

Durham E-Theses

Reconstructing the queen's household, 1485-1547: a study in royal service

TAFFE, JAMES,JOHN

How to cite:

TAFFE, JAMES,JOHN (2022) *Reconstructing the queen's household, 1485-1547: a study in royal service*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/14773/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Reconstructing the queen's household, 1485 – 1547: a study in royal service

James Taffe

Abstract

This thesis examines the queen's household in England and the careers of its servants from 1485 to 1547. Reconstructing the offices they held in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber, and their relationships with the queen, their mistress, the king, their sovereign, and the wider court and kingdom, it reassesses and redefines our understanding of the nature of royal service. This thesis builds upon the wider historiography on queenship, politics and women in this period. It demonstrates that the study of monarchy must constitute the sovereign and their consort, and reiterates the importance of studying servants, and women, reinstating them as central to the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. In order to conceptualise fully the political, religious, and cultural significance of the court, not strictly the king's servants, but the queen's servants too, must be studied. Six women served as queens consort during Henry VIII's reign, and their households were situated at the centre of their rise and fall. This thesis investigates the impact of Henry VIII's marital instability, which saw the queen's household discharged, its servants disbanded, and many of their careers cut short on no less than five occasions between 1527 and 1547. Requiring new and extensive archival research to reconstruct the households of Henry VIII's queens, this thesis constructs a database of servants for prosopographical study, and integrates them into the master narrative of court studies. Rethinking and reflecting upon royal service more broadly as a *career*, this thesis provides a framework through which to interpret the evidence of service more sensitively, and accurately. It recommends ongoing and in-depth research into their individual careers, with a more nuanced understanding of the nature of royal service, and of the Tudor court from 1485 to 1603.

**Reconstructing the queen's household,
1485 – 1547:**

a study in royal service

James Taffe

Submitted in consideration for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**Department of History
Durham University**

2021

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1	33
Ordinances for the queen's household, 1100-1547	
Structure of the queen's household, 1485-1547	
Offices in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber	
Chapter 2	70
Appointments to the queen's household	
Composition of the queen's household, and length of service	
Chapter 3	96
Access	
Character, or personality	
Intimacy, and the queen's Privy Chamber	
Chapter 4	142
Wages	
Livery	
Advancement, or preferment, and other perquisites	
Politics in the queen's Chamber, Privy Chamber, and the wider court	
Chapter 5	205
Oaths	
Loyalty and allegiance	
Agency, or instability	
Conclusion	247
Appendix 1:	262
Offices in the queen's and king's Chamber and Privy Chamber, 1485-1547	
Bibliography	273

Abbreviations

APC	Dasent, John Roche (ed.), <i>Acts of the Privy Council of England</i> , vol. 1, 1542-1547 (London, 1890)
Arundell	Grose, Francis, Astle, Thomas, Jefferey, Edward (eds), 'The Booke of Henrie Erle of Arundell, Lord Chamberleyn to King Henrie Theighte', in <i>The Antiquarian repertory</i> , vol. 2, (London, 1808)
BB	Myers, A. R., (ed.), <i>The household of Edward IV, the Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478</i> (Manchester, 1959)
BL	British Library
Castiglione	Castiglione, Baldassare, <i>The Book of the Courtier</i> , ed. and trans. by Opdycke, Leonard Eckstein (New York, 1903)
Cavendish	Cavendish, George, <i>The Life of Cardinal Wolsey</i> , ed. by Singer, Samuel Weller (London 1827)
CC	Nichols, J. G. (ed.) <i>The Chronicle of Calais in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII to the year 1540</i> (1838)
CPR	Black J. G., and Brodie, Robert Henry (eds), <i>Calendar of the Patent rolls preserved in the Public record office: Henry VII, 1485-1509</i> , 2 vols. (London, 1914)
CSP Sp	Gayangos, Pascual de, et al. (eds), <i>Calendar of State Papers, Spanish</i> , 13 vols. (1888-1954)
CSP Ven	Brown, Rawdon, et al. (eds), <i>Calendar of State Papers, Venetian</i> , 38 vols. (1867-1947)
Cognatus	Cognatus, Gilbertus, <i>Of the office of servavntes a boke made in Latine by one Gilbertus Cognatus and newly Englyshed</i> , ed. Chaloner, Sir Thomas (1543)
Devonshire	Heale, Elizabeth (ed.), <i>The Devonshire Manuscript: A Women's Book of Courtly Poetry</i> (Toronto, 2012)
Ellis	Ellis, Henry (ed.), <i>Original Letters illustrative of English History</i> , 2 vols. (London, 1825)
Foxe	Foxe, John, 'Actes and Monuments', in Cattley, Stephen Reed (ed.), <i>The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: A New and Complete Edition</i> , 8 vols. (London, 1837-41)
Giustinian	Giustinian, Sebastian, <i>Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII</i> , ed. and trans. by Rawdon Lubbock Brown (London, 1854), 2 vols.

HC	Hall, Edward, <i>Hall's Chronicle: containing the history of England, during the reign of Henry the Fourth, and the succeeding monarchs, to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth</i> , 2 vols. (1809)
HMC Rutland	Historical Manuscripts Commission, <i>The Manuscripts of His Grace, The Duke of Rutland, Preserved at Belvoir Castle</i> , 4 vols. (London, 1888-1905)
HMC Bath	Historical Manuscripts Commission, <i>Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire</i> , 5 vols. (Dublin, 1907)
HO	<i>A collection of ordinances and regulations for the government of the royal household, made in divers reigns : from King Edward III to King William and Queen Mary, also receipts in ancient cookery</i> (London, 1790)
Holinshed	Holinshed, Raphael, <i>Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland</i> , 6 vols. (1807)
Latymer	Latymer, William, 'A briefe treatise or cronickille of the moste vertuous ladye Anne Bulleyne late quene of England', in Bodleian MS Don., C, 42, ff. 21r-33v transcribed in Dowling, Maria, 'William Latymer's Chronickille of Anne Bulleyne', <i>Camden Fourth Series</i> , 39 (1990), pp. 23-65.
Lisle	Byrne, Muriel St. Clare (ed.), <i>The Lisle Letters</i> , 6 vols. (London, 1981)
LP	Brewer, J. S., et al. (eds), <i>Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-47</i> , 21 vols. and addenda (1920)
Mueller	Mueller, Janel (ed.), <i>Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence</i> (London, 2011)
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
PCP	Nicolas, Sir Nicholas Harris (ed.), <i>Privy Council of England, Proceedings and Ordinances (1386-1542)</i> , 7 vols. (1834-1837)
PPE, Eliz	Nicolas, Sir Nicholas Harris (ed.), <i>The Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York and Wardrobe Accounts of Edward the Fourth. With a Memoir of Elizabeth of York, and Notes</i> (London, 1830)
PPE, Hen	Nicolas, Sir Nicholas Harris (ed.), <i>The Privy Purse Expenses of King Henry VIII from Nov. 1529 to Dec. 1532</i> (London, 1827)

Pizan	Pizan, Christine de, <i>The treasure of the city of ladies; or, The book of the three virtues</i> , edited and translated with an introduction by Sarah Lawson (London, 1985)
Receyt	Kipling, G. (ed.), <i>The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne</i> (Oxford, 1990)
SC	Hume, Martin A. Sharp (ed.) <i>Chronicle of King Henry VIII: Being a Contemporary Record of some of the Principal Events of the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. Written in Spanish By An Unknown Hand</i> (London, 1889)
Statutes	Luders, A., et al. (eds), <i>The Statutes of the Realm: Printed by command of his Majesty King George the Third in pursuance of an address of The House of Commons of Great Britain, from Original Records and Authentic Manuscripts</i> , 10 vols. (1831)
TNA	The National Archives
WC	Wriothesley, Charles, <i>A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors, From A.D 1485 to 1559</i> , ed. William Douglas Hamilton, 2 vols. (1838)
Wood	Wood, Mary Anne Everett (ed.), <i>Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, from the commencement of the twelfth century to the close of the reign of Queen Mary</i> , 3 vols. (London, 1846)
Wyatt	Wyatt, George, 'Life of The Virtuous Christian and Renowned Queen Anne Boleigne' in 'Appendix' Samuel Weller Singer (ed.), <i>The Life of Cardinal Wolsey</i> (London, 1827)

Notes

For quotations taken from manuscripts, original spelling has been retained. If the meaning is ambiguous, explanations are in square brackets.

All institutions and departments of the English royal household (Chamber, Privy Chamber, Household, Wardrobe, etc.) are capitalised, whereas physical spaces (chamber, the queen's chambers, Presence chamber, Privy chamber, court, etc.) are not.

Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Durham University, the Arts and Humanities Research Council, and the Northern Bridge Consortium for awarding me a Doctoral Studentship, without which this thesis would not have been possible.

I am particularly grateful to my supervisor, Dr Natalie Mears, for her support, training, advice, and patience(!) throughout the last four years. I am grateful to Professor Christian Liddy for his comments on my research, and for providing feedback on drafts of the thesis. I would also like to thank all of my friends and colleagues at Durham University, particularly Fergal Leonard, Rachel Clamp and Lily Chadwick, who have always been so supportive, not least by sitting through many conference papers and in allowing me to discuss my research with them, often at length.

I am indebted to Paul John ('Mr. John'), Jane King, Dr Ceri Law, and Dr Jonathan Willis, from each of whom, as mentors at different, formative stages in my career, from pupil to postgraduate, I have learnt so much. Their guidance, care, and enthusiasm for history, spanning nearly two decades, has been both inspiring and essential.

I would like to acknowledge the work and help of all of the staff in the Department of History and Bill Bryson Library at Durham University, The National Archives in Kew, The British Library in London, and at all other institutions, libraries and archives that I have visited to undertake research for this thesis. I would also like to thank Dr Nikki Clark, Gareth Russell and Dr Sara Wolfson for sharing their unpublished MA and Ph.D. theses – to Nikki in particular I am grateful for her advice, and for allowing me to vent my many frustrations while writing up this past year.

I would like to thank Shahnaaz, Deepak, Jaspal and Lakshana for their friendship over the years, but especially the last four years. After I relocated to Durham for study, they were sure to check in regularly, and were always encouraging. I am particularly grateful to Michael, for his support, understanding, and for helping keep life in perspective. And to my Mum – I owe her everything, and without her love I would not have made it this far.

Introduction

This thesis examines the queen's household in England and the careers of its servants from 1485 to 1547. Henry VII married once, but Henry VIII married six times, which saw as many as seven households established for a queen throughout the early Tudor period. Elizabeth of York, Catherine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn, Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, Catherine Howard, and Catherine Parr each had her own household. Theoretically, and conceptually, a queen's household was the institutional framework upon which she would conceive of, comprehend and carry out her day-to-day existence.¹ More practically, it was a group of individuals who functioned as her servants.² Everything in and of the queen's household was administered to provide service. The queen's servants performed duties, tasks and functions for the projection of her majesty, and magnificence. Demonstrating the wealth and status of the queen, and maintaining her in regal state, meant ensuring that she always ate, slept, dressed, and was in every place treated and honoured like a queen, often in elaborate ceremony. The queen's household was thus central to the lives and careers of women who wore the crown. It comprised nearly half of the early Tudor court, the centre of power and politics in this period, and constituted the leading and largest group of women near to the English monarchy.

Historiography

Henry VIII's queens in particular remain intensely popular for biographical study. Agnes Strickland, E. W. Ives, Elizabeth Norton, Giles Tremlett, Retha Warnicke, Lacey Baldwin

¹ Kate Mertes, *The English Noble Household, 1250-1600: Good Governance and Politic Rule* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 183-4; C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (London, 1999), p. 8.

² The term 'household' may simultaneously, or otherwise, refer to a specific building or place, or a set of resources, like food, drink, clothing, furnishings and wall hangings, gold and silver plate, etc., which were retained by the householder.

Smith and many more have uncovered the lives of women who served as queens consort from 1509 to 1547. Yet rarely do such accounts provide any insight into their households.³ Few have attempted to integrate their servants into the narrative in any meaningful way. Exceptions are Gareth Russell, who situated Catherine Howard's brief tenure as queen in the context of her household, and Susan James, who had shown that there was a core affinity in Catherine Parr's household comprised of friends, relatives and well-wishers.⁴ These studies have shown the potential for a new perspective in which to analyse the early Tudor queens, as mistress of the household, surrounded by the men and women who served them.

More useful than biographical studies are those of queenship, specifically queens consort.⁵ The role of queens consort, their relationship with the king, their husband and sovereign, and how far queens were involved in, or separated and restricted from, government and politics, are all fundamental to the study of queenship. Identifying the social, political, cultural and diplomatic contexts in which queens operated, and drawing out similarities or patterns in the rituals and behaviours of queenship, Marion Facinger, J. C. Parsons, Charles Beem, Retha M. Warnicke and others have reinstated the relevance of the public, or political, and the personal, or private, affairs of queens.⁶ Reflecting dynastic

³ Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest: From the Official Records and Other Private and Public Documents*, 12 vols. (London, 1840-1848); E. W. Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: 'The Most Happy'* (Oxford, 2004); Elizabeth Norton, *Catherine Parr* (Gloucestershire, 2010); Jane Seymour: *Henry VIII's True Love* (Gloucestershire, 2009); Giles Tremlett, *Catherine of Aragon: Henry's Spanish Queen* (London, 2010). Retha Warnicke, *The Marrying of Anne of Cleves: Royal Protocol in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000); Lacey Baldwin Smith, *A Tudor Tragedy: The Life and Times of Catherine Howard* (London, 1962).

⁴ Gareth Russell, *Young and Damned and Fair: The Life and Tragedy of Catherine Howard at the Court of Henry VIII* (London, 2017), adapting his postgraduate research on the household of Henry's fifth wife for a full reappraisal of the queen; Susan James, *Catherine Parr: Henry VIII's Last Love* (Gloucester, 2008), pp. 122-4.

⁵ In his biography of Anne Boleyn, E. W. Ives observed in 1987, and reiterated in 2004, that we have no study of queens consort in England. 'It is a reflection on the essential maleness of history, of those who made most of it and those who have written most of it,' Ives remarked, 'that we still do not know enough about the position of the queen consort'. Ives, *Anne*, p. 258. Extensive and ongoing research into medieval and early-modern queens has since begun to redress this imbalance.

⁶ Marion Facinger, 'A Study of Medieval Queenship: Capetian France, 987-1237', *Nebraska Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 5 (1968), pp. 45-46; J. C. Parsons (ed.), *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1993); Theresa Earenfight, *Queenship in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke, 2013); Charles Beem, *Queenship in*

insecurity and political uncertainty, the importance of royal marriages, coronations, fertility and the birth of heirs, and the health, illness and death of queens, is well-documented, though it is now clear that the responsibilities of queens consort amounted to more than wifely companionship and the birth of male heirs. It has also been acknowledged by many historians that the household of a queen was central to her queenship, yet more often it is mentioned only briefly, or dealt with superficially. As J. L. McIntosh observed, the household ‘cannot be divorced from the lives of historical figures in sixteenth-century England without anachronistic distortion’.⁷ An examination of the queen’s household in England from 1485 to 1547 will provide evidence for, and further insight into, the practice and performance of queenship. Their individual styles of queenship, and the significance of royal personality too, will be considered. Both David Starkey and Kevin Sharpe have demonstrated that a new sovereign, a change in person, or personality, saw fundamental change in the king’s household.⁸ The queen’s household was no exception. Six women wore the crown from 1527 to 1547, and this revolving door of queens provides an opportunity to address the impact of personality on the household, widening the scope of analysis from monarch to monarchy.

Queens in the medieval and early modern period rarely exercised power or authority in their own right. Demonstrating that the study of monarchy must constitute both the sovereign *and* his consort, Theresa Earenfight, Joanna L. Laynesmith and Michelle Beer in particular have emphasised the role of queens as partners for their husbands. Queenship

Early Modern Europe (New York, 2019); Retha M. Warnicke, *Elizabeth of York and Her Six Daughters-in-Law, Fashioning Tudor Queenship, 1485–1547* (London, 2017), pp. 59-96.

⁷ J. L. McIntosh, ‘Sovereign Princesses: Mary and Elizabeth Tudor as Heads of Princely Households and the Accomplishment of the Female Succession in Tudor England, 1516-1558’ (John Hopkins University, Unpublished Ph.D thesis, 2002), p. 8.

⁸ ‘Cutting across the continuity of institutions and offices of the household was the change of royal personality’. David Starkey, et al, eds., *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the English Civil War* (London, 1987), pp. 6-7; Sharpe, ‘Charles’, in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 226.

legitimated the king's rule by practising the 'necessary feminine attributes of sovereignty'.⁹ Monarchy was a complex institution, particularly in that 'monarchical' power was rarely in the hands of one person. Deconstructing and redefining the term 'monarchy' as 'a multiplicity of power relations which are not separate entities, but elements contained within a network that extends beyond the persons of the king and queen, whose power is not localised individually', it becomes clear that it was a partnership, accommodating the personalities, circumstances, and attitudes of both sovereigns and consorts.¹⁰ Everything in and of their role as consort was fit to serve the king, and the further queens traversed away from this, the more dangerous the game they were playing. Queens were recognised as 'reigning alongside', or together, with kings, and yet, simultaneously, they too acknowledged and were subject to the king's authority and sovereignty. As will be demonstrated, this dichotomy is never more apparent than in the queen's household. Hilda Johnstone and Lisa Benz have argued that the households of medieval queens had their own identity, and could operate independently,¹¹ whereas Heather Lindsay Carter and Christopher Given-Wilson suggest there is reason to be cautious in overstating this.¹² This thesis reveals the interaction, negotiation, or, as it will be characterised, the struggle, in this period, between queens and kings, for power, authority and control of the institution, its servants, and the wider court.

⁹ J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 22, 26, 263; Michelle Beer, *Queenship at the Renaissance Courts of Britain: Catherine of Aragon and Margaret Tudor, 1503-1533* (Suffolk, 2018).

¹⁰ Or 'rulership'. Theresa Earenfight, 'Without the Persona of the Prince: Kings, Queens and the Idea of Monarchy in Late Medieval Europe', *Gender & History*, 19, 1 (2007), pp. 1-21 (p. 10).

¹¹ Hilda Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in J. F. Willard and W. A. Morris (eds), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1940-50), pp. 250-299 (pp. 294-6); Lisa Benz St. John, *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England* (New York, 2012), p. 66.

¹² Heather Lindsay Carter, 'Power Strategies and Negotiations: English Queenship from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Centuries' (Unpublished M.A. thesis, California State University, 2006); Christopher Given-Wilson, 'The Court and Household of Edward III' (University of St. Andrews, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1976), p. 108; 'The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households, 1360-9', *Historical Research*, 51, 124 (1978), pp. 183-187.

Unlike the queen's household, the king's household in this period has been the subject of many studies. Predominantly concerned with the institution of the English royal household and the wider court as the administrative centre of government, the focus of this research has been if, how, and why the king's servants were engaged in matters of state, the making of policy, maintaining dynastic and political stability and developing religious settlements, forging alliances and facilitating diplomacy, managing financial resources and distributing crown patronage, making war and peace, or in the localities, enforcing law, order and justice.¹³ G. R. Elton adopted an institutional approach, emphasising the national, bureaucratic government of Parliament, the Privy Council, law courts, and the Exchequer, which he argued had replaced the administrative functions of the medieval king's household.¹⁴ David Starkey in particular challenged this, arguing that government was centralised, and more personal, maintaining that the king's household, specifically the Privy Chamber, was more important politically.¹⁵ Its staff of body servants and 'boon companions' became institutionally-defined, and their proximity to the sovereign saw them engage in 'politics of intimacy'. It has been suggested by Starkey that to be near about, or nearest, to the king, and his Privy Chamber, was what mattered.¹⁶ This represented a new approach to Tudor political history, which adopted a more socially and culturally derived understanding of

¹³ T. F. Tout and W. C. Richardson laid the foundations for the study of the household as an institution and its role in governing medieval and early modern England. T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 1 (Manchester, 1920-33), pp. 36-7, 67-176; W. C. Richardson, *Tudor Chamber Administration, 1485-1547* (Louisiana, 1952). The queen's household was, understandably, outside of the scope of these studies.

¹⁴ G. R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 1953).

¹⁵ David Starkey, 'Court and Government', in Christopher Coleman and David Starkey (eds), *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 29-58; K. B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (Oxford, 1973); S. J. Gunn, *Early Tudor Government, 1485-1558* (Hampshire, 1995), in which such arguments and other relevant works are summarised in the 'Introduction', pp. 1-22.

¹⁶ Starkey, 'Intimacy', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 71-118; Likewise Kevin Sharpe, varying slightly, describes 'politics of access and influence'. Kevin Sharpe, 'The image of virtue: the court and household of Charles I, 1625-1642', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 248.

government and politics, and thus focused on the English royal household, and the court, rather than the council.¹⁷

Concentrating on the early Tudor court, from 1485 to 1547, many historians have established that access to, and intimacy with, the king, was central to politics, though they have varied in their interpretation, with contention mainly on the role of the nobility, factionalism, and the Privy Chamber. Henry VII and Henry VIII, predominantly concerned with preventing civil unrest and dynastic conflict throughout the kingdom, firmly established and maintained their rule by obliging both men and women to be loyal to them as the centre of power, prestige and preferment. G. W. Bernard and Helen Miller have demonstrated the role of the English nobility and gentry, as decisions made by the sovereign, Parliament, or by the Privy Council, had to be enforced in the counties and localities.¹⁸ Kings and queens could not govern without them. The court thus functioned as a 'point of contact' for governing the kingdom, reinforced both in the distribution of patronage, and as a framework for the display of its power and magnificence.¹⁹ Identifying the ways in which they interacted, for what purpose, and on what issues or in what areas they could engage in, Steven Gunn breaks down this relationship between the sovereign, the court and the wider kingdom.²⁰ Demonstrating that royal service facilitated the interaction of, and created ties between, the crown and its subjects, historians have concentrated on men in service in the household of the sovereign, specifically the king's Chamber and Privy Chamber. Starkey, Gunn, Bernard, and Ives, with R. C. Braddock, Derek Wilson, David Loades, Narasingha Prosad Sil and Richard Egbert

¹⁷ Natalie Mears, 'Courts, Courtiers, and Culture in Tudor England', *Historical Journal*, 46 (2003), pp.703-722.

¹⁸ G. W. Bernard, 'The Tudor nobility in perspective', in Bernard (ed.), *The Tudor nobility* (Manchester, 1992), pp. 1-48; Helen Miller, *Henry VIII and the English Nobility* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 78-101.

¹⁹ Elton, 'Court', pp. 211-228; Gunn, *Government*, p. 42.

²⁰ Steven Gunn, 'The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5 (1995), pp. 59-90 (p. 85).

