicanism as the State religion, were both primary features of the Settlement of 1689.[56]

The development of the form of the coronation ceremony in its second and third phases reflects the historical context of the 1685 to 1689 period as the balance of power lay first with the monarchy, and then with Parliament and the aristocracy. In both instances, the adaptation of the 1661 ceremony, especially in regard to the Recognition, the Oath and the Communion service, demonstrates a conscious desire on the part of the dominant group in government to remodel the ceremony so that it communicated the prevailing ideological outlook.

The revision of the coronation ceremony ordered by James reflected the desire of a monarch to rule absolutely, and one who sought to establish Catholicism as the nation's religion.[57] In the first place, James dispensed with the extremely popular progress from the Tower, claiming it would make too great a demand on the royal purse.[58] Although this omission achieved a great reduction in the overall length of the ceremony,[59] the abolishment of the progress deprived the aristocracy of an opportunity to demonstrate their rightful place in the ruling elite. James II's decision to forgo the progress can therefore be interpreted as an appropriate step for a monarch aspiring to rule independently of the aristocracy to take.

Archbishop Sancroft's extensive revision of the coronation service itself, the first substantial redrafting of the rites since 1307,[60] clearly demonstrates James's constitutional and religious position. The most significant change was the omission of the Communion service altogether, a measure designed to circumvent the difficulties arising from a devout

Catholic monarch taking Communion from the hands of a Protestant bishop.[61] James's desire to rule absolutely is reflected in the revised form of the prayer which originally blessed the ornaments of investment. Whereas in 1661 the archbishop asked God to "bless this Kingly ornament," Sancroft asked God to "bless this thy Servant James our King;" the traditional blessing of the regalia had been transformed into an unprecedented blessing of the king himself.[62] Interestingly, the oath remained unchanged. It may be argued, even given the context, that it did not require alteration. The promise to "cause Law, Justice and Discretion in Mercy and Truth, to be Executed in all your Judgments" may be interpreted by an absolute monarch in any manner he chooses, just as a Catholic could argue that "the Lawes, Customs and Franchises Granted to the Clergy by the Glorious King St. Edward" referred to the Church of Rome, not the Anglican Church.[63] The ambiguous wording of the traditional oath preempted the mutilation of that aspect of the ceremony.

The revisions of 1685 were so extensive the committee appointed to create the 1689 order found that they could not merely adopt the 1661 order.[64] Further revision was absolutely necessary if the 1689 order was to reflect the newly acquired power of the aristocracy and Parliament and the security of the Anglican Church.

Parliament's new status of superiority over the monarchy is given expression in two places in the 1689 order.[65] The first occurs in the Recognition: the words "the Rightful Inheritor of the Crown of this Realm" are substituted by the phrase "undoubted King and Queen of the Realm." In addition, the people are asked to do "Homage and Service" to the new monarchs, not the "Homage, Service and Bounden Duty" required of them by previous coronation orders.[66] These revisions not only reflect Parliament's power to set the succession, but also, in 1689, the nature of the dual succession of William and Mary as co-

monarchs.[67] The second expression of Parliament's newly established power comes in the provision allowing the members both Houses to view the monarchs during the Anointing. Prior to 1689, four Knights of the Garter held a canopy so that this rite was obscured from view. In the 1689 order, the coronation order directed that unction be visible to all, a symbol of Parliament's authority in religious and political matters.[68]

Other revisions in the 1689 order reflect the defense of Anglicanism as the religion of England. In 1661, the communion followed the coronation ceremony. The entire 1689 coronation ceremony was encased by Dr. Henry Compton within the communion service so that the monarch was compelled to take communion at the hands of the same person who anointed him, preventing a repetition of the 1685 coronation.[69] In addition, the crowning, now made the final and principle act of investment, was followed by the solemn presentation of the Bible to the sovereign as "the most valuable thing that this World affords," a reminder for the monarch to rule in accordance with the teachings of the Church of England.[70]

The new Oath, created by Act of Parliament (1 Will. & Mary, c. 6), is the clearest indication that the 1689 coronation order celebrated the ascendency of the aristocracy and the Anglican Church. The Oath was rewritten so that any further attacks by the monarchy on the Church of England could be prevented: the monarch swore to maintain "the Protestant Reformed Religion Established by Law." The Oath also expressed the new principle that sovereignty resided in the King in Parliament: the king promised to "govern the People of the Kingdome of England, and the Dominions thereto belonging, according to the statutes in Parliament agreed on, and ye Laws and Customs of ye same."[71] The Oath, by expressing the supremacy of the statutes, of common law, of Parliament, the Anglican

Church and the sovereignty of the people, seems to have registered the new status quo forged between the monarchy and the aristocracy in 1689.

The coronation ceremony, after two revisions in the space of four years, underwent no major revision in the next 132 years. The coronation orders of Queen Anne and the first four Hanoverian monarchs were all patterned after the 1689 coronation order. Besides the revision of some of the anthems, the only revisions of note occurred in the Oath, but these did not change the meaning of the oath established in Parliament in 1689 and so do not constitute a new recension.[72] Some of the revisions to the oath reflect England's changing political status in the eighteenth century: the first section of the oath referring to the "Dominions" was altered to account for the Acts of Union with Scotland and Ireland.[73] Other minor alterations merely emphasize the supremacy of Parliament and the Anglican Church already expressed in the 1689 oath. The Hanoverian monarchs were required to take the oath and affix their signatures to it, while Anne and George I and George II made an additional declaration against Transubstantiation, the Invocation of Saints and the sacrifice of the Mass.[74]

How can the continuous use of one form of the coronation ceremony over a 132 year period be accounted for, especially since three separate forms of the ceremony were used between 1661 and 1689? The coronation ceremony of the eighteenth century remained fundamentally unaltered because the relationship between the aristocracy and the monarchy established by the Settlement of 1689 remained stable.

Coming after a long period on silence on the issue of the English elite in the eighteenth century, recent research establishes that the post-1689 era was, to use John

Cannon's term, an "aristocratic century." This body of research portrays the aristocracy as enjoying near social, economic and political superiority.[75] The basis of aristocratic power is found to have resided in the countryside, on their large estates.[76] The country house and estate not only reflected the power and grandeur of the landed family but was also the "centre of a considerable complex of social and business responsibilities" through which the aristocrat exacted and preserved deference.[77] As the century progressed, the financial situation of the aristocracy improved,[78] allowing them to make greater contributions to the economic development of the country.[79] The aristocracy's political power also originated in the countryside, in the control of local affairs. Aristocratic control of the local governmental system stemmed from the management of the county, borough and parish authorities who effectively supervised local affairs.[80] Patronage was the means allowing the aristocracy to control national government. This was accomplished in two ways: the aristocracy routinely filled House of Commons seats with their own nominees (usually family or closely connected clients);[81] their grasp of the senior positions of authority in the cabinet, the armed forces, the judiciary, the civil service and the Church enabled this group to manage all other aspects of government.[82] Aristocratic social, economic and political hegemony remained formidable until well into the nineteenth century.

The aristocracy did not stand alone, however. The power of the Crown, according to J.C.D. Clark, should not be underestimated.[83] He notes that the court was still the centre of politics. Royal favour and the promise of nomination to office were prizes the members of the aristocracy fought over, allowing the crown to exercise political influence in the House of Lords. The outcome of 1689 was not total domination by the two Houses of Parliament: a stronger Parliament was matched by a stronger monarchy. Clark concedes that Parliament may have impinged upon the Crown's powers, but it did not assume them all. Clark

demonstrates that the monarchy's financial position actually improved in the eighteenth century (particularly in the reigns of George I and George II), and that the Crown retained control over foreign policy until the decade following the American Revolution. Real, effective "limited" monarchy, Clark concludes, only became a reality after 1832.[84]

Clark suggests that the new co-existence and interdependence of the aristocracy and the monarchy established in 1689 found expression in the ideology of patriarchalism.[85] This doctrine espoused the values of traditional hereditary authority, hierarchical social structure and deference, and was well-served by the Church of England with its teaching emphasis on obedience, humility and reverence for social superiors, and the primacy of a social system premised on order, rank and degree. Patriarchalism was the product, Clark concludes, of an "old society" and its dominant institutions: the monarchy, the aristocracy and the Church of England. The post-1689 coronation, by expressing the values of patriarchalism, was but one of the ways in which the ruling elite's ideology was communicated to the people.

The 1660-1821 period is typically interpreted to consist of a turbulent early period, followed by the gradual establishment of political stability. The adaptation of the coronation ceremony reflects the political and constitutional temper of the period because it underwent a great number of significant changes in 1685 and 1689, but then remained consistent in form until 1831. It is this consistency of form in the eighteenth century, not the transformation of the later seventeenth century, that is truly significant because it underlines the essentially conservative nature of the coronation. The coronation ceremony is a conservative type of ceremonial in two distinct, though related, ways. First, the coronation ceremony was conservative because its form was highly resistant to change and adaptation. In many respects, the coronation ceremony is characterized by continuity as

much as it is by change. Between 1661 and 1821, only the progress from the Tower disappears entirely. All the other changes, for example to the oath, the recognition and the investment, are relatively minor and are changes in degree, not kind. The essential traditional essence of every stage in the coronation ceremony is retained throughout the period. This helps account for the second sense in which the coronation ceremony can be considered a conservative ceremony: it always expressed the ideology of the aristocracy and the monarchy, the ruling elite. The three phases in the development of the ceremony corresponded to shifts in the relationship amongst the elite's elements. Although the coronation underwent adaptation so as to represent the new form of that relationship, the ceremony never stopped celebrating both elements of the elite and it certainly never took account of any other social group or ideology. The coronation was in this sense a conservative ceremony because it continued to express the ideals of hierarchy, traditional hereditary rulers and deference underpinning the elite's social standing, and for this reason the coronation ceremony was a potentially formidable weapon in the arsenal of elite hegemony.

Notes

1. This interpretation is epitomized by the scholarship of Ilse Hayden, Symbol and Privilege: The Ritual Context of the British Monarchy (Tuscon 1987), pp. 147-58.

2. Members of the ecclesiastical body of the Anglican Church are represented in this chapter, except where their specific roles in the coronation are mentioned, under the heading "the aristocracy." They are grouped with the aristocracy in this manner because a significant number of ecclesiastical posts were held by the nobility, moderate Anglicanism increasingly became acceptable to the peerage, and the Church received considerable patronage from landed gentlemen (John Cannon, Aristocratic century: The peerage of eighteenth-century England (Cambridge 1984), pp. 59-70).

3. Cannadine has examined the general meaning of ceremonial and its context in some detail ("The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition', c. 1820-1977" in The Invention of Tradition, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge 1983), especially pp. 104-08). I here adopt his assertion that in stable times unchanging or traditional ritual is an accurate indicator of the stability and consensus existing in that society. Similarly, I accept his belief that in a period of conflict and crisis the deliberately unaltered ritual is employed to "give an impression of continuity, community and comfort, despite overwhelming contextual evidence to the contrary" (p. 105); arguably, this adequately summarizes the post-1689 situation in which the coronation ceremony remains unchanged while the aristocracy held the preponderance of power. Cannadine does not, however, explore the relationship between the changing form of a ceremony and a turbulent historical context, as I do below in examining second and third phases of the coronation ceremony's development.

4. K.H.D. Haley, "Charles II," in The Stuarts, ed. K.H.D. Haley (New York 1973), pp. 139-40; Richard Ollard, The Image of The King: Charles I and Charles II (London 1979), p. 104.

5. Ollard, p. 112; Robert M. Bliss, Restoration England 1660-1688 (London 1985), p. 31.

6. Bliss, p. 14.

7. Bliss, p. 12; Maurice Ashley, Charles II: The Man and the Statesman (London 1971), pp. 105-06.

8. Bliss, p. 12.

9. Lawrence E. Tanner, The Historic Story of the Coronation Ceremony and Ritual (London 1952), p. 8 and Percy Ernst Schramm, A History of the English Coronation (Oxford 1937), p. 101. Schramm writes: "It was only natural that at the first coronation after the Restoration everything should be done according to precedent, for the trends that had been dropped had to be picked up."

10. In the discussion that follows I have followed the account of Elias Ashmole, "A Brief Narrative of his Majestie's Solemn Coronation: With His Magnificent Proceeding, and Royal Feast in Westminster Hall [London 1662]," in The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II, ed. Ronald Knowles (Binghamton, N.Y. 1988). "A Brief Narrative of his Majestie's Solemn Coronation" appeared without the author's name when it was published but C.H. Josten reveals that it was written by Elias Ashmole, the Windsor Herald, in 1661 (Elias Ashmole 1617-1692, 5 vols. (Oxford 1966), 1: 139).

11. The progress from the Tower had not been held since Elizabeth's coronation. The progress was cancelled on the occasion of James's coronation due to the danger posed by the plague and, ostensibly, this was the reason the progress did not take place in 1626 (although some contemporaries claimed that Charles I balked at the expense the progress would incur). (Jocelyn Perkins, The Coronation Book or the Hallowing of the Sovereigns of England, 2nd ed. (London 1911), p. 157). The most complete account of Charles II's progress is John Ogilby's "The Entertainment of His Majestie Charles II in his Passage through the City of London to his Coronation...[London 1662]" in The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II.

12. Perkins, p. 152.

13. John Brooke-Little, Royal Ceremonies of State (London 1980), p. 44. The procession followed this route: Cornhill - Cheapside - St. Paul's - Ludgate Hill - Fleet Street - The Strand - Whitehall Palace (L.G. Wickham Legg (ed.), "Introduction" in English Coronation Records (Whitehall 1901), p. xxi).

14. Schramm, pp. 94-95.

15. Schramm, p. 91 and B. Wilkinson, The Coronation in History (London 1953), pp. 30-31.

16. New Knights of the Bath were created during a special ceremony at the Tower the preceding night (Schramm, pp. 93-94 and Perkins, p. 153).

17. Perkins, p. 157.

18. Ashmole, p. 167.

19. Perkins, p. 167.

20. Brooke-Little, p. 44 and Lawrence E. Tanner, "Coronations in the Abbey," in A House of Kings: The History of Westminster Abbey, ed. Edward Carpenter (London 1966), p. 406.

21. The Swords were delivered by the Master of the Jewel House (Sir Gilbert Talbot in 1661) to the Lord High Constable, who in turn gave them to the Lord Great Chamberlain for delivery to the table before the King (Perkins, pp. 169-70 and Ashmole, p. 168).

22. Ashmole, p. 168 and Perkins, p. 174. The new regalia commissioned to replace the ancient regalia broken up by Cromwell cost £31,978 (W.J. Passingham, A History of the Coronation (London 1937), p. 213).

23. Brooke-Little, p. 44.

24. Eight earls, three dukes and two bishops bore the regalia in 1661 (Ashmole, p. 169).

25. The procession set out at approximately 10 a.m. and proceeded out of the Hall into Palace Yard, passed through the Gate House, went along to the end of King's Street, and crossed the Great (or Broad) Sanctuary to the west entrance of the Abbey, a distance of 1220 yards (Ashmole, p. 169 and Perkins, p. 177). Sir George Carteret, Charles's Vice-Chamberlain, acted as Almoner that day and was therefore responsible for the laying of the blue cloth that stretched along the procession route from the foot of the throne to the steps of the Abbey (Ashmole, p. 169).

26. L.G. Wickham Legg, pp. xxv-xxvi.

27. See Ashmole, pp. 170-72.

28. Tanner, Historic Story, p. 4.

29. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey (New York 1887), p. 133.

30. I have adopted, throughout the following discussion, the division of the service suggested by Lawrence E. Tanner, The History of The Coronation (London 1952), p. 26. Cf. L.G. Wickham Legg, p. xix.

31. Ashmole, p. 173 and Perkins, pp. 218-19. The Bishop of London presided over this part of the coronation ceremony in 1661 as the Archbishop was too ill to fulfil all of his duties (Ashmole, p. 173).

32. Tanner, Historic Story, p. 16 and Wilkinson, p. 17.

33. Ashmole, p. 173. The particulars of the 1661 service can be seen to exactly approximate the form of Charles I's coronation service. Cf. Charles Wordsworth (ed.), The Manner of the Coronation of King Charles the First (London 1892), pp. 13-55.

34. Tanner, "Coronations in the Abbey," p. 406.

35. The first and second phases of the Introduction were, in 1661, separated by the first oblation, the delivery of the regalia by the bishops and noblemen to the altar, a prayer, and the sermon (Ashmole, p. 174). In reference to the Oath, Wilkinson observes that "there is no single document in British history in which more importance is stated in fewer words," (p. 12), an observation that is borne out by the transformation of the oath in 1689 examined below.

36. Ashmole, p. 176. Cf. Wordsworth, pp. 18-24.

37. Ashmole, p. 176. As was the custom, Charles also affirmed how he would uphold the Bishops' Petition: "He would preserve unto them, and the Churches committed to their charge, all Canonical Privileges; due Law, and Justice; as also protect, and defend them, and the Churches, under their Government."

38. Wilkinson, p. 9 and L.G. Wickham Legg, p. xxxiv.

39. Perkins, p. 235 and Brooke-Little, p. 41.

40. Wilkinson, p. 12.

41. Perkins, p. 249; Wilkinson, p. 22. Although the order in which the sovereign has been invested has varied over the centuries, the order of investment in 1661 followed that used in 1626. Cf. Ashmole, pp. 178-81 and Wordsworth, pp. 36-44. For a good discussion concerning the symbolic significance of each item of the regalia, see Roger Milton, The English Ceremonial Book: A History of Robes, Insignia and Ceremonies Still in Use in England (New York 1972), pp. 76-83.

42. Brooke-Little, p. 41. In the coronations of Charles I and II, the crowning was not the last act of the Investment, but was, rather, followed by the investment with the ring and the sceptres surmounted with the Cross and the Dove, respectively (Wordsworth, pp. 36-44 and Ashmole, pp. 178-81).

43. For the text of the fealty and homage, see Ashmole, pp. 182-83.

44. Perkins, p. 256. The acts of fealty and homage do not convey a sense of reverence and subservience.

45. Wilkinson, p. 27.

46. The Banquet dates to, at least, 1189; the challenge to 1326 (Wilkinson, pp. 32-33).

47. See Ashmole (pp. 186-91) for details of the seating arrangements, the procession of bringing up the courses, the Challenge and the other services performed at the banquet.

48. Wilkinson, p. 32.

49. W.A. Speck, Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688 (Oxford 1988), p. 153.

50. John Miller, James II: A Study in Kingship (London 1977), pp. 123-55.

51. Bliss, pp. 43-44; Miller, James II, pp. 123-24.

52. Miller, James II, pp. 125-28.

53. J.R. Jones, Country and Court: England 1658-1714 (Cambridge, Mass. 1978), p. 235; M.L. Bush, The English Aristocracy: A Comparative Synthesis (Manchester 1984), p. 122.

54. Jones, p. 235; Bush, p. 112; J.V. Beckett, The Aristocracy in England, 1660-1914 (Oxford 1986), p. 406; Cannon, p. 157; John Miller, The Glorious Revolution (London 1983), p. 77; and, Speck, p. 250.

55. Speck, pp. 233-36.

56. Miller, Glorious Revolution, pp. 70-77 and Speck, pp. 164-65.

57. The authoritative account of the 1685 coronation is: Francis Sandford The History of the Coronation of... James II... (London 1687). The 1685 coronation order is also contained in L.G. Wickham Legg, pp. 287-316.

58. William Jones, Crowns and Coronations: A History of Regalia (London 1902), p. 172. This was a rather dubious claim on James's part, for he saw fit to spend nearly £100,000 for the adornment of his Queen (Perkins, p. 158 and Stanley, p. 110). The omission of the progress meant that no new Knights of the Bath were created for the 1685 Coronation (Sandford, p. 4).