Brock, have studied many of their careers in-depth.²¹ Neither servants in the queen's 'Chamber' nor her 'Privy Chamber' in this period have received the same attention, suggesting that there remains the need to 'integrate more fully' the role of women into the master narrative of court studies.²² An examination of the queen's servants, and their interactions with the queen, their mistress, with the king, their sovereign, and the wider court, will begin to redress this imbalance.

Historians of the English royal household and the early Tudor court have focused their attentions on the king's side, not the queen's side, and as such, on the careers of men, not of women, who, it was clearly felt, held no political significance.²³ 'The evidence would have it', Mortimer Levine observed, 'that what was true for queens consort surely held true for all women in Tudor England: they held no significant place in Tudor government'.²⁴ This is reflected in the debate concerning the nature of the 'Privy Chamber'.²⁵ Whereas the king's

²¹ Steven Gunn's 'new men' of Henry VII's council, court and parliament, whose social and political power, and the accumulation of wealth, 'rested on their relationships with him'. Steven Gunn, *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England* (Oxford, 2016), p. 39; G. W. Bernard, 'The rise of Sir William Compton, early Tudor courtier', *English Historical Review*, 96, 381 (1981), pp. 754-777; E. W. Ives, 'Court and County Palatine in the Reign of Henry VIII: The Career of William Brereton of Malpas', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 123 (1971), pp. 1-38; E. W. Ives, 'Patronage at the Court of Henry VIII: The Case of Sir Ralph Egerton of Ridley', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 52 (1969-70), pp. 346-74; R. C. Braddock, 'The Royal Household, 1540-1560: A Study of Officeholding in Tudor England' (Northwestern University, Unpublished PhD thesis, 1971); R. C. Braddock, 'The Rewards of Office-holding in Tudor England', *The Journal of British Studies* (1975), pp. 29-47; Derek Wilson, *In the Lion's Court: Power, Ambition and Sudden Death in the Reign of Henry VIII* (London, 2002); David Loades, *The Tudor Court* (Bangor, 1992), pp. 41, 95; Narasingha Prosad Sil, *Tudor Placemen and Statesmen: Select Case Studies* (New Jersey, 2001); 'The Rise and Fall of Sir John Gates', *Historical Journal*, 24, 4 (1981), pp. 929-43; 'Sir William Herbert in Tudor Politics, 1547-53', *Biography*, 5, 4, (1982), pp. 297-318; 'Sir Anthony Denny: A Tudor Servant in Office', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 8, 3 (1984), pp. 190-201; Richard Egbert Brock, 'The Courtier in Early Tudor Society, Illustrated from Selected Examples' (University of London, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1963).

²² Mear, 'Courts', p. 722.

²³ This rigorous agenda to 'approach the court as an institution and try to assess its importance politically' was set by G. R. Elton, 'Tudor Government: The Points of Contact. III. The Court', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976), pp. 211-228.

²⁴ Mortimer Levine, 'The Place of Women in Tudor Government', in *Tudor Rule and Tudor Revolution, Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, ed. Delloyd J. Guth and John McKenna (Cambridge, 1982) pp. 109-123.

²⁵ For the debate, more specifically, on the role of the Privy Chamber in early Tudor government, see David Starkey, 'Intimacy and innovation: the rise of the Privy Chamber, 1485-1547', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 1-24, 71-118; G. R. Elton, 'Tudor Government', a review of *The English Court* in *The Historical Journal*, 31, 2 (1988), pp. 425-434.

Privy Chamber became involved in national administration, often undertaking financial and secretarial duties, such as obtaining the king's signature or in operating the dry stamp,²⁶ a queen's Privy Chamber, when the sovereign was a woman, apparently became a 'glorified boudoir'.²⁷ Its significance under Mary I was 'neutralised', and her women, according to John Murphy, were lacking in ambitions to form a 'petticoat government'.²⁸ Pam Wright maintained that the Privy Chamber under Elizabeth I 'retreated into mere domesticity', suffering a 'sudden and catastrophic decline', as her most intimate servants were necessarily women.²⁹ It was understood by Gunn that 'there is no sign that they were regarded as important figures in their own right, nor that any woman could do much to forge her own career at court'.³⁰ Clearly the sovereigns Henry VII and Henry VIII, their councillors, like Cardinal Wolsey or Thomas Cromwell, and their servants, led the charge,³¹ and women were operating within the constraints of patriarchy in this predominantly male environment. Yet women themselves surely did fall within boundaries, structures, or 'cultures' identified by Gunn, wherein politics took place:³² were women too not 'bound to each other by close ties', involved in 'matters of patronage',³³ belonging to an 'affinity', engaged with 'leading

²⁶ David Starkey, 'The development of the Privy Chamber, 1485-1547' (University of Cambridge, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1973); David Starkey, 'Representation through intimacy: A study in the symbolism of monarchy and Court office in early modern England', in John Guy (ed.), *The Tudor Monarchy* (London, 1997), p. 52.

²⁷ David Loades, *Power in Tudor England* (Hampshire, 1997), p. 41 for Mary I's Privy Chamber. Women were 'limited by their sex to a purely domestic role', whereas, for Edward VI, who was a minor, power was situated in the Privy council rather than the Privy chamber, which was staffed by childhood companions. Starkey, 'Privy Chamber', p. 293.

²⁸ John Murphy, 'The illusion of decline: the Privy Chamber, 1547-1558', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 119-146 (p. 140).

²⁹ Pam Wright, 'A Change in Direction: the Ramifications of a Female Household, 1558-1603', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 147-72 (p. 150).

³⁰ Steven Gunn, 'The Courtiers of Henry VII', *English Historical Review*, 108, (1993), pp. 23-49 (p.35); Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, p. 211 for a rebuttal of this statement. Gunn was referring to women in the household of Elizabeth of York, though he did speculate that 'their friendship with the queen must have helped their spouses' relationship with the King' (pp. 35-6).

³¹ Peter Gwyn, *The King's Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey* (London, 2011); Michael Everett, *The Rise of Thomas Cromwell: Power and Politics in the Reign of Henry VIII, 1485-1534* (London, 2015).

³² Gunn, 'Structures', pp. 77-82; Janet Dickinson, 'Political culture(s)', in Laura Sangha and Jonathan Willis (eds), *Understanding Early Modern Primary Sources* (London, 2016), pp. 187-205 (p. 187).

³³ Patronage, the pursuit of the king or queen at the centre was 'not improper', for the sovereign, 'it was essential'. Ives, 'Brereton', p. 8; For patronage, see Wallace MacCaffrey, 'Place and Patronage in Elizabethan Politics', in S. T. Bindoff et al. (eds.), *Elizabethan Government and Society* (London, 1961), pp. 108-9.

councillors or courtiers who seem consistently to have cooperated with one another', or a part of 'what we might fairly call factions'? Did the queen's servants too engage in 'politics of intimacy'?

Such studies examining strictly the king's side are thus limited in scope, and yield a distorted and incomplete view of the early Tudor court. We must first differentiate between the royal 'household' and the 'court'. These terms are often used interchangeably, with historians of the medieval and early modern period often equating the household with the court. Unlike the household, the court was not an institution too often formalised in administrative records. It comprised all individuals who, at any given time, occupied that physical space surrounding the sovereign.³⁴ This meant not strictly the household of the sovereign, but that of their consorts, and their children too.³⁵ Few studies even acknowledge the queen's side in their examination of the early Tudor court, and this is likely due to it being staffed by women. Elton observed briefly that 'the king's matrimonial history... deeply influenced affairs', yet makes no mention of the queen's household in his study, and it surely falls within his definition of the court as comprising all those who at any given time were within 'his grace's house'.³⁶ Starkey stated categorically that 'the king's household', specifically his Privy Chamber, 'became the court'.³⁷ This definition is too narrow and restrictive. As a result, the relationship between the king's household, the queen's household, and the wider court, is obscured.³⁸

³⁴ Elton, 'Court', p. 217.

³⁵ Malcolm Vale, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe* (Oxford, 2001), p. 16.

³⁶ Elton, 'Court', p. 217.

³⁷ Starkey, 'Introduction', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 3.

³⁸ Asch (ed.), *Princes*, pp. 8-9, 44. They were 'mutually dependent', and as such 'separate definitions are unlikely to be satisfactory'. Laynesmith, *Queenship*, p. 212.

Historiography on Tudor court politics can be contentious, and has even been likened to ‘trench warfare’.³⁹ Greg Walker, along with Ives, Warnicke, Bernard, and Starkey, have debated the existence and extent of factionalism at court of Henry VIII.⁴⁰ In this the ‘expulsion of the minions’ in 1519, and the fall of Anne Boleyn in 1536 have proven to be influential as case studies. Starkey suggested that the expulsion of the minions in 1519 was a result of a determined effort by Cardinal Wolsey to oust political rivals from the king’s Privy Chamber, whereas Walker disputes claims of ‘political factioneering’, and suggests that the men who were discharged were immoral, frequently misbehaving in public to the detriment of the king’s honour, and his council necessarily intervened.⁴¹ Ives maintained that Anne was not guilty of committing adultery, but the victim of a factional plot carefully calculated by Thomas Cromwell, the principal secretary of the king.⁴² Others have found ‘the logic of such a scenario’ to be elusive and unconvincing. The ‘insurmountable weakness’ of this theory is in proving that Cromwell and the conservative court factions acted together as a coherent force to contrive the death of a political rival.⁴³ Alternatively, Warnicke argued that Anne was not guilty, and that her miscarriage of a ‘deformed foetus’ in January 1536 ‘triggered a fearful reaction’ in the king, who set in motion her execution.⁴⁴ There is no conclusive

³⁹ Gunn, ‘Structures’, p. 59. Greg Walker, ‘Rethinking the Fall of Anne Boleyn’, *The Historical Journal*, 45, 1 (2002), pp. 1-29.

⁴⁰ ‘The crux of the debate on Henrician factionalism is how the king’s personality and authority is defined: was he easily manipulated by competing factions or did he know his own mind, enabling factions little opportunity to shape or direct policy?’ Mears, ‘Courts’, p. 709. E. W. Ives defined early Tudor court politics as courtiers and councillors ‘grouping together’ to attain royal favour, influence policy and bring down their rivals. E. W. Ives, *Faction in Tudor England*, 2nd ed. (London, 1986). It must be observed that there are ‘dangers inherent’, as demonstrated by Gunn, with reconstituting political or religious groupings ‘which would not have been recognisable to contemporaries’ Gunn, ‘Structures’, p. 77.

⁴¹ Starkey, ‘Privy Chamber’, pp. 108-14; Greg Walker, ‘The ‘Expulsion of the Minions’ of 1519 Reconsidered’, *The Historical Journal*, 32, 1 (1989), pp. 1-16; *Persuasive Fictions: Faction, Faith and Political Culture in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot, 1996).

⁴² Cromwell, apparently aided by the conservative court factions, would admit ‘a fantasier et conspirer led. affaire’, or that he had ‘set himself to arrange the plot’ for Anne’s destruction. J. S. Brewer, et al. (eds), *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-47*, 21 vols. and addenda (1920), X 1069.

⁴³ Ives, *Anne*, p. 297.

⁴⁴ Retha M. Warnicke, *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn: Family politics at the court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 191.

evidence that the foetus was deformed.⁴⁵ More recently, Bernard argued his ‘own hunch’ that Anne was guilty of committing adultery with Henry Norris, and ‘probably’ with Mark Smeaton and Francis Weston.⁴⁶ Yet no historian has fully or critically investigated the role of her household, and her servants, who were at the centre of the scandal.⁴⁷ I propose that an examination of the queen’s household can potentially resolve this stalemate, and provide further insight into the early Tudor court and its politics.

Historians of medieval and early modern women have concentrated on the question of their participation in politics, often expressed in terms of agency, and autonomy. Whereas many have emphasised the institutions, laws and customs which reinforced female subordination, exclusion and inferiority in this period, Barbara J. Harris, Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, Bernard Capp, James Daybell, Laura Gowing, Nicola Clark and others have considered if, and how, women challenged, resisted, negotiated, evaded, accommodated or accepted patriarchy, or the beliefs, assumptions, traditions, and practices of male superiority and authority.⁴⁸ Harris in particular has shown that women were responsible for building and maintaining kinship networks, arranging marriages for family, petitioning, and providing hospitality.⁴⁹ In assessing the role of women, Harris observes a clear distinction between government and politics. Certainly women were restricted by their sex from

⁴⁵ The story of a ‘deformed foetus’ was recounted by Nicholas Sander, a Catholic polemicist writing in 1585 who alleged, rather obscurely, that Anne gave birth to ‘a shapeless mass of flesh’. Nicholas Sander, *The Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, ed. by David Lewis (London, 1877).

⁴⁶ G. W. Bernard, *Anne Boleyn: Fatal Attractions* (London: Yale University Press, 2010), p. 192.

⁴⁷ ‘Only in 1528, with the rise of Anne Boleyn, does faction, the key structural element in the politics of intimacy, become a constant and continuing factor’. Starkey, ‘Intimacy’, in Starkey, (ed.), *Court*, p. 108.

⁴⁸ Barbara J. Harris, ‘The View from My Lady’s Chamber: New Perspectives on the Early Tudor Monarchy’, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 60:3 (1997), pp. 215-247; Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1998); Bernard Capp, *When Gossips Meet: Women, Family and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2003), Daybell (ed.), *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700* (Hampshire, 2004); Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford, 1996); Laura Gowing, ‘The Politics of Women’s Friendship in Early Modern England’, in Laura Gowing, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin (eds), *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe, 1300-1800* (Basingstoke, 2005), pp. 131-149.

⁴⁹ Harris, ‘Women and Politics’, p. 259.

government, or ‘the establishment of dynastic stability, administration of justice, enforcement of law and order, and expansion of the power of the Crown’. Yet women could engage in politics, ‘the personal, familial, and factional interactions that determined the beneficiaries and casualties of government action and often influenced the direction of institutional reform’.⁵⁰

It has been demonstrated that women in this period could and did participate in court politics, when ‘politics’ is understood not strictly as the making of policy, or in institutional terms, such as in Parliament, Privy Council, law courts, and the Exchequer (wherein women were restricted from holding office), but more broadly, and is properly defined, in terms of interactions between men, women, and the English monarchy, or relationships in the royal household and at court, making access to, and intimacy with, the monarch central.⁵¹ The question is no longer if women were involved in politics, but how, where and why. Albeit restricted to a single chapter, article, or queen, Harris and Clark, with Dakota Hamilton and Michelle Beer, have demonstrated the potential for a full-length study of women serving in the households of Henry VII and Henry VIII’s queens. Their arguments are either sustained, developed, or challenged, and their assumptions rigorously tested throughout this thesis.⁵² Nadine Akkerman, Birgit Houben and Helen Joanne Graham-Matheson have also shown that the surviving source material on ‘female’ households can be made to work harder and break considerable ground.⁵³ The foundation for this study has also been laid by the pioneering

⁵⁰ Harris, ‘Chamber’, p. 220.

⁵¹ Curtis Perry, ‘The Politics of Access and Representations of the Sodomite King in Early Modern England’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53, 4 (2000), pp. 1054-1083 (p. 1056).

⁵² Barbara J. Harris, ‘Their Brilliant Careers: Aristocratic Women at the Yorkist and Early Tudor Court’, in Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, pp. 210-240; Nicola Clark, ‘Courtiers’, in Clark, *Gender, Family and Politics: The Howard Women, 1485-1558* (Oxford, 2018), pp. 92-115; Dakota L. Hamilton, ‘The Household of Queen Katherine Parr’ (University of Oxford, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1992); Beer, *Queenship*.

⁵³ Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben (eds), *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting across Early Modern Europe* (Boston, 2013); Helen Joanne Graham-Matheson, ‘“All wemen in thar degree shuld to thar men subiectit be”: The controversial court career of Elisabeth Parr, marchioness of Northampton, c. 1547-1565’ (University College London, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2015).

research both on women in the households of Tudor queens regnant, and of Stuart queens consort. Reassessing the role of Elizabeth I's Chamber and Privy Chamber, Natalie Mears has argued that women serving the queen gave her *ad hoc* counsel, communicated directly with her, and thus facilitated diplomacy, patronage, and crucially, access to their sovereign.⁵⁴ Catherine Louise Howey and Charlotte Isabelle Merton have also shown that women in attendance at the court of a queen regnant had privileged access which permitted them to exercise political agency.⁵⁵ Re-evaluating 'female institutional powerlessness' in the households of Anna of Denmark and Henrietta Maria, Helen Margaret Payne, Sara Joy Wolfson and Caroline Hibbard have explored how ties to the court facilitated women's ability to influence politics, patronage and policy through informal networks, which was crucial to their own advancement.⁵⁶ Contextualised by studies of service in the households of their predecessors and their successors, this thesis contributes to the master narrative of its development through the late medieval and early modern period, evaluating if there was any substantial, or meaningful change.

This thesis builds upon the wider historiography on queenship, the early Tudor court and its politics, and women in this period. Its focus, however, is the nature of royal service. Service, specifically royal service, is lacking a more precise definition. 'Service', and the 'servant', are rather more difficult, and complex, to define, as in the medieval and early

⁵⁴ Natalie Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 54-55, 66, 71; 'Politics in the Elizabethan Privy Chamber: Lady Mary Sidney and Kat Ashley', in Daybell (ed.), *Women and Politics*, pp. 67-82.

⁵⁵ Catherine Louise Howey, 'Busy Bodies: Women, Power and Politics at the Court of Elizabeth I, 1558-1603' (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2007); Charlotte Isabelle Merton, 'The women who served Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth: Ladies, Gentlewomen and Maids of the Privy Chamber, 1553-1603' (University of Cambridge, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1992).

⁵⁶ Helen Margaret Payne, 'Aristocratic Women and the Jacobean Court, 1603-1625' (University of London, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2001); Sara Joy Wolfson, 'Aristocratic Women of the Household and Court of Queen Henrietta Maria, 1625-1659' (Durham University, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2010), pp. 67, 98, 309; Caroline Hibbard, 'The Role of a Queen Consort: The Household and Court of Henrietta Maria, 1625-1642', in Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (eds), *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c. 1450-1650* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 393-414.

modern period both terms had wider application, and their meanings were broad and flexible.⁵⁷ Servants performed specific duties, tasks, or functions corresponding to their office, the title, rank or position they held within the household. Yet, what constituted ‘service’ varied from household to household, as servants were sworn by oath to be loyal and faithful to their master, or mistress, to obey them in everything. And thus service was everything, and anything, at all, which was performed on behalf of their master, or mistress, who would, in turn, maintain them in wages and provide them with food, shelter and clothing. More than an institution, service was the relationship between master, or mistress, and servant, or in other words, the ways in which they interacted, and were ‘bound’ to one another. It was a *career*, or in other words, it was their ‘course or progress through life’, a ‘vocation’ which was ‘publicly conspicuous and significant’, and ‘a person’s advancement or promotion in condition, status, or position’, otherwise known as ‘preferment’.⁵⁸

This thesis aims to widen the scope of inquiry on royal service. Whereas historians have concentrated more often on the royal household as an institutional body, this thesis is taken from the view of the servant. The focus thus far has been on their role in government and bureaucracy. Our understanding of royal service is predicated on the king’s men, and the English royal household and wider court is often reconstructed as if it were ‘exclusively male’: the court, we are told, was a male-dominated society, the archetypal ‘courtier’ is male, and its politics were strictly a *masculine* preserve.⁵⁹ Barbara Harris and Sharon Kettering have conceptualised the service of women at court as careers, ‘in the fullest sense of the

⁵⁷ A servant might undertake commercial, trade, or labour activities on behalf of a client, or be one devoted to another (in the ‘courtly love’ tradition), or one who worships God (in religious rituals). Service could be specific, or general, contracted, or uncontracted, paid, or unpaid, etc. It may otherwise refer to administrative, military, or legal service, or generally ‘service’ undertaken for the government of the country. Elizabeth Rivlin, ‘Service and Servants in Early Modern English Culture to 1660’, *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, 4 (2015), pp. 17-41 (p. 19); Ann Kussmaul, *Servants in husbandry in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 1-2.

⁵⁸ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, p. 17.

⁵⁹ Barbara J. Harris, ‘Women and Politics in Early Tudor England’, *The Historical Journal*, 33, 2 (1990), pp. 259-281.

word', though it is apparent that the careers of both men and women in royal service require an accurate, broader, and yet more precise, definition.⁶⁰ A career in service should not be defined by its occasional forays into high politics, nor should its success (or failure) be measured strictly by how much patronage servants did, or did not, enjoy.⁶¹ Royal service was in itself a political culture. It had its own definition, structures, behaviours and language.⁶² More specifically the relationship between master, or mistress, and servant, had its own character, its own conventions, distinct from relations between monarch and subject, patron and client, lord and tenant, court and courted. The interaction of master, or mistress, and servant, within the institution, and the relationships between them, are yet to be explored.⁶³

Reconstructing the queen's household in England from 1485 to 1547, this thesis addresses fundamental questions on the nature of royal service. What did it mean to serve in the household of a queen consort – a woman, and the wife of the sovereign? How did service function specifically for queens, and queenship? Did serving in the queen's household constitute a 'career'? Was service strictly a matter of politics, or was it personal? In what ways was service 'gendered', or in other words, what did mean to serve in the household as a woman, and of a woman, and how did this experience differ from that of men? Concentrating on the period from 1485 to 1547 raises questions too on the stability of service. What was the impact of Henry VIII's marital instability on the queen's household in England and the careers of its servants? How was royal service stabilised, or destabilised, by the machinations

⁶⁰ Barbara J. Harris, 'Their Brilliant Careers', in Harris, *Women*, pp. 210-240; Sharon Kettering, 'The Household Service of Early Modern French Noblewomen', *French Historical Studies*, 20:1 (1997), pp. 55-85.

⁶¹ See, for example, Ives, 'Egerton', pp. 346-374; Bernard, 'Compton', pp. 754-777; Simon Adams, 'The patronage of the crown in Elizabethan politics: the 1590s in perspective', in Guy, John (ed.), *The reign of Elizabeth I: Court and culture in the last decade* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 20-45 (pp. 44-45).

⁶² David Starkey, 'The age of the household: politics, society and the arts c. 1350- c. 1550' in Stephen Medcalf (ed.), *The Later Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 225-290 (pp. 251-253) for more on the language of service.

⁶³ Some notable exceptions are David Grummitt, 'Household, politics and political morality in the reign of Henry VII', *Historical Research*, 82, 217 (2009), pp. 393-411 (p. 410); McIntosh, 'Sovereign Princesses', p. 116.

of the crown, and those who served them? If we are to comprehend and conceptualise fully the English monarchy, court and kingdom, and the nature of royal service in this period, the queen's side must be integrated with the king's side, and the careers of not merely the king's servants, but the queen's servants too must be studied.