59. Charles II's progress lasted some five hours (Schramm, p. 98).

60. Wilkinson, p. 28.

61. Schramm, pp. 101-02; Tanner, History of the Coronation, p. 18; Wickham Legg, p. 287.

62. Wordsworth, p. 35 and Sandford, p. 92.

63. Sandford, pp. 88-89. There were a number of minor revisions. The longer prayers were discarded by Sancroft altogether, and every remaining prayer underwent haphazard revision. For some indiscernable reason, the Litany was moved to occupy a place before the Sermon, an alteration which caused some confusion during the service (L.G. Wickham Legg, pp. xx and 287).

64. The short amount of time available to the committee proved to be the greatest obstacle. Dr. Henry Compton, the Bishop of London, was appointed to the committee late and had, at the most, two months to create a new order (J. Wickham Legg (ed.), "Introduction," in Three Coronation Orders (London 1900), p. xx). Archbishop Sancroft was not involved because he refused to take the oath of allegiance to the new rulers (Wilkinson, p. 29).

65. The 1689 coronation was the first attended by the assembled House of Commons. A special gallery was built behind the altar and over the Confessor's chapel to accommodate them (Stanley, p. 113).

66. Sandford, p. 84 and L.G. Wickham Legg, pp. 322-23.

67. Wilkinson, p. 21. Brooke-Little finds that very few of the revisions in the 1689 order reflect the nature of the dual coronation. Most of the revisions are indicative, rather, of the new constitutional and religious settlement (p. 42).

68. Wilkinson, pp 10-12, L.G. Wickham Legg, p. xxxvi; and, J. Wickham Legg, p. 143. An Exact Account of the Ceremonial at the Coronation of...King William and Queen Mary (London 1689) relates that the monarchs were "more Conspicuous to the Members of the House of Commons" (p. 3).

69. Wilkinson, p. 28; Tanner, History of the Coronation, p. 18; J. Wickham Legg, pp. xx-xxi. This represents a return to the form of the first recension of Egbert's pontifical, but it is unlikely Compton knew this (J. Wickham Legg, p. xxi).

70. J. Wickham Legg, pp. 27-28; Wilkinson, p. 25; Tanner, History of the Coronation, p. 18; and, Schramm, p. 102.

71. J. Wickham Legg, p. 19 and L.G. Wickham Legg, p. 326; Schramm, p. 221.

72. L.G. Wickham Legg, pp. xxvii and xix.

73. See Jones, Crowns and Coronations, pp. 281-82.

74. J. Wickham Legg, p. 140 and L.G. Wickham Legg, p. xxx. Works outlining the form of the post-1689 coronation in varying degrees of detail include: A complete account of the ceremonies observed in the coronations of the kings and queens of England... (London 1727); An Account of the Ceremonies Observed in the Coronations of the Kings and Queens of England... (London 1760); The form and order of the service that is to be performed and of the ceremonies that are to be observed in the coronation of their Majesties King George III and Queen Charlotte... (London 1761); Richard Thomson A faithful account of the processions and ceremonies observed in the coronations of the kings and queens of England, exemplified in that of their late most sacred Majesties King George the Third and Queen Charlotte... (London 1820); Ceremonies, and Ancient Customs, Observed at the Coronations of the Kings of England, (London 1820); and, Robert Huish, An Authentic History of the Coronation of His Majesty, King George the Fourth..., (London 1821).

75. I refer, collectively, to the following works: Lawrence Stone and Jeanne C. Fawtier Stone, An Open Elite?: England 1540 -1880, abridged ed. (Oxford 1986); Jonathan Powis,

Aristocracy, (Oxford 1984); Bush, The English Aristocracy; Beckett, The Aristocracy in England; and, John Cannon, Aristocratic century.

76. Beckett, pp. 325-26.

77. Beckett, p. 337.

78. Cannon, p. 132.

79. Beckett, p. 321.

80. Beckett, p. 374.

81. Beckett, pp. 428-32.

82. Beckett, p. 406, and Cannon, pp. 116, 120-21.

83. Revolution and Rebellion: State and Society in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, (Cambridge 1986), pp. 68-91.

84. Clark, Revolution and Rebellion, pp. 70-76, 84, 90-91.

85. For a fuller discussion, see Clark, English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, social structure and political practice during the ancien regime (Cambridge 1985), pp 42-118.

CHAPTER II

THE PREPARATION, PERFORMANCE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ENGLISH CORONATION: THE CORONATION AS AN ELITE AND PRIVATE CEREMONY

In the course of his historical investigations of English ceremonial, David Cannadine identifies the aspects of ceremonial that most concern the historian. According to Cannadine, the historian must isolate the historical context, consider the nature of the preparations made prior to the ceremonial occasion, examine the nature of the performance of the ceremonial, and determine the meaning or significance the ceremonial held for the society which produced it.[1] The primary object of such an investigation is to determine the changing meaning of ceremonial with reference to the evolving social context and the evolution of the ceremonial itself.[2] Cannadine, in his study of English royal ceremonial in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, provides a characterization of royal ceremonial up until the late nineteenth century: it was intended for an elite audience, was ineptly executed, and was of limited appeal.[3] Each of these suppositions holds true for the English coronation between 1661 and 1821. The preparations for the coronation were oriented towards an elite audience. Just as the form of the coronation invariably expressed the ideals of the socio-political elite, so too was the coronation prepared for and consumed by an elite audience. As was the case for the form of the coronation, the arrangements for the coronation were more or less intense depending on the ability and the need of the monarchy to assert its authority and legitimacy through this ceremony. Cannadine's assertion that royal ceremonial was ineptly executed also applies to the performance of the coronation

ceremonial. As is demonstrated below, the performance of the coronation deteriorates as the preparations become increasingly ambitious from George II's coronation forward. The coronation was also of limited appeal throughout this period; it was primarily of significance only to members of the elite. Their comments on the coronation are highly consensual for they uniformly find value in the coronation's expression of splendour and authority underpinning their preeminence in English society. By the time of George III's coronation, however, the fledgling middle class began to enunciate a desire for the coronation to become more public in orientation, that it become an expression of the egalitarian, democratic and nationalistic spirit that was then beginning to emerge.[4] The elite did not comply and took additional action to distance the public from Westminster, making the ceremony even more private in nature. The coronation ceremony can be characterized as an elite and private ceremonial because the elite ensured that it reflected their ideals, not those of the rest of society, and because it was not consciously intended to reach an audience outside of Westminster.

The elite character of the coronation ceremony is accounted for by the organization and the nature of the preparations made in anticipation of the ceremonial occasion. Throughout the 1660-1821 period, the coronation remained a ceremony which was entirely planned, developed and managed for the elite, by the elite.

Without exception, each coronation was organized and prepared by the same officers and departments, in the same manner.[5] The overall supervision and coordination of the preparations was the responsibility of the Committee of the Privy Council appointed by the monarch to consider the matter of the coronation. First and foremost a planning body, the Committee initially solicited and reviewed the accounts of the preparations for past

coronations and the estimates of the work required for the present coronation submitted by the various departments and individuals.[6] Once tasks had been assigned, the Committee kept abreast of the progress made by each department through periodical reports, and co-ordinated the activities of the departments working in unison.[7] The Committee's other primary responsibility was to establish the Court of Claims to hear the feudal services claimed by the elite at the upcoming coronation, a task occupying the majority of the Committee's time once other preparations were under way.[8]

In regard to the preparations for the coronation, the most preeminent of the four Great Officers of State were the Earl Marshal and the Lord Great Chamberlain.[9] Of the two, the Earl Marshal had the greater responsibilities. In addition to the supervision of the preparations and seating arrangements in the Abbey,[10] the Earl Marshal served as the Committee of Council's advisor for ceremonial matters. With the help of the College of Arms,[11] the Earl Marshal organized the ceremonial for the proclamation of the coronation, drafted the form of the proceeding to the Abbey and the return to the Hall (including the assignment of the regalia), and determined the form of the ceremonies occurring in both the Abbey and the Hall.[12] His other major responsibility was to inform the peerage of the instructions they were to observe on the day of the coronation.[13] The responsibilities of the Lord Great Chamberlain in advance of the coronation were far less onerous. His jurisdiction was Westminster Hall and he superintended the construction of the galleries, boxes and other necessities in readiness of the banquet.[14] On the day itself, however, the Lord Great Chamberlain had to tend to the needs of the monarch and participated in a great number of the ceremonies, while the Earl Marshal primarily marshalled the processions.[15]

The departments directly involved in the preparation of the coronation followed the

directions issued by the Committee, the Earl Marshal and the Lord Great Chamberlain. The activities of these departments did not vary from coronation to coronation, and their efforts were invariably directed towards the production of an elite ceremonial. The Master of the Wardrobe not only supplied the monarch and the consort's royal robes, but also provided coats for the Heralds, the habits for the King's Musicians, the Champion's riding equipment and all the decorative fabric required by the coronation ceremony (i.e., the canopy of gold cloth carried by the Barons of the Cinque Ports, the pall of gold cloth for the monarch's offering, the covering for the chairs and stools in the Abbey, the red say* adorning the thrones in the Hall and the Abbey, and the blue cloth covering the procession platform running between the Hall and the Abbey).[16] The preparation of the regalia, the items used in the feudal services during the Banquet and the delivery of the ceremonial maces carried by the Serjeants at Arms was the responsibility of the Master of the Jewel House.[17] All the preparations for the Banquet were taken care of by the Lord Steward and the Officers of the Board of Green Cloth.[18] The Lord Chamberlain of the Household ensured that the retiring and dressing rooms in the Palace of Westminster and in the Abbey were properly furnished.[19] The scaffolding, platforms and daises in the Hall and the Abbey, the stable for the champion's horse and the retiring rooms were all designed and constructed by the Surveyor-General and his staff at the King's Works.[20] Coronation medals were prepared by the Master of the Mint,[21] while the Master General of the Ordnance and Armoury readied the Champion's suit of armour and weapons and organized the artillery salute that signalled the coronation of the monarch.[22] As the nature of the preparations listed above indicate, the coronation was meant to be enjoyed by a select audience with access to the Hall and

---

* "A cloth of fine texture resembling serge; in the 16th c. sometimes partly of silk, subsequently entirely of wool" (Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, 3 vols., (Oxford 1987) 2: 2650).

Abbey, the venues receiving the vast majority of the preparations.

Although these necessary preparations where made by the same departments and officials in a relatively similar manner throughout this period, the degree of preparation undertaken varied from coronation to coronation. Historical circumstances dictated what could and could not be fulfilled in advance of the ceremonial occasion. Among the factors affecting the preparations for the coronation were: the political power of the monarchy, the degree of the popularity of the monarch, and the attitude of those responsible for the preparation and organization of the ceremonial, the monarch included.

Three distinct phases in the development of the preparations for the coronation can be discerned. The first phase consists of the coronations of Charles II and James II. Due to the high degree of political stability achieved with the Restoration and their personal involvement in the preparations, the arrangements for these coronations were of a very high calibre. During the second phase, comprising the coronations of William and Mary, Anne and George I, the preparations were hurriedly organized and consisted of only the requisite components. Doubt as to the power of the monarchy, the instability of factious party politics and the unpopularity of the Hanoverian Succession, in turn, diverted the monarch and the officials' attention from the formulation of careful plans towards pressing matters of state. In the third phase, efforts were redoubled to produce careful and extensive arrangements for the coronations of George II, George III and George IV. The return of political stability, and an increased interest in ceremonial, resulted in elaborate and detailed preparations for the coronations of George II and George III. The unpopularity of George IV (especially owing to his questionable moral character) and his personal supervision of the arrangements together account for the ostentation of this coronation, one calculated to turn

the public towards acceptance of the monarch. In each case, historical context explains why the curtailment or enhancement of coronation preparations occurred.

The relative stability of the monarchy by early 1661, the general acceptance of the return of monarchical and aristocratic institutions and the careful supervision of the preparations are the key factors accounting for the elaborate ceremonial celebrating the crowning of Charles II and James II. In particular, the considerable personal attention given by the monarch to the arrangements should not be underestimated. Clarendon tells us "his Majesty had directed the old Records and old Formularies should be examined, and thereupon all things should be prepared, and all Forms accustomed be used, that might add Lustre and Splendour to the Solemnity."[23] James II attended the Committee's meetings a total of eleven times in a six week period.[24]

The object of these elaborate preparations appears to be to project a sense of the legitimacy and majesty of the traditional rulers after the Interregnum. Charles had quite a generous budget with which to do this because Parliament voted £70,000 towards the expense of his coronation.[25] Some £25,000 went towards defraying the expense of creating the new regalia, purchasing plate and jewels for the monarch, and supplying the collars and garters for the participants in the procession.[26] The cost of his coronation robes was £2,027 19s. 10d. and his banquet came to £1209 15s. 7d.[27] Preparations in the Hall and Abbey cost £1558.[28]

Perhaps the most splendid aspect of the coronation, however, was the cavalcade through Westminster and the City of London on 22 April 1661, the day preceding the coronation. The City invested £11,000 into the preparation of this event.[29] The streets were

cleaned, houses decorated and the cavalcade route lined with the city companies.[30] The highlight of the cavalcade was the four symbolic arches erected along the route.[31] The first arch commemorated Charles II's return to England: the symbolism drew a parallel between Octavius's return to Rome after the civil wars of the triumvirate and Charles's restoration after the English civil wars and the Interregnum.[32] A naval representation adorned the second arch, commemorating the new monarchical millennium inaugurated by Charles II. The third and fourth arches represented Concord and Plenty, the necessary corollaries to the king's triumphant return.[33] En route, the cavalcade encountered a great number of entertainers, musicians and a few attractions, including a fountain venting wine near the Cornhill Conduit and two youths attired in Indian garb who scattered jewels, spices and silks among the spectators from atop the camel they rode in front of East India House.[34]

The magnificence of James II's coronation approximated that of the previous one. Although a lesser amount (£1181) was spent on preparations in the Hall and Abbey, the effect was "not lacking in splendour."[35] Considerably more money was spent on the king and queen's robes (£4864), while the expense of covering the thrones, chairs and stools in the Abbey, providing the blue cloth for the procession walkway and the red say for the thrones, and outfitting the Officers of Arms and the King's Musicians with their coats totalled the not inconsiderable amount of £4553 9s. 4d.[36] The anointing oil itself was supplied for £200 because "it was exceeding rich and fragrant; and so highly approved of by their Majesties."[37]

Two aspects of James II's coronation are particularly noteworthy. The first is the fantastic banquet prepared for the monarch and the elite in Westminster Hall following the coronation service. An *ambigne* of 99 dishes of cold meats, and three great chargers and

14 large basins of dried sweet meats, jellies and salads was laid on the king's table, all served on various types of dishes and arranged on stands of various heights and proportions so "that it made an extraordinary good appearance."[38] The king's first and second courses consisted of 175 dishes of vegetables, fish, fowl, red meat, poultry, pork, fruits and sweets.[39] The other six tables in the Hall received 1270 dishes of food, for a grand total of 1445 dishes,[40] a truly gastronomical orgy.

The other aspect of James II's coronation celebration indicative of the elaborate preparations he personally supervised was the fireworks display held on the Thames across from White Hall.[41] The principal launching site was a barge measuring 180 by 50 feet. In the centre stood two pyramids set upon pedestals (overall height of 36 feet), between which was hung a giant cypher of the king and queen's names, and the images of an imperial crown and a brilliant sun. Twelve mortars shot "stars of white fire" from behind this set, while "rushing fire" spewed out of the top of the pyramids and "fire cones" and "water rockets" poured out of the pedestals. To the right of this arrangement stood a seven foot high statue on an eight foot high pedestal, surmounted by the inscription "Monarchia" in "letters of fire." To the left of the pyramids stood another statue upon a pedestal (of similar dimensions), surmounted with the inscription "Pater Patriae." Each figure was filled with fireworks and another 1500 rockets from behind and 600 rockets from in front fired "stars and fire swarms." A barge 200 feet closer to shore housed nineteen "water machines" set amongst figures of Neptune and dolphins. Another barge 300 feet behind the first barge supported twelve more mortars which lofted rockets into the air. This pyrotechnic display allegorically celebrated the coronation of James II and Mary in a manner analogous to the high degree of preparation and expense characterizing the coronation ceremonial of both Charles II and James II.

Preparations for the coronations of William and Mary, Anne and George I were, owing to historical circumstances, rather hurried and ordinary in comparison. James II's abdication, and the subsequent constitutional and political dilemmas that event created, prevented the monarchs and their advisors from carefully preparing for the coronation of 1689. Following the momentous decision to offer the crown jointly to Mary and her Dutch husband, the celebration of the coronation was anti-climatic.[42] A survey of the preparations for that occasion reveals nothing remarkable except the provision of the articles required for the unprecedented double coronation (two canopies and a double set of regalia - two coronation crowns, two crowns of State, two orbs and four sceptres), and the adaptation of the ceremony demanded by the Revolutionary Settlement.[43] A total of £2240 was spent in preparing the Hall and Abbey, an increase over the amount spent for the last two coronations explained by the new seating required by the members of the House of Commons attending their first coronation.[44] A considerable amount of the Committee's time was also devoted to considering the form of the new oath.[45] The results of the Revolution and the considerable efforts required to settle the succession prevented organizers from preparing for the coronation in a more elaborate manner.[46]

Anne and George I's coronation preparations were also rushed and ordinary. Preparations for Anne's coronation were overshadowed by the "division and strife" which were the "hallmarks of the new queen's inheritance:"[47] she was the focus of the struggle for power and influence between the Whigs and Tories, and relations between England and Scotland were unsettled due to the latter nation's refusal to endorse the Hanoverian Succession.[48] George I's coronation took place during a time of instability for the monarchy and unpopularity for the monarch. The Hanoverian Succession aroused suspicions in many

Englishmen concerning their new foreign monarch, while the Jacobites condemned the usurpation of the Stuart claim to the English throne. George I's belated arrival in London on 20 September 1714 and his aversion for spectacle also hindered preparations for the coronation.[49] The coronations of Queen Anne and King George I were the most unremarkable of the period.[50]

George II's coronation ushered in a new phase of preparations for this type of royal ceremonial. Increasingly, coronations became splendid pageants.[51] This occurred as a result of a return to the political stability of the monarchy and a revival of interest in ceremonial on the part of the monarch and his advisors. The greater demands placed on those entrusted with the arrangements for the ceremony was the most important factor in the ever-widening interval between the date of accession and the coronation.[52] With more time at their disposal, the organizers of the Hanoverian monarchs' coronations were able to plan very elaborate and ornate ceremonies.

The magnificent preparation of Westminster Hall and Abbey came to be the organizers' chief concern. Since these buildings provided the setting for the most significant of the ceremonies performed in front of an elite audience, they necessarily commanded the greatest amount of the organizers' interest and energy. Costs for the arrangements in the Hall and Abbey rose correspondingly, from £8720 in 1727 to £9430 in 1761.[53] In 1727, this expense is accounted for by the addition of new scaffolding in the Abbey to accommodate foreign dignitaries, by the addition of seats in the Hall, by the installation of superior illumination in the Hall (costing £815 more than was spent in 1714), and by the erection of the triumphal arch which stood against the north wall immediately inside the entrance to the Hall.[54] Although arrangements for the Hall and Abbey in 1761 closely

followed the precedents set in 1727, embellishment was undertaken at every opportunity. Illumination in the Hall, for instance, was provided by 3000 wax candles set in 52 large chandeliers surmounted by a gilt imperial crown. This represented an increase of 50% more candles than illuminated the Hall in 1727.[55] Even more seating was squeezed into the Abbey.[56] An innovation was introduced which cost another £500; it was decided to provide a retractable canvas awning for the procession platform running between the Hall and the Abbey.[57]

The preparations for the coronation of George IV were even more elaborate. One reason accounting for the magnificent preparations of the 1821 coronation was the unpopularity of the king. George IV's coronation appears to have been a calculated attempt to win back popular support after the divorce trial of 1820.[58] The high degree of the arrangements can also be explained by the monarch's love for pageantry. The Duke of Buckingham wrote that George IV was "perfectly absorbed in all the petty arrangements" and was desirous that the precedents set by James II's coronation be accordingly altered and improved upon.[59] The King urged Lord Henry Molyneaux Howard, the Deputy Earl Marshal, and the heralds at the College of Arms to uncover every particular associated with past coronations, and to devise the means to surpass them in splendour.[60]

The extent of the preparations do not belie the considerable effort put forth by the organizers. George IV's coronation was unequalled by any of the previous coronations in terms of the expense and splendour of its preparations. The amount spent in furnishing the Hall and Abbey, preparing the regalia and making the costumes of the persons performing in the ceremonies was £111,880 3s. 2d.[61] George IV's coronation robes cost £24,704 8s. 10d. and featured a twenty-seven foot long crimson train with golden stars.[62] The Banquet,

prepared in twenty three temporary kitchens erected in Cotton Garden,[63] cost another £25,183 9s. 8d.[64] A truly immense amount of food was used in the preparation of the 1120 hot dishes and 1670 cold dishes served in the Hall.[65] Other expenses incurred included: £4,770 5s. 4d. for the coronation medals, £5216 15s. for expenses in the Earl Marshal's department, and £8205 15s. for the snuffboxes presented to the foreign ministers.[66]

Renovation of the Hall and Abbey, at £52,095 6s. 9d., was unprecedented.[67] A theatre, measuring forty feet in diameter, was built in the Abbey and supported a four foot square stage for the throne. A 110 foot long, 24 foot wide platform joined the theatre to the entrance of the Abbey.[68] The altar was covered with a rich carpet of blue and gold brocade,** trimmed with gold lace at the bottom and sides. Behind the altar stood a twelve foot long dossal*** of corresponding blue and gold brocade.[69] In the Hall, the law courts were dismantled, a new wooden floor laid and two tiers of galleries erected.[70] A triumphal arch stood inside the entrance to the Hall. It was gothic in design and measured 36 by 32 feet (with an opening of 19 by 14 feet). Thirty foot high turrets flanked the arch, each one decorated by a niche containing a figure of a king. A pair of massive doors, painted in imitation of gothic panels, was set in the archway.[71] At the other end of the Hall stood the throne platform, covered by a square canopy of crimson velvet trimmed with gold fringe.[72] Underneath the canopy stood the throne itself, measuring 19 feet high by 7 feet wide. Boxes for the royal family and foreign dignitaries lined each side of the platform.[73] The wall behind the platform was covered with scarlet drapery.[74] The seats in the galleries were

---

** "A textile fabric woven with a pattern of raised figures" (Compact Edition of the OED, 1: 280).

*** "An ornamental cloth, usually embroidered, hung at the back of the altar or at the sides of the chancel" (Compact Edition of the OED, 1: 789).

also covered with scarlet cloth, and scarlet cushions trimmed with gold fringe lined the tops of the front rails.[75] Labour and materials for the work in the Abbey and the Hall brought the total expense of George IV's coronation preparations to the unprecedented sum of £238,238.[76]

Regardless of the degree of preparation, every performance of the coronation was plagued by mishaps. Some were entirely unpreventable, such as the thunderstorm which occurred at the conclusion of Charles II's banquet, or the royal standard rent by the wind at the very moment James II was crowned, or the gout which struck Anne and necessitated her conveyance to the Abbey in a sedan chair.[77] The vast majority of Coronation Day mishaps, however, were the direct result of poor planning or inept management of the ceremonial on the part of the organizers. Generally, the more elaborate the preparations, the more severe was the misfortune. The performance of the late Georgian coronations was therefore subject to the greatest number of errors.

Prior to 1727, the mishaps occurring on Coronation Day were relatively minor. After escorting Charles II to his throne for the commencement of the banquet, The King's Footmen advanced on the Barons of the Cinque Ports, "insolently and violently seized upon the canopy," and "dragged it down to the lower end of Westminster Hall" with the Barons "still keeping their hold."[78] This incident apparently occurred because the Court of Claims did not clearly define the rights and privileges granted the Barons. The Barons were the victims of the organizers' ineptitude once again in 1685 when their canopy broke during the procession to the Abbey.[79] In 1689, William III's purse went missing, requiring Lord Danby to provide his king with twenty guineas for the offering. At the conclusion of Anne's banquet, a crowd of people was permitted to enter the Hall and make off with the dining

ware and valuable table linen.[80] Thievery of this nature was allowed to reoccur following George I's coronation banquet.[81] The ceremony in the Abbey was plagued with language difficulties: George I understood very little English, and the participants almost no German, so Latin was used throughout the service and served to confuse the proceedings immensely.[82] The organizers' inability to anticipate potential problems directly resulted in the occurrence of these incidents.

Technology contributed to the inferior performance of the ensuing coronations. The awning installed to cover the procession walkway proved to be one source of difficulty in 1761. The order was given to remove the canvas because the weather was fine. The organizers attempted to roll up the awning but apparently ran into difficulties because, from out of the audience along the procession route, a Jack Tar "climbed up to the top, and stripped it off" himself.[83] The illumination of Westminster Hall was a recurring nightmare for the organizers. A great deal of attention was given to this detail because the organizers conceived of flooding the Hall with brilliant light the moment their Majesties entered. Returning in near darkness following the 1761 marathon service in the Abbey, the head of the procession entered the sombre surroundings of the Hall, leading Horace Walpole to comment that the procession "arrived like a funeral, nothing being discernible but the plumes of the Knights of the Bath, which seemed the hearse."[84] When Queen Charlotte and King George entered, and the chandeliers were finally lit, great masses of burning flax descended upon the spectators for nearly half a minute. Similar difficulties arose in 1821. An additional number of candles had been installed to brighten the Hall even further, but the extra heat generated caused globules of melted wax to fall amongst the spectators, ruining some ladies' make-up and coiffured hair. The heat, combined with warm July weather, also caused a number of ladies to faint.[85] The organizers' desire to enhance the

coronation through innovative means such as these ultimately led to problems that might otherwise have been avoided.

Another feature of the performance of the coronation between 1727 and 1821 is the repeated deterioration of the organizers' authority. In 1727, for instance, no sooner had the Yeomen of the Guard passed, bringing to a close the procession to the Hall, did members of the Foot Guard posted along the route jump up onto the platform, tear up the blue cloth and the wooden boards, and fight among themselves for the spoils.[86] Only a few hours later, after the King and Queen and the peers and peeresses had left the Hall following the banquet, a great scramble for the contents of the tables occurred:

> The pillage was most diverting; the people threw themselves with extraordinary avidity on everything the hall contained; blows were given and returned, and I cannot give you any idea of the noise and confusion that reigned. In less than half an hour everything had disappeared, even the boards of which the tables and seats had been made.[87]

Repeat performances of this scene almost transpired in 1761 and 1821. Chaos was limited in 1761 to a melee for the glass Queen Charlotte had drank from, while in 1821 Lord Gwydir, the Great Lord Chamberlain, only just brought the revellers under control before the head table was plundered.[88]

The most serious errors, however, were those committed as the direct result of inadequate planning and organization on the part of the organizers themselves. In 1727, the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey neglected to bring the chalice and paten with them when they delivered the regalia to the Hall. Their incompetency was matched by that of the Officers of Arms, who failed to assign the judges their seats as indicated by an Order of Council.[89] In 1761, the Earl Marshal failed to ensure that the Sword of State, the Barons' canopy and their majesties' chairs were in their assigned places when the ceremonies

commenced.[90] Proceedings were delayed even further while the Earl Marshal struggled to order the procession bound for the Abbey.[91] One hour late, the procession crept into the Abbey, where the service dragged on for an unbearable six hours. "Such long pauses between some of the ceremonies," commented one eyewitness, "...plainly shewed all the actors were not perfect in their parts." George III, allegedly, was himself forced to prompt the Officers of State in their duties while the service commenced.[92] Due to this series of delays, the procession returned to the Hall in the dark: "the whole was confusion, irregularity and disorder."[93] Further chaos ensued as Lord Talbot, the Lord High Steward, quarrelled with the Barons, the Knights of the Bath, and the aldermen of London over the seating arrangements.[94] George III, who had nevertheless maintained his dignity while this burlesque played itself out, demanded a public apology from his Earl Marshal. The latter complied, saying: "It is true, sir, that there has been some neglect, but I have taken care that the next Coronation shall be regulated in the best manner possible." Finding some humour in this remark, the King had his Earl Marshal repeat his apology several times for the amusement of the spectators.[95]

Any experience which may have been gained from the disastrous performance of George III's coronation was obliterated by the sixty years separating that ceremonial occasion from the 1821 coronation. Despite a full dress rehearsal a few days prior to the event,[96] the 1821 coronation was as poorly organized and managed as the preceding one. The marshalling of the procession to the Abbey did not go smoothly and only the presence of prize fighters, dressed as attendants, preserved some semblance of peace and order.[97] During the coronation ceremony, it was discovered that the vellum coronation roll had been misplaced and so George IV signed beneath the oath printed in a copy of the order of service.[98] Heat, fatigue and the unbearable length of the service caused spectators and

attendants alike to flee the Abbey once the service had concluded and the King had momentarily retired to St. Edward's Chapel, as was the custom. When he emerged a few moments later, George IV and his Officers and the nobles were resigned to proceed down the centre of the nave between almost empty seats.[99] The procession into the Hall was poorly marshalled and the aldermen, perhaps aware of the plight that befell their predecessors in 1761, were allowed to break rank in search of their table.[100] Lord Gwydir had a great deal of difficulty clearing the centre of the Hall for the entrance of the King and nobles because a great number of spectators had been allowed to descend from the galleries to inspect the arrangements for the banquet more closely.[101] The crush of people seeking to escape from the Hall once the festivities had concluded also stemmed from the organizers' inability to control the situation. Exhausted by the heat and the duration of the proceedings, many peers, peeresses and distinguished guests sought temporary refuge wherever they could, on sofas, chairs and even the matted floors of the rooms and passages in which they were trapped. Many were not able to leave until 3 a.m.[102] The coronation of George IV, like the two coronations before it, was one delightful muddle from beginning to end.

Two distinct aspects characterize the preparation and performance of the coronation in this period. On the one hand, arrangements were elite and private in orientation. Although the quality of the preparations varied according to the ability of the organizers to plan and ready things for the ceremonial occasion, there was an unmistakable intensification of preparation from 1727 onwards. On the other hand, although all the coronations suffered in performance from the mismanagement and pure ineptness of the organizers, there was a distinct decline in the quality of the performance from 1727 onwards. As has been suggested above, the relationship between these two aspects of the coronation is a causal

one: performance worsened as preparations became more complicated. The advantage of perspective affords historians the luxury of determining characteristics such as these; in a sense, we have an understanding of the past that the contemporary may not, indeed could not, have had. It is one thing, then, to understand the minutia of the ceremony itself, but it is quite another to appreciate what the coronation signified for its audience. How did the contemporary audience conceive of the coronation? Were they aware of the development of the coronation ceremony in the terms outlined above? Did they privilege one aspect of ceremonial above another? And was there a uniformity of opinion? If not, when and why did the fissure occur? In short, the historian can only fully understand ceremonial in all its dimensions once some sense of the significance the ceremony held for its society is recaptured.

The coronation appears to have only held significance for the socio-political elite of England between 1660 and 1761. This group held a consensual opinion as to the significance of the ceremony: they invariably found it to be a reflection of the values which underpinned their predominance in society. The elite lauded those aspects of the ceremony the organizers struggled to produce, namely the splendour of the occasion, and the representation of the elite's social supremacy suggested by different aspects of the ceremonial.

References to the splendour of the coronation are abundant in the elite's accounts of the coronation. The superlatives used to describe the ornateness of the occasion are particularly noteworthy. For example, Samuel Pepys, writing about the cavalcade of Charles II, claimed "it is impossible to relate the glory of this day - expressed in the clothes of them that rid - and their horses and horse-cloths." After describing their clothes' fine

embroidery work and diamonds, Pepys concludes: "So glorious was the show with gold and silver, that we were not able to look at it - our eyes at last being so much overcome with it."[103] Celia Fiennes was dazzled by the richness of Queen Anne's coronation robes and circlet and described them in exhaustive detail.[104] A Mrs. Pendarves described the coronation of George II for Ann Granville, and noted: "No words...can describe the magnificence my eyes beheld."[105] César de Saussure concurred. In writing his wife about George II's coronation procession, he notes:

> It is impossible for me to make you understand and imagine the pomp and magnificence of this solemn procession....Everything in it was grand and sumptuous.[106]

The splendour of the occasion was perhaps so impressive because it symbolized the wealth which helped define the power and status of the elite.

The elite's attention to the ostentation of the coronation was matched with a fixation for the representation of their social superiority they found to be inherent to the coronation ceremony. This self-reflectivity took a number of forms. Perhaps the most self-evident representation of the social standing of the elite was revealed to them by the ranks and degrees of the participants of the coronation's various processions. Pepys and John Evelyn both provide full accounts of Charles II's cavalcade through Westminster and London in April 1661.[107] Celia Fiennes provides her readers with a general account of coronation processions, while de Saussure described George II's coronation procession in great detail.[108] Attention to elite hierarchy can also be detected in their approval of the interaction that took place between the monarch and the nobles. For instance, Celia Fiennes applauds the mutual admiration and respect demonstrated as Queen Anne "walked to the doore of the Abby with obligeing lookes and bows to all that saluted her."[109] Lady Montagu felt that George II's "countenance expressed a benevolent joy in the vast concourse of people and their loud

acclamations."[110] Other eyewitness accounts subsume a celebration of the elite's standing in society in their estimation of the bearing of the monarch. Lady Montagu found George II behaved during his coronation "with the greatest reverence and deepest attention."[111] Bishop Newton's account reveals that the elite's praise of George III, and, by inference, of themselves, was widespread:

> The king's whole behaviour at the coronation was justly admired and commended by everyone, and, particularly his manner of ascending and seating himself on the throne after his coronation.[112]

The elite therefore saw their monarch, or the head of their hierarchy, as the exemplar of the decorum on which this etiquette-obsessive elite thrived.

What is particularly interesting is the fact that the elite accounts rarely make mention of the mishaps that occurred. If one is mentioned, it is dismissed in a good-humoured manner as a trifling detraction. It is as if to draw much attention to the errors was too dangerous, too unsettling. Rather, it was the representation of wealth and status in the coronation ceremony that captivated and preoccupied the members of the elite who recorded their impressions of the coronation. For all of them, the coronation was a confirmation of their power and position of authority in society; it was a declaration of elite solidarity.

By 1761, however, the emergence of a distinctly different opinion of the coronation, based upon a wholly separate set of assumptions, can be detected. Samuel Johnson is perhaps the most eloquent spokesman for this new body of opinion. His position is outlined in a short pamphlet entitled "Thoughts on the Coronation of His Present Majesty King George the Third," published a few weeks prior to the event.[113] Johnson's preference for a type of ceremony entirely divorced from the elite's conception of the coronation is

evident from his opening assertion:

> All pomp is instituted for the sake of the public. A shew without spectators can no longer be a shew. Magnificence in obscurity is equally vain with "a sun in the grave."[114]

The nature of recent coronations, observed Johnson, was in direct violation of "the wisdom of our ancestors," whose intention it was that the coronation must impress upon monarchs "a due sense of the duties which they were to take, when the happiness of nations is put into their hands," while "the people, as many as can possibly be witnesses to any single act...openly acknowledge their sovereign by universal homage." Instead of this, Johnson found that the contrary had been occurring:

> Our Kings, with their train, have crept to the temple through obscure passages; and the crown has been worn out of sight of the people. Of the multitudes, whom loyalty or curiosity brought together, the greater part has returned without a single glimpse of their prince's grandeur, and the day that opened with festivity ended in discontent.

The chief problem was identified by Johnson to be "the narrowness and shortness" of the procession route to the Abbey:

> As it is narrow, it admits of very few spectators; as it is short, it is soon passed. The first part of the train reaches the abbey before the whole has left the palace; and the nobility of England, in their robes of state, display their riches only to themselves.[115]

Johnson's solution was to conduct the procession along another wider and longer route; he cites Charles II's cavalcade in 1661 as a precedent for this.[116] Nine different routes were outlined by Johnson, each one taking the procession through a greater part of the metropolis and thereby exposing the procession to a greater number of people.[117] He also suggested that a "longer course of scaffolding" be erected to accommodate the people.[118] Johnson's criticism of the elite and private nature of the coronation ceremony in his time is especially evident in his closing remarks. There he suggested the Horse Guards should be removed from the vicinity of the procession because they represented a threat to the people's safety,

and that the number of foot soldiers be reduced since "it cannot but offend every Englishman to see troops of soldiers placed between him and his sovereign, as if they were the most honourable of his people, or the King required guards to secure his person from his Subjects."[119] Johnson's pamphlet represented a challenge to the elite's conception of the coronation and a rallying call for those people desiring a more public ceremony.

Johnson underestimated the tenacity and stubbornness of the elite. His sentiments and suggestions were not heeded by the organizers of George III's coronation. As a result, criticism of the elite and private nature of the ceremonial escalated. In 1761, criticism revolved around the issues of visibility and accessibility. One disgruntled spectator complained, in the pages of the London Evening Post, of how "the People were greatly disappointed in their Expectations of Gratification" because they could not see the King. A number of obstacles presented themselves to the viewer. One of these was the canvas awning covering the procession platform: even though the canvas was rolled-up, "the Posts and Frame-work remained, a very disagreeable Spectacle, and greatly obstructive to the Eye of the Procession as it passed." The writer also found the platform itself to be too low, causing the soldiers who lined the route to entirely obstruct the view of the people watching from ground level.[120] Another spectator addressed the issue of accessibility. He found that the large scaffold in St. Margaret's Churchyard and the best venues on the procession route were occupied by "genteel Persons" and "Ladies and Gentlemen," while the less wealthy and privileged crowded onto Westminster Bridge in hopes of catching a distant glimpse of their sovereign on his way to the Abbey.[121] James Heming, a country gentleman who came down to London especially to see the coronation, related how the members of the general public were not only denied a good view, but that they ran the risk of personal injury at the hands of the guards in their endeavour to move closer:

> On the out-side were stationed, at proper distances, several parties of horse-guards, whose horses, indeed, somewhat incommoded the people, that pressed incessantly upon them, by their prancing and capering; though luckily I do not hear of any great mischief being done. I must confess, it gave me pain to see the soldiers, both horse and foot, most unmercifully belabouring the heads of the mobs with their broad swords, bayonets and musquets.[122]

Johnson was right. Not only would the public be denied sight of, and access to, their monarch, but the "insolence" of the guards and "the impatience of the people" could lead to "quarrels, tumults, and mischief."[123]

By the time of George IV's coronation in 1821, opinion against the elite's management of the coronation had hardened considerably. In his Memoirs of George the Fourth (1830), Robert Huish demonstrated how much the public objected to the expense of a coronation held for the enjoyment of the elite alone: to stage the ceremony "for the mere gratification of Royal vanity," at a time "when the nation groaned under the pressure of poverty" (*accentuated by the national debt and rising poor rates and taxes*), was not "only unwise, but actually criminal."[124] Huish found the public felt betrayed by their King, and so it "deprecated the ceremony" and "abrogated from him all claim and title to the character of a patriotic king."[125] The coronation was, therefore, to Huish mind's, "a senseless ceremony...to which no letters of administration ought to be taken out."[126]

The emergence and growth of dissension with the elite and private nature of the coronation ceremony can be attributed to the development of English nationalism in the eighteenth century. A relatively neglected aspect of English history, nationalism has received considerable attention in the last few years by Gerald Newman and Linda Colley.[127] Both scholars have discovered that nationalism had begun to develop in England by the mid-eighteenth century. Newman demonstrates how the intelligentsia disseminated to the

reading public a clear definition of the nation's cultural heritage and inculcated an interest in the native language and literature: the superiority of English culture was being engrained into the Englishman's mind by mid-century.[128] Colley suggests that, by George III's coronation, "British public opinion was inclining towards national self-congratulation and show," that ceremonial on the local level was being surpassed by "spectacle glorifying the nation in the person of its king."[129] In the course of fighting its war against Revolutionary France, the Government consciously strengthened the connection between the State and the monarchy in public ceremonial. In the imagery of public celebrations, Britain's economic and political power in the international sphere was increasingly attributed to the longevity and stability of her monarchy and the superiority of national cultural traditions. By the conclusion of George III's reign, the British public had acquired a taste for glamorous shows expressing nationalistic sentiment through the celebration of the monarchy.[130]

These expectations were not fulfilled, as it was noted above, by the organizers of the coronation ceremonial. Furthermore, the organizers began to take additional steps to secure the privacy of the coronation ceremonial at approximately the same rate public opinion hardened against their management of the ceremony. Clearly defined and patrolled coach routes, passenger disembarkation zones, the issuance of pass tickets and designated hours of admittance to the Hall and Abbey helped to limit access to the coronation site.[131] In addition to the Honour Guard lining the procession route, 500 light-horse were assigned to patrol the streets of Westminster "that they might be at hand to assist the civil magistrates in case of any tumults, riots or other disorders." The Westminster police force was also placed on alert.[132] Crowd control provisions escalated in 1821 as a total of 129 officers and 4835 men, armed and carrying provisions, patrolled the streets and occupied strategic points throughout London.[133] Manned barriers placed across the avenues leading to

the vicinity of the Abbey and Hall regulated pedestrian and vehicular traffic quite effectively.[134]

In the interests of safety, the authorities began to issue orders that essentially infringed upon public demonstrations of joy. The officials' primary concern was for fire, a considerable threat given the large amount of flammable products employed in the various construction projects about Westminster. Orders prohibiting open fires were issued by the Earl Marshal, thereby denying the people the opportunity to celebrate by the means of customary bonfires.[135] Orders were also given concerning the sale, possession and use of fireworks. The Justice of the Peace for Westminster empowered constables to arrest anyone in possession of fireworks; a bounty of 20s. per offender encouraged the execution of this order.[136]

The private nature of the coronation was also safeguarded by innovative measures initiated in 1821. The aim of these arrangements was to divert the public's attention away from Westminster while maintaining surveillance of the people. This was not exactly an unique idea. The magistrates of Norwich had already devised an effective means of occupying the public's attention on ceremonial occasions by 1761:

> Wisely concluding that the populace must have something to amuse themselves with on these occasions, they ordered fire-works to be played off at the city's expense, in places where the least inconveniences were likely to arise for them.