Methodology

This thesis benefits from cross-disciplinary dialogue, adopting a range of approaches and methodologies from research occurring in other fields, specifically, networks, gender, and emotions, to reinterpret and bring new meaning to the surviving source material. Networks, connections formed between any two or more individuals, are central to reconstructing the queen's household in England from 1485 to 1547. The 'network turn', in practice and in discourse, develops scientific and conceptual frameworks for network analysis. Ruth Anheer, Sebastian Anheer, Catherine Nicole Coleman, Scott B. Weingart and others have demonstrated the use of network analysis for the study of the arts and humanities.⁶⁴ This has been invaluable for understanding the early modern world, society and its culture. Using visual and quantitative methods, the *Tudor Networks of Power* project, for instance, reconstructs a network connecting over 20,000 individuals by collating and analysing data held in over 130,000 letters dating from the accession of Henry VIII to the death of Elizabeth I.⁶⁵ Charles Wetherall, Barry Wellman, and Andrejs Plakans have demonstrated that communities, such as families, neighbourhoods, and indeed households, and the ways in which these functioned to create and sustain all manner of meaningful connections, with their own ideas, thoughts, feelings, behaviours, interests, spaces, even linguistic variations, can be

⁶⁴ Ruth Anheer, Sebastian E. Anheer, Catherine Nicole Coleman and Scott B. Weingart, *The Network Turn: Changing Perspectives in the Humanities* (Cambridge, 2020), p. 54.

⁶⁵ See tudornetworks.net for a visualisation of this data.

recovered through social network analysis.⁶⁶ Historians of early modern women, Gowing and Capp in particular, have shown that female networks of kinship, friendship and more provided women with advice, support, companionship, independence and power, and could have social and political significance as those formed between men.⁶⁷ This thesis analyses both quantitative and qualitative data to draw out the significance of these networks for queens and their households, how they were established, strengthened and maintained, how they functioned in terms of interaction, support and obligation, politics, patronage, and in facilitating information and communications, extending through the court and the wider kingdom.

Gender, the social and cultural construction of sexual difference (as opposed to sex, which is biological), has proven useful for historical analysis.⁶⁸ Joan W. Scott observed that political history had been ‘the stronghold of resistance to the inclusion of material or even questions about women and gender’.⁶⁹ In recent years, this has been addressed. Historians seek to understand ideas of masculinity and femininity as they existed in particular cultures, and how these ideas in practice shaped the experience of being a man, or a woman, in an attempt, in the words of Susan Pedersen, ‘to reexamine and rewrite the entire historical narrative to reveal the construction and workings of gender’.⁷⁰ It could be understood in

⁶⁶ Barry Wellman and Charles Wetherell, ‘Social Network Analysis of Historical Communities: Some Questions from the Present for the Past’, *History of the Family*, 1, 1 (1996), pp. 97-121; Andrejs Plakans and Charles Wetherell, ‘Households and Kinship Networks: The Costs and Benefits of Contextualization’, *Continuity and Change*, 18, 1 (2003), pp. 49-76; For social network analysis and the Tudor court, see, for instance, Mel Evans, ‘“The vsuall speach of the Court”? Investigating language change in the Tudor family network (1544–1556)’, *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 1, 2 (2015), pp. 153-188 (pp. 177-180).

⁶⁷ Gowing, ‘Friendship’, in Gowing, Hunter and Rubin (eds), *Love, Friendship and Faith*, p. 147. The quote is taken from Capp, *Gossips*, p. 376.

⁶⁸ Joan W. Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1988), p. 32.

⁶⁹ Joan W. Scott, ‘Gender: a Useful Category of Historical Analysis’, *Gender and History*, 91:5 (1986), pp. 1053-1105 (p. 1070).

⁷⁰ Susan Pedersen, ‘The Future of Feminist History’ presented at the breakfast meeting of the Committee on Women Historians of the American Historical Association on 8 January 2000. <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/october-2000/the-future-of-feminist-history>.

terms of expectations (the way one is expected to behave as a man, or woman), identity (the way an individual sees oneself as a man, woman, masculine or feminine), ideas (about what roles were deemed appropriate for men and women), and perspectives (how men and women are seen, and how far that perception is reflected in society), which could be cohesive or in conflict.⁷¹ As Susan Amussen and Christopher Brooks have argued, ‘gendered’ expectations, identities and ideas were inherent to the household structure.⁷² This thesis aims to ‘recover the lives, experiences, and mentalities of women from the condescension and obscurity’, and considers if and how gender had any bearing on service. It will ask if and how far the queen’s household, properly defined as a subsidiary of the English royal household, itself a patriarchal institution, was ‘gendered’. In the medieval and early modern patriarchal family, men, as husbands and fathers, were meant to be authoritative, and governed their wives, children and servants. Women were held to be subordinate, and inferior. Was the queen, and her household, subject to, or the exception, to patriarchal rule? Were the duties tasks and functions performed by its staff, the queen’s servants, many of whom who were necessarily women, in any way ‘gendered’? Was there any distinction between man and woman’s work?

Through spatial and access analysis, A. J. Flather, Amanda Richardson and Daphne Spain have illustrated the ways in which spaces can be conceived, experienced, and understood by different individuals at different times.⁷³ This thesis explores ‘spaces’ – more than, and different from, a physical location or place – and considers how a physical location or place – specifically the queen’s chambers – was transformed into ‘space’ by the

⁷¹ Amanda Richardson, ‘Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces c. 1160—c. 1547: A Study in Access Analysis and Imagery’, *Medieval Archaeology*, 47, 1 (2003), pp. 131-165 (p. 132).

⁷² A wife may be responsible for managing the estate and its affairs, yet ‘her subjection to her husband, as well as her love and respect for him, were crucial to maintaining a godly, orderly household’. Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York, 1993), pp. 34-66 (p. 42); Christopher Brooks, *Law, Politics and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 352-383 (p. 359).

⁷³ A. J. Flather, ‘Space, place and gender: the sexual and spatial division of labour in the early modern household’, *History and Theory*, 52, 3 (2013), pp. 344-60 (p. 346); Daphne Spain, ‘Gendered Spaces and Women’s Status’, *Sociological Theory*, 11, 2 (1993), pp. 137-151; Richardson, ‘Gender and Space’, p. 132.

individuals who constituted it and find meaning in their actions. How did the household ‘space’ define how women saw their role, and how they acted in turn? The physical, spatial, and architectural separation of women and men often perpetuated gender stratification. This thesis considers the ‘spaces’ created in the queen’s household, and the wider court, and asks if they were gendered, specifically if they encouraged, or restricted, female agency.⁷⁴ Was domesticity in the household, mediated through space, as Doreen Massey observed, a control on identity, and power? Were ‘gendered’ power structures reinforced, or circumvented, by the spatial arrangements of royal palaces?⁷⁵ Were the queen’s chambers distinct from the king’s chambers, with their own separate, ‘feminine’ identity, or culture?⁷⁶ In this area of study the distinction between the private (home, family, personal relationships) and the public (work, business, government, and politics) spheres of activity has proven influential.⁷⁷ This thesis proposes that the queen’s household was neither strictly private nor public, and that these spheres overlapped, and the distinction between them blurred, when the household, an essentially domestic institution, was politicised.

As Scott observed, it is misleading to suggest that women had a history separate from men’s.⁷⁸ This thesis preserves the understanding that women were operating within the constraints of patriarchy,⁷⁹ negotiating its terms for their own agency, and autonomy, and thus aims to ‘unravel some of the complexities and contradictions in relations between men and women’.⁸⁰ Gender did not necessarily restrict women from engaging in politics, but rather defined the ways in which they did. Men are often seen as straightforwardly dominant

⁷⁴ Flather, ‘Space, place and gender’, pp. 346-7.

⁷⁵ Thorstad, *Castles*, p. 167; Spain, ‘Gendered’, p. 139.

⁷⁶ For the essentially *masculine* culture of the king’s household in this period, see Glenn Richardson, ‘Hunting at the Courts of Francis I and Henry VIII’, *The Court Historian*, 18, 2 (2014), pp. 127-141.

⁷⁷ Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex & Subordination in England 1500–1800* (New Haven, 1995), p. xix.

⁷⁸ Scott, ‘Gender: a Useful Category’, p. 1055.

⁷⁹ ‘...as to do otherwise would be anachronistic’. Clark, *Gender*, p. 14.

⁸⁰ Capp, *Gossips*, p. 1.

in an oppressively patriarchal system. More recently, studies have explored the ‘complexity of configurations of gender’, and have begun to emphasise the ‘problematic nature of constructing patriarchal authority’.⁸¹ The male and the female were not tied inextricably to biological sex. Men and women did not always adhere to contemporary ideologies of gender, which itself found expression in didactic literature.⁸² Yet, failing to meet and conform to these expectations or ideals often led to friction, tension, or a ‘crisis’ in relations between men and women. Women must be studied with men, and their interactions within specific contexts should be examined. This thesis will concentrate on integrating the queen’s household with the king’s household and in the context of the ‘functioning’ early Tudor court. Gender proves useful as a comparative paradigm. How did the experience of women in service, and their attendance at court, differ from that of men? The queen’s household will be examined alongside and measured against the king’s household in this period, in everything – queenship and kingship, sovereign and consort, master and mistress, men and women – to draw out in contrast its own characteristics, the significance of gender, and determine, more accurately, the nature of royal service.

Emotions in the medieval and early modern period are the subject of a growing body of research – otherwise known as the ‘affective turn’. Emerging in the last twenty years as a distinct field, with its own conceptual apparatus, the history of emotions adopts an interdisciplinary approach, tracing the social, psychological, and material forms of emotion, analysing the different dimensions of emotional experience in this period.⁸³ What emotions were experienced by the queen and her servants? Where do we find them, and how can we

⁸¹ Michael J. Braddick and John Walter, ‘Grids of Power: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Early Modern Society’, in Braddick and Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 1-42 (pp. 17-18).

⁸² Linda Pollock, ‘“Teach her to live under obedience”: the making of women in the upper ranks of early modern England’, *Continuity and Change*, 4, 2 (1989), pp. 231-258 (p. 233).

⁸³ Katie Barclay, ‘State of the Field: The History of Emotions’, *History*, 106, 371 (2021), pp. 456-466.

interpret them? Did the queen's household, in their shared experience of service, constitute what Barbara Rosenwein has termed an 'emotional community', with its own language, and its own attitudes to specific emotions?⁸⁴ Did the queen's household, and the wider court, 'bend, shape, encourage, and discourage the expression of various emotions', and if so, how?⁸⁵ Susan Broomhall, Katie Barclay, Stephanie Tarbin, Catherine Mann and others have considered the range of emotions that developed within the household, investigating the ways in which the household functioned as an 'emotional landscape', or 'a site of emotional expression'.⁸⁶ Concentrating on the emotional dynamics or paradigms of service, this thesis too aims to categorise, conceptualise and interpret emotional phenomena (feelings, moods, attitudes) in the household as a framework for historical analysis.

Emotional rhetoric, display, performance, and behaviours must be nuanced to their social, cultural and political contexts. Emotions in the courts of the medieval and early modern period are difficult to find, read and interpret, not least because courtiers were advised and encouraged to conceal them.⁸⁷ As Baldassare Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier* (1528) observed, one should 'avoid affectation to the uttermost and... to practise in everything a certain nonchalance that shall conceal design and show that what is done and said is done without effort and almost without thought'.⁸⁸ Emotions at courts, often politically-charged, have been realised by Norbert Elias, whose work *The Court Society*

⁸⁴ Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 2011), p. 2.

⁸⁵ Barbara H. Rosenwein, 'Worrying about Emotions in History', *American Historical Review*, 107, 3 (2002) pp. 821-45 (p. 837).

⁸⁶ Susan Broomhall, 'Introduction', in Broomhall (ed.), *Authority, Gender, and Emotions in Late Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2015); Stephanie Tarbin, 'Raising Girls and Boys: Fear, Awe, and Dread in the Early Modern Household' in Broomhall (ed.), *Authority*, pp. 106-130; Catherine Mann, '"Whether your Ladship will or ne": Displeasure, Duty and Devotion in *The Lisle Letters*', in Broomhall (ed.), *Emotions*, pp. 119-134.

⁸⁷ Tracy Adams, 'Court culture', in Susan Broomhall (ed.) *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* (Abingdon, 2017), pp. 225-227 (p. 225).

⁸⁸ Baldassare Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. Leonard Eckstein Opdycke (New York, 1903), p. 35.

remains widely influential.⁸⁹ Emotions, we are told, had to be ‘regulated in the service of maximizing one’s competitive position in an increasingly complex and volatile network of social relations’.⁹⁰ This required distinction of one’s own status and place in the social hierarchy, with attention to clothing, gesture, manners, taste, expression, and wit. Concealing ‘true’ feelings was necessary, as affective outbursts were ‘a sign of weakness’.⁹¹ If, outwardly, the performance or display of one’s feelings and thoughts was not meant to correspond with their innermost emotional or cognitive state, the problem arises then of how to read the emotions of men and women in the household and at court as authentic or otherwise. More recently, Bradley J. Irish has imagined the emotional world of the Tudor court, itself an ‘archive of feeling’, by analysing literary and cultural texts as ‘repositories of feelings and emotions’, the authors of which are felt to have negotiated between private and public spheres. Irish has shown that ‘emotion is crucial to understanding literary and political interaction in the Tudor court’. Reflecting the ‘inescapable realities of Tudor social organisation’, Irish acknowledges that his work focuses strictly on men.⁹² This thesis addresses this gap by focusing on women at court, emphasising too the centrality of emotion to social and political action in this period.⁹³

Relationships in the queen’s household were established, in part, through the emotional interactions of mistress and servant. More specifically, this thesis aims to understand how, and in what circumstances, queens and their servants might conform to, or

⁸⁹ Norbert Elias, *The Court Society*, trans. by Edmund Jephcott (New York, 1983).

⁹⁰ Robert Van Krieken, ‘Norbert Elias and Emotions in History’, in David Lemmings and Ann Brooks (eds), *Emotions and Social Change: Historical and Sociological Perspectives* (New York, 2014), pp. 19-42 (p. 25).

⁹¹ Elias, *Court Society*, p. 121.

⁹² Irish has elsewhere explored the emotional dynamics of women’s manuscript circulation, namely the Devonshire Manuscript. Bradley J. Irish, ‘Gender and Politics in the Henrician Court: The Douglas Howard Lyrics in the Devonshire Manuscript (BL Add 17492)’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 61, 1 (2011), pp. 79-114.

⁹³ Bradley J. Irish, *Emotion in the Tudor Court: Literature, History and Early Modern Feeling* (Evanston, 2018), pp. 4-5.

disrupt, structures of authority through what has been termed ‘emotional power’?⁹⁴ What was the role of affection in tempering authority in the queen’s household? How was authority and order at the early Tudor court defined, ‘made’, maintained, or challenged, through the emotions?⁹⁵ William Reddy’s concept of ‘emotional regimes’ is relevant too in highlighting how emotions were ‘of the highest political significance’, as they were embedded in political institutions, and in political action.⁹⁶ This has proven useful in understanding and interpreting how emotions became an agent to the behaviour of servants, in either abiding by or rejecting the authority, or hierarchies, to which they were subject. How emotions were practised, performed, and expressed, could be powerful, i.e. in empowering servants to challenge, or resist, authority. This thesis considers emotions as stabilising (ensuring harmony), or potentially, destabilising, social and political order in the formal, or ‘institutional’ hierarchy, of the queen’s household.

Sources

The surviving source material for servants, and women, is fragmentary. The evidence is not continuous, nor is it consistent, and it is often incomplete.⁹⁷ Records can be insufficient where it concerns the study of women.⁹⁸ The evidence which has survived for the queen’s household can be categorised as 1) ordinances, drawn up for managing provisions and

⁹⁴ Susan Broomhall (ed.), *Emotions in the Household, 1200-1900* (New York, 2008).

⁹⁵ See also Katie Barclay, ‘Family and household’, in Susan Broomhall (ed.) *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* (Abingdon, 2017), pp. 244-247 (p. 245).

⁹⁶ William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the history of emotions* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 124.

⁹⁷ David Starkey describes the evidence of the household as ‘defective’. Starkey, ‘Privy Chamber’, p. 420.

⁹⁸ For example, calendars, such as the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, were compiled by men during the twentieth century, often omit women, and thus, where possible, the original manuscript has been consulted. J. S. Brewer et al. (eds), *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-47*, 21 vols. and addenda (1920). The digitisation of many documents, chiefly state papers, has made such a task much more straightforward in recent years.

expenditure, regulating consumption in the royal household,⁹⁹ instructions, and descriptions of court ceremonial, occasionally, with lists of attendants;¹⁰⁰ 2) records of the lord chamberlain, predominantly for the distribution of livery at coronations and funerals;¹⁰¹ 3) exchequer, account books of queens for their income and expenditure, wage lists and subsidy rolls;¹⁰² 4) state papers containing correspondence of the king and council, ambassadorial reports, depositions and trial records;¹⁰³ 5) grants, for offices, titles, pensions, pardons, licences, land, leases, etc.;¹⁰⁴ 6) personal letters,¹⁰⁵ wills and inventories;¹⁰⁶ and 7) near-contemporary accounts in chronicles, literature, and poetry, such as satire, panegyric, religious polemical and hagiography.¹⁰⁷

⁹⁹ For instance, the Eltham ordinances of 1526, or ‘Articles Ordained by King Henry VII, for the regulation of his Household’ of 1494, in *A collection of ordinances and regulations for the government of the royal household, made in divers reigns : from King Edward III to King William and Queen Mary, also receipts in ancient cookery* (London, 1790); ‘Liber Niger Domus Regis Angliae’, or the Black Book of the Household, in Myers, A. R., *The Household of Edward IV: The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478 ed. with Introduction, Notes and Glossary* (Manchester, 1959); ‘The Booke of Henrie Erle of Arundell, Lord Chamberleyn to King Henrie Theighte’, in Francis Grose, Thomas Astle, Edward Jefferey (eds), *The Antiquarian repertory*, vol. 2, (London, 1808).

¹⁰⁰ The British Library (BL), Additional MS, 6113, 21116, 45716A, 71009, etc., or Harleian MS, 41, 543, 6807, etc.

¹⁰¹ The National Archives, Records of the Lord Chamberlain and other officers of the Royal Household (TNA LC).

¹⁰² The National Archives, Records of the Exchequer, and its related bodies, with those of the Office of First Fruits and Tenths, and the Court of Augmentations (TNA E). Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas (ed.), *Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York and Wardrobe Accounts of Edward the Fourth. With a Memoir of Elizabeth of York, and Notes* (London, 1830); *The Privy Purse Expenses of King Henry VIII from Nov. 1529 to Dec. 1532* (London, 1827).

¹⁰³ The National Archives, State Papers Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Correspondence and papers of the king’s principal secretaries and others relating to home and abroad for the reign of Henry VIII, 1509 to 1547 (TNA SP).

¹⁰⁴ This material is calendared in *LP*, supplemented by J. G. Black, Robert Henry Brodie (eds), *Calendar of the Patent rolls preserved in the Public record office: Henry VII, 1485-1509*, 2 vols. (London, 1914).

¹⁰⁵ Muriel St. Clare Byrne (ed.), *The Lisle Letters*, 6 vols. (London, 1981), abbreviated to *Lisle*. Janel Mueller (ed.), *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence* (London, 2011). Mary Anne Everett Wood (ed.), *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, from the commencement of the twelfth century to the close of the reign of Queen Mary*, 3 vols. (London, 1846). Henry Ellis (ed.), *Original Letters illustrative of English History*, 2 vols. (London, 1825).

¹⁰⁶ The National Archives, Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury and related jurisdictions, including wills and other probate matters (TNA PROB). See also, the will of Anne of Cleves in Samuel Bentley (ed.), *Excerpta Historica, or, Illustrations of English History* (London, 1831), and inventories of the queen, Jane Seymour and Catherine Howard’s jewels, in BL Royal MS 7 C XVI and BL Stowe MS 559.

¹⁰⁷ William Latymer, ‘A briefe treatise or cronickille of the moste vertuous ladye Anne Bulleyne late quene of England’, in Bodleian MS Don., C, 42, ff. 21r-33v, transcribed in ‘Maria Dowling, ‘William Latymer’s Cronickille of Anne Bulleyne’, *Camden Fourth Series*, 39 (1990), pp. 23-65; John Foxe, ‘Actes and Monuments’, in Stephen Reed Cattley (ed.), *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: A New and Complete Edition*, 8 vols. (London, 1837-41); George Wyatt, ‘Life of The Virtuous Christian and Renowned Queen Anne Boleigne’ in ‘Appendix’ Samuel Weller Singer (ed.), *The Life of Cardinal Wolsey* (London, 1827); Elizabeth

Requiring new and extensive archival research, no study as yet has attempted to reconstruct the queen's household from 1485 to 1547. I began by identifying the queen's servants – and thereafter, the king's servants – to create a preliminary database of the English royal household for prosopographical study.¹⁰⁸ The queen's servants can be difficult to trace in the evidence. No one document yields a complete list, and many of them were either uncategorised or misdated. Servants can, however, be identified if, in the evidence, they were in receipt of a wage, wore the queen's livery, or held office in the queen's household. I have collated data on the men and women who served in the queen's household in this period. Within the database, each servant has a unique identification number, with entries listing their name, and (where the evidence has survived) their date of birth and death, origin, the office they held, who they served, records of their attendance, relationships (familial, and other), with additional biographical notes and references, such as if they received a grant or if they left a will. Like the *Tudor Networks of Power* project, this database provides useful relational information and facilitates an examination of networks of queens, the core of which were their households.¹⁰⁹

Heale (ed.), *The Devonshire Manuscript: A Women's Book of Courtly Poetry* (Toronto, 2012); Sir Thomas Wyatt, *Collected Poems*, ed. by J. Daalder (Oxford, 1975).

¹⁰⁸ This research has been conducted for the late-seventeenth through early-nineteenth centuries. We must uncover the experience of *all* those who served, from lord and vice-chamberlains to grooms and chamberers, echoing the concerns of Robert Bucholz to understand the court 'from top to bottom'. See <http://courtofficers.ctsdh.uc.edu/>; Robert Bucholz and John Sainty, *Officials of the Royal Household 1660-1837: Department of the Lord Chamberlain and Associated Offices, Office Holders in Modern Britain*, 11 (London, 1997); Robert Bucholz, 'The Database of Court Officers', *Court Historian*, 3, 2 (1998), pp. 22-28. Investigating the lives, backgrounds and careers of the servants in the household of Thomas Cromwell, the king's secretary, Mary L. Robertson considered their age, social and economic status, geographic spread, education, religious beliefs, career patterns, methods of admission to service and the rewards that they received during that service, demonstrating the potential of such databases for prosopographical study. Mary Louise Robertson, 'Thomas Cromwell's Servants: The Ministerial Household in Early Tudor Government and Society', (University of California, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1975).