The crowd was not left to its own devices for "at the same time they [(the magistrates)] ordered the constables out, and directed them to seize all offenders against the quiet of the city."[137] The organizers of the 1821 coronation followed this advice to the letter, planning numerous exhibitions which "ultimately tended to preserve the peace and harmony" of the occasion.[138] Once the procession entered the Abbey, the public was encouraged to move off

to Green Park to witness a manned balloon ascent. At two in the afternoon, boat races took place on the Serpentine in Hyde Park. Pavilions about the Park provided another source of amusement throughout the afternoon. The organizers also arranged with theatre owners to admit the public to shows free of charge that evening. Finally, at 9:30 p.m., a great fireworks display was mounted in Hyde Park which attracted an estimated crowd of 500,000 people.[139] Through a combination of carrot-and-stick tactics such as these, the elite and private nature of the coronation ceremony was kept intact, even as the public denunciation of the ceremony's orientation reached a crescendo.

Inevitably, the coronation, like other forms of royal ceremonial, was transformed from a private, ineptly managed ceremony with limited public appeal into a public, splendid and popular ceremony. The private and elite nature of royal ceremonial began to wane even during the course of George IV's reign, as is evidenced by his public royal visits and travels throughout the realm. The transformation royal ceremonial underwent was especially evident by the later part of the nineteenth century. Queen Victoria's Golden and Diamond Jubilees (1887 and 1897) were huge public relations successes;[140] the beginning of the elevation of the monarchy's public image had unmistakeably occurred. The unprecedented developments in English industry and in social relations from the 1870s onward both demanded and made it possible for the monarchy to be represented in a new manner as the head of the nation and as a "symbol of consensus and continuity to which all might defer."[141] As circumstances changed, a new set of royal ceremonial and traditions, with a distinctly public appeal, was invented and developed.[142]

Even on the eve of George IV's coronation these developments seemed far off. It is true that his coronation was in part an attempt to win back public favour after the matter of

Queen Caroline's divorce, but, as Samuel Johnson pointed out in 1761, magnificence which the public could not participate in was essentially an exercise in the vanity of the privileged. It would appear from the evidence that this is exactly what the elite intended the coronation ceremonial to be. The nature of the coronation ceremonial between 1660 and 1821 evolved very little: continuity, not change, is the dominant characteristic of this type of ceremonial. The form of the ceremony never ceased to communicate the ideology of the English ruling elite because it reflected the evolution of relations between the aristocracy and the monarchy. Preparations for the coronation remained the prerogative of the elite and were directed at an elite audience. Although the performance of the coronation was ineptly handled, it seems the elite felt this was an acceptable price to pay for more elaborate and ever grander preparations. And, as public opposition to the elite and private nature mounted, the elite was prepared to respond in a convincing manner, determined to protect what it jealously coveted.

The coronation was, in essence, a looking glass, reflecting for the elite the power and authority it used to maintain its control of English society. This is the significance the coronation held for the elite: it reconfirmed and celebrated the continuity, longevity, legitimacy and stability of the ruling class which unquestionably dominated England from The Restoration to the First Reform Act. For as long as England remained a thoroughly aristocratic and conservative nation, the coronation ceremonial both reflected and helped to create the image of solidarity and confidence upon which so much of the elite's power hinged.

Notes

1. "The Transformation of Civic Ritual in Modern Britain: The Colchester Oyster Feast," Past and Present 94 (1982): 107-130; "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition,' c. 1820-1966," in The Invention of Tradition, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge 1983), pp. 101-164.

2. Cannadine, "Civic Ritual," pp. 108-109.

3. Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual," p. 120.

4. The nationalistic culture of the eighteenth-century middle class has been delineated by Gerald Newman, The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History, 1740-1830 (New York 1987).

5. This assessment, and the discussion that follows, is based upon a comparative analysis of the two most complete accounts of the preparations for a coronation, Francis Sandford's The History of the Coronation of...James II... (London 1687) and Sir George Nayler's The Coronation of His Most Sacred Majesty King George the Fourth (London 1837). The similarities between the preparations and the manner of the organization described in these works is striking. It appears that subsequent coronations were based on Sandford's account, a book written, incidently, to "preserve the Memory of this Glorious Solemnity, in all its Incidents and Circumstances...as to Render it truly useful to Prosperity" (p. v). References to Sandford and Nayler are cited in the notes below, where appropriate.

6. The Committee ordinarily demanded accounts of past preparations from the Master of the Wardrobe, the Master of the Jewel House, the Lord Steward, the Surveyor-General of the King's Works, the Earl Marshal, and the Lord Great Chamberlain (Sandford, pp. 1, 2 and 4-5; Nayler, pp. 14-15). Estimates of the cost and work required for the approaching coronation were solicited from the same departments and officers (Sandford, pp. 4 and 11; Nayler, pp. 35-50).

7. For example, the Earl Marshal and the Lord Steward had to co-operate to prepare for the banquet, as did the Surveyor-General with the Earl Marshal and the Lord Great Chamberlain on preparations for Westminster Abbey and Westminster Hall, respectively (Sandford, p. 12; Nayler, p. 24).

8. The Court of Claims met 7 times in 1685, 9 times in 1820-21 (Sandford, pp. 23-24; Nayler, p. 12).

9. The two other Officers of State were the Lord High Steward and the Lord High Constable. At one time, the Lord High Steward was the most senior and influential of the Officers but since the reign of Henry IV his office was granted for only a limited time prior to the solemnity, and his role as President of the Court of Claims assumed by the Commissioners appointed by the sovereign. The Lord High Constable's function was strictly a ceremonial one: he assisted in the delivery of the regalia, attended the monarch during the procession to the Abbey, and conducted the Champion into the Hall (W.J. Passingham, A History of the Coronation (London 1937), pp. 9-10 and 17).

10. The Earl Marshal also took steps to ensure the safety of the workers and the security of the Abbey (Sandford, p. 81 and Nayler, pp. 40 and 50).

11. The entire issue of the College of Arms' role in the preparation of the coronation still requires a great deal of investigation. The unavailability of sources has prevented me from determining the specifics of the College's participation with any degree of precision.

12. Sandford, pp. 22, 4-5 and 12; Nayler, pp. 12, 14 and 39.

13. Public orders were issued by the Earl Marshal to the members of the peerage concerning the proper design of their coronation robes and coronets, and the places where they were to assemble for the marshalling of the processions into the Hall and to the Abbey (Sandford, pp. 28 and 58; Nayler, pp. 14, 41 and 109).

14. Sandford, p. 26; Nayler, pp. 13 and 30.

15. Passingham, pp. 15-16 and 13, respectively.

16. Sandford, pp. 11, 20 and 29; Nayler, pp. 42 and 59.

17. Sandford, pp. 20-21 and 35. This office appears to have been delegated to the Lord Chamberlain in 1821 (Nayler, pp. 39 and 59-60).

18. Sandford, p. 5; Nayler, p. 35.

19. Sandford, pp. 25-26; Nayler, pp. 26 and 39.

20. Sandford, p. 11; Nayler, pp. 16-17, 28-29 and 32-34.

21. Sandford, p. 8; Nayler, pp. 50-52.

22. Sandford, pp. 29 and 94; Nayler, pp. 41-42.

23. Quoted in Ronald Knowles, "Introduction," The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II, ed. Ronald Knowles (Binghamton 1988), p. 14.

24. James attended on 27 February; 3, 11, 13, 19 and 20 March; and, 1, 3, 8, 10, 12 April (Sandford, pp. 6-30).

25. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, of the Reign of Charles II, eds. Mary Anne Everett Green, F.H.B. Daniell and F. Bickley, 18 vols. (London 1860-1909), 1: 423.

26. CSP Dom., Charles II, 2: 25.

27. CSP Dom., Charles II, 2: 103; Sandford, 6.

28. H.M. Colvin (ed), The History of the King's Works, 6 vols. (London 1976), 5: 454.

29. Knowles, p. 16. The participants of the cavalcade contributed to the grandeur by their own volition: Lord Wharton spent £8,000 for his horse's equipment and the Duke of Buckingham allegedly spent £30,000 for the suit he wore that day and the next (Knowles, p. 17).

30. Jocelyn Perkins, The Coronation Book or The Hallowing of the Sovereigns of England, 2nd ed. (London 1911), p. 154.

31. The first arch stood in Leadenhead Street, the second in Cornhill (near the Royal Exchange), the third in Cheapside (near the end of Wood Street), and the fourth in Fleet Street (John Gough Nichols, London Pageants: Accounts of Fifty-five Royal Processions and Entertainments in the City of London (London 1831), p. 74).

32. Knowles, p. 28.

33. Knowles, p. 28.

34. Nichols, pp. 74-75.

35. Colvin, 5: 454.

36. Sandford, p. 11; "The Report Concerning the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary," in Three Coronation Orders, ed. J. Wickham Legg (London 1900), p. 4.

37. Sandford, p. 19.

38. Sandford, pp. 108-09.

39. Sandford, pp. 110-11.

40. Sandford, p. 109.

41. Originally planned to take place the evening of 23 April, the fireworks were postponed until the following night owing to "the great Fatigue of the Day" (Sandford, between pp. 124-25).

42. Lois G. Schwoerer ("The Glorious Revolution as Spectacle: A New Perspective," in England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763, ed. Stephen B. Baxter (Berkeley 1983), pp. 109-48) has demonstrated how carefully planned and executed were the processions celebrating the accession and proclamation of William and Mary as joint monarchs. Since the Committee of Council was only ordered to form on 26 February, and the coronation occurred on 11 April, little time was devoted to the preparation of the coronation (Extract from Council Register William III, Volume 1 in Three Coronation Orders, p. 67). As a result, the preceding processions were far more instrumental in suggesting the legitimacy of the new rulers than was the coronation ceremony which effectively celebrated what was, by then, *a fait accompli.*

43. See "The Report," pp. 3-9. The jeweller charged £3703 16s. 5d. for the regalia (p. 4).

44. "The Report," p. 4.

45. The Committee only first discussed the oath at a meeting on 26 March, just two weeks before the coronation (CSP Dom. William III, eds. William John Hardy and E. Bateson, 11 vols. (London 1895-1969), 1: 42).

46. It also appears that the Committee attempted to curtail expenses, as is suggested by the lesser amounts of gold used to fashion the Chief Cupbearer's cup and cover (26 oz.) and the Champion's bowl and cover (30 oz.); ordinarily 32 oz. and 36 oz., respectively, were used ("The Report," 4-5).

47. Edward Gregg, Queen Anne (London 1980), p. 130.

48. Gregg, pp. 154-60 and 130-32.

49. Lord Hervey described how "pageantry and splendour, badges and trappings of royalty" were "irksome" to George I (Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second, ed. John Wilson Croker, 3 vols. (London 1884), 1: 88). Also refer to: John M. Beattie, The English Court in the Reign of George I (Cambridge 1967), Chapter 7.

50. Details of the preparations for Anne and George I's coronations are sketchy. It appears from the information available that the increases in expenditure were not the result of innovation or elaborate arrangements, but of inflation. £10,000 was spent for resetting the regalia in 1702 (CSP Dom. Anne, ed. Robert Pentland Mahaffy, 2 vols. (London 1916-24) 1: 27); work in Westminster Hall and Abbey and the queen's wardrobe accounted for £4677 and £7439, respectively (Colvin, 5: 454). The Surveyor-General charged £7287 to ready the Hall and Abbey in 1714, but the preparations were "in no way remarkable." (Colvin, 5: 454). A new royal crown was commissioned only after the coronation: George I wore the crown made for Anne (T.C. Banks, An historical and critical account... (London 1830), p. 129). As was the case in 1689, the nature of the dynastic scenario dictated that George I's public entry into London on 30 September was a far more politically significant ceremonial occasion than the coronation. (For details of this occurrence, see Nichols, pp. 77-81).

51. Perkins, p. 328.

52. Perkins, p. 234-35. A longer period of court mourning also played a part. The interval was four months for George II (11 June to 11 October), eleven months for George III (25 October 1760 to 22 September 1761) and eighteen months for George IV (29 January 1820 to 19 July 1821). In comparison, the period of preparation for Charles II's coronation was four months, funds for the coronation having only been voted by Parliament on 25 December 1660 (CSP Dom. Charles II 1: 427).

53. Colvin, 5: 454.

54. Colvin, 5: 454. The arch, designed by William Kent, was thought to have been prepared "'in a far superior manner than was ever done on the like occasion.'"

55. Banks, pp. 63 and 54.

56. Edward Carpenter, "Restoration and Resettlement", in A House of Kings: The History of Westminster Abbey, ed. Edward Carpenter (London 1966), p. 221.

57. Douglas Macleane, The Great Solemnity of the Coronation (London 1911), p. 151.

58. Passingham, p. 243.

59. Quoted in George Hibbert, George IV: Regent and King, (London 1973), p. 190.

60. Passingham, p. 259.

61. Perkins, p. 404. George IV's crown cost £54,000 and the Sword of State £6000 (Macleane, p. 145 and John Brooke-Little, Royal Ceremonies of State (London 1980), p. 61).

62. Perkins, p. 404 and Hibbert, p. 190. The ermine for his robes alone cost £855.

63. Colvin, 6: 647.

64. Perkins, p. 403.

65. See Passingham, pp. 254-55. 1175 additional people dined in the rooms adjacent to the Hall.

66. Perkins, p. 404.

67. Perkins, p. 404. The huge increase in expenditure is only partly due to the greater cost of labour and materials (Colvin, 6: 649).

68. Robert Huish, An Authentic History of the Coronation of His Majesty King George the Fourth (London 1821), pp. 105-07.

69. Macleane, p. 253.

70. Colvin, 5: 647.

71. Huish, Authentic History, p. 95; Colvin, 6: 647.

72. Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle, June 1821, p. 558.

73. Huish, Authentic History, p. 92.

74. Huish, Authetic History, pp. 93-94.

75. Gentleman's Magazine, June 1821, p. 558.

76. Cannadine, "British Monarchy," Table 1, p. 163.

77. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Historical Memoirs of Westminster Abbey (New York 1887), p. 110; Macleane, pp. 149 and 83. The unintentional humour of the coronations of this period has been investigated by George S. Rousseau, "'This grand and sacred solemnity...': of coronations, republics and poetry," British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies, 5.1 (1982): 1-19.

78. Passingham, p. 214. Charles II dismissed and sent the offenders to prison for their indiscretion (CSP Dom. Charles II, 1: 585). Due to this unfortunate incident, the Barons forfeited their places at the upper end of the first table, which were claimed by the bishops and judges (Passingham, p. 215).

79. Macleane, p. 149.

80. Perkins, p. 314.

81. Macleane, p. 265. Public advertisements commanded the offenders to make restitution, but they escaped detection.

82. William Jones, Crowns and Coronations: A History of Regalia (London 1902), p. 321.

83. London Magazine, September 1761, p. 447.

84. The Letters of Horace Walpole, ed. Paget Toynbee, 16 vols. (Oxford 1903-05), 5: 115.

85. Perkins, p. 262.

86. César de Saussure, A Foreign View of England in the Reigns of George I and George II..., (London 1902), p. 260.

87. de Saussure, p. 265.

88. Macleane, p. 166; Huish, Authentic History, p. 269.

89. Sir Anthony Wagner, Heralds of England: A History of the Office and College of Arms (London 1967), p. 358. The members of the judiciary only reluctantly took their seats at the lower table assigned them once the Officers had pleaded with them to do so, permitting the procession to continue on its course into the Hall.

90. The Lord Mayor's Sword was carried in proxy before the King in the procession to the Abbey; the Sword of State was found lying on the altar some time later (Macleane, p. 118). A new canopy was fashioned in the Hall, delaying the procession's departure for the Abbey (Perkins, p. 316).

91. Perkins, p. 175.

92. London Magazine, September 1761, p. 449; Macleane, p. 268.

93. London Magazine, September 1761, p. 450.

94. Perkins, p. 318. Talbot did not have a good showing that day. Later his horse, which he had painstakingly trained to walk backwards down the hall so as to not offend the King after the presentation of the Champion, insisted upon entering the Hall backwards (p. 319).

95. Passingham, pp. 230-31.

96. Macleane, p. 271.

97. Perkins, p. 175.

98. Perkins, 231. This provision was duly noted in a certificate later attached to the coronation roll.

99. Macleane, p. 258.

100. Macleane, p. 259-60. The heralds remarshalled the aldermen with some difficulty.

101. Macleane, p. 260.

102. Huish, Authentic History, p. 271.

103. Diary of Samuel Pepys, eds. R.C. Latham and W. Matthews, 11 vols. (London 1970-72), 2: 82.

104. The Journeys of Celia Fiennes, ed. Christopher Morris, rev. ed. (London 1949), p. 300. She also devoted a great deal of space to descriptions of the other participants' clothing.

105. The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, ed. Lady Llanover, 3 vols. (London 1861), 1: 137.

106. de Saussure, p. 257.

107. Pepys, p. 82; The Diary of John Evelyn, ed. E.S. de Beer, 6 vols. (Oxford 1955), 3: 278-81. Evelyn also provides a detailed description of the procession into the Abbey.

108. Fiennes, pp. 296-99; de Saussure, pp. 241-57.

109. Fiennes, p. 302.

110. Elizabeth Montagu, The Queen of the Blue-Stockings. Her Correspondence from 1720-1761, ed. Emily J. Climenson, 2 vols. (New York 1906), 2: 259.

111. Montagu, p. 260.

112. Quoted in Passingham, p. 232.

113. Samuel Johnson: Political Writings, ed. Donald J. Greene, The Yale Edition of the *Works of Samuel Johnson*, 15 vols. (New Haven 1977), 10: 292. Greene dismisses the theory, first enunciated by Boswell, that the tract is the result of collaboration with an architect named John Gwynn. The text is so "wholly consistent in style and content" with Johnson's other work of the period that it is unlikely anyone else had a hand in the composition of the pamphlet (pp. 290-91).

114. Johnson, p. 293.

115. Johnson, p. 293.

116. Johnson, p. 294.

117. Johnson, pp. 294-95. Johnson claimed the longest of his routes would take no more than one hour to traverse (p. 296).

118. Johnson, pp. 297-98. Anticipating the criticism of the expense that would be incurred by this proposition, Johnson stated: "Magnificence cannot be cheap, for what *is* cheap *cannot* be magnificent. The money that is so spent, is spent at home, and the King will receive again what he lays out on the pleasure of his people" (pp. 298-99). He also suggested that the erection of public scaffolding would drive down the exorbitant prices speculators were asking for a good view of the procession (p. 300).

119. Johnson, p. 300.

120. London Evening Post, 24-26 September 1761, p. 1. The view from upper storey shop and house windows was partially obscured.

121. London Evening Post, 22-24 September 1761, p. 3.

122. London Magazine, September 1761, p. 447.

123. Johnson, p. 300.

124. Huish, Memoirs of George the Fourth, 2 vols. (London 1830), 2: 311.

125. Huish, Memoirs, 2: 318.

126. Huish, Memoirs, 2: 311.

127. Gerald Newman, The Rise of English Nationalism and Linda Colley, "The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation 1760-1820," Past and Present 102 (1984): 94-129.

128. See Newman, Chapters 4 and 5.

129. Colley, p. 99.

130. Colley, pp. 110-24.

131. "Order of the Committee of Council," printed in Public Advertiser 18 September, 1761, p. 2. Servants were not permitted to accompany their masters and were instructed to follow the coach out of the area.

132. London Evening Post, 19-22 September 1761, p. 3; Richard Thomson, A faithful account of the...coronation of...George the Third... (London 1820), p. 36.

133. Huish, Authentic History, pp. 182-86.

134. Huish, Authentic History, p. 119 and Gentleman's Magazine, July 1821, p. 75.

135. See, for instance, Gentleman's Magazine, September 1761, p. 414.

136. London Evening Post, 19-22 September 1761, p. 1. The offender paid a £5 fine or faced imprisonment. Officials also offered awards for information leading to the arrest of offenders (Public Advertiser, 18 September 1761, p. 1).

137. Gentleman's Magazine, September 1761, p. 407.

138. Huish, Authentic History, p. 279.

139. Huish, Authentic History, pp. 279-82.

140. Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual," p. 134.

141. Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual," p. 133.

142. Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual," p. 137.

CHAPTER III

THE CELEBRATION OF THE CORONATION IN THE ENGLISH TOWN: ELITE HEGEMONY AND LOCAL RELATIONS ON A CEREMONIAL OCCASION

English civic ceremonial has commanded the attention of historians in much the same manner as royal ceremonial has done.[1] Historians have demonstrated, in the course of delineating the main characteristics of civic ceremonial, how civic and royal ceremonial are very similar in nature. These types of ceremonial share two primary characteristics. First, both types of ceremonial were primarily developed for and by the social elite. Civic ceremonial is similar to royal ceremonial in that it gave expression to the ideals and served the needs of the elite: civic ceremony established the innate power and authority of corporate institutions and officers, bolstered corporate identity by defining elite solidarity, and forged the urban elite's relationship with the wider local and national society in which they participated. Townspeople, like their counterparts who attended royal ceremonial, necessarily held a supporting role.[2] Secondly, civic ceremony, like royal ceremony, was not static but was transformed through deliberate changes in the form of the ceremonial made by the elite in response to developments in the social, economic, cultural and political context.[3] Civic ceremony was thereby made an integral aspect of social context and cultural systems, and was capable, like royal ceremony, of mobilizing "deep seated feelings of authority, consensus and conflict."[4] Civic ceremony was of significance to different social groups in different ways, and was therefore potentially both the cause and the object of tensions between the ruling elite and plebian society.

The coronation of English monarchs was a celebratory occasion which afforded urban elites the opportunity to express their power and authority to their social inferiors by drawing upon their alliance with the elite participating in the royal ceremonial at Westminster. Newspapers of the 1660-1821 period are full of accounts of the civic ceremonies the urban elites prepared and executed in order to tap into the symbolic display of the national elite's preeminence being played out at Westminster. An examination of newspaper accounts of coronation celebrations in seven representative towns - Norwich, Bristol, Bath, Lincoln, Liverpool, Manchester and Newcastle[5] - reveals how civic celebrations of the coronation was transformed, and became an issue of contention, as urban social relations evolved. During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, coronation celebrations communicated the dominance of the Corporation, the gentry, and the economic magnates in the urban hierarchy. Due to the traditional quality of prevailing social relationships, the celebrations were marked by a distinct popular element and plebian participation.[6] The coronation celebrations of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, a time of rapid economic and demographic transformation and social and political upheaval, were markedly different. Civic ceremony was used to express the authority of a new, emerging urban elite consisting of the Corporation and, increasingly, the middling rank of society. Plebian participation in the celebrations became almost non-existent, victimized by the upper and middle classes' wider campaign against popular recreations.[7] In the place of popular celebrations there emerged new aspects of ceremonial suggestive of the elite's management of the charity system to which increasing numbers of the lower orders were forced to submit due to deteriorating economic conditions. Whereas the significance the elite attached to the civic ceremony celebrating the coronation remained essentially unaltered, the transformation of the ceremony resulted in increased apathy, even hostility, on the part of their marginalized social inferiors. This transformation in the role played by the

lower orders on Coronation Day in part accounts for the widespread disturbance of the 1821 coronation celebrations. Like the coronation ceremony at Westminster, the civic ceremony held on the occasion of the coronation was not only an integral aspect of elite hegemony, but was underpinned by the transformation English society underwent in these years, particularly the increasingly volatile nature of the relationship existing between the upper and lower orders of English society.

The form of the civic ceremonies celebrating the coronations of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was determined by the composition of the urban elite and by their acceptance of the popular culture of their social inferiors. The composition of urban elites during this period evolved due to the increasing economic, social and political interdependence of town and country in the years following the Restoration. Although both urban and rural settlements benefitted from this comprehensive interaction, it was the towns which particularly prospered from the landed elite's clout as a consumer force, and its contributions to further urban development.[8] As towns became "social amphitheatres for the landed elite," the gentry increasingly acquired and developed land and bought homes in town. Once they were better established in the community, the gentry spurred on the professional men (particularly those in the legal and medical professions), while their patronage further increased the fortunes and social status of the great merchants and wholesale dealers.[9] The urban elite was thereby established through the interconnection between landed society, the big bourgeoisie and urban professionals, an oligarchy consisting of the front ranks of the socially and economically most influential citizens.[10] Formal political power was wielded by the same urban elite which came to dominate the Corporations through control of the aldermanic bench.[11] The same urban renaissance that brought the elements of the elite together economically and politically also united the urban

elite socially and culturally.[12] As a result, the urban elite of this period, riding a gathering wave of urban prosperity, was more stable and united than any preceding it in English history.[13]

Because the members of the urban elite "based their authorities not on popular mandate but upon tradition, custom, and the general acceptance of ancient rights," the processional aspect of civic ceremony primarily served to proclaim the status, authority and solidarity of the ruling elite, not the unity of the community as a whole.[14] This is precisely the sense communicated by the processions which were such an integral and ubiquitous aspect of Coronation Day festivities in this period. As civic ceremony was "largely centred on the activities of the ruling elite,"[15] these processions consistently featured elite participants wearing or bearing distinctive marks of their status in the urban hierarchy. On the occasion of James II's coronation, the Mayor and Magistrates of Norwich proceeded through town "in their Scarlet Gowns and Formalities." In other towns, other members of the urban elite joined the Corporation in procession. In Newcastle, for instance, the 1685 procession consisted of "the Magistrates in their Scarlet Gowns, with the Gentry of the Town in their most splendid Apparel," while in Manchester the Lord of the Manor and his officers were accompanied by "all the Burgesses, and a numerous company of Halbanders, and all the Neighbouring Gentry of Quality."[16] The most prominent members of the military and the town's commercial interests frequently took part in the processional display of elite power and solidarity: on the occasion of George II's coronation the Corporation of Bristol was joined by the highest-ranking officers of Brigadier Kirk's regiment, militia officers, and a "great Number of Merchants." Ecclesiastical officials were also included in some processions, such as the one at Lincoln in 1727 when the Mayor, Recorder, Aldermen, Common Council, gentry and the clergy proceeded "in their Formalities, and with their

Regalia before them."[17] It can be discerned that the Coronation Day procession was employed by the urban elite to advertise their preeminence in the urban hierarchy.

The power, status and solidarity of the urban elite was also communicated through the procession because it proceeded between the landmarks which were demonstrative of the elite's social, political and economic status. The boom in town planning and the construction of administrative, commercial and ecclesiastical buildings were important aspects of the urban renaissance English towns underwent in this period.[18] Since these building projects were initiated by the urban oligarchy, and because the fruits of their labour helped project a sense of corporate identity,[19] Coronation Day processions were primarily conducted within the orbit of these elite constellations. Processions were usually drawn up at the seat of civic government, such as the 1685 Coronation Day procession at Norwich which formed at the New Hall, or the 1727 Liverpool procession which was conducted from the Town Hall.[20] The Mayor's house was a destination of these processions. Such was the case in Newcastle when the Mayor hosted "a great feast" in 1685 and a "splendid Entertainment" and a ball in 1727.[21] Sites of commercial activity were also visited by Coronation Day processions as the urban elite sought to convey the importance of their contributions to the urban economy. Market crosses provided a venue for the processions in Manchester (1702) and Newcastle (1727); guildhalls, which commonly housed markets on the ground floor, and merchant halls were visited by processions in Newcastle (1685 and 1727) and Bristol (1727).[22] The towns' principle churches were other frequent stops on the procession routes followed by the elite in Norwich (1685), Manchester (1685 and 1702), Liverpool (1727) and Bath (1702 and 1727).[23] The Coronation Day procession was an invaluable aspect of the urban oligarchy's hegemony because it served as a vivid symbolic showcase for social, political and economic aspects of the elite's power.

Coronation Day also provided an occasion on which the members of the urban elite could pause to celebrate their good fortune with one another in private. Besides the production of a variety of public buildings and squares, the urban renaissance entailed the development of private walks, gardens and assembly rooms, "arenas of display" within which the urban elite could gather to socialize outside of the public sphere.[24] Following the procession, members of the elite usually retired to a less formal setting for food, drink and merriment. The mayor and members of the Corporation frequently hosted these social gatherings. At Newcastle in 1685, the elite was treated to "a great feast" at the Mayor's house before moving on to the Guildhall for "a Noble Banquet," all of which was provided "at the Expence of the Town." In 1727, the same Corporation arranged for a "splendid Entertainment" at the Mayor's house and the drinking of toasts at the Guildhall before returning to the Mayor's house "where there was a Ball for all the Ladies." [25] The arrangements were similarly impressive in Liverpool where the coronation of George II was celebrated by the Corporation and its guests at the Townhall with "a very fine collation of wet and dry Sweetmeats, great plenty of Wine for the Gentlemen, and cool tankards for the Ladies," followed by the drinking of healths, a ball, and additional "Entertainment" at neighbouring houses, all at the expense of the Corporation.[26] On occasion, the more socially prominent members of the urban elite took their turn hosting these festivities, as did Lt.- Col. Collin Pownal when he hosted "a splendid Entertainment" in Lincoln in 1702, or the great merchants of Bristol when they invited 200 guests to "a very splendid cold Treat, with all sorts of Wine" at the Merchant's Hall in 1727.[27] In gathering to observe the coronation of their monarch at Westminster in this fashion, the elite were, in effect, reinforcing their collective perception of the privilege they enjoyed as the senior representatives and custodians of the urban community.

Coronation Day celebrations in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were not, however, observed by the elite alone. Plebian participation was, in fact, as distinctive an element of this festive occasion as the elite component discussed above. Even though the urban elite was increasingly becoming preoccupied with the finer social graces demanded by civility, members of the elite continued to condone, even participate in, the sphere of popular culture cultivated by their social inferiors.[28] The elite's interaction with popular culture demonstrated its active involvement and interest in preserving the customary and traditional relationship existing between the social orders in this period.[29] This involvement with popular culture is especially evident on special occasions when the elite encouraged the lower orders of society to partake of the festivities. On Coronation Day, social interaction typically took the form of the elite providing the lower order with drink and entertainment. A recurrent phrase appearing in numerous accounts of Coronation Day festivities is: "the conduits ran with wine." Run they did, often for as long as the three hours recorded by a correspondent in Liverpool in 1702.[30] The purpose of furnishing the people with liquor was apparently so that they could participate in the drinking of healths to the newly-consecrated monarch. Although the members of the urban elite often drank toasts in the privacy of their assembly rooms, they met with the people at a public site, usually the Market Cross, to drink to the health of the monarch communally. Public toasts were essentially as important an aspect of the Coronation Day celebration as the elite's procession through the town, as is evidenced by the fact that the toasts were accompanied by well-orchestrated displays, such as "Vollies of Small-shot and discharging of all the Great Guns upon the Key and on board the ships in the River" or by "great acclamations and...Drums, Trumpets and Musick playing."[31]

Besides drink, the elite frequently provided the populace with entertainments. During the 1702 and 1727 coronation festivities in Bath, the Corporation sponsored extensive processions featuring troupes of maids, morris dancers, prancing horses, military companies in full uniform, and bands.[32] On the occasion of Anne's coronation, the elite of Manchester arranged a "Troop" consisting of halberdiers, 140 young men "each with white Wands in their hands," and musical accompaniment consisting of trumpets, kettle-drums and drums.[33] In Bristol in 1727, Brigadier Kirk's regiment marched about the city and paraded in the main square, where they "fired many Vollies" to the delight of the crowd.[34] The people of Lincoln were treated to "great Numbers of Sky-Rockets and other Fireworks were play'd off for several Hours together" during the celebrations marking George II's coronation.[35] More typical were the huge bonfires erected in market squares, general illuminations, and the incessant ringing of bells that signalled the beginning and conclusion of the day's festivities. These more common features of Coronation Day celebrations were all typical aspects of the popular culture in which both the patrician and plebian orders participated during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.[36] Coronation Day celebrations of this period were as valuable to the elite, which used the occasion to display their power, status and solidarity, as they were to the common people, who were acknowledged as a vital part of urban society through their inclusion in the civic ceremony.

The transformation of the civic ceremonies celebrating the coronations of the mid-eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries resulted from changes in the composition of the urban elite, its response to the increasingly acute problem of urban poverty, and the reevaluation of its attitude towards popular culture. The impact each of these developments had upon particular aspects of coronation celebrations, and the general nature of this

occasion, will be discussed in turn below.

In the course of the eighteenth century the urban elite was redefined through the growing cohesion between the upper and middling strata of English society. The urban middling ranks (shopkeepers, small businessmen, minor merchants, traders and dealers, builders, small master craftsmen, lesser professionals, authors, journalists, clerks and government officials) grew considerably and, by the later half of the eighteenth century, had considerable economic clout, growing confidence and social assertiveness. As the gentry began to withdraw from urban affairs, this emerging middling class began to take their place, creating an alliance with the "old guard" of the urban elite, the great merchants and urban professionals. Together, these two groups, the established urban rulers and the newcomers, formed the urban elite which wielded economic, political and social power in the towns and cities of England during this period.[37]

The composition of the new urban elite was delineated in the form of Coronation Day celebrations in 1761 and 1821. On the occasion of George III's coronation, acknowledgement of the emergence of the middling rank into the upper reaches of the urban hierarchy was, judging from the Coronation Day activities, rather ambiguous. In Liverpool, the procession through the town was formed by the Corporation and 500-600 gentlemen; the "principle Tradesmen" were, however, invited to attend the several house parties held that evening where they rubbed shoulders with gentlemen and merchants. In Manchester, the Corporation permitted the city's craftsmen to stage a separate procession: "the Workmen in the several Branches of Trade, being formed into Companies, with their proper Emblems and Devices, went in Procession through the Town." The Corporation held their own procession that afternoon. At Bath, several trade companies were permitted to

precede the Mayor and the Corporation in the procession to the Abbey Church.[38] With the exception of Bath, it does not appear that the middling rank had been entirely assimilated into the ruling elite. By 1821, however, the middling rank's quest for status seems to have been given the consent of the traditional urban elite. Various trades, benefit societies and officers of the excise and customs were allowed to join the Corporation, merchants and some gentlemen in the procession through the streets of Liverpool, and to partake of the dinners held at the Townhall and the Liverpool Arms Hotel. Of the 15,000 participants in Manchester's grand procession from St. Ann's Square to Ardwick Green, 9,000 people, their professions proclaimed by 101 banners, belonged to the "trades." Here, too, the Corporation permitted them to partake of refreshments with other members of the urban elite. A few trades also joined the Corporation, the military and the merchants in a procession through the streets of Bristol.[39] The growing inclusion of representatives of the middling ranks into the elite elements of Coronation Day festivities demonstrates the extent to which the membership of the urban elite was transformed by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[40]

Civic celebrations of the coronation in 1761 and 1821 also demonstrate how the urban elite was mobilizing its resources in an attempt to cope with rising levels of poverty, and how their attitudes toward the destitute were changed in the process. The rapid economic and demographic change that accompanied industrialization in the course of the mid to late eighteenth century took an immense toll on the lower orders everywhere in England, but nowhere more so than in the towns and cities. In response to growing urbanization and increasing numbers of people, the very nature of relief was transformed. Personal charity necessarily gave way to institutionalized forms of giving. An antiquated administrative structure meant, however, that the elite's efforts to deal with growing numbers

of the poor in the late eighteenth century were ultimately frustrated; money was poured into the poor rates without any visible signs of ameliorating the problem. Blue Coat schools, hospitals, and work houses were developed. These charitable institutions subjected their inmates to strict regimes in an attempt to educate the poor in the habits of industry and piety, to teach them to help themselves. This was clearly an inadequate solution. All the charitable institutions really succeeded in doing, with the aid of residential zoning, was to sever any contact the rich had with the poor, in the process destroying the paternalism members of the elite had traditionally demonstrated toward the less fortunate members of the community. The economic and demographic crisis of the late eighteenth century was not brought under control and charity took on a distinctly less humane face.[41]

Civic celebrations such as that occasioned by a coronation provided the urban elite with an opportunity to symbolically demonstrate the charity they ordinarily attempted to provide for their social inferiors. The general practice of regaling the poor with food and drink on Coronation Day appears to have begun in 1761 when the parishes, the various Corporations and the custodians of charitable institutions all took action to see to the needs of the less fortunate. In Norwich, for instance, the poor were "generously entertained in their respective parishes" through the "voluntary contributions of the inhabitants in general." The Corporation of Liverpool took the lead when the Mayor ordered that oxen be roasted and thirty barrels of strong beer be distributed to the people. An ox was roasted and hogsheads of beer were distributed in Bath. Manchester's civic leaders organized the building of three stages from which roasted oxen and sheep, and "a Number of Barrels of Beer and Wine," were distributed amongst that city's burgeoning populace.[42] Although parish philantrophy continued to be demonstrated, such as in Bristol where bread, cheese, and money was doled out to the poor, the Corporations and charitable institutions managed

most of the charitable acts of Coronation Day, 1821. Considered "a characteristically generous offer to the local poor," roasted oxen and drink was a mainstay of local governments' contributions to the poor. Dead oxen, decorated with ribbons and "a gilt crown placed on the horns" were carted in grand parade through the streets of Newcastle. Before they were stuffed with potatoes and spitted, the oxen were publicly weighed so that the exact dimensions of the Corporation's generous bounty may be ascertained and reported. They were then taken to central locations for roasting and distribution. Similar scenes were enacted in Norwich and Manchester.[43] Charitable institutions, with the help of gentlemen's donations, were also busy on Coronation Day to remind everyone of the work they performed throughout the year. The charity school children of Manchester were "taken by their kind Patrons and Guardians to their respective schools, were they were bounteously served with beer, negus, and other refreshments." In addition, they received "a handsome Coronation Medal...at the expense of the inhabitants of Manchester and Salford." In Lincoln, some 430 children of the National School were "very liberally regaled in the school-room, which was decorated for the occasion." Once again, the elite seems to have been very pleased with its efforts because a description of the quantity and the quality of the food the children consumed was released to the press: "407 lb. of excellent plum-pudding, and 243 lb. of beef, were consumed on this occasion; as also 20 pecks of potatoes, 8 stone of bread, and two hogsheads of beer; and every child...carried home an additional plateful out of the feast." Institutional charity was mobilized to a similar extent in Newcastle, where the children of the charity schools "were provided with a substantial dinner...and a half pint of ale each, to drink the King's health," the "inmates" of the corporation hospitals received 5 s. each, and the poor house residents ate "a dinner extraordinary of roast beef and plum-pudding, with one pint of ale each, to drink his Majesty's health."[44] The urban elite exploited this occasion to the best of its ability in an

attempt to suggest how a paternalistic relationship with urban society's loss fortunate had been maintained.