¹⁰⁹ Anheer, and Anheer, *Tudor Networks of Power* (Oxford, forthcoming).

The ‘institutional’ evidence is lacking, and is clearly insufficient where it concerns the queen’s household and its servants. Household ordinances carefully listed the offices, and their respective tasks, duties and functions of the king’s servants, but not the queen’s servants. The institutions of royal service were created, developed, and its roles clearly defined, for men in the household of the king. It sufficed to say in c. 1471 that ‘the quene’s seruyse’ was to ‘nygh like vnto the king’, and as will be demonstrated, this lack of its own definition, documentation, or ‘institutional’ backbone, for the households of queens, reflects its status as an extension, or subsidiary, of the king’s household. Albeit incomplete, it is possible to reconstruct the queen’s ‘household’, as an institution, from the surviving evidence. What the queen’s servants did, how much they were paid, what they wore, where and what they ate, if they were, or were not, entitled to ‘bouche of court’, how many horses they had stabling for, how many beds they were given to accommodate their own servants, what perquisites or ‘fees’ they were entitled to, what room or chamber, and in what capacity, they served in, all corresponded with their office. This evidence has been tallied and compiled in the Appendix, alongside, for comparison, the offices held by servants in the king’s Chamber and Privy Chamber.¹¹⁰

Yet royal service constituted more than the office they held in the formal, ‘institutional’ household.¹¹¹ Relationships, in the household, between queens and their servants – the ways in which they interacted, and were ‘bound’ to one another – were crucial. It is difficult to determine the nature of the interactions between queens and their servants, as much of the evidence which survives is determinedly one-sided, even hagiographic. Foreign ambassadors too were not neutral observers. The ambassadorial reports of Eustace Chapuys,

¹¹⁰ Appendix 1.

¹¹¹ Is it true that the ‘relative importance of an office depended upon the man [*or woman*] who held it’? My square brackets and italics. Braddock, ‘Household’, p. 212.

Charles de Marillac, and later, François Van der Delft, were usually distorted if not by their own bias then potentially by the biases of their – very often unnamed – sources, subject to rumour and gossip, upon which they relied heavily for information.¹¹² ‘The Queen and her ladies’ is a phrase used so frequently by chroniclers that it is indeed ‘tantalising in its inadequacy’: although they give an impression of their attendance in the crowded court agenda of banquets, feasts, pageants, masques, jousts and tournaments, these accounts are largely anecdotal.¹¹³ The lives and careers of servants – and women – can be difficult to uncover in the evidence, as few would have felt it worth their while to record them; chroniclers, for instance, would have meant to affirm the presence of the king or queen’s servants in attendance, but these servants remain unnamed and anonymous.

To reconstruct them with some meaning, these relationships must be interpreted in the context of their role as ‘mistress’ and ‘servant’. To explain how and why they interacted as they did, William Latymer’s *A briefe treatise or cronickille of the moste vertuous ladye Anne Bulleyne late quene of England* (c. 1564), and *Of the office of servavntes* by Gilbertus Cognatus (1535) provide a framework to interpret this evidence and reconstruct the relationship between queens and their servants. Cognatus was a French humanist and a servant to Desiderius Erasmus. *Of the office of servavntes* was published in 1535, and around eight years later, was translated by Thomas Chaloner, at the request of his master, Sir Henry

¹¹² Pascual de Gayangos, et al. (eds), *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*, 13 vols. (1888-1954); Rawdon Brown, et al. (eds), *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, 38 vols. (1867-1947); Sebastian Giustinian, *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*, ed. and trans. by Rawdon Lubbock Brown (London, 1854), 2 vols.

¹¹³ If not distorted by the fact they were often written during the reigns which they were recording, and thus would necessarily convey a flattering image of the king. Charles Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors, From A.D 1485 to 1559*, ed. William Douglas Hamilton, 2 vols. (1838); Edward Hall, *Hall’s Chronicle: containing the history of England, during the reign of Henry the Fourth, and the succeeding monarchs, to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth*, 2 vols. (1809); Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, 6 vols. (1807); John Gough Nichols (ed.), *The Chronicle of Calais in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII to the year 1540* (1838); Martin A. Sharp Hume (ed.) *Chronicle of King Henry VIII: Being a Contemporary Record of some of the Principal Events of the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. Written in Spanish By An Unknown Hand* (London, 1889).

Knyvett, himself a gentleman of the Privy Chamber to Henry VIII. ‘As ye bad me haue I inglyshid this litle booke, of the office of seruauntes’, Chaloner wrote in the preface, ‘...I pray God geue your maistership longe soo to serue, as in a lesse degree we your seruauntes owght, and woulde doo.’¹¹⁴ *Of the office of servavntes* was written by a servant, and translated by a servant on behalf of his master, who was himself a servant to the sovereign, for use by ‘bothe... the maisters, and them that serue’. Thus it has some bearing on what manner, it was felt by contemporaries, service should be conducted.¹¹⁵ More useful is *A brieft treatise or cronickille of the moste vertuous ladye Anne Bulleyne late quene of England* (c. 1564), by William Latymer, related all as he ‘did heare, see and certaynly know’ as one of her ‘ordinarie chappellaynes’. Latymer also claimed to ‘atteyne to the knowledge of’ those ‘whoo did attende her highnes in dyverse kyndes of service’ to corroborate his account, namely ‘the lorde Borough, then lorde chamberlayne, Sir James Bulleyne, her majesties chauncelar, Sir Edward Baynton her vizchamberlayne, and Mr Udall hir secretary’. Although Latymer was determinedly one-sided in exaggerating Anne’s pious and ‘godly’ rule,¹¹⁶ his account more accurately represents the idyllic, or ‘good’ mistress.¹¹⁷ To explain how and why queens and their servants interacted as they did, here Latymer’s *Cronickille* and others provide a framework to interpret this evidence and reconstruct the relationship between them.

Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century representations of women, and patriarchy in contemporary texts, like conduct and polemical literature, provide social, political and gendered contexts to their careers in royal service. Christine de Pizan’s *Le Trésor de la Cité des Dames*, or *Treasure of the City of Ladies* (1405), a conduct book for women, is

¹¹⁴ Gilbertus Cognatus, *Of the office of servavntes a boke made in Latine by one Gilbertus Cognatus and newly Englyshed*, preface, abbreviated to Cognatus, *servavntes*. Sir Thomas Chaloner signs it, ‘Your humble seruaunt’, and in the preface describes Knyvett as his master.

¹¹⁵ Cognatus, *servavntes*, doc. 3.

¹¹⁶ Dowling, ‘Latymer’, p. 30 and p. 43.

¹¹⁷ Latymer, *Cronickille*.

particularly useful, as it consists in part of advice specifically for queens consort and women attending at court.¹¹⁸ It reflects what contemporaries thought of, and how they understood, the role and expectations of queens, their ladies, gentlewomen and maids. It also provides a view of the court from their perspective. Although it is unclear if this book was known in England, the popularity of Pizan's *Livre de la Cité des Dames*, or *The Book of the City of Ladies* (c. 1405), a defence of women in the form of a didactic exchange between Christine and allegorical figures, may have brought her other works to the attention of the queen and her household.¹¹⁹ Informed by Pizan's familiarity with the French court in the fifteenth century, it was translated into English in 1521 by a member of Catherine of Aragon's household, Brian Annesley, her yeoman of the cellar.¹²⁰ Catherine may have requested the translation, though it could have been produced to appeal to the queen, as her daughter Mary was, at this time, a potential successor to the English throne, and the *Livre* 'promoted the education of women, and, indirectly, the legitimacy of female monarchs'.¹²¹ It is possible that not only the *Livre* but the *Trésor* would have been read by the queen and within the wider court. In this thesis, the *Trésor* interprets and brings meaning to the words and actions of Henry VII and Henry VIII's queens and her servants. It also considers how far they abided by the principles, ideals and virtues set forth by Pizan's conceptual 'Cité des Dames'.¹²² Baldassare Castiglione's *Libro del Cortegiano*, or *The Book of the Courtier* (1528), takes the form of a fictional

¹¹⁸ Christine de Pizan, *The treasure of the city of ladies; or, The book of the three virtues*, translated with an introduction by Sarah Lawson (London, 1985).

¹¹⁹ Part of the *querelle des femmes* genre in medieval literature, debating the role and responsibilities of women.

¹²⁰ Brian Annesley was in attendance at the coronation of the queen in 1509 as a yeoman of the cellar (TNA LC 9/50 ff. 198-211), and was still serving in her household when the *Livre* was translated in 1521 (TNA SP 1/73 f. 70). Christine de Pizan, *The Boke of the Cyte of Ladyes*, ed. Hope Johnston, trans. Brian Anslay, *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 457 (New York, 2014), p. xi; Hope Johnston, 'How the Livre de la cité des dames first came to be printed in England', in Liliane Dulac, Anne Paupert, Christine Reno and Bernard Ribémont (eds), *Desireuse de plus avant enquerre* (Paris, 2008), pp. 385-96.

¹²¹ Cristina Malcolmson, 'Christine de Pizan's *City of Ladies* in Early Modern England', in Cristina Malcolmson and Suzuki Mihoko (eds), *Debating Gender in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (New York, 2002), pp. 15-36 (pp. 20-21).

¹²² Caroline Zum Kolk, 'The Household of the Queen of France in the Sixteenth Century', *The Court Historian*, 14, 1 (2009), pp. 3-22 (p. 22), shows how the queen and her women were potentially inspired by Pizan's ideas.

debate, in four parts, on the ideal nature, and virtues, of the ‘Courtier’. Its relevance to the early Tudor court is widely acknowledged and well-established.¹²³ The third part, or book, which turns its attention to the ‘Court Lady’, was translated by Thomas Hoby, commissioned in 1551 by Elisabeth Parr, née Brooke, marchioness of Northampton, who had served as a maid-of-honour, and later a lady-in-waiting at the Tudor court.¹²⁴ As will be demonstrated, this material informs and interprets the evidence to more accurately reconstruct the social, cultural, and occasionally ‘gendered’ environment of the queen’s household and the wider court.

Structure

The first chapter forms an institutional analysis of the queen’s household. It begins with a brief history of the queen’s household from 1100 to 1485, reproduced through surviving ordinances, to trace its development alongside the king’s household, before examining offices in the queen’s Chamber and Privy Chamber, establishing the importance of the duties, tasks and functions they performed on behalf of the queen. Investigating the impact of Henry VIII’s marital instability, the second chapter considers appointments to the queen’s household. It focuses on petitions for preferment to determine who was in charge of granting office and to illuminate the process by which such appointments were made, before analysing the composition of the queen’s household from 1485 to 1547. It also considers length of service, or tenure, in the careers of the queen’s servants, using quantitative data. The third chapter begins first by examining access to the queens’ chambers, determining when and

¹²³ Janet Elizabeth Mullin, ‘Words to Live By: Castiglione’s *Il Libro Del Cortegiano* and Four Men of Henry VIII’s Court’ (University of New Brunswick, Unpublished MA thesis, 1984), pp. 82-84; David Starkey, ‘The Court: Castiglione’s Ideal and Tudor Reality; Being a Discussion of Sir Thomas Wyatt’s Satire Addressed to Sir Francis Bryan’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 45 (1982), pp. 232-239.

¹²⁴ Graham-Matheson, ‘Parr’, pp. 49-50.

where servants interacted with their mistress. It then considers *how* they interacted, in what contexts, concentrating on intimacy in the queen's Privy Chamber to measure the depths and significance of relationships between 'mistress' and 'servant', which constituted the 'functioning' household. The fourth chapter assesses wages, livery, advancement and other perquisites of serving in the queen's household. It situates the advancement of men and women at court within the context of office-holding, and their relationships with their master, or mistress. It also examines politics in the queen's Chamber, Privy Chamber, and the wider court, focusing chiefly on the potential for patronage. The fifth and final chapter analyses closely the oath sworn by the queen's servants, before drawing out the nature of loyalty and allegiance in the 'rival' households of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn. It demonstrates that loyalties, or allegiances, of servants in the queen's household, became a matter of royal policy, and were managed, or manipulated by the king, to create one queen, and simultaneously, to dethrone the other. This chapter also considers if, how, and to what extent the queen's servants had their own agency, and autonomy. All chapters raise and address fundamental questions on the nature of royal service in this period, and together provide a framework through which to interpret the evidence of service more sensitively, and accurately.

Chapter 1

Office, in the queen's household, was the title, rank or position held by a servant. It determined the specific duties, tasks and functions they performed, and their position in the institutional, hierarchical chain of command. Although the offices held by the king's servants have been examined, and many of their careers have been studied in-depth, neither servants in the queen's Chamber nor her Privy Chamber have received the same attention.¹ Women, usually restricted from holding office, held positions in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber. Were attendants' duties straightforwardly domestic, and the part they played fairly inconsequential, or could they have a meaningful role? Did offices grant women – and men – serving the queen a measure of authority, and status, or was a career in the queen's household doomed to domesticity? Re-evaluating 'female institutional powerlessness', and building on studies of both Tudor queens regnant² and Stuart queens consort,³ this chapter begins to evaluate the significance of gender. How far was the nature of royal service determined by the sex or gender of who was being served, and that of who was serving? What did it mean to serve in a household that was headed by a queen consort, a woman, and the wife of the sovereign? What did it mean for a woman to serve in the English royal household? Reconstructing the queen's Chamber, and tracing the development of the queen's Privy Chamber, this 'institutional' analysis begins with a brief history of the household from 1100 to 1485, reproduced through surviving ordinances, to trace its development alongside the king's household. It examines the offices held by its servants, and more importantly, its

¹ Braddock, 'The Royal Household'; 'Office-holding', pp. 29-47. Bernard, 'Compton', pp. 754-777; Ives, 'Brereton', pp. 1-38; Ives, 'Egerton', pp. 346-74; Sil, 'Gates', pp. 929-43; 'Herbert', pp. 297-318; 'Denny', pp. 190-201.

² Howey, 'Busy Bodies'. Akkerman and Houben (eds), *Female Households*; Merton, 'Privy Chamber'; Graham-Matheson, 'Parr'; Mears, 'Politics', in Daybell (ed.), *Women and Politics*, pp. 67-82.

³ Payne, 'Jacobean'; Wolfson, 'Henrietta Maria', pp. 67, 98, 309. Hibbard, 'Consort', in Asch and Birke (eds), *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility*, pp. 393-414.

women, establishing the duties, tasks and functions they performed on behalf of the queen, their status, and the ‘institutional’ authority they exercised within the household. Providing a case study for the ‘functioning’ queen’s household, this chapter concludes with an analysis of the role of ladies and gentlewomen in attendance at the Field of Cloth of Gold, the diplomatic summit which took place from 7 to 24 June 1520 between England and France.⁴

Ordinances for the queen’s household, 1100-1547

Royal households in the medieval and early-modern period were governed by a set of articles, or ordinances, ‘for the establishment of good order’.⁵ It was not until 1136, shortly after the death of Henry I, that the *Constitutio Domus Regis*, the first known set of ordinances, was drawn up for the English royal household.⁶ Such ordinances laid out instructions for departments and servants on the king’s side, but made no mention of the queen, or her side of the royal establishment. It may appear that there was no such distinction between the king’s side and the queen’s side, but Matilda of Scotland, Henry I’s wife and queen, did have her own servants, as her maids-of-honour, Emma, Gunilda and Christina, were, in 1128, described as ‘three virgins of God, sacred damsels who had belonged to the chamber of Matilda, the good queen consort to Henry I’.⁷ After the *Constitutio*, the next known ordinance was The Household Ordinance of Westminster of 1279, in the reign of

⁴ Both Glenn Richardson and Joycelyne G. Russell consider in good measure the queens and their ladies in their respective accounts of the summit, though not critically or as the focus for analysis. Glenn Richardson, *The Field of Cloth of Gold* (New Haven, 2013); Joycelyne G. Russell, *Field of Cloth of Gold: Men and Manners in 1520* (London, 1969).

⁵ *HO*, p. 137.

⁶ Charles Johnson (ed.), *Constitutio Domus Regis, The Establishment of the Royal Household*, with corrections by F. E. L. Carter and D. E. Greenway (Oxford, 1983), pp. 128-35. For a discussion of extant ordinances for the governing of the English royal household, see T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, vol. 1, (Manchester, 1920-33), pp. 36-7, pp. 67-176.

⁷ My italics, for emphasis. BL Cotton MS Claudius A, quoted in Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, vol. 1 (Boston, 1894), p. 1.

Edward I.⁸ These ordinances were likely the first to acknowledge the household of the ‘madame’, or queen, though only by acknowledging that it ‘should be conducted according to the ordinance of the king’s household’.⁹ Reiterating this, the author of the *Liber Niger Domus Regis Anglie Edwardi Quarti*, or the ‘Black Book of the Household of Edward IV’, briefly observed in 1471 that:

We fynde of old recordes and new both, that for the quene’s seruyse, wich must be nygh like vnto the king, and for her ladyes and other worshipfull men and jentylwomen, theire seruices and lyuez after as hit accordith to high and lowe degree after the maner as hit is to the kinges household maynie.¹⁰

The households of Henry VII and Henry VIII’s queens are invariably described as being ‘loosely modelled’ on the king’s household.¹¹ Through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the queen’s side developed gradually alongside the king’s side. In 1236, Henry III saw fit to set up a ‘Wardrobe’ for his wife, Eleanor of Provence.¹² The Wardrobe, previously attached to the Chamber, and hitherto little more than a place of deposit for state papers and correspondence, became the chief administrative, directive, financial, secretarial and sealing department of the English royal household. More than merely a cupboard for storing her rich garments, gowns and jewels, the queen’s Wardrobe was self-sufficient; it was administered separately, staffed with its own servants, producing its own accounts, and was responsible for nearly all of her expenditure. This apparently marked its beginning as an institution all of its

⁸ ‘Le ordenence del hostel le rei, fet par le commandement le rei a Westminster, le jur de seint Brice, lan du regne de rei Edward setime.’

⁹ TNA C 47/3/15. In French, transcribed in Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 2, pp. 158-63, translated in David Charles Douglas and Harry Rothwell (eds), *English Historical Documents*, vol. 3 (London, 1975), pp. 581-586.

¹⁰ *BB*, pp. 92-93.

¹¹ Hamilton, ‘Parr’ p. 2; Maria Hayward, *Dress at the Court of Henry VIII* (Abington, 2007), p. 302 (‘paralleled’); Evans, *Ladies-in-Waiting*, p. 47 (‘mirrored’); Warnicke, *Fashioning Tudor Queenship*, pp. 61-63 (‘mirrored’); Harris, *Women*, p. 216 (‘paralleled’).

¹² Hilda Johnstone finds that this is ‘our starting point’ in tracing the development of the queen’s side. Hilda Johnstone, ‘The Queen’s Household’, in Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 5, p. 231.

own.¹³ Offices held by the queen's ladies, gentlewomen and maids would become increasingly defined, as illustrated by the accounts of Eleanor of Castile in 1290.¹⁴ The queen's side grew out of necessity, expanding and evolving alongside the king's side in dignity, size and splendour, until it could be fairly and accurately described as a household in its own right, with its own separate departments and an extensive staff.¹⁵ Historians of medieval queenship have argued that this separation meant that the queen's household had its own identity, and could operate independently,¹⁶ but there is reason to be cautious, as in 1363, on account of her fiscal irresponsibility, increasing debt and the incompetence of her administration, the household of Philippa of Hainault, Edward III's queen, was effectively merged with the king's household.¹⁷ This placed her servants and her affairs under the direct supervision of his officers. Although Philippa's Chamber received its annual income of 4000 marks, her servants were paid for and received their livery from the king, and the term 'household' now described the two households merged, regarded as one institution. This incident, and others, warn against overstating its independence from the king's side.¹⁸

Crucially, the household inherited by early Tudor queens from their medieval predecessors was integrated with, and in many ways was treated as an extension of, the king's household. Unlike the king, queens consort did not rule their households *absolutely*.

¹³ Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 1, p. 19; S. B. Chrimes, *An Introduction to the Administrative History of Mediaeval England* (Oxford, 1952), pp. 79, 103. Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 1, pp. 253-6; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 5, p. 232.

¹⁴ The *Liber Garderobe* in John Carmi Parsons, 'The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290', *Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies* (Toronto, 1997); Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 5, p. 236.

¹⁵ Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 5, p. 232.

¹⁶ Benz St. John, *Queenship*, pp. 65, 67, 97; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in Tout, *Chapters*, vol. 5, p. 231; Laynesmith, *Queenship*, pp. 121-3.

¹⁷ Wilson, *Affinity*, pp. 92-93; Christopher Given-Wilson, 'The Court and Household of Edward III' (University of St. Andrews, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1976), p. 108; 'The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households, 1360-9', *Historical Research*, 51, 124 (1978), pp. 183-187.

¹⁸ Edward I would treat Eleanor of Castile's Wardrobe as a component of his own in spite of his predecessors innovations. Altogether without autonomy, it was no longer independently accountable to the exchequer, but instead to the king's own Wardrobe.

This reflected the traditional, familial or ‘patriarchal’ household, wherein women, as wives, might undertake many important duties or functions as mistress of the household, but were ultimately subject to men, specifically their husbands. As will be demonstrated, the king as sovereign retained authority over his queens’ households, and exercised his prerogative as sovereign to intervene and interfere where he saw fit. Henry VIII, for instance, kept a watchful eye over his queens’ servants, appointed, and discharged them, obliged them to him by oath, paid and provided for them, rewarded and advanced them, gave them orders, and set the rules by which they were governed.¹⁹ The Eltham ordinances of 1526, representing ‘the King’s minde and pleasure’, were rules and regulations by which all of his own servants and his queens’ servants were to abide, with ordinances drawn up to determine the process by which servants were to be appointed, or discharged, to define ‘what number of personages of every degree, estate, and condition, his Highness will admit to be lodged and entertained in his house’, and ‘what number of servants shall alsoe be allowed to them and every of them, with the specialtyes of their liveries’.²⁰ Instructions laid out for ‘the King’s chamber’ in previous ordinances were, by 1526, directed at ‘the King and Queen’s chambers’, and ordinances concerning the king’s Lord Chamberlain and Vice-chamberlain were now directed ‘likewise’ towards ‘the Queen’s chamberlyn and vice-chambelyne for her side’.²¹ It was made explicit in 1526 that the households of Henry VIII’s queens were to be governed by the same set of ordinances as his own. Like the king’s servants, the queen’s servants fulfilled their obligations by performing the duties, tasks and functions specific to their office competently, diligently and faithfully, adhering strictly to household ordinances. They had to be dressed ‘clenlye and decentlye’; to ‘order themselfe after suche godly and honest sorte’; to

¹⁹ See chapter 2 for appointments, chapter 4 for wages, livery and advancement, and chapter 5 for oaths and loyalty.