In an apparent attempt to highlight their concern for the poor and the unprivileged, the urban elite occasionally shared their most effective vehicle of power and authority, the procession, with the lower orders. The first recorded instance of this practice amongst the cities selected for this survey occurred in Liverpool in 1761, when "a company of invalids" joined the Corporation's procession from the Mayor's House to the Exchange. Children of the National School were also included in the procession through the streets of Lincoln on Coronation Day 1821. In Manchester, the local officials saw fit to mount two separate processions. One, the grand procession, only featured representatives of the urban elite. The other, held earlier in the day, was made up of military bands, municipal officials, members of the local ecclesiastical establishments, and the heads and children of the city's numerous schools and institutions. The correspondents for two newspapers, The Manchester Mercury and The Manchester Guardian, enthusiastically described the order in which representatives of the various institutions marched, the names of the patrons and the custodians, the banners carried before each group, and descriptions of the clothes the children wore on this special occasion. Both correspondents were taken with the decorum and civility they felt the children demonstrated, but the Guardian correspondent perhaps best captures the sense of self-pride and accomplishment the urban elite evidently felt when the fruits of their labour where presented to them in such a stage-managed and hyperbolic fashion:

> We have seldom witnessed a scene which gave us so much pleasure, as that which we have here been faintly attempting to describe. The immense number of the more humble class of our fellow subjects in this vicinity, who are receiving from the care and charity of their wealthy and benevolent neighbours, a valuable and well grounded education - the important moral advantages which their education involves - the cleanly appearance of the children who were assembled - the neatness of the

> dress, both of boys and girls, but particularly of the latter - and their quiet and orderly demeanour - all these together gave birth to a train of reflections, and hopes of a most gratifying and animating character. He, indeed, who could look upon such a scene without emotion, must have been more or less than man.[45]

Through essentially symbolic gestures of charity and their association with poor under the ideal, and theatrical, circumstances afforded by the convention of the procession, the urban elite manipulated Coronation Day festivities in order to pontificate upon their virtues as the supposedly paternalistic ruling class.

Coronation Day celebrations in 1761 and 1821 also bear the mark of the cultural differentiation of the urban social orders which developed in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The urban renaissance that helped solidify the ranks of the elite in the early eighteenth century had, by the latter decades of the 1700s, served to distance the elite from the general populace. Momentum gathered as the members of the middling rank aspiring to social leadership took steps to culturally separate themselves from the lower orders beneath them. With the increasing sophistication of industrial organization, furthermore, a concerted campaign against popular recreations was initiated. Propertied men attempted to curtail the more passionate and boisterous activities of their employees in an effort to inculcate in the people the moral qualities of industry, frugality and sobriety underpinning the regime of labour discipline that helped mould a more steady and productive labour force. The combined effects of the elite's quest for cultural differentiation and the concerted campaign against popular recreations distanced the urban elite and the common people from one another to such a degree that a new source of social tension was created.[46]

Upon first appearances, the activities of the urban elite away from the general population closely resemble the private celebrations of their status, authority and power that their forbearers held on Coronation Days of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The leaders of Liverpool society, for instance, gathered at the Town Hall, where "a most elegant and neat cold collation was set out" before retiring to the Exchange for a ball and the drinking of healths, bringing to a close their observance of George III's coronation. Similar activities - dinner, drinking and dancing - were held at similar venues - inns, townhalls, assembly halls and Exchange buildings - in Manchester, Norwich and Bath.[47] Elite gatherings were of the same nature in 1821, though the scale of the activities had grown immensely: 200 guests, consisting of members of the corporate body, officers and gentlemen, sat down to "a grand civic dinner" at Newcastle's Mansion House; meanwhile, 250 invited guests dined in the assembly rooms of Bristol's Council House.[48] What fundamentally separates the elite's activities on Coronation Day in 1761 and 1821 from their predecessors' is the marked reluctance to venture out amongst the populace. Whereas the elite in the earlier period joined the people at a prominent location in the city centre, usually the market place, for a public drinking of healths to the new monarch and the royal family, the urban elite of the later period did not drink public toasts in any of the cities studied. In some instances, the urban elites, particularly in 1821, compensated for their reluctance to celebrate with the people by staging various divergences. In Lincoln, the North Lincoln militia carried out manoeuvres on Cornhill and fired three vollies for the assembled crowd. The Corporation of Newcastle also abstained from public toasting but was apparently determined that the people do so. A great ale fountain, nearly twelve feet high, was erected in the Old Fresh Market. It was adorned with the legend "King George IV" and arms of the town (strategically located above and below the ale spout, respectively) and surmounted by a "handsome crown on a crimson velvet cushion."[49] Except for small

concessions such as these, the elite was conspicuously absent from public revelry.

In addition to withdrawing themselves from the public sphere of celebration, the urban elites took steps to ensure that public festivities did not degenerate into disorderly behaviour. Curtailment of the traditional popular modes of merrymaking is a recurring theme in the accounts of the 1761 and 1821 Coronation Day celebrations, representing another chapter in the ongoing campaign against popular recreations. Two victims of cultural suppression were the bonfire and fireworks. Omnipresent in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, these modes of celebration are scarcely mentioned in the Coronation Day accounts of 1761 and 1821;[50] restriction of these rather more boisterous forms of celebration appear to have been effective.[51] The ringing of bells and illuminations, on the other hand, appear to have been graced by official sanction. The lower orders, however, do not seem to have patronized these traditional forms of celebration. Perhaps this was because they had been appropriated by the elite. Bell-ringing appears to have occurred, on the orders of the elite, to mark the beginning and the conclusion of the day's festivities. Illumination typically graced the windows of public buildings and the homes of the more prominent members of society. Deprived of popular forms of expression through a combination of curtailment and appropriation, the lower orders were stripped of the means to celebrate Coronation Day in the ways they were accustomed. This occurrence epitomized the manner in which the celebration of Coronation Day had been transformed from an occasion on which the elite and the lower orders could both derive pleasure and demonstrate their separate identities, to on in which only the elite's sense of corporate identity, civic responsibility to the poor, and notions of acceptable forms of celebration were given expression. By the late eighteen and early nineteenth centuries, Coronation Day celebrations had little of significance to offer to the lower orders; they had been effectively

shut out from the celebrations.

The social tensions that accompanied the growing exclusion of the common people from Coronation Day celebrations can be detected in newspaper accounts that otherwise attempt to represent the festivities as consensual, not conflictual, in nature. Accounts of coronation celebrations during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are unanimous in their assertion that the occasion was one in which people of all social ranks participated, apparently without reservations. James II's coronation was reportedly celebrated in Bristol with "all demonstrations of a general satisfaction." In Manchester, the event was "observed with all imaginable expressions of Joy and Duty," while in Norwich the people issued "testimonies of Joy and true Loyalty."[52] Anne's coronation was also reportedly celebrated in an unanimous fashion. In Lincoln the people offered "hearty and unanimous Acclamations and Prayers for a long and prosperous Reign," and in Manchester there were "the utmost Expressions of Gratitude to God, and Loyalty."[53] Quite often the writers used superlatives in an attempt to express the general consensus underpinning the celebration of these occasions. In 1685 the Newcastle correspondent wrote that the people were everywhere "endeavouring to excel each other in demonstrating their abundant Joy and Satisfaction upon so great an Occasion." Celebrations in Bristol for George II's coronation allegedly exceeded any made there "in the Memory of Man," while in Liverpool there were "all Demonstrations of Joy imaginable, the like never seen here before."[54] What distinguishes the accounts of the 1761 Coronation Day celebrations from these earlier accounts is a concern to indicate that the festivities were held without incident. The account describing the celebration in Manchester in 1761 concludes upon such a note:

> ...not withstanding so many Thousand People were assembled, there was not the least Disorder or Tumult - An undeniable Proof of their Affection for the best of Kings.

The same sentiment was echoed by the Liverpool correspondent:

> The day and night was spent with that joy, spirit and harmony, throughout all ranks of people, that we don't hear that any accident or outrages have been done or happened to any persons or houses.[55]

Both these accounts appear to communicate the ruling elite's great sense of relief that the festivities, which they apparently feared might be marred by interference on the part of the lower orders, passed without incident. The concern demonstrated by the urban elites of Liverpool and Manchester illustrates how the authorities were increasingly aware of the possibility that coronation day celebrations were just as likely to promote popular dissension as consensus.

In 1714 and 1821, the worst fears of the ruling elite were confirmed. On each occasion, the literature of coronation day celebrations contains accounts of the disruption of civic ceremony, and, on a few occasions, the outbreak of riot. The nature of the crowd actions on each of these two coronation days are markedly different, however, and reflect the transformation the form of coronation day celebrations underwent between the early eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Approximately thirty disturbances were reported across England on the day of George I's coronation. Two of these incidents occurred in Norwich and Bristol. Like the majority of disturbances on 20 October 1714, the Norwich and Bristol episodes occurred due to party strife and fissures in the urban elite.[56] In Norwich, several "Gentlemen of the High Party" refused to join the coronation day procession. That evening, several prominent Tories "headed a Mob" that descended upon the celebratory bonfire where they countered huzzas for King George with declarations for "Bene and Berney," the standing members. Some even "had the impudence to cry, God d--n King George, pull off their Knots."[57] In

Bristol, however, intense political differences fuelled riot. Prompted by the rumour that the Whigs intended to burn Dr. Sacheverell in effigy, a Tory mob numbering 500 was led to search the homes of two zealous Dissenters. Windows of the Whig under-sheriff's residence were broken en route. A riot broke out in front of one of the effigy's suspected hiding places. One Quaker cordwainer was killed, several gentlemen were injured and sixteen people arrested.[58] As Nicholas Rogers points out, these two disturbances should be interpreted within the context of the "invigoration of political festival" which emerged after George I's accession in August 1714, "a contentious political culture to which *all* classes were party."[59]

The disturbances which marred the celebration of Coronation Day 1821 were, on the other hand, decidedly popular in nature. Between 1714 and 1821 the urban lower orders had become increasingly politicized and involved in the political arena in an organized manner. Whereas John Wilkes had shown the way in the 1760s, this process was accelerated with the emergence of urban radicalism and the call for the (male) universal franchise in the 1790s, and by the discontent spurred by the increasingly poor quality of urban life and the economic depression of the years which followed the cessation of hostilities with France in 1815.[60] The incidents of Coronation Day 1821 demonstrate both the lower orders' growing disenchantment with the elite's control and management of urban politics, economy and culture, and their opposition to the way the elite shaped the form of coronation celebrations to suit their own needs.

In his study of crowd phenomena in the early nineteenth century, Mark Harrison has discovered that the elite interpreted crowd behaviour to be "correct" if it was deferential in nature, and "incorrect" if they initiated unauthorized or unofficial celebration. For the elite,

the "crowd" ceased to be the crowd, and became "the mob," once the people had ceased to be spectators and became participants in activities that were not part of the official agenda or programme.[61] In 1821, the crowds that gathered in urban centres to watch the elite celebrate George IV's coronation demonstrated their dissatisfaction with elite hegemony and manipulation of the festivities in various ways and to differing degrees of intensity. While the lower orders of Manchester and Bristol were not particularly active in "unofficial" activities, their refusal to wholeheartedly join in with the celebrations and what they represented to the elite was signified by their declared support of Queen Caroline. The Manchester Guardian reported that trades participation in the procession through the city was not as general as it might have been because "for them to assist in the celebration of a coronation from which the Queen was excluded, would seem to imply an approbation on their parts of the proceedings against her Majesty." The Manchester crowd also signified its allegiance to the Queen. As the procession entered Ardwick Green, the military elements sent up a cheer, "but few, if any, of the spectators joined with this demonstration of enthusiasm." That night the people shouted for the King as long as the beer lasted, "but as soon as it was done, they, ungratefully, forgetting the lessons just taught them, sent up a spontaneous chorus of God Save the Queen."[62] Similar tactics were employed by Bristol's crowd. Little public enthusiasm was demonstrated by the crowd during the procession, and so "the pageant passed through the street in all the silent dullness of a funeral procession." In the evening cries were heard in the street in support of the Queen, and no windows were broken in the houses that did not observe the call for a general illumination.[63]

Crowds in Liverpool and Newcastle were more demonstrative of their support for Queen Caroline, matching the imagery employed by the elite with imagery of their own. As in Bristol and Manchester, the Liverpool procession was greeted by an unenthusiastic

crowd, and so it moved along "self-cheered and self-elated, altogether unmarked by those hearty rounds of general applause and enthusiasm, which we have so often witnessed in the processions of the independent freemen of Liverpool." In addition, a number of spectators held banners proclaiming their support for the Queen.[64] The crowd's imaginal assault was far more pointed in Newcastle. The wine fountain the Corporation had erected in front of the Exchange was one object of the crowd's assault upon the elite's celebrations. The gilt crown which graced the pinnacle of the fountain was dislodged "and after being well kicked about, was afterwards thrown into the river, to the great disappointment of a number who wished it put down the privy at the High Crane." Healths to the Queen were "drank repeatedly, with much enthusiasm" and a placard "expressive of respect for the Queen" was posted before the fountain and trough were entirely demolished. The crowd's abuse of facilities intended for their celebration of the King continued when it turned its attention to the stage and grill in front of St. Nicholas' Church upon which an ox was roasted. At first, members of the crowd contented themselves with throwing the pieces of meat which were distributed to them back onto the stage. Eventually, however, the crowd forced the cooks from the stage and destroyed the grill. Afterwards, a sailor posted a sign reading "The Queen that Jack loves." The remains of that ox, along with those of the one roasted in the Old Fresh Market, were "dragged down to the Mansion house, in order to be returned to the worshipful governor of the feast for the entertainment of his friends."[65] By employing their own imagery, and subverting the imagery that elite had developed, the crowds of Liverpool and Newcastle demonstrated their disenchantment with the orientation and the nature of the elite's coronation day celebrations.

Lincoln's crowd was by far the most boisterous and bold, directly challenging members of the elite as they celebrated the King's coronation. Events began much as they

had in Liverpool and Newcastle: the crowd, which had gathered on Cornhill to watch a military procession, drowned "the orders to the soldiers with loud cries of 'the Queen'...and groans and hisses." By nine o'clock that evening a crowd had gathered out front of the Rein Deer Inn where a number of gentlemen, as was the established custom, had gathered in private to observe the great occasion with dinner and drinking. At first, members of the crowd demonstrated their displeasure by scattering "the dirt of the street" upon arriving guests. The Mayoress and her woman companion were singled out for special treatment; "large quantities of filth" were thrown at them. Hostilities escalated to the point where stones were thrown through the inn's windows and the gentlemen inside verbally insulted. A few gentlemen ventured out to face the crowd but their numbers were insufficient to be very effective in deterring the crowd from its course of action. In fact, their presence only incited the crowd further. Between ten and eleven o'clock the North Lincoln militia and a recruiting party finally arrived to defend the beleaguered occupants of the inn. When the crowd would not voluntarily dispense, the riot act was read. The Mayor was finally forced to order the military to clear the square, which it did with impunity: both aggressive and passive, spectating elements of the crowd were injured. Only two of the riot's instigators were apprehended, and later tried.[66] The Lincoln riot on coronation day 1821 marked the pinnacle of crowd hostilities on that civic occasion not only because the crowd forcibly opposed the festivities organized by the elite for the lower orders, but because it succeeded in disrupting the festivities the elite had organized for itself. Events in Lincoln illustrate the lengths to which the urban lower orders were prepared to go in order to voice its opposition to the elite's observance of an occasion which, marked both by the exclusion of the crowd's favourite, Queen Caroline, from Westminster Abbey and the primarily elite-oriented celebrations held in the provincial towns, symbolized the extent to which the elite had distanced itself from their social inferiors and had turned the reflective powers of civic

ceremonial wholly on themselves. The primarily orderly and disciplined crowd actions of coronation day 1821, like the majority of direct popular actions in early modern England, were attempts to remind the elite of the social obligations the plebian class felt had been abandoned.[67]

Judging from the accounts of the seven English towns surveyed, civic ceremony in celebration of the coronation in the 1660 to 1821 period was a stage on which perceptions and expectations of social hierarchy, order and community were enacted. Members of the urban elite monopolized centre stage, shaping the form of the festivities to reflect their status, power, authority and solidarity. Room was made for senior members of the middling rank as they earned admittance to the urban oligarchy. The scenery and props were also primarily of their choosing: the tangible evidence of their contributions to the emerging urban landscape and the marks and badges of their rank helped communicate to themselves and others alike, the preeminent position in urban society they retained throughout this period. Civic ceremony on the occasion of the coronation first and foremost existed to serve the needs and express the ideals of the urban elite.

Changes in the urban context spurred the transformation of this type of civic ceremony. Until the mid-eighteenth century, the urban elite was tolerant and accepting of the plebian presence on the ceremonial stage. Coronation festivities were community oriented and intended to promote good faith between the patrician and plebian classes. Growing demographic and economic stresses, however, tore asunder the thin veil of paternalism and deference. The urban elite reorganized coronation celebrations into a spectacle in which its role in institutional charity was acclaimed on the one hand, and the growing social and cultural chasm between itself and the lower orders was dramatized on

the other. Plebian participation was severely curtailed. The new, officially sanctioned roles of the lower orders consisted either of being recipients of wealthy benefactors' charity or as an audience for elite-centred festivities.[68] The most that the urban elite could ask for was compliance with these requests. Consensus can only be forged through reciprocal social relations: it cannot be forced upon a socially disadvantaged class that was becoming more politically active and better organized. The lower ordered refused the passive role thrust upon them in 1821 and, to varying degrees, demonstrated their discontent with both the elite's hegemony and its usurpation of civic ceremony by championing Queen Caroline's cause, sallying forth to wreck the celebratory properties provided by the elite and, as occurred in Lincoln, violating the sanctity of propertied gentlemen's private celebrations. Civic ceremony in celebration of the coronation had ceased to only serve as an example of patrician theatre and had been appropriated by the plebs as an occasion for their countertheatre of opposition and sedition.[69] Although this development must not be misinterpreted as the manifestation of a revolutionary movement determined to upset the social hierarchy, it does serve to illustrate the extent to which the celebration of the coronation could no longer mask nor withstand overwhelmingly strong social tensions, and how this aspect of civic ceremonial ceased to masquerade as a consensual event.

Notes

1. David Cannadine's attention is particularly evident. His contributions to the study of civic ceremonial include: "The Transformation of Civic Ritual in Modern Britain: The Colchester Oyster Feast," Past and Present 94 (1982): 107-30, and (with Elizabeth Hammerton) "Conflict and Consensus on a Ceremonial Occasion: The Diamond Jubilee in Cambridge in 1897," Historical Journal 24.1 (1981): 111-46.

2. Peter Borsay "'All the town's a stage:' urban ritual and ceremony 1660-1800," in The Transformation of English Provincial Towns 1600-1800, ed. Peter Clark (London 1984), pp. 241-42, 234.

3. Cannadine, "Civic Ritual," p. 108.

4. Borsay, "Urban Ritual," p. 239.

5. These towns are representative because 1) they are located in a variety of geographical locations, 2) they vary in size and hence in the impact they had on their hinterlands, 3) they occupied various and changing positions in the urban hierarchy, and 4) they together represent the five various town types identified by urban historians of eighteenth century urban settlements: industrial (Manchester), port (Bristol and Liverpool), resort (Bath), and provincial centres (Lincoln, Newcastle and Norwich). (Peter Clark and Paul Slack, English Towns in Transition 1500-1700 (Oxford 1976), Chapters 2, 3, and 4; Peter Clark, "Introduction: English Country Towns 1500-1800" in Country towns in pre-industrial England, ed. Peter Clark (New York 1981) pp. 15-29). Ultimately, the availability of information concerning the civic ceremony on Coronation Day determined the cities selected for this study; considerable information also exists for coronation day celebrations in Northampton, Coventry, Warwick, Leicester, Gloucester, Yarmouth, Leeds, Bury, Sheffield, Doncaster, Wigan, Carlisle, Durham, Worcester, Colchester, Chichester, Rye, Exeter, and Honiton.

6. For a good discussion of the characteristics of popular culture, and the interaction of the lower and upper orders, see: Robert W. Malcolmson, Life and Labour in England, 1700-1780 (London 1981), Chapter 4.

7. See Robert W. Malcolmson, Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850 (Cambridge 1973), Chapter 6.

8. Peter Borsay, The English Urban Renaissance: Culture and Society in The Provincial Town 1660-1770 (Oxford 1989) pp. 16-17, 201-3.

9. Clark, "Introduction" in Country Towns pp. 21-23; Borsay, Urban Renaissance, pp. 204-10.

10. P.J. Corfield, The Impact of English Towns, 1700-1800 (Oxford 1982), pp. 130-31 and 154.

11. Clark, "Introduction" in Transformation, pp. 38-39.

12. Borsay, Urban Renaissance, pp. 278-82

13. Borsay, Urban Renaissance, pp. 11-16.

14. Corfield, p. 153; Clark and Slack, English Towns, p. 131.

15. Clark, "Introduction" in Transformation, p. 46.

16. London Gazette, 11-14 May 1685, p. 2; London Gazette, 27-30 April 1685, p. 2; London Gazette, 11-14 May 1685, p. 2.

17. Evening Post, 11-14 October 1727, p. 2 and Evening Post 17-19 October 1727, p. 1.

18. Clark and Slack, English Towns, pp. 147-148 and Peter Borsay, Urban Renaissance, Chapters 3 and 4, and pp. 323-28.

19. Borsay, Urban Renaissance, p. 80.

20. London Gazette, 11-14 May 1685, p. 1; Evening Post, 14-17 October 1727, pp. 2-3.

21. London Gazette, 27-30 April 1685, p. 2 and Evening Post, 14-17 October 1727, p. 2.

22. London Gazette, 11-14 May 1685, p. 2 and Evening Post 14-17 October 1727, p. 2.

23. London Gazette, 11-14 May 1685, p. 2; London Gazette, 11-14 May 1685, p. 2 and 30 April - 4 May 1702, p. 3; Evening Post, 14-17 October 1727, pp. 2-3 and Gloucester Journal, 24 October 1727, p. 2.

24. Borsay, Urban Renaissance, Chapter 6.

25. London Gazette, 27-30 April 1685, p. 2 and Evening Post, 14-17 October 1727, p. 2.

26. Evening Post, 14-17 October 1727, pp. 2-3.

27. Post Boy, 28-30 April 1702, p. 1 and Evening Post, 14-17 October 1727, p. 2.

28. Borsay, Urban Renaissance, Chapter 10; Malcolmson, Popular Recreations, Chapter 4 and Life and Labour, pp. 97-98.

29. Malcolmson, Popular Recreations, pp. 64-74.

30. Post Man, 28-30 April 1702, p. 2.

31. London Gazette, 27-30 April 1685, p. 2 and London Gazette, 11-14 May 1685, p. 2.

32. Celia Fiennes, in The Journeys of Celia Fiennes, ed. Christopher Morris (London 1949), pp. 21-22; Gloucester Journal, 24 October 1727, p. 2.

33. London Gazette, 30 April - 4 May 1702, p. 3.

34. Evening Post, 14-17 October 1727, p. 2.

35. Evening Post, 17-19 October 1727, p. 1.

36. Malcolmson, Life and Labour, pp. 99-102.

37. Borsay, Urban Renaissance, p. 282; Corfield, pp. 132-33; Clark, "Introduction" in Transformation, p. 34; James Walvin, English Urban Life 1776-1851 (London 1984), pp. 66-69.

38. London Chronicle, 26-29 September 1761, p. 312; Manchester Mercury, 29 September 1761, p. 4; and, Bath Journal, 28 September 1761, p. 156.

39. Manchester Guardian, 21 July 1821, p. 3; Manchester Mercury, 24 July 1821, pp. 1-4; Mark Harrison, Crowds and History: Mass Phenomena in English Towns, 1790-1835 (Cambridge 1988), p. 250.

40. The celebrations were also more centrally organized: coronation committees were formed to plan and organize the 1821 coronation day festivities in Manchester and, apparently, in Liverpool (Manchester Guardian, 21 July 1821, pp. 2 and 3.

41. Walvin, pp. 83-87, 90-91; Clark, "Introduction" in Transformation, pp. 16-17.

42. London Chronicle, 26-29 September 1761, p. 312; Bath Journal, Vol 18 #39, 28 September 1761, p. 156; Manchester Mercury, 29 September 1761, p. 4.

43. Harrison, p. 252; Walvin, p. 162; The Times, 24 July 1821, p. 3; Harrison, p. 256; Manchester Guardian, 24 July 1821, p. 1.

44. Manchester Guardian, 24 July 1821, p. 1; The Times, 31 July 1821, p. 3; The Times, 24 July 1821, p. 3.

45. London Chronicle, 26-29 September 1761, p. 312; The Times, 31 July 1821, p. 3; Manchester Mercury, 24 July 1821, p. 1; Manchester Guardian, 21 July 1821, p. 2.

46. Borsay, Urban Renaissance, pp. 285-96, 301-08; Malcolmson, Popular Recreations, pp. 89-100; Walvin, Chapter 9.

47. London Chronicle, 26-29 September 1761, p. 312; Manchester Mercury, 28 September 1761, p. 4; Bath Journal, Volume 18 #39, 28 September 1761, p. 156.

48. The Times, 24 July 1821, p. 3; Harrison, pp. 250-52.

49. The Times, 31 July 1821, p. 3; 24 July 1821, p. 3.

50. The sole exception is Bristol (1821), but the fireworks used there appear to have been supervised by the authorities (Harrison, p. 252).

51. In Bristol, the Corporation issued a notice prohibiting bonfires, and the discharge of firearms and fireworks in the street. Similar notices were issued in Norwich (Harrison, pp. 250 and 256).

52. London Gazette, 23-27 April 1685, p. 2 and 11-14 May 1685, p. 2.

53. Post Boy, 28-30 April 1702, p. 1; London Gazette, 30 April - 4 May, 1702, p. 3.

54. London Gazette, 27-30 April 1685, p. 2; Evening Post, 14-17 October 1727, pp. 2-3.

55. Manchester Mercury, 29 September 1761, p. 4; London Chronicle, 26-29 September 1761, p. 312.

56. Nicholas Rogers, "Popular Jacobitism in Provincial Context: Eighteenth-Century Bristol and Norwich," in The Jacobite Challenge, eds. Eveline Cruickshanks and Jeremy Black (Edinburgh 1988), pp. 123-41 and "Riot and Popular Jacobitism in Early Hanoverian England," in Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh 1982), pp. 70-88. Coronation Day riots which were managed from above tended to occur in open constituencies

where party rivalries and faction thrived. Locations of Coronation Day riots in 1714 which involved members of the bench, the clergy, the country gentry or the civic elite include: Canterbury, Chichester, Gloucester, Hereford, Salisbury, Worcester, Taunton and Shrewsbury. Other demonstrations, such as that which occurred in Bedford, had a "distinctly popular flavour" and were generated from below, but these types of disturbances were in the minority in 1714 (S.P. Dom., George I 35/74/5-19; "Riot and Popular Jacobitism," pp. 74-76).

57. Quoted in Rogers, "Popular Jacobitism," p. 127.

58. Rogers, "Popular Jacobitism," pp. 127-28.

59. Rogers, "Popular Jacobitism," p. 127. Emphasis added.

60. Corfield, pp. 165-67 and Walvin, pp. 110-18 and 122-27.

61. Harrison, pp. 171-73, 184-88.

62. Manchester Guardian, 21 July 1821, p. 3; Harrison, p. 256.

63. Quoted in Harrison, pp. 252-53.

64. Quoted in Harrison, p. 255.

65. The Times, 24 July 1821, p. 3.

66. The Times, 31 July, 1821, p. 3.

67. Malcolmson has characterized popular actions as culturally mediated, imbued with moral purpose, disciplined in execution, limited in aims, and conservative in nature (Life and Labour, pp. 121-22).

68. The predominantly elite nature of civic ceremony in the early to mid-nineteenth century has been noted by Cannadine, "Civic Ritual," pp. 108, 109-13.

69. I borrow the terms "theatre" and "countertheatre," and the sense these terms convey, from E. P. Thompson, "Patrician Society, Plebian Culture," Journal of Social History 7.4 (1974): 382-405.

CONCLUSION

King William IV's coronation on 8 September 1831 ushered in a new era in the role the monarchy and the aristocracy played in English political and social life. The nature of the ceremonial developed for that occasion reflected the great magnitude of the changes redefining the monarchy and the aristocracy's previously unassailable position atop the social hierarchy. At a total of £42,298, William IV's coronation cost approximately one-sixth the amount lavished on George IV's coronation; "a due regard to the public purse" was certainly observed because the cost did not nearly approach the £50,000 Parliament had voted towards the expense of the coronation.[1] William IV's coronation also bore little resemblance to its predecessors in another important regard: for the first time since 1689, the form of the coronation ceremony was drastically altered. Instead of commencing with the assembly of the peerage at Westminster, Coronation Day 1831 formally began at ten o'clock with a grand procession from the palace to Westminster Abbey. Following a route through Pall Mall, Charing Cross, Parliament Street and King Street to the west entrance of the Abbey, the King and Queen (riding in the State Coach) and their retinue were enthusiastically greeted by a vast crowd that thronged the procession route. The people of London had simply not had such a fine opportunity to see their monarch on the occasion of a coronation since Charles II rode in cavalcade from the Tower in 1661. The other major alteration in the form of the 1831 coronation involved the elimination of the elite-oriented formalities traditionally held in Westminster Hall preceding and following the coronation service:[2] the symbolic elevation of the monarch, the delivery of the regalia, the solemn procession from

the Hall to the Abbey, the Challenge and the Banquet (with its attendant feudal services), all these aspects of the coronation ceremonial disappeared forever. Occurring on the dawn of the Reform Act, William IV's recognizably "modern" coronation served both as a harbinger of the diminished power the Crown and the peerage wielded in the post-1832 world, and as a herald of the "popular monarchy" just then emerging.[3]

George IV's coronation, then, was the last of a series of ceremonies that both celebrated and projected the monarchical and aristocratic hegemony that was reestablished by the Restoration in 1660 and maintained throughout the eighteenth and into the early nineteenth century. The ability of the coronation ceremony to communicate essentially the same message for such a long period of time is explained by the conservative form of the ceremony. On one hand, the ceremony was conservative in form because it underwent very little adaptation. An important legacy was established in 1661 when the unique circumstances of Charles II's coronation demanded that a ceremony steeped in tradition, and carefully adhering to the Liber Regalis, be developed to suggest the triumphant resumption of monarchical and aristocratic leadership after the tyranny of the Interregnum. Except for the alterations desired by James II, the form of the coronation service underwent no major adaptations after the revision of the ceremony in 1689 when William and Mary were installed by Parliament after James vacated the throne. The coronation ceremony was also conservative in form, on the other hand, because it served as a microcosmic representation of the relationship between the monarchy and the aristocracy, while suggesting the legitimacy of their domination of English society. Although the form of the coronation fulfilled this role in 1661 and 1685, it is especially evident that it did so from 1689 forward. The coronation ceremony primarily served to solemnize the mutual pledge of support that the monarch (by his swearing to the Coronation Oath, his anointing, and the

acceptance of the regalia) and the aristocracy (through its participation in the Recognition and the oaths of fealty and homage) committed themselves to within the framework of a Church of England service. Witnessed by representatives of the gentry, the City, the Anglican establishment and the judiciary, the coronation symbolized the political, social and economic solidarity and hegemony of "the English Ruling Class" that was forged in the early eighteenth century and prevailed until the Reform Act.[4] Numerous civic ceremonies, mounted by urban elites comprised of the gentry, merchants and leading professionals scattered throughout England, replicated the form, and the message, of the proceedings held at Westminster. From 1689 until 1821, the coronation took the form it did because a strong and vibrant patrician class used it to communicate and celebrate its status, traditional hereditary authority and leadership of a hierarchical society.

The preparation and performance of the coronation enhanced the message conveyed by the form of the ceremony: the coronation communicated the elite's ideal of social leadership and order, and existed primarily to serve the need of maintaining social hegemony. The preparations of the coronation ceremony where made by the elite, for the consumption of the elite. This element could be maintained because the coronation's organizational apparatus remained essentially static: the Committee of the Privy Council, the Earl Marshal and the Lord Great Chamberlain, and the same departments of the King's Household planned, developed and managed every coronation between 1661 and 1821. Although the extent and expense of the preparations varied according to the nature of the political situation existing at the time of the coronation, these were differences of degree, not kind; the greatest expenditure and care was expended on those preparations of which the elite alone partook, particularly those in Westminster Abbey and Hall. The performance of the coronation ceremony itself, despite careful planning and often enormous expense, was

generally inept in nature. This did not, judging by eyewitness accounts, seem to bother members of the elite too greatly. Rather, their commentary consistently emphasizes those features of the performance that they found suggestive of their social predominance: unequalled wealth, authority and status. This is exactly the impression conveyed by the preparation and performance of civic ceremony in celebration of the coronation held in urban centres. On Coronation Day, in London and elsewhere, England's elite celebrated their status and authority in society by observing the consecration of a new monarch in an elitist, and primarily private, manner.

It is difficult to determine the extent to which the coronation ceremony and the accompanying civic celebrations successfully inculcated amongst the common people the political, social and economic hegemony of the ruling class. For most of the period, the populace appear to have acquiesced to the message and the medium offered by this particular ceremonial occasion. It can be ascertained, however, that both the conduct and the content of the coronation ceremonial began to be questioned by the mid-eighteenth century. Previous to the 1761 coronation, Samuel Johnson criticized the private and elite nature of the preceding coronations, and suggested that the organizers of George III's coronation might take steps to make the ceremony more accessible to the people of London. As letters to city newspapers indicated, access to the ceremony was severely curtailed. Expectations were dashed again in 1821 when the organizers took additional efforts to secure the privacy and elite nature of the performance of the coronation. This trend was replicated in the provincial centres. Whereas the urban elite had previously allowed the lower orders to actively participate in civic celebrations, by 1761, and 1821 especially, the lower order's role on coronation day was relegated to that of passive spectating and dutifully receiving the elite's gestures of charity. The disturbances of 1821 indicate the extent to

which the urban lower orders rejected the elite's appropriation of the festivities and the theme of benevolence and concern the elite designed the celebrations to communicate. Disenchantment with both the coronation ceremony and civic ceremony celebrating the consecration of the monarch indicate the extent to which an essentially static type of royal ceremonial no longer had anything to offer to most segments of English society.

Except for the aristocracy and the uppermost ranks of English society, the coronation does not appear to have had the capacity to integrate different social groups by reaffirming common social values as has been asserted by neo-Durkheimian theorists such as Shils and Young. By examining the eighteenth-century coronation ceremony in its historical context, Lukes' interpretation that political and religious ritual and ceremonial was an instrument which reinforced and perpetuated dominant and official models of social structure has been vindicated. The primarily elite orientation of the form, preparation and performance of the coronation demonstrates the great extent to which the ceremony acted as propaganda on behalf of the rulers' value system. The coronation ceremony was an integral aspect of the system of dominant ideology - including the exercise of law, religion, education and military might - which the elite developed to maintain social order and political stability.[5] As English social and economic development intensified, however, and the traditional mode of English life began to pass away, there is some considerable evidence to suggest that the coronation ceremony began to be interpreted by different social groups in different ways. As has been noted, the coronation and its celebrations were occasionally met with indifference, even hostility. The coronation ceremony was therefore not just capable of reflecting and perpetuating the ties and bonds which held society together, but was equally capable, given a context of tremendous change and crisis, of giving expression to and playing out social tensions and strains. We simply cannot impose our romanticized,

twentieth-century view of the coronation onto the past: we must see it for what it was, an instrument of elite hegemony that increasingly came to be challenged in the decades leading up to the Reform Act.

Notes

1. David Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition', c. 1820-1977," in The Invention of Tradition, eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge 1983), Table 1, p. 163; William Jones, Crowns and Coronations: A History of Regalia (London 1902), p. 252.

2. Jones, Crowns and Coronations, pp. 252-54.

3. The term "popular monarchy," and the sense it connotes, has been borrowed from John Cannon and Ralph Griffiths, The Oxford Illustrated History of the British Monarchy (Oxford 1988), Chapter 6.

4. This term was coined by W.A. Speck, Stability and Strife: England, 1714-1760 (Cambridge, Mass. 1977), Chapter 6.

5. J.H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England, 1675-1725, (London 1967), p. 188.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Government Documents

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, of the Reign of Charles II, 1660-1677. Eds. Mary Anne Everett Green, F.H.B. Daniell and F. Bickley. 18 vols. London: HMSO, 1860-1909.

- - -, - - - - -. CSP Dom, William III, 1689-1695. Eds. William John Hardy and E. Bateson. 11 vols. London: HMSO, 1895-1969.

- - -, - - - - -. CSP Dom, Anne, 1702-1704. Ed. Robert Pentland Mahaffy. 2 vols. London: HMSO, 1916-1924.

- - -, - - - - -. State Papers: Domestic, George I. (SP 35).

- - -, - - - - -. State Papers: Domestic, George II. (SP 36).

- - -, - - - - -. State Papers: Domestic, George III. (SP 37).

- - -. Historical Manuscripts Commission. Calendar of the Stuart Papers Belonging to His Majesty the King, Preserved at Windsor Castle. Eds. F.H. Blackbourne Daniell and S.C. Lomas. 7 vols. London: HMSO, 1902-1923.

Printed Sources

1. Pamphlets, Essays, Sermons, Memoirs, Correspondence and Books.

An Account of the ceremonies observed at the coronation of Our Most Gracious Sovereign George III.... London: G. Kearsey, 1761.

An account of the ceremonies observed at the coronation of the kings and queens of England.... London: J. Read, 1727.

An Account of the Ceremonies Observed in the Coronations of the Kings and Queens of England.... London, 1760.

Ashmole, Elias. "A Brief Narrative of his Majestie's Solemn Coronation: With His Magnificient Proceeding, and Royal Feast in Westminster Hall [London 1662]." The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II. Ed. Ronald Knowles. Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1988.