²⁰ *HO*, pp. 137, 162.

²¹ *HO*, pp. 146, 152. See also, the ordinance of 1478, in A. R. Myers (ed.), *The household of Edward IV, the Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478* (Manchester, 1959), pp. 211-228.

‘kepe scilence aswell within my Lades grace chambr as her hall at dyn[ner] & soppar’; to ‘abstayne from vicious lyving’, ‘sweryng’ and ‘vnlawfull gaemes as dyce cards and suche other prohibited by the king’s Lawes’; were not to be ‘pickars of quarelles nor sowers of discorde & sedicion betwixe p[ar]te and parte’; were not to ‘fighte nor brawle nor give occacion so to do’, and were not to ‘pike nor breake lokes nor dors of anny house of office nor chambr w[i]th in the said house’.²² These ordinances were to be set in ‘a booke’, signed by the king’s hand, which ‘shall remaine and be kept in the compting house, for the better information of the head officers of the chamber and household, how they shall from time to time, see the same put in effectuall execution’.²³

Institutionally, the queen’s household was administered alongside the king’s household. When Henry VIII twice attempted to reform the royal household, such reforms extended to the queen’s household. Both Cardinal Wolsey in 1519 and 1526, and Thomas Cromwell in 1540, were tasked with economising and improving efficiency by reducing the size and expense of the household, while systematically addressing the issues of cost and waste, incompetency, idleness and disorder, such as riotous or unlawful behaviour.²⁴ Significantly, their jurisdiction for reform extended to the queen’s Chamber. In a document entitled ‘the Names of certain personnes put out of there Rowmes by the kinges grace, and other by his grace in their Rowmes appointed’, for example, Wolsey identified the names of six servants ‘ffor the quenes syde’ whose offices were to be redistributed.²⁵ On 18 September 1540, the king’s Privy Council issued orders to Robert Tyrwhit, the king’s Vice-chamberlain, Sir Edward Baynton, the queen’s Vice-chamberlain, and ‘div[er]se other gent[lemen of] the

²² BL Harleian MS 6807, ff. 10-12; *HO*, p. 144.

²³ *HO*, p. 161.

²⁴ From 1519, plans were drawn up to restore ‘honorable substanciall & profitable ordre’ to the royal household ‘with oute any further dilay’. BL, Titus, B, I, ff. 188-90v. By the end of 1539, Thomas Cromwell began instituting ‘thorough and wide-ranging’ reforms of the royal household. G. R. Elton, *Revolution*, p. 212.

²⁵ TNA SP 1/18, f. 66 (*LP* III 151).

King's and Quenes s[er]vants to the nombr of xvj.' They were 'adv[er]tised of the King's pleas[ure] concernyng aswel the sobre and temperat ordyr that his Highnes woold have them to use in his Highnes chamb[re] and the Quenes, of presence, as also the behavo[ur] of themselves towards the King's Pryvey Counsail gent[lemen] of the prvyi chamb[re] and all other his Highnes s[er]vants of ev[er]y degree'.²⁶ A few weeks later, on 6 October, the king's Privy Council sent for

the Vicechambrelains of the King's and Quenes syde w[ith] diverse other gent[lemen of] the King's and the Quenes s[e]rvants... unto whom at their cumyng it was declared and alsoo comaundeme[n]t given unto them to declare the same unto others their felowes then absent that the King's pleas[ure] was they shuld from hensforth in no wise molest his persone w[ith] any maner [or] sute.²⁷

Structure of the queen's household, 1485-1547

Like the king's household, the queen's household comprised many departments and rested on a broad stratum of servants. The *domus regis magnificencie*, 'Chamber', or household 'above-stairs', was responsible for attending upon her person, performing menial or routine tasks on her behalf, such as making her bed, waiting on her at table, dressing or undressing her, or standing guard in her chambers. The *domus providencie*, 'Household', or household 'below-stairs', was concerned with the day-to-day administering of various provisions to the 'Chamber', like food, drink, light and fuel, for warmth, security and shelter.²⁸ In addition to

²⁶ Sir Harris Nicolas (ed.), *Privy Council of England, Proceedings and Ordinances (1386-1542)*, 7 vols. (vol. 7, p. 39).

²⁷ *PCP*, VII, pp. 51-52.

²⁸ This bi-partite structure was first laid out in precise terms in c. 1471 by the author of the 'Black Book'. The queen's 'Household', or household 'below-stairs', comprised the kitchen, the buttery, the larder, the bakehouse, the pantry, the pastry, the poultry, the saucery, the spicery, the cellar, the bottles, the ewery, the acatry, the almonry, the chandlery, the scaldinghouse, the scullery, the laundry, the woodyard and the hall (TNA E101/426/2, ff. 1-5). It may also have had its own – or least had access to the king's – slaughterhouse, boilinghouse, brewhouse, pitcherhouse, wafery and confectionery, with its own harbingers, porters and cart-

the Chamber and Household departments, the queen's household comprised a 'Wardrobe', 'Council', and 'Stable'. The queen's Wardrobe by this period functioned, more specifically, for the keeping, repairing and transport of the queen's clothing, mattresses, bed-linen and coverlets. It purchased, stored, acquired, transported and distributed both raw materials such as cloth and linens, as well as entire gowns and garments, and its staff liaised closely with the queen's tailor, her silkwomen, and even her laundress, in order to ensure that the queen and her servants were properly attired at all times.²⁹ Her Council was a loosely-organised administrative body which managed the queen's landed estate, accommodating her increased acquisition of financial resources, the core of which comprised the queen's dower.³⁰ It had its own judiciary and advisory functions to audit and administer her lands, with a staff consisting of a receiver-general, a surveyor, an auditor, an attorney, a solicitor, a chancellor and various clerks, who kept the queen informed by memoranda, which, on occasion, required her signature.³¹ The queen's Council collected fees and debts owed to the queen, drew up indentures, represented her and sued on her behalf, summoned litigants to its presence, arbitrated and settled disputes between her tenants, and even had jurisdiction over local officials – stewards, constables, keepers and bailiffs – who were themselves responsible for

takers for transporting provisions (*HO*, pp. 138-144; BL Harleian MS 6807, ff. 18r-19r, ff. 30v-31r; BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 22v-26r; Hamilton, 'Katherine Parr', pp. 16-17). See TNA SP 1/37, f. 62, for 'The kyngs householde hed officers', specifically the king's 'Household' below-stairs, with entries for 'The Lord Stuarde'; 'The Treasurer'; 'The Comptroller' and 'The Cofferer, with all other officers customably bilyongyng to the said householde'. At the end of this document, there is a brief statement: 'Officers for the quene in the kyngs household as hath byn acustomably used'. This makes clear that the queen too would have had the same officers to serve her in her 'Household' below-stairs.

²⁹ Although Eleanor of Provence had her own distinct 'Wardrobe' in 1236, it would appear that the queen's Wardrobe was brought under – and warrants for the wardrobe of the queen's servants were issued directly to – the 'Magna Garderoba' or Great Wardrobe. Mistress Vaughan, Catherine Parr's silkwoman, for example, supplied goods in value of £186 12s. 5d. to 'The wardrobe to the Quene' (TNA E315/161, f. 212r). They kept itemised records specific to orders given by the queen and her lord chamberlain for gowns, cloth, furs, linens etc. to make her own apparel, as well as for the liveries to be distributed to her servants. For more on the Great Wardrobe, see Maria Hayward, *The Great Wardrobe Accounts of Henry VII and Henry VIII* (London, 2012).

³⁰ Dakota Hamilton, 'The Learned Councils of the Tudor Queens Consort', in Charles Carlton (ed.), *State, Sovereigns & Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of A. J. Slavin* (Gloucestershire, 1998), pp. 87-102 (p. 87); Anne Crawford, 'The Queen's Council in the Middle Ages', *The English Historical Review*, 116, 469 (2001), pp. 1193-1211; TNA E/298 for records of medieval and early-modern queens' Councils.

³¹ For example, 'remembrances unto the Queen's grace for divers and sundry matters that be needful for her gracious pleasure to be known in'. BL Cotton MS, Vespasian, C, XIV, 1, f. 281 (*LP VI* 1188); TNA SP 2/O, f. 75 (*LP VI* 1189). It was her name who they invoked to legitimate the authority of their position.

keeping order and general maintenance of her estate.³² The queen's household was a peripatetic institution. As queens did not always have the same itinerary as their husbands, they had their own 'Stable', which kept and maintained horses for the queen and her servants to move from palace to palace. It was headed by her master of the horse, who appointed, supervised and disciplined its staff of yeomen, grooms, pages, clerks of the stable, an avener, saddlers, palfreymen and sumptermen who were responsible for feeding and maintaining the queen's horses, breeding replacements, keeping ready all the necessary riding equipment, as well as footmen who accompanied the queen at either side of her horse as she moved from palace to palace, or when she was on the hunt.³³

The nature of service provided by these departments differed from the 'Chamber'. Few of them would have known the queen personally. Unlike the queen's Chamber servants, most of them would never have had the opportunity to be near the queen, or to have met her at all, and virtually none of them would have been admitted to her chambers. The queen's 'Chamber' was, essentially, the centre, or the core of her household. Everything in and of the queen's Chamber, her household 'above-stairs', was facilitated by the operation 'below-stairs' and on the periphery. For this reason this thesis, an examination of the queen's household from 1485 to 1547 and the careers of its servants, will concentrate on the queen's Chamber, and by extension, her 'Privy Chamber'.

³² Hamilton, 'Councils', in Carlton (ed.), *State*, pp. 89-90; Johnstone, 'The Queen's Household', in Willard and Morris (eds), *Government*, p. 251. A significant number of indentures, or landholding agreements between landholder and tenant, have survived for Henry's queens, usually specifying the rent, and any obligations, goods, resources or services that are provided by the tenant as part of the agreement to lease. See TNA E315/176 for Catherine of Aragon, TNA E315/177 for Anne Boleyn and Jane Seymour, and TNA E315/178 for Catherine Parr.

³³ For records of the queen's 'Stable', see, for example, TNA E101/107/21 for Catherine Howard, TNA E101/424/3 for Catherine Parr.

Reflecting the king's increasing concern for privacy, the 1490s saw the development of the 'Privy Chamber', a significant innovation for the English royal household under Henry VII, which became more clearly defined and 'fully developed' under Henry VIII.³⁴ Previously the architectural structure of royal residences mirrored the bi-partite division of a household above-stairs ('Chamber') and below-stairs ('Household'). By the end of the fifteenth century, there had developed a third, autonomous department, the 'Privy Chamber', which functioned by 'not admitting', or restricting access, to the king, making 'a firm and clear distinction between his private and his public lives'.³⁵ It began with a few grooms of the Chamber chosen especially to attend upon the king, Henry VII, in private, providing him with comfort and solace. The ordinances of 1494 'institutionalised' access, stating 'the groome of the stoole, with a page with hym, or such as the kyng woll commaunde aught to wayte in the kynges secret Chamber specially and noone elles'. The groom of the stool headed this 'secret', or 'Privy Chamber', distinct from the Chamber.³⁶ Reforms of the Privy Chamber were instituted throughout Henry VIII's reign, like an increase in staff (fifteen in 1519, twenty-two in 1525).³⁷ David Starkey demonstrates that the Privy Chamber became a 'specialised and important sub-department of the Chamber itself'.³⁸ What Starkey did not observe, however, is that, simultaneously, there developed, alongside the king's side, on the queen's side, her own 'Privy Chamber'.³⁹

³⁴ Starkey, 'Representation through intimacy: A study in the symbolism of monarchy and Court office in early modern England' in John Guy (ed.), *The Tudor Monarchy* (London, 1997), pp. 42-77 (pp. 51-2, 59).

³⁵ Starkey, 'Privy Chamber'.

³⁶ BL *Arundel* MS XVII, f. 17v; *AR*, p. 204.

³⁷ 'Certain Ordenaunces deuised by the kinges highnes with thaduises of his counsail concerning the good ordre of suche persones as his grace hath deputed to be in his priue chambre' in BL Cotton MS Vespasian, C, XIV, ff. 257-294v. Early drafts of the Eltham ordinances distinguished the Privy Chamber from the Chamber. TNA *SP* 1/37, f. 72; *LP* IV 1939 [7].

³⁸ Starkey, 'Representation through intimacy' in Guy (ed.), *Monarchy*, p. 59.

³⁹ For architectural developments in royal palaces accommodating the queen's side, see Simon Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (London, 1993) p. 19.

Offices in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber

All of the queen's 'Chamber' and 'Privy Chamber' servants were identified by their office, the title, rank or position they held within the household. A set of documents drawn up in 1519, 1525 and 1540 can provide a view of the structural makeup of servants according to their offices. In the left-hand margin of the document entitled 'a nombre of persons thought conuenient to attende upon the quenes grace acordyng to hir astate roiall',⁴⁰ dated to 1525, there is 'The chambour', for which there are the following entries: 'The Lorde chamberlayn'; 'The vicechamberlayn'; 'Gentilmen huysshers'; 'yeomen huysshers'; 'yeomen of the chambour'; 'Gromes'; 'Pages'; 'Messyngers'; 'Sewers for the quenes borde';⁴¹ 'Kervers'; 'Cuppeberers'; 'Sewers at the bordes ende';⁴² 'Phisician'; 'Appotecary' and 'Sargiant at Armes'.⁴³ Separated from the above, but without a specific heading are the 'Chaunceler'; 'Confessor'; 'Almoner'; 'The Secretarie'; 'Chaplayns'; 'Ladies dayly attendant'; 'Ladys quarterly attendant', and 'noblemens doughters' (maids-of-honour).⁴⁴ In the same document, under the heading 'The quenes privie chambour', there were two entries: 'a nombre of gentilwomen to be chambourers', and 'Gromes'.⁴⁵ Similar documents drawn up in 1519 outline a virtually identical structure, adding only 'Ladies in presens', a 'groome porter', 'Gentilmen waiters', and the yeomen, grooms and pages each of 'The quenys wardrop of the the Robes' and 'The Wardrobe of the Queen's beds'.⁴⁶ Like the king's Privy Chamber, the

⁴⁰ TNA SP 1/37, ff. 60r-63 (LP IV 1939 [7]). This document was, 'in all probability', the 'first sketch of the reorganised household', drawn up by Cardinal Wolsey in around 1525. Starkey, 'Privy Chamber', p. 136.

⁴¹ 'The Quenes sewer', see TNA SP 1/19, ff. 85-7 (LP III 491).

⁴² 'Sewers of the chamber', Ibid.

⁴³ TNA SP 1/37, f. 62.

⁴⁴ 'The Quenes maydens'. Ibid., f. 62, and TNA SP 1/19, ff. 85-7 (LP III 491).

⁴⁵ TNA SP 1/37, f. 61.

⁴⁶ TNA SP 1/19, ff. 85-7 (LP III 491, October 1519); TNA SP 1/19, ff. 117-8 (LP III 528, November 1519); BL Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV (A), f. 273 (LP III Appendix 20, November 1520); TNA SP 1/19 ff. 150-1 (LP III 577, January 1524 – June 1525); TNA SP 1/37, ff. 70-1 (LP IV 1939/6); TNA SP 1/37, f. 65, (LP IV 1939/4). David Starkey observed that those lists which have survived are 'five out of what was probably originally a much larger number of documents'. Starkey, *Privy Chamber*, p. 420.

queen's Privy Chamber soon acquired an attendant staff of its own, who, like the king's 'Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber', became institutionally-defined: 'The booke of Certayne of the Quenys Ordynary' and 'thordynarye of the quenes syde' taken in 1540 had 'ladies of the prevy Chambre' and 'Gentlewomen of the prevy Chambre', who complete the structure.⁴⁷

Like the king's household, the queen's household was a rigidly-constructed hierarchy in which servants held a fixed position, clearly defined, and circumscribed, by their office. Offices held by servants in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber preserved an institutional, hierarchical chain of command. All of the queen's servants were afforded a measure of status and authority within the household. This was reflected in the duties, tasks and functions they performed.⁴⁸ Household ordinances recorded in explicit detail the respective duties of the men who served in the queen's 'Chamber'.⁴⁹ Like the king's Chamber, the queen's Chamber was headed by a Lord Chamberlain and a Vice-chamberlain who were in charge of administering the queen's servants by distributing lodgings, keeping strict attendance records and, 'by their diligent attendance and good oversight', arbitrating disputes to keep them 'in due order and attendance, everie one his roome and place as apperteyneth'.⁵⁰ Gentlemen Ushers were to 'oversee yomen huisshiers, yomen of the

⁴⁷ TNA SP 1/157, ff. 13-17 (LP XV 21); BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 15v – 18r. The earliest reference I can find in Henry VIII's reign to a 'Lady of the Privy chamber' is in one of Thomas Cromwell's letters, dated in 1536. BL Add MS 25114, f. 160 (LP X 873).

⁴⁸ The queen's lord and vice-chamberlains reported to her, whereas her gentlemen ushers reported to her lord and vice-chamberlains, her yeomen to her gentlemen ushers, her grooms to her yeomen etc. *Arundell*, pp. 184-208 makes it clear that there was an order of precedence, according to rank, with the king (or queen) at the head of his (or her) own household. Although there is a lack of evidence, it is likely that the queen's lord and vice-chamberlains corresponded with her regularly, and surely would have been careful to consult their mistress on matters of administration. *HO*, pp. 31, 146-147, 151, 229-230; *BB*, pp. 104-6; BL Harleian MS 6807, f. 11, f. 12. If any servant were to be absent from court for any reason, they required a license granted to them by the Lord Chamberlain or Vice-chamberlain. *HO*, p. 139.

⁴⁹ Most of the duties, tasks and functions specific to the office held by the queen's *male* servants are taken from the Black Book of Edward IV, c. 1471, and the Eltham Ordinances of 1526, detailed in *HO*, and 'The Booke of Henrie Erle of Arundell, Lord Chamberleyn to King Henrie Theighte', in *Arundell*.

⁵⁰ The duties of the vice-chamberlain appear to have been virtually identical to the lord chamberlain, to whom he was deputy. Servants were to resort 'in all cases doubtfull to the lord chamberlyn, or in his absence to the vice chamberlyn'. *HO*, p. 144.

chamber, gromes, and pages', ensuring that they were 'redie to do all such service' and 'to maintaine them in the right of theire places'.⁵¹ Yeomen Ushers and Yeomen of the Chamber had to arrive at the entry to the queen's Presence chamber 'by eight of the clocke in the morning' to stand guard, 'passe up and downe, perusing the said chamber', and 'not to depart from the same'. These men kept a watchful eye over who had the right or had been granted permission to be present in the queen's chambers, 'and in case they shall perceive any person to be there, not meete nor convenient to be therein, they shall incontinently expell and avoyd them from the same'.⁵² Grooms of the Chamber were responsible for the maintenance of the queen's chambers, ensuring they were 'pure, clean, wholesome and meet' and kept 'in right perfect maner' fit for her status. This meant they had to 'take good heede' that all 'arras, beddes, fourmes, stooles, carpetts, cusshyns' and 'the same roofes, wyndowes, and portalls of the place' were 'kept cleane from dust, filthe, and cobwebbes'.⁵³ What is more, grooms were 'to make fyres to sett up tressyls and bourdes' in the queen's Presence chamber, and 'be redie at all tymes in the evening in the chamber to take a torche when thei be comaunded, to stande in the chamber all the while the chamber is in seruing', as well as wait on Gentlemen and Yeomen Ushers, removing their pallet beds in the chambers, and at their meals bring them basins of water to wash their hands beforehand.⁵⁴ The Groom Porter was in charge of provisions 'as it hath been accustomed to be deliuerid'.⁵⁵ Pages of the Chamber had to be 'redie at all tymes' to 'wayte uppon' the queen's chambers,⁵⁶ and like the queen's Messenger, was often 'sente in message', to convey letters or run errands, sometimes 'oute of courte'.⁵⁷ Carvers, Cupbearers, Sewers and Gentlemen Waiters served the queen 'at houres and tyme of

⁵¹ In the absence of both the queen's Lord Chamberlain and Vice-chamberlain, the gentleman usher 'shall have the same power to command in like manner'. *Arundell*, pp. 186-193. *HO*, pp. 38, 340-342.

⁵² *HO*, pp. 144, 152-153; *Arundell*, pp. 199-201.

⁵³ *HO*, pp. 41, 155.

⁵⁴ *Arundell*, pp. 203-205.

⁵⁵ *HO*, p. 147.

⁵⁶ *HO*, p. 41.

⁵⁷ *HO*, pp. 48-49. *Arundell*, pp. 205-206.

dyner and souper'. The sewer would 'fetch the seruice', 'setteth and dyrecteth' the meal and wait on the queen at table, while her carver would be brought forward to cut the meat and, 'with the accustomed reverences', would 'see the meate honourably served to the board'. Her cupbearer would take her cup, covered, pour out a few drops into the cover to taste the wine for himself as to prevent her being poisoned, before handing it to her.⁵⁸ Yeomen, Grooms and Pages of the Wardrobe of the Robes and of the Beds were responsible for the keeping, repairing and transport of the queen's clothing, mattresses, bed-linen and coverlets 'saufly and clenly, that no stranger shall touche it'.⁵⁹ Her Physician and Apothecary cared for and provided 'councellyng' for her physical and mental health, though they were chiefly in attendance when the queen fell ill, or if she was pregnant.⁶⁰ Her Confessor was responsible for her spiritual welfare, hearing her confession for the preservation of her soul, and often provided her with counsel, whereas her Almoner distributed her alms, and her Chaplains held religious services such as 'mattines, masses, and other devotions' for the queen and her servants.⁶¹ Her Chancellor liaised with the queen's councillors, while her Secretary handled her correspondence.⁶² Her Master of the Horse was in charge of the queen's Stable, and finally, her Receiver-General, who accounted for her income and expenditure.⁶³

It is thus a popular misconception that the queen's household was exclusively, or even predominantly, female. Only her most intimate servants necessarily had to be women.

Certainly this, the presence of her ladies and her gentlewomen servants, is what distinguished

⁵⁸ Her meals were frequently taken in public, either in her Presence chamber, or the Great Hall, but occasionally they would be served in private. *Arundell*, pp. 197-198; *HO*, p. 341.

⁵⁹ *HO*, p. 156.

⁶⁰ More specifically which 'medecines' she should take and 'whiche dyet is best', and would 'devyse by counsayle what metes or drinkes' she should be served to assure the rest and comfort of their mistress. If they were to 'espie if any of this courte be infected with leperiz or pestilence', they were to 'keepe hym out of courte'. *HO*, pp. 42-3.

⁶¹ *HO*, p. 35.

⁶² *HO*, p. 35.