Banks, Thomas C. An historical account of the ancient and modern forms, pageantry, & ceremony, of the coronation of the kings Of England, from the first upon record, to that of his late majesty George III.... London, 1820.

- - - - -. An historical and critical account of the institution of the coronation ceremony; its indispensability; the high and official services of the day.... London: J.E. Gubbins, 1830.

- - - - -. An historical and critical enquiry into the nature of the kingly office, and how far the act of coronation, with the oath established by law, is a solemnity indispensible to the exercise of the regal dignity. London: Sherwood, Neely and Jones, 1814.

- - - - -. Disquisition upon the kingly office, conformable to the revolution and bill of rights of 1688; embracing the interesting origin of inunction and the coronation ceremony.... London: C. Harris, 1826.

Ceremonial of the Coronation of His Most Sacred Majesty King George the Fourth.... Westminster: J. Whittaker, 1823.

The Ceremonial of the Coronation of King George II and His Consort Queen Caroline. Dublin, 1727.

Ceremonies, and Ancient Customs, Observed at the Coronations of the Kings of England. London: George Smeeton, 1820.

Collections Relative to Claims at the Coronations of Several of the Kings of England, Beginning with King Richard II. London: J. Nichols and Son, 1820.

A complete account of the ceremonies observed in the coronations of the kings and queens of England.... London: J. Roberts, 1727.

The Coronation. A Poem. London: J. Roberts, 1714.

The Coronation: a Poem. Humbly Addressed to Nobody who as There. By a Spectator. London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1761.

de Saussure, César. A Foreign View of England in the Reigns of George I and George II: The Letters of Monsieur Cesar De Saussure to his Family. Ed. Madame Van Muyden. London: John Murray, 1902.

Evelyn, John. The Diary of John Evelyn. Ed. E.S. de Beer. 6 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.

An Exact Account of the Ceremonial at the Coronation of their Most Excellent Majesties King William and Queen Mary,... London: E. Jones, 1689.

An exact account of the form and ceremony of His Majesty's coronation, as it was solemnly perform'd in the collegiate church at Westminster, on Wednesday the 20th day of October, 1714. London: J. Baker, 1714.

An Exact and Ample Account of the Ceremonies that will be observed in the Coronation of their Most Sacred Majesties King George the Second, and Queen Caroline,... London: J. Read, 1727.

Farington, Joseph A. The Farington Diary. Ed. J. Greig. 8 vols. London: Hutchinson, 1923.

Fiennes, Celia. The Journeys of Celia Fiennes. Ed. Christopher Morris. Revised ed. London: Cresset, 1949.

The form and order of the service that is to be performed, and the ceremonies that are to be observed, in the coronation of their Majesties, King George II and Queen Caroline,... London: J. Baskett, 1727.

The form and order of the service that is to be performed, and the ceremonies that are to be observed in the Coronation of their Majesties King George III and Queen Charlotte,... London: M. Baskett, 1761.

The form of Prayers and Services used in West-minster Abbey at the Coronation of the Kings and Queens of England. London: Randal Taylor, 1689.

The FORM of the intended coronation oath agreed upon by the committee. Edinburgh, 1689.

The Form of the Proceeding to the Royal Coronation of His Most Excellent Majesty King George...on Wednesday the 20th day of this instant October, 1714,... London: John Nutt, 1714.

The Form of the Proceeding to the Royal Coronation of their Majesties King George II and Queen Caroline,... London: John Stagg, 1727.

Granville, Mary. The Autobiography and Corresondence of Mary Granville. Ed. Lady Llanover. 3 vols. London: Richard Bentley, 1861.

Hervey, Lord. Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second. Ed. John Wilson Croker. 3 vols. London: Bickers and Son, 1884.

Huish, Robert. An Authentic History of the Coronation of His Majesty, King George the Fourth,... London: J. Robins and Co., 1821.

- - - - -. Memoirs of the Reign of George the Fourth. 2 vols. London: T. Kelly, 1830.

Johnson, Samuel. "Thoughts on the Coronation of His Present Majesty King George the Third [1761]." Samuel Johnson: Political Writings. Ed. Donald J. Greene. The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson. 15 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977. 10: 290-300.

Montagu, Elizabeth. Elizabeth Montagu, The Queen of the Blue-Stockings, Her Correspondence from 1720-1761. Ed. Emily J. Climenson. 2 vols. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1906.

Nayler, Sir George. The Coronation of His Most Sacred Majesty King George the Fourth. London: Henry George Bohn, 1839.

Nichols, John Gough. London Pageants: Accounts of Fifty-five Royal Processions and Entertainments in the City of London. London: J.B. Nichols and Son, 1831.

Ogilby, John. "The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II in his Passage through the City of London to his Coronation...[London 1662]." The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II. Ed. Ronald Knowles. Binghampton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1988.

A particular account of the solemnities used at the coronation of...King George II and Queen Caroline,... London, 1761.

Pepys, Samuel. The Diary of Samuel Pepys. Eds. R.C. Latham and W. Matthews. 11 vols. London: Bell and Sons, 1970-1972.

Reresby, Sir John. The Memoirs of John Reresby. Ed. James J. Cartwright. London: Longmans, 1875.

The Royal Coronation of George IV. London, 1821.

Sandford, Francis. The History of the Coronation of the Most High, Most Mighty and Most Excellent Monarch, James II...And of His Royal Consort Queen Mary,... London: T. Newcomb, 1687.

Taylor, Arthur. The Glory of Regality: An Historical Treatise of the Anointing and Crowning of the Kings and Queens of England. London: R. and A. Taylor, 1820.

Taylor, William Cooke. Chapters on Coronations. London: John W. Parker, 1838.

Thomson, Richard. A faithful account of the processions and ceremonies observed in the coronation of the kings and queens of England, exemplified in that of their late most sacred Majesties King George the Third and Queen Charlotte,... London: J. Major, 1820.

A View of the Coronation of His Majesty George the Fourth: with a Delineation of the Grand Procession,... London: John Marshall, 1821.

Walpole, Horace. The Letters of Horace Walpole. Ed. Paget Toynbee. 16 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1903-05.

The whole ceremony of the coronation of His most sacred Majesty King George: on Wednesday the twentieth day of October, 1714.... Dublin: J. Carson, 1715.

2. Newspapers

Bath Journal
British Chronicle
British Journal
British Mercury
The Champion
Daily Courant
Daily Journal
Daily Post
Evening Post
General Evening Post
Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle
Gloucester Journal
Leeds Mercury
Leicester and Nottingham Journal
London Chronicle
London Evening Post
London Gazette
London Journal
London Magazine
Manchester Chronicle
Manchester Gazette
Manchester Guardian
Manchester Magazine
Manchester Mercury
Mercurius Publicus
Mist's Weekly Journal
Newcastle Courant
Northampton Mercury
Nottingham Weekly Courant
Parker's Penny Post
Post Boy
Post Man
Public Advertiser
Scots Magazine
Sussex Weekly Advertiser or Lewes Journal
The Times
Whitehall Evening Post: or, London Intelligencer
Worcester Journal

SECONDARY SOURCES

1. The Coronation

Churchill, Randolph S. The Story of the Coronation. London: Derek Verschoyle, 1953.

The Complete Ceremonies and Procedures Observed at the Coronation of the Kings and Queens of England. London: Boot and Son, 1902.

The Coronation Prayer Book. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902.

Debrett's Dictionary of the Coronation. London: Dean and Son, 1902.

Jones, William. Crowns and Coronations: A History of Regalia. London: Chatto and Windus, 1902.

Knowles, Ronald. "Introduction." The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II. Ed. Ronald Knowles. Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1988. 9-49.

Macleane, Douglas. The Great Solemnity of the Coronation of A King and Queen According to the Use of the Church of England. London: George Allen and Co., 1911.

Passingham, W.J. A History of the Coronation. London: Sampson, Law, Marston and Co., 1937.

Perkins, Jocelyn. The Coronation Book or The Hallowing of the Sovereigns of England. 2nd ed. London: Pitman, 1911.

- - - - -. The Crowning of the Sovereign of Great Britain and the Dominions Overseas. A Handbook to the Coronation. 2nd ed. London: Methuen, 1953.

Reedy, Gerard S.J. "Mystical Politics: The Imagery of Charles II's Coronation." Studies in Change and Revolution: Aspects of English Intellectual History, 1640-1800. Ed. Paul Korshin. New York: Menston, 1972. 19-42.

Rousseau, G.S. "'This Grand and Sacred Solemnity....': Of Coronations, Republics and Poetry." British Journal of Eighteenth-Century Studies 5.1 (1982): 1-19.

Russell, John Fuller. The Coronation Service According to the Use of the Church of England. London, 1875.

Schramm, Percy E. A History of the English Coronation. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Tanner, Lawrence. "Coronations in the Abbey." A House of Kings: The History of Westminster Abbey. Ed. Edward Carpenter. London: John Baker, 1966. 405-15.

- - - - -. The Historic Story of the Coronation Ceremony and Ritual. London: Pitkin, 1952.

- - - - -. The History of the Coronation. London: Pitkin, 1952.

Thurston, S.J. Herbert. The Coronation Ceremonial: Its True History and Meaning. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1911.

Wickham Legg, J., ed. Three Coronation Orders. London: Harrison and Sons, 1900.

Wickham Legg, Leopold G., ed. English Coronation Records. Whitehall: Archibald Constable and Co., 1901.

Wilkinson, B. The Coronation in History. London: British Historical Association, 1953.

Wordsworth, C., ed. The Manner of the Coronation of King Charles the First. London: Harrison and Sons, 1892.

2. Ritual, Pageantry and Ceremonial

Anglo, Sydney. Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

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

Birnbaum, N. "Monarchies and Sociologists: A Reply to Professor Shils and Mr. Young." Sociological Review N.S. 3 (1955): 5-23.

Blumler, J.G., J.R. Brown, A.J. Ewbank and T.J. Nossiter. "Attitudes to the Monarchy: Their Structure and Development During a Ceremonial Occasion." Political Studies 19 (1971): 149-71.

Borsay, Peter. "'All the town's a stage': urban ritual and ceremony 1600-1800." The Transformation of English Provincial Towns 1600-1800. Ed. Peter Clark. London: Hutchinson, 1984. 228-58.

Brentnall, Margaret. The Old Customs and Ceremonies of London. London: Batsford, 1975.

Brooke-Little, John. Royal Ceremonies of State. London: Country Life Books, 1980.

Cannadine, David. "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition,' c. 1820-1977." The Invention of Tradition. Eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. 101-64.

- - - - -. "Introduction: divine rites of kings." Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies. Eds. David Cannadine and Simon Price. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 1-19.

- - - - -. "The Transformation of Civic Ritual in Modern Britain: The Colchester Oyster Feast." Past and Present 94 (1982): 107-30.

Durkheim, Emile. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. New York: The Free Press, 1915.

Fritz, Paul S. "From 'Public' to 'Private': The Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1800." Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death. Ed. J. Whaley. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981. 61-79.

- - - - -. "The Trade in Death: The Royal Funerals in England, 1685-1830." Eighteenth-Century Studies 15.3 (1982): 291-316.

Geertz, C. "Centers, Kings and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power." Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual and Politics Since the Middle Ages. Ed. Sean Wilentz. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985. 13-38.

- - - - -. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Hammerton, Elizabeth and David Cannadine. "Conflict and Consensus on a Ceremonial Occasion: The Diamond Jubilee in Cambridge in 1897." Historical Journal 24.1 (1981): 111-46.

Harris, Leonard M. Long To Reign Over Us? The Status of the Royal Family in the Sixties. London: William Kimber, 1966.

Hayden, Ilse. Symbol and Privilege: The Ritual Context of British Royalty. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1987.

Hobsbawm, Eric. "Introduction: Inventing Tradition." The Invention of Tradition. Eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. 1-14

Howard, Philip. The British Monarchy in the Twentieth Century. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977.

Knightly, Charles. The Customs and Ceremonies of Britain: An Encyclopaedia of Living Traditions. London: Thames and Hudson, 1986.

Lant, Jeffrey L. Insubstantial Pageant: Ceremony and Confusion at Queen Victoria's Court. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1979.

Lukes, S. "Political Ritual and Social Integration." Sociology 9 (1975): 289-308.

Martin, Kingsley. The Crown and the Establishment. London: Hutchinson, 1962.

- - - - -. The Magic of Monarchy. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937.

Milton, Roger. The English Ceremonial Book: A History of Robes, Insignia and Ceremonies Still in Use in England. New York: Drake Publishers, 1972.

Nairn, Tom. The Enchanted Glass: Britain and its Monarchy. London: Hutchinson Radius, 1988.

Rose, Richard and Dennis Kavanagh. "The Monarchy in Contemporary Political Culture." Comparative Politics 8 (1976): 548-76.

Schwoerer, Lois G. "The Glorious Revolution as Spectacle: A New Perspective." England's Rise to Greateness, 1660-1763. Ed. Stephen B. Baxter. Berkley: University of California Press, 1983. 109-48.

- - - - -. "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." American Historical Review 82 (1977): 843-74.

Shils, E. and M. Young. "The Meaning of the Coronation." Sociological Review N.S. 1 (1953): 63-81.

Strong, Roy. Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450-1650. London: Boydell and Brewer, 1973.

- - - - -. Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1973.

Thompson, J.A. and Arthur Mejia, Jr. The Modern British Monarchy. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1971.

Wilentz, Sean. "Introduction: Teufelsdrockh's Dilemma: On Symbolism, Politics and History. Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual and Politics Since the Middle Ages. Ed. Sean Wilentz. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985. 1-10.

Ziegler, P. Crown and People. London: Collins, 1978.

3. General

Ashley, Maurice. Charles II: The Man and the Statesman. London: Panther Books, 1973.

- - - - -. James II. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1977.

Ayling, Stanley. George the Third. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1972.

Bagehot, Walter. The English Constitution. London: Fontana, 1963.

Beattie, John M. The English Court in the Reign of George I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Beckett, J.V. The Aristocracy in England, 1660-1914. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Beddard, R.A. "The Restoration Church." The Restored Monarchy, 1660-1688. Ed. J.R. Jones. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979. 155-75.

Bliss, Robert M. Restoration England, 1660-1688. London: Methuen, 1985.

Borsay, Peter. The English Urban Renaissance: Culture and Society in The Provincial Town 1660-1770. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Brooke, John. King George III. London: Constable and Company, 1972.

Brooke-Little, J.P. A Complete Guide to Heraldry. London: Nelson, 1964.

Bush, M.L. The English Aristocracy: A Comparative Synthesis. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

Cannon, John. Aristocratic century: The peerage of eighteenth-century England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

- - - - -. "The Survival of the British Monarchy." Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Fifth Series (1986): 143-64.

Cannon, John and Ralph Griffiths. The Oxford illustrated History of the British Monarchy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Carpenter, Edward. "Restoration and Resettlement." A House of Kings: The History of Westminster Abbey. Ed. Edward Carpenter. London: John Baker, 1966. 179-269.

Christie, Ian R. Wars and Revolutions: Britain, 1760-1815. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Clark, J.C.D. English Society 1688-1832: Ideology, social structure and political practice during the ancien regime. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

- - - - -. Revolution and Rebellion: State and Society in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Clark, Peter. "Introduction: English Country Towns 1500-1800." Country towns in pre-industrial England. Ed. Peter Clark. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981. 1-43.

- - - - -. "Introduction." The Transformation of English Provincial Towns 1600-1800. Ed. Peter Clark. London: Hutchinson, 1984. 13-61.

Clark, Peter and Paul Slack. English Towns in Transition 1500-1700. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Colley, Linda. "The Apotheosis of George III: Loyalty, Royalty and the British Nation 1760-1820." Past and Present 102 (1984): 96-129.

Colvin, H.M., ed. The History of the King's Works. 6 vols. London: HMSO, 1963-1973.

Corfield, P.J. The Impact of English Towns, 1700-1800. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Coward, Barry. The Stuart Age. London: Longman, 1980.

Daly, James. "The Idea of Absolute Monarchy in Seventeenth-Century England." The Historical Journal 21.2 (1978): 227-50.

Dennys, Rodney. The Heraldic Imagination. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1975.

- - - - -. Heraldry and the Heralds. London: Jonathan Cape, 1982.

Fox-Davies, A.C. A Complete Guide to Heraldry. Revised ed. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1969.

Girouard, M. The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Green, D. Queen Anne. New York: Scribners, 1970.

Greene, Donald J. The Politics of Samuel Johnson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Gregg, Edward. Queen Anne. London: Routedge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

Haley, K.H.D. "Charles II." The Stuarts. Ed. K.H.D. Haley. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973. 134-54.

- - - - -. Politics in the Reign of Charles II. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Harrison, Mark. Crowds and History: Mass Phenomena in English Towns, 1790-1835. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Hatton, Ragnhild. George I: Elector and King. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Hibbert, C. George IV: Regent and King. London: Allen Lane, 1973.

Holmes, Martin. English Regalia: Their History, Custody and Display. London: HMSO, 1972.

Hutton, Ronald. The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Jarrett, Derek. Britain 1688 to 1815. Hong Kong: Longman, 1965.

Jones, J.R. Country and Court: England, 1658-1714. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Josten, C.H., ed. Elias Ashmole (1617-1692). 5 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Kenyon, J.P. Stuart England. 2nd ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

Loades, David M. Tudor Courts. London: Batsford, 1986.

Malcolmson, Robert W. Life and Labour in England 1700-1780. London: Hutchinson, 1981.

- - - - -. Popular Recreations in English Society 1700-1850. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Miller, John. The Glorious Revolution. London: Longman, 1983.

- - - - -. James II: A Study in Kingship. London: Wayland, 1977.

- - - - -. "The Later Stuart Monarchy." The Restored Monarchy 1660-1688. Ed. J.R. Jones. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979. 30-47.

Newman, Gerald. The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History 1740-1830. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

Ollard, Richard. The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II. London: Hodden and Staughton, 1979.

Pares, Richard. Limited Monarchy in Great Britain in the Eighteenth Century. London: Historical Association, 1967.

Plumb, J.H. England in the Eighteenth Century. Revised ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.

- - - - -. The First Four Georges. London: B.T. Barsford, 1956.

- - - - -. The Growth of Political Stability in England 1675-1725. London: Macmillian, 1967.

Porter, Roy. English Society in the Eighteenth Century. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.

Powis, Jonathan. Aristocracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Rogers, Nicholas. "Popular Jacobitism in Provincial Context: Eighteenth-Century Bristol and Norwich." The Jacobite Challenge. Eds. Eveline Cruickshanks and Jeremy Black. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988. 123-41.

- - - - -. "Riot and Popular Jacobitism in Early Hanoverian England." Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759. Ed. Eveline Cruickshanks. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982. 70-88.

Speck, W.A. Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

- - - - -. Stability and Strife: England, 1714-1760. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn. Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey. New York: Anson D.F. Randolph, 1887.

Stone, Lawrence and Jeanne C. Fawtier Stone. An Open Elite?: England 1540-1880. Abridged ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Thompson, E.P. "Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle Without Class." Social History 3 (1978): 133-65.

- - - - -. "Patrician Society, Plebian Culture." Journal of Social History 7.4 (1974): 382-405.

- - - - -. The Making of the English Working Class. Revised ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.

Trench, Charles Chenevix. George III. London: Allen Lane, 1973.

van der Zee, Henri and Barbara van der Zee. 1688: Revolution in the Family. London: Penguin, 1988.

- - - - -. William and Mary. London: Macmillian, 1973.

Wagner, Sir Anthony. Heralds of England: A History of the Office and College of Arms. London: HMSO, 1967.

Walvin, James. English Urban Life 1776-1851. London: Hutchinson, 1984.

Williams, E.N., ed. The Eighteenth-Century Constitution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Wrightson, Keith. English Society 1580-1680. London: Hutchinson, 1982.