⁶³ The queen's master of the horse and her receiver-general were not strictly 'Chamber' servants, but ate and drank in the queen's chambers and often liaised with her directly.

the queen's side from the king's side, as the king's household was essentially male in composition, and historically, households were predominantly male institutions.⁶⁴ Household ordinances did not provide for the offices held by women until the 'Orders and Regulations of the Government of the Queen's Household', drawn up for Henrietta Maria of France in 1627, the first set of ordinances drawn up for the household of a queen consort of England.⁶⁵ These articles built upon previous ordinances, and as the evidence would suggest, likely formalised what was already in practice for the households of early Tudor queens consort. It is difficult to define precisely the duties, tasks and functions performed by the queen's women, yet these may be ascertained by identifying which offices in the king's Chamber and Privy Chamber are absent from those of his queens, namely the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber, Grooms of the Privy Chamber, the Groom of the Stool, and the Esquires for the Body, who, it is no coincidence, were the most intimate of the king's servants. The author of the 'Black Book' of 1471 briefly observed that 'for her ladyes and other worshipfull men and jentylwomen, their seruices and lyuez after as hit accordith to high and lowe degree after the maner as hit is to the kinges household maynie'.⁶⁶ That the queen's household never received its own prescribed set of ordinances before 1627 indicates that, at least practically, no further distinction was made, or felt necessary, between the responsibilities of male servants who served the king, and those women who served the queen.⁶⁷

Ladies and Gentlewomen of the Privy Chamber were responsible for the queen's personal, intimate and everyday service. The queen's Privy chamber was a set of two or three

⁶⁴ Contemporary courtesy handbooks for governing households warned against the dangers of women as servants. Mertes, *Household*, p. 57.

⁶⁵ *HO*, pp. 340-351.

⁶⁶ *BB*, pp. 92-93

⁶⁷ See, for example, Elizabeth I, who was able to staff her Privy Chamber with women without revising the ordinances of the household. Pam Wright takes this as evidence of 'the domestic, uncontentious nature of the Privy Chamber'. Wright, 'Ramifications', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 147-72 (p. 148).

smaller rooms, yet more restricted from the court, where the queen retreated and relaxed in private, and in 'quiet, rest, comfort and preservation' of her health. Adjacent to the Privy chamber and the innermost of her privy lodgings was the queen's bedchamber, where the queen slept, at which time gentlewomen would 'lie on the pallet within' the queen's Privy chamber.⁶⁸ Like the king's 'Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber', these women would dress and undress the queen, wash and bathe her, and wait on her, with none other presuming to touch her body, while keeping themselves at a 'convenient distance' without being 'too homely or bold advanceing themselves thereunto, otherwise than to their roomes doth apperteyne'.⁶⁹ Chamberers were responsible for the more menial and routine tasks such as making the queen's bed,⁷⁰ cleaning, and arranging her bed linens, wardrobe and lodgings, preserving and maintaining her Privy chamber and bedchamber in a 'pure, clean, wholesome and meet' condition.⁷¹ Like the king's Grooms of the Privy Chamber, chamberers 'ought to wayte and give their attendaunce at all tymes' the queen was present in her Privy chamber, in all manner of service, ready to receive at the door bread, ale or wine fetched by her gentleman usher, or messages as and when they were delivered by her page. And when the queen was to lie in her Privy chamber, her chamberers 'everie night prepared and made ready' the pallets on which

⁶⁸ *HO*, p. 156.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 156. For the Esquires for the Body, see *HO*, p. 118. The ordinances for Henrietta Maria make it clear that, 'when the Queene eateth privately', none were 'admitted to attend or bee present but the ladyes and gentlewomen that are sworne in those chambers'. *HO*, p. 343.

⁷⁰ It is unlikely the Yeomen, Grooms and Pages of the Beds were involved in the highly-ritualised making of the queen's bed, as they would not have been permitted to enter her Privy chamber. Yeomen of the Robes would 'from day to day' find whichever garment the queen wanted to wear and bring it 'honestly and cleanly' to the entry of her Privy chamber 'without entring into the same', where one of her chamberers would receive it. The king's Wardrobe of the Beds brought the 'stuf into the chamber' and laying it 'vpon a faire sheete', left it for the groom of the Privy Chamber, the equivalent of which, for the queen's side, was the chamberer. *HO*, p. 40.

⁷¹ *HO*, p. 155; *LP IV* 1939 [7] establishes that chamberers staffed the queen's Privy chamber. David Loades suggests that the chamberers to Mary I took over the duties of the grooms of the king's Privy chamber. Loades, *Tudor Court*, p. 56; Hamilton, 'Parr', p. 33 agrees with Loades. Contrary to this, although there are no 'grooms of the Privy chamber' on record in attendance on any of Henry VIII's queens, a document drafted for the Eltham Ordinances entitled 'A number of persons thought convenient to attend upon the King according to his estate royal.' lists for 'the quenes privy chamber' first, 'a nombre of gentilwomen to be chamberers', and second, 'Gromes'. *LP IV* 1939, [7]. It may be reasonably suggested that the chamberers will have 'taken over' the duties of the grooms of the Privy chamber when the queen herself was in her chamber.

the queen's gentlewomen would sleep, 'and the fires made up, and lights ordered, afore they shall depart to their lodgeings'.⁷²

There is no record of any of Henry VII or Henry VIII's queens' servants bearing the title 'Groom of the Stool'. The Groom of the Stool was chief gentleman of the Privy Chamber, serving in the king's bedchamber and in 'other privy places', i.e. attending the king in the antechambers of his bedchamber, or when he used his lavatory, privy or 'close stool', as well as arranging for its manufacture and transport when the king went from palace to palace. There is an entry in the accounts of Elizabeth of York on 5 September 1502, when she laid out 14d. 'for cariage of the quenes Stole', the responsibility of which was reserved for the groom of the stool, yet no name is given as to who received this reward. The groom of the stool slept on a pallet mattress or folding bed placed on the floor at the foot of the king's bed, and his own lodgings were adjacent to the king's chamber by a private staircase. He was often entrusted with matters more delicate as the king's confidante. There is evidence that Sir William Compton, Henry VIII's groom of the stool from his accession in 1509 until Compton's death in 1528, acted as an intermediary between the king and his mistresses, often arranging and even accommodating their trysts.⁷³ It is likely that one of the Ladies or Gentlewomen of the Privy Chamber for the queen fulfilled the duties of the king's Groom of the Stool.⁷⁴ Some parallels can be drawn between Sir William Compton and Jane, Lady

⁷² This refers to the grooms of the Privy chamber, attending upon the gentlemen of the Privy chamber. *HO*, p. 156. Certainly Henry VIII's later queens had a 'gentleman usher of the Privy chamber', who presumably ordered the grooms of the Privy chamber and the queen's chamberers in her absence. *HO*, pp. 342-348, for the ordinances of Henrietta Maria, by which time this office was more defined.

⁷³ BL Cotton MS, Cleopatra, E, IV, f. 99 (*LP* VI 923).

⁷⁴ Elizabeth I had a groom of the stool, Katherine Carey-Howard, in 1592, and a 'groome of the stoole' was listed among the 'Women Servants to her Majestie' Henrietta Maria in 1627. Likewise Wolfson identifies Susan Feilding, countess of Denbigh, who was First Lady of the Bedchamber, and responsible for the queen's privy purse, as the likely groom of the stool to Henrietta Maria (Wolfson, 'Women', p. 114.) and Payne identifies Jane Drummond, whose duties mirrored those of the groom of the stool. Although Payne acknowledges the truth behind Neil Cuddy's statement that the Elizabethan female Privy Chamber staff 'enjoyed neither the status, the departmental authority nor the administrative powers of the Henrician officer', she argues that this 'should not be read as implying that a female Groom of the Stool had no status, authority or administrative powers at all'.

Rochford, who was queen Catherine Howard's chief confidante. She had her own lodgings adjacent to the queen's bedchamber by a staircase, and arranged the queen's trysts with Thomas Culpeper, on one occasion, perhaps coincidentally, in her 'close stool'!⁷⁵ It has been suggested that the groom of the stool was de facto head of the king's Privy Chamber, and that servants in this department was under his authority, and *not* that of the lord chamberlain.⁷⁶ Neither the ladies nor the gentlewomen of the Privy Chamber appear to have been above the authority of the queen's lord chamberlain or vice-chamberlain. It is intriguing, however, that Catherine's chamberers remarked that, if they were to be discharged from the service, then the queen would have 'taken other off my lade off rochfordes pouttyng', as such appointments were under the jurisdiction of the lord chamberlain.⁷⁷

Like the king's Privy Chamber, the queen's Privy Chamber functioned by restricting access to, and maintaining the privacy of, its mistress. All of the queen's Privy Chamber servants had to be circumspect and discreet. Like the king's servants, they would have been sworn 'not [to] disclose any secretts or other things which may touche the king's most honorable person, or the honor of his chamber'.⁷⁸ 'All such persons as be appointed of the privy chamber', were explicitly sworn to 'keeping secret all such things as shall be done or said in the same, without discloseing any parte thereof to any person not being for the time present in the said chamber'.⁷⁹ This meant that queens could conduct their own affairs in private. Some time in around 1529, when Wolsey went to Bridewell to visit Catherine of Aragon, he, 'being in the chamber of presence', waited until the queen 'came out of her privy

Payne 'Jacobean', pp. 57-58; Neil Cuddy, 'The Revival of the Entourage: The Bedchamber of James I, 1603-1625', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 173-225 (p. 178).

⁷⁵ TNA SP 1/167/157-9.

⁷⁶ Bernard, 'Compton', pp. 754-777.

⁷⁷ TNA SP/167/153-4 (*LP XVI* 1338). For appointments, see chapter 2.

⁷⁸ BL Harleian MS, 2210, f. 9r; BL Add MS, 21116, ff. 3-4.

⁷⁹ *HO*, p. 156.

chamber'. 'If it please you,' the cardinal advised Catherine, 'to go into your privy chamber, we will show you the cause of our coming', to which the queen replied, 'My lord, if you have any thing to say, speak it openly', making a clear distinction between public and private. The ensuing conversation was recorded in detail by George Cavendish, Wolsey's servant who was in attendance, until Catherine took the cardinal 'by the hand and led him into her privy chamber', where they 'were in long communication', during which Cavendish remained 'in the other chamber'. There Cavendish and the rest of the servants 'might sometime hear the queen speak very loud, but what it was we could not understand'.⁸⁰

Like the king's Privy Chamber,⁸¹ the queen's Privy Chamber servants were responsible for her jewels and plate, linens and furnishings, and had charge of the queen's petty cash (*ex officio* keepers of her 'privy purse'), purchasing necessities, handing out rewards, distributing alms, and repaying debts, with occasional reimbursements made from the queen for payments which were already laid out by her servants.⁸² Unlike routine payments, their servants dealt with varied, both small and large, personal and private expenses of their mistress, which, like the king's, were drawn from the deposits held in their 'privy coffers'. For Elizabeth of York, 40s. was conveyed 'to the quenes purs by thandes of lady Elizabeth Stafford, an additional 40s. by Eleanor Johns, 20s. by Elizabeth Lee, and 53s.

⁸⁰ George Cavendish, *The Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, ed. by Samuel Weller Singer (London 1827), pp. 227-231.

⁸¹ See, for example, Hugh Denys, groom of the stool to Henry VII. Starkey, 'Privy Chamber', pp. 29-35. He was '*ex officio* Keeper of the Privy Purse, with important secretarial functions'. Starkey, 'Representations', in Guy (ed.), *Monarchy*, p. 60. Francis Marzen, 'oon of the gromes of our priue chambre' to Henry VII, was in receipt of various sums of money. (TNA E101/415/7, f. 82)

⁸² Eleanor, countess of Rutland, of the Privy Chamber, was reimbursed by Anne of Cleves for 5s. laid out to 'the gardener of Saynt James', and 40d. 'to the princes mynstrells'. TNA E101/422/15. For the king's household, see Dale Hoak, 'The Secret History of the Tudor Court: The King's Coffers and the King's Purse, 1542-1553', *Journal of British Studies*, 26, 2 (1987), pp. 208-231 (pp. 208-218). See also the accounts of Elizabeth of York (TNA E36/210), who frequently reimbursed her servants for items purchased or rewards laid out on her behalf: for example, to Eleanor Johns, gentlewoman, 3s. 4d. 'for money by hir geuen in reward to a seruaunt of the lady Lovell for bringing a Chest of Iverey with the passion of oure lord theton' (f. 32), and to Edmond Calver, John Bright and William Gentleman, sums varying from 2s. 8d. to 5s. 6d. 'for butter Egges and milke by him bought at diuers tymes for the quenes vse' (f. 60).

4d. by Anne Weston, her gentlewomen.⁸³ For Anne of Cleves, Gertrude Wyllyk conveyed 46s. 8d. on her behalf, Katherine Malecrowde, £10, Dorothy Wingfield, 40s. ‘for cards’, and Anne Joscelyn, chamberer, 20s. ‘for grots to play’.⁸⁴

Unlike the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber, the queen’s ladies and gentlewomen servants were not involved in national administration, local government or the making of policy, nor did they provide crucial military assistance,⁸⁵ or undertake secretarial duties such as obtaining the king’s signature or operating the dry stamp.⁸⁶ Queens consort did not govern; their servants functioned for the practice, construction and display of *queenship*. But what did this involve? In many ways, queens consort, as the wife of the sovereign, would undertake roles which were no different from that of any other married woman in this period, but on a grander scale.⁸⁷ Queens accomplished roles as mother, in giving birth to and nurturing heirs to the throne, and as wife, in fulfilling the duty of companionship to the king. Queens were to uphold and epitomise for court and kingdom the idyllic traits of ‘woman’: loyalty, companionship, wifely dignity, chastity and virtue. She was expected to be charming, but gracious, physically attractive, or sufficiently presentable, kind, obedient and submissive to the will of her husband, the sovereign. In the familial, or patriarchal contexts in which they operated, the role of queens was supportive, and complementary, to their husbands and their kingship. Conforming, with the queen, to expectations upon them by their contemporaries, ladies and gentlewomen servants, essentially the embodiment and extension of her body, will

⁸³ TNA E36/210, f. 31 (Elizabeth Lee), f. 35 (Eleanor Johns), f. 41 (Anne Weston), f. 50 (Elizabeth Stafford).

⁸⁴ TNA E101/422/15; TNA E101/422/16.

⁸⁵ In the medieval period, ‘the king’s household servants were there to guard his body and to fight for him’, and ‘when a medieval king went to war, his household troops formed the nucleus of his army’. Wilson, *Affinity*, p. 1.

⁸⁶ Starkey, ‘Intimacy’, in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 83-84; Starkey, ‘Representations’, in Guy (ed.), *Monarchy*, p. 52.

⁸⁷ This is reflected in ‘the scant reference to queens in the vast majority of fifteenth-century advice literature’. Laynesmith, *Queenship*, p. 4.

and needs, fulfilled the 'gendered' functions of monarchy on behalf of their mistress, and many of the duties, tasks and functions they performed may be described as 'women's work'.

A queen's Privy Chamber and its servants functioned in 'not admitting', specifically men, protecting her modesty, her dignity, and most importantly, the integrity of the crown.⁸⁸ Her first duty was to give birth to a male heir.⁸⁹ Ensuring the legitimacy of heirs was paramount. A queen's body was sacred, and she had to guard her chastity or risk compromising the purity of the true and royal bloodline.⁹⁰ But the lack of a male heir – or later, a 'spare' – was a source of anxiety, and apprehension. Publicly, queens were watched closely. Their physical attractiveness, character, demeanour, morality, health, fertility, and their relationships with the king, were all scrutinised by court and kingdom because of their implications for the succession. When a queen was heavily pregnant, some time between four and six weeks before the birth, she was to 'take her chamber', a highly-ritualised procession by which the queen, conducted by her ladies and gentlewomen, withdrew from the court to her confinement in her chambers. It was customary for queens to 'lie in' for up to forty days after the delivery until her 'churching', or purification, during which time men were no longer admitted to be in her presence, and women were to undertake all of their duties. The protocol for royal childbirth was recorded in *The Ryalle Booke*, or the ordinances of 1493, which observed that Elizabeth of York was to be taken 'to hir chamber where sche schall be delyvryd', at which time her men would 'take ther leve off the quene' and 'all the ladys and gentylwomen' were 'to go in with her and after that no man to come into hir chamber save

⁸⁸ There may have been one exception: Henry Webbe held the office of 'Gentleman Usher of the Privy Chamber' in 1540 (TNA SP 1/167 f. 140), indicating that he had access to the Privy chamber, but he was likely only admitted when the queen was not present, undertaking perhaps to order her chamberers in the manner gentleman ushers would give direction to yeomen and grooms of the chamber.

⁸⁹ 'A Quene ought to be chaste, ...and not curious in nourishynge of her children'. W. E. A. Axon (ed.), *The Game and Play of Chess* (London, 1969), p. 27.

⁹⁰ 'to the most fearful peril and danger of the destruction of [his] most royal person [the King] and to the utter loss, disherison and desolation of this [the] Realm of England'. J. R. Tanner (ed.), *Tudor Constitutional Documents: A.D 1485-1603* (Cambridge, 1922) pp. 383-395.

women and they to be made all maner off offecers'.⁹¹ It was likely a copy of these ordinances or similar instructions which were sent from William Mountjoy, Catherine of Aragon's lord chamberlain, to Cromwell on 24 July 1533, accommodating the new queen Anne Boleyn's pregnancy: 'I do sende vnto youe certaine remembraunces of thyngs necessary to be provyded ageinst the Quenys grace take the hyr chambre wherof I had experyence the tyme I dyd occupye the Rome. Hit may please you the same may be delyveryd vnto my Lorde hyr Chamberlaine for it was his desyer moche to have information therof'.⁹²

Ladies in Presence, or 'Great Ladies', and Maids-of-Honour, attended upon the queen in her Presence chamber.⁹³ At a banquet for the coronation of Anne Boleyn in 1533, for instance, Elizabeth Browne, countess of Worcester, stood beside the queen's chair, 'did hold a fine cloth before the Queen's face when she list to spit or do otherwise at her pleasure'.⁹⁴ A queen's Presence Chamber and its servants functioned in hospitality, diplomacy, and crucially, display. As Castiglione remarked in his *Book of the Courtier*, 'that woman lacks much who lacks beauty', as 'no court, however great it be, can have in it adornment or splendour or gaiety, without ladies, nor can any Courtier be graceful or pleasing or brave, or perform any gallant feat of chivalry, unless moved by the society and by the love and pleasure of ladies'.⁹⁵ In the queen's Presence chamber, the queen and her servants would host, entertain, and occasionally dine with the king, courtiers and councillors, and receive foreign ambassadors and dignitaries. Upon her arrival in England in 1501, Catherine of Aragon was received by her mother-in-law, Elizabeth of York, 'solemnely with moost honoure and behaviour' in 'the quenes chambre'. Therein 'after all the ladies and company of

⁹¹ BL Add MS 4712, f. 15r.

⁹² TNA SP 1/78, f. 27 (LP VI 890).

⁹³ Or sometimes, 'dining chamber': see LP VI 5 for extensive work done by carpenters, bricklayers etc. on 'the Queen's dining chamber' in the Tower of London.

⁹⁴ BL, Harleian MS, 41 f. 10 (LP VI 601).

⁹⁵ Castiglione, *Courtier*, pp. 174-176.

gentilwomene' was 'pleasure and goodly communycacioun, dauncyng, and disportes'.⁹⁶

When Catherine received the king and his servants in her apartments at Havering in 1519, she and her servants 'purveyed all thynges in the moste liberallest maner: and especially she made to the kyng suche a sumptuous banket', to such 'greate prayse' that 'the kyng thanked her hartely'.⁹⁷ When Anne Boleyn 'received the king at dinner in her chamber' in 1533, with 'many other lords and ladies' in attendance, it was 'richly ornamented with tapestry, and the most beautiful sideboard of gold that ever was seen'. At this banquet, the king was reportedly 'so much occupied with mirth and talk that he said little which could be understood'.⁹⁸

Knowing it was customary for the king to dine there, Ralph Sadler, Thomas Cromwell's secretary, on at least one occasion even attempted to conduct business with Henry 'in his going to the quenes chamber to supper'. Sadler appears to have escorted Henry right through to the queen's Presence chamber where, observing that the king was 'redy to washe and syt downe to supper', he left him. After supper, the king returned to his own chambers, and sent for him.⁹⁹

A stage for major ceremonial occasions, and demonstrating the queen's wealth and status, the queen's Presence Chamber was adorned with rich tapestries, furnishings and various other accoutrements. Like the king's Esquires for the Body,¹⁰⁰ maids-of-honour were 'to come into the Presence Chamber before eleven of the clock, and to goe to prayers, and

⁹⁶ G. Kipling (ed.), *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne* (Oxford, 1990), p. 37.

⁹⁷ *HC*, p. 62.

⁹⁸ *LP* VI 212; *CSP Sp* IV, ii. 1055. For ceremony, banquets, or pastime in the queen's Presence chamber, see also *CSP Ven*, IV, 105; *LP* IV 1704.

⁹⁹ *TNA SP* 1/106, f. 217 (*LP* XI 501).

¹⁰⁰ There was seemingly no equivalent to the queen's maids-of-honour in the king's Chamber, yet their presence somewhat mirrored the king's Esquires for the Body. Esquires for the Body served the king when he dined, and at night, slept on pallets in the presence chamber: crucially they were 'attendant uppon the King's person, in ryding, and going at alle tymes' and were 'to help serve his table, as the assewer will assigne' (*HO*, p. 45); they were to 'be redie and obedient at dyner and souper to serue the King... euery night, at eight of the clock, after souper is doon, on of the esquiers hauing the fee, be redie in the King's chamber' (*Arundell*, pp. 185-186).

after prayers attend untill the Queene bee sett at dynner'.¹⁰¹ When the queen dined publicly, she sat on a throne in her Presence chamber under a canopy, situated directly opposite the entrance, and strictly no other 'no manner of whatsoever degree he be of' was permitted to go beneath the 'cloth of estate'.¹⁰² 'At two of the clock', after the queen had her dinner, maids-of-honour were to return to the Presence chamber, 'there to remaine untill supper time', or 'for some reasonable time, especially when any ambassador hath audience'.¹⁰³ Foreign ambassadors and dignitaries were honoured with an audience with the queen in her Presence chamber. Their reports are punctuated with references of being taken by the king through 'to the Queen's chamber', wherein they were received by her ladies and maids-of-honour. In 1510, at Richmond, 'diuerse straungers' and 'Ambassadors of Spayne' dined with Henry, and after supper, the king 'willed them to go into the Queues chamber, who so did'.¹⁰⁴ In 1517, Sebastian Giustinian reported that an Imperial ambassador was taken by the king 'into the Queen's chamber', where Henry 'made her and all those ladies pay him as much honor as if he had been a sovereign, giving him amusements of every description'.¹⁰⁵ Giustinian's secretary, Nicolas Sagudino, wrote that, after the banquet, when the king and his guests 'betook themselves into another hall', i.e. the queen's Presence chamber, there were waiting 'the damsels of the most serene Queen', her maids-of-honour, who danced with them.¹⁰⁶ Likewise shortly after arriving in England in 1544, the duke of Najera, a Spanish envoy, was received in the queen's Guard chamber by Catherine Parr 'and many attendants'. He was then taken through to the queen's Presence chamber, 'to which the Queen and ladies followed and there was music and dancing', reportedly for several hours.¹⁰⁷ Their hospitality in welcoming

¹⁰¹ *HO*, p. 341.

¹⁰² BL Add. MS. 21116, f. 8v. See, for example, at Anne Boleyn's coronation banquet, when Edward Hall observed that the queen sat 'vnder her canapy' in her Presence chamber. *HC*, pp. 798-805.

¹⁰³ *HO*, p. 347.

¹⁰⁴ *HC*, p. 516.

¹⁰⁵ Giustinian, *Four Years*, vol. 2, pp. 97-8 (*LP* II 3455).

¹⁰⁶ *LP* II 3462.

¹⁰⁷ *LP* XIX, i., 296.

guests, and facilitating interactions at social and cultural gatherings in the queen's chambers, was interactive, and required of her servants a certain grace and gaiety. As Castiglione observed, 'in her ways, manners, words, gestures and bearing, a woman ought to be very unlike a man; for just as it befits him to show a certain stout and sturdy manliness, so it is becoming in a woman to have a soft and dainty tenderness with an air of womanly sweetness in her every movement'.¹⁰⁸

Ladies and Gentlewomen 'attendant',¹⁰⁹ were invited, or 'summoned',¹¹⁰ to attend upon the queen and perform in infrequent, formal roles on state occasions such as coronations, christenings, marriages, funerals or diplomatic summits. Like the Ladies in Presence and Maids-of-honour, these women created an amicable, relaxed environment, for 'pleasaunt' pastime and, even, diplomatic negotiation or conciliation. Henry's break with Rome, the annulment of his marriage to his first wife, Catherine of Aragon, and his subsequent treatment of her and their daughter, Mary, was disastrous for, and embittered relations with, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, Catherine's nephew. But shortly after the death of Catherine's successor, Anne Boleyn, Henry married Jane Seymour, and Eustace Chapuys, the Imperial ambassador, who had been outwardly hostile and highly critical of the king in his reports to Charles V for nearly a decade, was received by the royal couple in 'the chamber of the Queen, whom, for the King's satisfaction,' the ambassador reported, 'I kissed,

¹⁰⁸ Castiglione, *Courtier*, p. 175.

¹⁰⁹ The wives and widows of dukes, marquesses, earls, viscounts, or barons, who were themselves serving in the king's Chamber or council.

¹¹⁰ Servants who were sworn 'in extraordinary', who held no office, but were often prominent in court ceremonial, and their participation reflected the importance of their relationship with the crown. Although attendance was not strictly mandatory, it was felt their duty to appear, and to absent oneself without good reason could incur the wrath or displeasure of their sovereign. Henry himself wrote a letter of summons directly to 'the right dere and welbeloved' Anne, lady Cobham in 1533, having appointed her 'amongst other' to attend 'the Coronacion of our derest wif the Lady Anne our Quene, as to her astate and dignitie doth appertain'. 'Trusting that for the lyveraies and ordering of your said women aswell in their apparel as in their horssees', the king wrote, 'ye woll in suche wise provide for them as unto your honor and that solemnpnite apperteineth', ensuring that she and all of her own servants were properly attired for the occasion. Ellis, vol. 2, pp. 32-33.

and congratulated her on her marriage'. Henry appropriately enough chose to receive Chapuys in the queen's Presence chamber as the new marriage was conducive to making amends and reconciling with the Empire. While Henry, as Chapuys observed, 'had been talking to the other ladies', the ambassador took full advantage of the warm, relaxed atmosphere of his audience with Jane and 'begged her' to 'labour' for the restoration of Princess Mary to the line of succession.¹¹¹

All of the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber servants performed their duties, tasks and functions, often in elaborate ceremony, for the projection of the queen's majesty and magnificence, by maintaining her in regal state, ensuring that she always ate, slept, dressed, and was in every place treated and honoured like a queen. In this the queen's servants facilitated and fulfilled the theory and practice of queenship (chastity, pregnancy and the succession, companionship with the king, hospitality, diplomacy and display). The court and wider kingdom was a stage,¹¹² the act of service itself was symbolic, governed by ritual, and servants truly *performed* their roles, upholding the dignity, and demonstrating the wealth and status, of their mistress – or in the words of a contemporary, himself a servant:

...the dignyte of a prince requirethe vche office must haue oon
 To be rewlere in his rome a seruand hym waytynge on.
 Moore-ower hit requirethe euerich of them in office to haue perfite science,
 For dowe and drede doyng his souereyn displicence,
 Hym to attende, and his gestis to plesse in place where they ar presence,
 That his souereyn through his seruice may make grete congaudence.¹¹³

¹¹¹ LP X 1069.

¹¹² Steven Gunn and Antheun Janse (eds), *The Court as a Stage: England and the Low Countries in the Late Middle Ages* (Suffolk, 2006).

¹¹³ John Russell, usher of the chamber to Humphrey, duke of Gloucester. BL Harleian MS 4011, f. 188, in Frederick J. Furnivall (ed.), *Early English Meals and Manners: John Russell's Boke of Nurture* (London, 1868).

Here the Field of Cloth of Gold, the diplomatic summit which took place from 7 to 24 June 1520 between England and France, provides a case study for the ‘functioning’ of the queen’s household, for display, hospitality, sociability, and even diplomacy. The evidence for its preparations attests to the importance of their attendance. On 26 March 1520, Sir Richard Wingfield, English ambassador at the court of Francis I, reported that, in preparation for the summit, ‘great search is made to bring to the meeting the fairest ladies that may be found’ to accompany the queen, remarking that the queen Catherine of Aragon must ‘bring such in her band that the visage of England, which hath always had the prize’.¹¹⁴ ‘A Memoriall of such things as be requisite’ was drafted in early 1520, with detailed plans and regulations laid out for the summit, chiefly concerning the display of magnificence in the preparation of lodgings, dress, and limitations on the size of royal retinues. This ‘Memoriall’ accounted for the presence of both queens and their ladies and gentlewomen:

...the Kyngs Hyghnesse with hys Nobles, and the Qwene with her Ladyes and Jentylwomen, schall mete with the Frensche Kyng and hys Qwene, with thayr Nobles, Ladies and Gentilwomen, at the said place on horseback, and after embracyng of each other familerly, and the Qwenys to do semblablely for theyr parties, the said Kyngs, Qwenys, and thays traynes, forthwith to repayre to Calais in such goode order.¹¹⁵

A few months prior to the summit, Henry VIII ‘wrote letters of summons to all suche lordes, ladies, gentlemen and Gentlewomen as he felt should give their attendaunce on hym and the

¹¹⁴ *LP* III 698. Henry ‘wrote letters to all suche lordes, ladies, gentlemen and Gentlewomen as should geue their attendaunce on hym and the quene’, with the order that they must ‘put thei[m]selves in a redines after the moste costliest fashion’. *HC*, pp. 600–601.

¹¹⁵ ‘A Memoriall of such things as be requisite’, hereafter ‘Memoriall’, in ‘Two papers relating to the interview between Henry the Eighth of England and Francis the First of France’, ed. John Caley, *Archaeologia*, 21 (1827), pp. 176–91 (pp. 184, 190).

quene'.¹¹⁶ Although their attendance was not mandatory, it was felt their duty to appear, and to absent oneself without good reason could incur the wrath or displeasure of their sovereign.

That entire households were transported, with Catherine's journeying to Calais and Guînes, and Claude's to Ardres, to be in attendance at the summit, is indicative of their importance to their queenship. Through the months of March, April and May in 1520, Wingfield was tasked with arranging the summit by facilitating communications between the sovereign kings. His correspondence reveals that the date of the meeting was carefully calculated to ensure queen Claude, who was heavily pregnant, could attend. When Henry requested that the meeting be delayed until the end of June, Francis refused, stating that if his wife was to travel any later than planned it 'myght be dangerous vnto to the frute she berythe'.¹¹⁷ It was concluded that there could be no such delay if the queen was to be there. 'All the concession he would make was that, if Henry would be at Calais on 4th June,' then he could 'prolong the assembly', but only for as long as Claude's condition would allow.¹¹⁸ 'The Queen's state of health will not allow of delay', Francis warned, and later remarked that 'the continual travel he caused the Queen here to take, being in the case that she is in' should leave Henry in no doubt of his resolve and commitment to meet with him.¹¹⁹ 'The King's highness would not for anything', Wingfield assured Francis, 'but that sh[e should be] at the assembly, without the which his highness thought the[re should] lack one great part of the perfection of the feast.'¹²⁰ These remarks by Wingfield and the urgency with which Francis ensured they kept to time, accommodating Claude's pregnancy, demonstrate that her

¹¹⁶ *HC*, pp. 600-601.

¹¹⁷ BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VII, ff. 205-206 (*LP* III 725); BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VII, f. 184 (*LP* III 697).

¹¹⁸ BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VII, ff. 198-201 (*LP* III 723).

¹¹⁹ BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VII, f. 195 (*LP* III 726); BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VII, f. 216 (*LP* III 808). Wingfield wrote to Henry, 'I assure your grace you would have no little compassion if y[e saw] the poor creature with the charge she beareth.'

¹²⁰ BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VII, f. 184 (*LP* III 697).

attendance, and by extension, that of her ladies and gentlewomen, was seen as integral to the summit.

Their physical appearance and presence constituted ‘queenliness’, or the feminine expression of queenship, and their bodies and virtues were appropriated in its construction. In this, clothing, the wearing of costly jewels and rich garments, was materially, and culturally, significant.¹²¹ The ‘Memoriall’, again, observed that ‘the Kyngs householde shalbe warned to prepare theymselves in their best mans apparelled, accordyng to their estates and degrees, to attend upon his grace at this metyng’.¹²² Undoubtedly, this ordinance was laid out for servants in the queen’s household too. Dressing the queen and her attendants required the utmost attention to detail. It is not difficult to conceive of how, upon receiving the summons from the king, these women will have urgently besought their silkwomen to ensure that they were properly attired for the occasion. The accounts of Elis Hilton, Catherine’s yeoman of the robes, reveal that she laid out vast sums – as much as £710, 3s. 1½d. from April to May 1520 alone – indicating that the queen took care in outfitting her household appropriately, concerning herself with the detail of their attire.¹²³ Both queens and their ladies and gentlewomen had approximately two or three months to ‘put theirownes in a redynes after the moste costliest fashion’, and they did not disappoint. As the chronicler Edward Hall remarked, ‘To tell you the apparel of the ladies, their riche attyres, their sumptuous luelles, their diuersities of beauties... I assure you ten mennes wittes can scarce declare it.’¹²⁴

¹²¹ Hayward, *Dress*, pp. 301-316 for dressing the households of Henry VIII’s queens.

¹²² ‘Memoriall’, p. 178.

¹²³ TNA E 315/242/3, fos. 22v-31r (*LP* III 852). Michelle Beer has examined the ‘material diplomacy’ of Catherine of Aragon and her household at the summit. ‘Using her clothing and the liveries of her household, Catherine inserted symbols of her dynasty and of Spain into the Anglo-French spectacle, thus publicly offering the English an alternative to the alliance with France’. Beer, *Queenship*, p. 60.

¹²⁴ *HC*, pp. 615, 618.

In royal palaces, or ‘on progress’, the queen and her ladies and gentlewomen often became the focus for display. The queen’s regal status and majesty was proclaimed by overaweing and impressing visitors through extravagance. On 5 June, Henry and Catherine travelled from Calais to their royal lodgings, the portable palace, or castle, at Guînes. Adorned with cloth of gold, the queen rode through the town on horseback, alongside the king and in procession ‘with her trayne of ladies’, in full view of attendees.¹²⁵ At a banquet held on 10 June, Catherine’s gentlewomen were ‘richlie appareled in cloth of gould velvet and silkes after the most gorgeous fashion’.¹²⁶ The masculine display of military prowess at the jousts taking place on 11 June was balanced by the feminine display of both queens Catherine and Claude, and their ladies and gentlewomen, ‘richly dressed in jewels, and with many chariots, litters and hackneys covered with cloth of gold and silver, emblazoned with their arms’.¹²⁷ Extensive, and occasionally detailed reports by foreign ambassadors in attendance concentrated on their physical appearance, though such accounts these could be distorted by their own prejudices or tastes, and they did not hesitate in their scrutiny. Soardino, the Mantuan ambassador to France, was unlikely to be neutral in observing that Catherine’s ladies ‘were ornamented in the English fashion, but were not richly clad’. Claude, on the other hand, was ‘accompanied by forty ladies of high rank, richly dressed and with jewels’.¹²⁸ Whereas the English ladies were on this occasion described as ‘well-dressed but ugly’, at a masque on 24 June, the French ladies were, again, ‘richly attired’, all ‘dressed in the Italian fashion with velvet caps, round which were feathers’.¹²⁹ This contrast is reiterated by an anonymous report, which described Catherine’s women as ‘handsome and well arrayed’, though again, compared them unfavourably with the French ladies, ‘all dressed in

¹²⁵ CSP Ven, III, 68.

¹²⁶ ‘The meating of the king of England and the emperour at Canterburie and the meating of the said king and the French king at Guysnes anno domini 1520 anno viith of his raigne.’ Bodleian MS Ashmole 1116, f. 101r.

¹²⁷ ‘L’Ordonnance et ordre du tournoy’, summarised in *LP* III 870.

¹²⁸ CSP Ven, III, 81.

¹²⁹ CSP Ven, III, 50.

crimson velvet, their sleeves lined with cloth of gold, a beautiful fashion, which the English is not'.¹³⁰ Though not all of the attendees were altogether impressed with the attire of the French ladies, Polydore Vergil felt it was 'singularly unfit for the chaste', and regretted that many of the English ladies in attendance had taken up the fashion, 'abandoning for the most part the far more modest costume of their forebears.'¹³¹ It is likely that their success in projecting magnificence was limited by differences in taste, fashions and culture, though it was inevitable that England and France would be measured against one another. Mirroring the rivalry of the kings Henry and Francis, as the ambassador Wingfield had predicted, there was much comparison, even competition, between the queens and their women, with one observer remarking yet more plainly that they were 'all vieing with each other in beauty and ornamented apparel'.¹³²

Certainly their contemporaries focused their reports on their physical appearance and attire, but there is evidence that the ladies and gentlewomen in attendance were engaged in the summit in ways which were more than merely decorative. At a banquet held on 10 June, Francis I was reportedly 'received in the most courteous manner possible'.¹³³ Catherine's ladies and gentlewomen were accomplished, and well-rehearsed, in welcoming and entertaining guests, as they did on many occasions in the queen's chambers in England.

'When that dinner was doune', Francis

passed the tyme in the banqueting chamber with dauncing among the ladies first erre
that he dide daunce he went from one ende of the chamber to thother on both sides and

¹³⁰ CSP Ven, III, 84.

¹³¹ *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil, A. D. 1485-1537*, ed. and trans. Denys Hay, *Royal Historical Society*, Camden Series, vol. 74 (London, 1950), p. 269.

¹³² CSP Ven III 69.

¹³³ *La description et ordre du camp, festins et joustes*, summarised in LP III 869.

with his capp in his hand and kissed the ladies and gentilweomen one after an other...saving iiii or fyve that were ould and not faire standing together.¹³⁴

How queen Catherine and her ladies reacted to this faux pas cannot now be known, though one can imagine that these women often had to bite their tongue to keep up appearances. They dined again with Francis in the queen's chambers two weeks later, on which occasion the king staged a masque.¹³⁵ Ladies and gentlewomen were 'apparaled in masking clothes with vizers on their faces gorgiouslie besene', and they all 'danced to the sound of fifes'.¹³⁶ Such occasions facilitated close interaction between the English and the French courts, so that they 'shall se and conuerse together familiarly, to the ende that it may engender betwene them an amitie more firme and stable, for that cause and that more suerly and agreeably they may bee together'.¹³⁷ It was reported that 'there was very great abundance of good cheer, and vast pomp',¹³⁸ as 'the Frenchmen' were 'making merry with the English women, and the Englishmen with the French women'.¹³⁹

Surely aiding in the merriment were the stores of wine and beer flowing freely at the summit.¹⁴⁰ The Mantuan ambassador observed that, 'in the long hall were prepared two large cupboards of silver-gilt vases, constantly used by persons drinking, and the Englishwomen never gave those bowls and flasks any rest'.¹⁴¹ At a tournament held at Guînes on 11 June, in

¹³⁴ Bodleian MS Ashmole 1116, f. 101r.

¹³⁵ In preparing the queen's lodgings to accommodate the festivities, it was observed that there was to be a 'large chamber', which was 'to joyne to and uppon the Qwenes lodgyng for Ladyes and Gentylweme to daunce in', and a 'withdrawyng' chamber, whereunto the Qwenys Ladies and Gentylwemen may pawse and repayre, as the cas schall requyre'. 'Memoriall', p. 189.

¹³⁶ Bodleian MS Ashmole 1116, f. 102v; 'Memoriall', pp. 182-183, for instructions for 'an honorable Mumery' in which the ladies were to take part.

¹³⁷ 'Memoriall', p. 190; *HC*, p. 603.

¹³⁸ *CSP Ven*, III, 50.

¹³⁹ *CSP Ven*, III, 83.

¹⁴⁰ Within the temporary 'palace' constructed in Guînes for the English court, there was a 'very large cellar, most excellently stored with every sort of good wine'. (*CSP Ven*, III, 94). An estimate of the expenses incurred for the summit observed that there was to be 700 qrs. of wine, at 12s. a quarter, 150 tonnes of French and Gascon wine, at 110s. a tonne, and 560 tonnes of beer, at 20s. a tonne, which, when calculated with the food, came to an astonishing £7,633. *TNA SP 1/20*, f. 179 (*LP III* 919, ii).

¹⁴¹ *CSP Ven*, III, 94.

the midst of the summit, one of the queen's ladies 'took a large flask of wine, and putting it to her lips, drank freely, and then passed it to her companions, who did the like and emptied it'. 'Not content with this, they drank out of large cups, which, during the joust', it was observed, 'circulated more than twenty times amongst the French lords and those English ladies'! The Mantuan ambassador in attendance stood aghast, remarking a few days later that these ladies 'were neither very handsome nor very graceful'.¹⁴² A country was judged by its spectacles. It may be that this unflattering report of the queen's attendants drinking freely, and without ceremony, hardly perpetuated an image of virtue, or magnificence. Yet as the French lords too were partaking in the merriment, a more nuanced reading of the evidence suggests that these women were engaging in the 'performance' of familiarity required of diplomacy, embracing fully the spirit of the summit, a celebration of peace. The chronicler Edward Hall regarded only their 'good behaviour from day to day since the first metyng'.¹⁴³ The bishop John Fisher, whose account survives in a sermon preached shortly after the summit, was in attendance on the queen's side, and as such was an eyewitness to all these festivities. Though Fisher condemned the cost, extravagance and wastefulness of the summit, of the 'fayre ladyes' he testified only to their 'sumptuose and gorgeous apparell', and their active participation in 'suche daunsynges, suche armonyces, suche dalyaunce, and so many pleasaunt pastymes'.¹⁴⁴ That neither Hall nor Fisher made mention of any disorder by the women suggests that their behaviour was seen, at least by the English camp, in good cheer.

At the end of the summit, it was judged that Henry and Francis were apparently like 'perfect friends, giving hope of good-will and union between these two nations, which for

¹⁴² CSP Ven, III, 81.

¹⁴³ HC, p. 618.

¹⁴⁴ 'Here after ensueth two fruytfull sermons, made [and] compyled by the right reverende father in God John Fysshier, Doctour of dyvynyte and Bysshop of Rochester', in Cecilia A. Hatt (ed.), *English Works of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester: Sermons and Other Writings, 1520-1535* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 212-254.

many years have been bred in hatred of each other'. Clearly it was the men who would be commended for their role, 'this change being effected through the wisdom and virtue of both the sovereigns, who are anxious for the peace of Christendom'. But it was not to last, as in the words of Fisher, 'theyr wylls dyd chaunge and nat abyde'. Notwithstanding the relative success – or failure – of the summit, and lacking this formal recognition of their role by their contemporaries, the Field of Cloth of Gold was a triumph for women. As they accompanied the queen, riding on horseback in procession, dined and danced with kings, engaged in the chivalric culture of the jousts, or kept up conversation and merriment with attendees, ladies and gentlewomen demonstrated their importance both practically and culturally, and the power of their presence, visually, materially, and diplomatically. All of the queens' women were crucial for the practice, construction and display of queenship. Between them they met the functions of her household: hospitality, sociability, and, at times, all too conspicuous consumption! Through their participation in the crowded agenda of banquets, feasts, pageants, masques, jousts and tournaments,¹⁴⁵ and by their beauty, charm, gaiety, and, occasionally drunken, diplomacy, these women encouraged friendship and goodwill, or at least, eased tensions and deflected attention from irreconcilable differences between the two countries.¹⁴⁶

In many ways this chapter has maintained a strictly 'institutional' view of the queen's household, which, as a result, appears as a secondary, or subsidiary, of the king's household. The nature of her attendants' duties were formally circumscribed, but this does not mean that the queen's servants could play no meaningful role, nor does it mean that the queen's

¹⁴⁵ 'There was gossip at court that the king was annoyed by the lack of physical attractions among Catherine's ladies; in plain words, he thought them a pack of crows', a reference not only to their looks but the daily uniform of her gentlewomen'. James, *Parr*, p. 127; BL Cotton, Caligula, E, IV, f. 55 for Henry VIII's letter from France and lack of enthusiasm for Catherine's ladies.

¹⁴⁶ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, p. 234.

household was doomed to domesticity. Unlike the king's household, the queen's household was headed – at least, figuratively – not by the sovereign, but the wife of the sovereign, a woman. This meant that its servants functioned for the practice, construction and display of queenship, and that many of them necessarily had to be women. Queens did undertake roles that were gendered, and thus required the attendance of women in her household. But the act of service itself was not gendered. Nor was gender central to the manner in which women carried out their role as servants. The offices held by men in the queen's household too, as they were described in surviving ordinances, were intrinsically, and essentially, domestic. That these servants were on the queen's side and not the king's side, or indeed that these servants were themselves men, or women, was, in many ways, inconsequential, as they performed nearly identical duties, tasks and functions.¹⁴⁷

This 'institutional' analysis of the queen's household alone, however, is restrictive and insufficient in evaluating the careers of its servants. Ordinances, for instance, were prescriptive, not descriptive. How the formal, or institutional, hierarchy of the household, might be challenged, or circumvented, must be explored. Offices merely laid the foundation for a career in royal service. It must be observed that what constituted 'service' in this period cannot be strictly or narrowly defined by the duties, tasks and functions performed specific to the offices they held. The Eltham ordinances of 1526 provided for servants to 'give their continuall and diligent attendance' and 'have a vigilant and reverent respect and eye' for the queen, so that, merely by her 'looke or countenance' they 'may know what lacketh', to know and act on the queen's pleasure 'to be had or done'.¹⁴⁸ Servants were always anxious to know 'the Queen's pleasure', and if the queen gave an order, very few, if any, of them, would have

¹⁴⁷ This much is clear in that many of these men served in both households, merely transferring their services from one Chamber to another.

¹⁴⁸ *HO*, p. 156.

dared disobey it, and none would have done so lightly or without the threat of punishment or dismissal. The multiplicity, or complexity of demands by the master or mistress was interminable. Nothing was outside of the scope of their activity, and their role cannot be defined strictly in terms of office. As will be demonstrated, servants were drawn in to the queen's affairs, and could be called upon or engaged in matters more *ad hoc* or further afield, in the wider court and kingdom, whatsoever they may be.¹⁴⁹ That the king too could order his queens' servants widened the potential scope, and significance, of their involvement still yet further. Nor were these *ad hoc* duties formalised or represented in the ordinances of the household. Servants were sworn by oath to be loyal and faithful to their master, or mistress, to obey them in *everything*. The nature of service was thus determined, and in a sense, negotiated, between master and servant. What mattered was not necessarily what they were doing, but their ability or capacity to do it, and do it well – to achieve whatsoever their master or mistress commanded or desired.¹⁵⁰ More than an institution, service was a *relationship* between master, or mistress, and servant, and it is this relationship which must be examined to broaden our understanding of what it meant to serve in the royal household in this period. As will be demonstrated, it was much less the sex or gender of a servant that determined the nature of their career,¹⁵¹ than it was access, intimacy, and the personality of the king, or queen, sovereign, or consort.

¹⁴⁹ Sir Peter Mewtas, gentleman of the king's Privy Chamber, for instance, was sent abroad in 1537 tasked with killing Cardinal Pole with a handgun. Nearly ten years later, he was sent to Normandy as a spy. (Starkey, 'Court', p. 88.) There is evidence of more *ad hoc* duties in the accounts of queens, though these entries are tantalising. Bryan Lee, Catherine Parr's yeoman of the chamber, for instance, travelled from Chelsea to London in 1547 'for the Quenes afferys by the Quenes comanndment'. TNA E101/424/12, f. 4.

¹⁵⁰ Simon Adams suggests that the end of Elizabeth I's reign saw a 'redefinition of service'. What constituted service was previously defined by the crown 'at will', whereas by the 1590s service was increasingly subject to wider criteria (there was 'public service', and 'some types of service would be more worthy than others'), which 'created a new justification for criticism and discontent'. Simon Adams, 'The patronage of the crown in Elizabethan politics: the 1590s in perspective', in John Guy (ed.), *The reign of Elizabeth I: Court and culture in the last decade* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 44-45.

¹⁵¹ See, again, Elizabeth I's Privy Chamber, Pam Wright concludes that because the department was 'essentially female', it was neutralised. Yet it is clear that it was the personality of the sovereign Elizabeth, not the sex of her Privy Chamber servants, which mattered: as Wright observes, it was Elizabeth who was 'determined to preserve her freedom of action' and 'vigorously suppressed any unauthorised meddling by her Ladies'. Wright admits that these women could and did regularly promote the suits of individual courtiers' and 'could assist the

promotion of larger suits and requests for favour': their involvement in the 'fraught politics of the 1560s' which 'touched the Privy Chamber', notably the queen's marriage and the succession, was 'more or less inevitable', and this too not because of their sex, but their position. Wright, 'Ramifications', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 161, 167, 172.)

Chapter 2

No study as yet has examined the queen's household during the period from 1527 to 1547. What was the impact of Henry VIII's marital instability on the households of his queens and the careers of their servants? We have studied at length the political and the religious crises that occurred as a result, but rarely the domestic. It has been suggested that the queen's servants 'smoothly passed from one royal establishment to the next',¹ and that 'the personnel in the queen's household remained relatively stable despite Henry VIII's rapid change of wives' in a period of 'exceptional instability'.² 'While Henry's queens had come and gone,' it has been observed, 'their servants had been a remarkably stable body'.³ Yet no conclusive evidence is cited, and it is clear that much of this rests on guesswork. These statements are yet to be rigorously tested. Although use of the word 'continuity' is rather more cautious – and accurate – than 'stability', still the evidence, when it has been cited, represents only a fraction of the documents which can be drawn together to reconstruct the households of Henry VII and Henry VIII's queens.

It has been shown that the succession of a new monarch demanded an overhaul in personnel, as they brought with them many of their own servants, whose claims took precedence over previous incumbents. A new sovereign required a new household. From 1485 to 1603, the structural makeup of the English royal household transformed with

¹ Evans, *Ladies-in-Waiting*, p. 179.

² Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, p. 211.

³ David Starkey, *Six Wives: The Queens of Henry VIII* (London, 2004), p. 747; Retha M. Warnicke ('some continuity of the consorts' staff and officials can be ascertained') uses the more readily-accessible calendars and abstracts of household lists found in the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*. Warnicke, *Fashioning Tudor Queenship*, pp. 61-63; Hamilton, 'Parr', pp. 2, 68 ('despite the turmoil of the period, there was a surprising sense of continuity between the households of the king's wives'); Hayward, *Dress*, p. 302 ('there was some continuity in staffing the household's of Henry VIII's wives') made similar observations. It is worth stating that none of the works cited focused on servants, or on their careers, and thus a full survey of the evidence for the households of queens would have been somewhat outside of their scope.

successive monarchs. Henry VIII's accession, for instance, saw an overhaul in personnel in the king's household, as his father's servants were replaced by his own 'boon companions'. As David Starkey observed, the new king's enthusiasm for sports and pastime characterised life in his household and created a new circle of intimates.⁴ Where there was stability, or continuity, between reigns, it was intentional, often practical, even political. Politically, and strategically, both Mary I and Elizabeth I took care in appointing their personal servants. R. C. Braddock has shown that, for Mary, 'past loyalty and religion' were paramount, while for Elizabeth 'bureaucratic routine took precedence'.⁵ There was continuity between Mary and Elizabeth, in spite of their confessional differences. Ralph Houlbrooke has suggested that 'good sense and well-judged pragmatism' saw former Marian councillors, for their 'expertise and experience', retained by Elizabeth.⁶ Kevin Sharpe characterised the transition from James I to Charles I as a 'compromise': though Charles 'had his own servants to reward', he 'had to satisfy the officers of his father's household who now petitioned for confirmation of their places'.⁷ It remains, as Steven Gunn remarked, that 'detailed and sustained consideration has not yet been given to the impact of the change of rulers on such men's careers, or to the impact of such careers on the continuity of politics and government'.⁸ This thesis extends this to consider the change of queens, or mistresses of the household, and its impact on the careers of not strictly men, but women too.

Investigating the impact of Henry VIII's marital instability, the first half of this chapter examines appointments to the queen's household. It focuses on petitions for

⁴ Starkey, 'Intimacy', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 76.

⁵ Robert C. Braddock, 'To Serve the Queen', in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock (eds), *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010), pp. 225-238, (p. 225, p. 229).

⁶ Ralph Houlbrooke, 'What Happened to Mary's Councilors', in Hunt and Whitelock (eds), *Tudor Queenship*, pp. 209-224.

⁷ Kevin Sharpe, 'The image of virtue: the court and household of Charles I, 1625-1642', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 228.

⁸ Gunn, 'Structures of Politics', p. 62.

preferment to determine who was in charge of granting office and to illuminate the process by which such appointments were made. Did queens merely inherit the establishments of their predecessors, or could they appoint their own servants? The second half analyses the composition of the queen's household from 1485 to 1547. Using the household of Anne Boleyn as a case study, it provides a prosopographical view of its composition, illustrating how queens formed networks of support and obligation. Like the *Tudor Networks of Power* project, this chapter uses relational information to facilitate an examination of networks of queens, the core of which were their households.⁹ It also considers length of service, or tenure, in the careers of the queen's servants, using quantitative data. Did serving in the queen's household in this period represent an 'opportunity for sustained, even lifelong, employment'? 'Women who performed their tasks in the queen's household successfully', or 'who developed independent ties with the queen', it has been suggested by Barbara J. Harris, 'often retained their offices'.¹⁰ Yet, again, no conclusive evidence is cited.¹¹ The 'transition' is an important, yet often overlooked, aspect of royal service. It must be asked who kept their offices in the household, and *why*. Remarkably, there were six queens consort from 1527 to 1547, whose households ran almost consecutively, thus providing an opportunity to analyse the 'art' of transition.

Appointments to the queen's household

Households were established upon, or shortly after marrying, the king. Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, for instance, were married at Whitehall on 30 May 1536, and within a few days, Sir

⁹ Anheer, Anheer, Coleman and Weingart, *The Network Turn*, p. 54. Anheer, and Anheer, *Tudor Networks of Power*.

¹⁰ Harris, *Women*, pp. 210, 211, 217.

¹¹ Harris cites the career of Jane Parker, lady Rochford, who served five out of six of Henry's queens. Although Jane did remain at court to serve five queens successively, her career was not forged in professionalism. Harris, *Women*, p. 216.

John Russell reported that Jane was being ‘served by her own servants, who were sworn that same day’.¹² The chronicler Charles Wriothesley recorded that, on 4 June, Jane was ‘proclaymed Queene at Greenewych, and went in procession, after the King, with a great traine of ladies followinge after her’. She ‘began her howsehold that daie, dyning in her chamber of presence under the cloath of estate’.¹³

Who appointed the queen’s servants? By the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century in England, when an individual was sworn to serve in office, they were issued a warrant which, upon the payment of a fee, was enrolled on a patent roll in the Chancery, documenting their names and dating their entry into the household. No such records exist for the early Tudor period. Offices were not granted by warrant but ‘by word of mouth... and so were not enrolled’.¹⁴ As a result, it can be difficult to trace the process by which these appointments were made, or to know more precisely who made them. The Eltham ordinances of 1526 stated that the lord chamberlain and vice-chamberlain were to ‘presenteth, chargeth, and dischargeth, all suche persounes as be of the... chaumbre’, and to ‘name, preferre, and present’ men and women whom they deemed fit to serve the queen.¹⁵ All servants were to be judged by his or her ‘condition’, or disposition. They were to be sincere, truthful, respectable, with good manners, morals and behaviour, a pleasing temperament, upright in mind, conduct, character and appearance, as opposed to sly, deceitful, or explicitly seeking their own advancement.¹⁶ And thus the queen’s lord chamberlain and vice-chamberlain were ‘to make

¹² *Lisle*, III, 713, pp. 395-6.

¹³ *WC*, vol 1., pp. 43-44. Edward Hall observed that it was ‘at Whitsontyde’ (4 June) that Jane was ‘openlye shewed as Quene’. *HC*, p. 819. The household of Anne of Cleves was something of an exception to this rule. On 6 January 1540, it was reported that her servants ‘were appointed before the coming of Madame’. *Lisle*, VI, 1636, p. 12. Some of her servants received Anne at Dover, while the rest greeted her when she arrived at Greenwich. *WC*, vol. 1, pp. 109-111; *HC*, pp. 832-838.

¹⁴ Fiona Kisby, ‘Officers and Office-Holding at the English Court: A Study of the Chapel Royal, 1485-1547’, *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 32 (1999), pp. 1-61. (pp. 5-6).

¹⁵ *HO*, pp. 31-32; Myers, *Household*, pp. 105-6.

¹⁶ *Lisle*, III, p. 25.

search and report thereof', and 'to put aparte all favour, affection, hate, and partiality', so that 'none other... be admitted into any roome, office, or place' within the household '...but such as be of good towardnesse, likelihood, behaviour, demeanour, and conversation'.¹⁷

Although the queen's lord-chamberlain might recommend an individual for service, the right to appoint them lay outside of his jurisdiction. If there were many individuals who were all qualified, and all vying for the same position, what recommended them for royal service? Who held the power, or had the authority, actually to grant office? And how was their choice determined? The evidence, such as it is, is varied and inconsistent. Petitions, for preferment to the queen's household, are thus crucial. Positions in the queen's household were highly coveted. Men and women often went to extraordinary lengths to secure an appointment. From the view of the English nobility and gentry, the queen's household provided additional opportunities to make and maintain their relationships with the crown. From the view of the queen herself, appointments were of utmost interest, as they had the potential to create, maintain, branch her networks throughout the wider court and kingdom.

Petitioners or would-be servants vying for office would often solicit the queen directly, or her servants, whom they could trust were in a position to advance their suit. On 12 July 1540, Catherine Howard received a letter from Joan Bulmer, an old acquaintance with whom she had served in the household of Agnes Tilney, dowager duchess of Norfolk: '...yt yst shewyd vnto me', Joan began, 'that god of hyse hyghe goodness hathe sent vnto the knowlege of the kyng a kontrakt of a mattrymony that the quyne had mad wythe an nother before she came un to england and therapone theyrse a lawfole devors had between them and

¹⁷ *HO*, p. 146. 'As often as he chargeth or dischargeth any new person in the chaumbre,' the lord chamberlain was 'to present those persones and names into the countynghouse'. *HO*, pp. 31-32; Myers, *Household*, pp. 105-6.

as yt yst thoughte the kyng of hyse goodness wyl set you in the same honuar that she wase in.’¹⁸ The king’s marriage to Anne of Cleves had been annulled on 9 July, and within a few weeks of receiving Joan’s letter, Catherine married Henry and became queen. Finding herself to be in ‘the moost mesary of the world and moost wrechyd lyf meny mo ways then I cane expres’, Joan wrote in some haste and urged Catherine to remember ‘the unfaynyd love that my hart hathe alwayes borne toward you’, before petitioning her directly for preferment to her household. ‘I besyche you to stay some rome [i.e. office] for me what you shal thynke best yourself, for the nerar I ware to you the glader I wold be’.¹⁹ When Francis Goldsmith was appointed to serve Catherine Parr in 1543, he wrote to the queen to express his gratitude, praising her ‘singular kindness’ and ‘generosity’ in admitting him as her gentlemen usher.²⁰

In around 1531, a man named John Creke found himself, in his own words, ‘at point of preferment’ to Catherine of Aragon’s household after petitioning her servants to speak with her on his behalf. ‘My fall was so low, that, without help of friends,’ Creke remarked, ‘I cannot rise’. ‘By the labor of the Spaniards’, that is, the queen’s Spanish servants, Creke expected that he would ‘enter into service with the Queen at 7d. a day’.²¹ But it was reportedly ‘by the labor’ of the queen’s lord chamberlain, William Mountjoy, her almoner, probably Sir Robert Dymock, and her receiver-general, Griffith Richards, that Creke ‘was appointed to be admitted her gentleman usher’.²² In the view of these petitioners and would-be servants, the power to appoint in the queen’s household lay in the hands of the queen

¹⁸ TNA SP 1/161, f. 85 (*LP* XV 875).

¹⁹ TNA SP 1/161, f. 85 (*LP* XV 875). Joan Bulmer was described as Catherine’s ‘bedfellow’ before she became queen (*LP* XVI 1321).

²⁰ Mueller, pp. 75-78 (*LP* XVIII, ii., 531).

²¹ TNA SP 1/68, f. 137 (*LP* V 652).

²² TNA SP 1/81, f. 95 (*LP* VI 1642). It was unfortunate for Creke that Catherine, at the time of his suit, was exiled and ostracised by the king, and as such herself in a precarious state, as the queen later informed him that ‘she will take no servants till such time as she may be more in quietness than now she is’. See also, an earlier suit, when a friend of Mountjoy’s wrote to him in the spring of 1522 to commend the bearer of his letter and inquire if he ‘shall have anything to do in the Queen’s court’. TNA SP 1/24, f. 159 (*LP* III 2279).

herself, and by extension, her servants. At least one other suit corroborates this. Shortly after Jane Seymour became queen, Honor, lady Lisle, began aggressively courting her gentlewomen servants in an effort to find preferment for her daughters, Anne and Katherine Basset. Lisle sent various gifts and tokens, and kept regular correspondence with the queen's servants through her agent in London, John Husee, who informed her on 17 July 1537 that, at the suit of Eleanor Paston, 'my lady of Rutland', and Mary Arundell, 'my lady Sussex', of the Privy Chamber, the queen had promised to take one of her daughters as her maid-of-honour. 'The matter is thus arranged that you shall send them both over', reported Husee, 'that her Grace may see them herself, and take which she pleases'.²³ Husee was quite explicit in his report that it was Jane herself who mattered.²⁴

Here the queen's hand in appointing her own servants is clearly discernible. Even Catherine Howard, who apparently 'did not see fit to spend her days in the sober administration of her house',²⁵ must have had a hand in appointing her childhood acquaintances from Lambeth and Horsham, like Francis Dereham, as her gentleman usher, and Katherine Tylney, as her chamberer, as this was later used against her to secure her own conviction. The indictment read that, in 1541, Catherine had 'traitorously retained' Dereham, a man with whom she had before led an 'abominable, base, carnal, voluptuous, and vicious life, like a common harlot', and Tylney, 'who was procuratrix between them and knew of their carnal life'.²⁶ The queen's attainder repeated the accusation: that Catherine 'tooke most trayterouslye to her service the same person with whome she used that vicious lyef before,

²³ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp.150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

²⁴ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp.150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271). Husee reported that Jane wanted to 'see them and know their manners, fashions and conditions', i.e. to observe their appearance and demeanour.

²⁵ Smith, *Catherine*, p. 137.

²⁶ *LP* XVI 1395; *LP* XVI 1470. The indictment was not actually presented at Catherine's trial, as she did not stand trial, but instead at the trial of her fellow accused, Francis Dereham and Thomas Culpeper. It is, however, explicit in the charges which were levied against Catherine, and was perhaps drawn up for that purpose before it was decided to proceed against her by Act of Attainder.

whose name was Fraunces Dereham', and 'calling also to her service in rowme of Chamberer a woman whiche was pryvie to her naughtie lief before'.²⁷ This was reiterated by the king's council, who made it clear that both appointments were made by the queen herself, and were taken as 'prof of will to retorne to her olde and abhomynable lief'.²⁸ The limitations of this evidence are obvious. The purpose of the indictment was, for the prosecution, to convincingly levy the charges laid against the queen, before presenting it at trial. Yet as the only tie of these old acquaintances to the court was Catherine, there is little reason to doubt it.

Although Henry VIII's fifth wife was able to surround herself with old acquaintances, companions and 'bedfellows' from her youth, the lack of foreign-born servants retained in her predecessor, Anne of Cleves', household warns that not all of Henry's queens were necessarily indulged to the same degree as his 'rose without a thorn'. When Anne arrived in Calais on her journey to Dover, the appearance of the German maids in her retinue of over 300 caused quite a stir. 'She brings from her brother's country 12 or 15 damsels', reported Charles de Marillac, a French diplomat, 'inferior in beauty even to their mistress and dressed so heavily and unbecomingly that they would almost be thought ugly even if they were beautiful'.²⁹ Henry intervened and ordered that arrangements be made for the 'strange maidens' to return to Cleves.³⁰ The king may have been concerned with the potential cost or financial strain of subsidising them, or perhaps he suspected these 'strangers' could, as they often did, exercise undue influence on his new bride, or even act as spies for their homeland. Most, if not virtually *all* of the gentlemen and women identified by Nicholas Wotton in

²⁷ *SOR*, III, pp. 857-8. 'The fact that she has since taken to her service one Francis Dereham, the person with whom she used that vicious life before, and has taken as chamberer a woman who was privy to her naughty life before, is proof of her will to return to her old abominable life' (*LP* XVII 28).

²⁸ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 250 (*LP* XVI 1334).

²⁹ *LP* XV 22; *LP* XV 23.

³⁰ Anne kept at least Dr. Cornelius Zifford, her physician, Gertrude Wyllyk and Katherine Malecrowde, her gentlewomen, and Lowe, the Mother of the Maids.

December 1539 as those who ‘came with the Queen’s grace to England’, and who intended ‘to continue with her’, were promptly sent back.³¹ Historically, foreign-born servants have been viewed with suspicion.³² Most of Catherine of Aragon’s servants, who travelled with her to England from Spain in 1501, were sent back to Spain almost immediately, much to Catherine’s ‘hevynes’.³³ Many of those who remained with Catherine were sent back once she married Henry in 1509. In a letter written to her father, Ferdinand I, on 29 July, Catherine requested that he continue to pay their wages.³⁴ The ambassador Luis Caroz observed in 1514 that but a few of them remained in her household.³⁵ Catherine was reportedly advised by her confessor, Fray Diego Fernández, that ‘she ought to forget Spain and everything Spanish in order to gain the love of the King of England and the English’.³⁶ Foreign-born queens have been encouraged to assimilate by learning the English language, and the country’s own manners and graces. One way in which foreign-born queens were to integrate themselves was by surrounding themselves with and keeping the company of Englishmen and women, rather than those of her native land, who were usually expelled from the kingdom and sent back at the earliest opportunity.

Unlike the king’s household, or the households of early-modern English nobility, where the right to grant office remained in the hands of the master or mistress who retained them, appointments to the queen’s household – even those made by the queen herself – were subject to, and often required, the king’s consent. The Eltham ordinances of 1526 stated that

³¹ TNA SP 1/155 f. 85.

³² Elizabeth Woodville, Edward IV’s queen from 1464 through 1483, was accused of having ‘attracted to her party many strangers and introduced them to court, so that they alone should manage the public and private businesses of the crown, surround the king, and have bands of retainers, give or sell offices, and finally rule the very king himself’. Although ‘there is very little evidence to substantiate this accusation’, it does well to evoke the kinds of – even, if only irrational – concerns which were necessarily had over the presence of foreigners or ‘strangers’ at the English court. Laynesmith, *Queenship*, p. 225.

³³ *Receyt*, pp. 77-78.

³⁴ *LP I* 127.

³⁵ *LP I* 3524.

³⁶ CSP Sp, II, 201.

the queen's lord chamberlain and vice-chamberlain were to 'present unto the King's Highnesse' the names of all those who were to be admitted 'into any roome, office, or place'. The reason for this was clear: 'soe as the King's house, which is requisite to be the myrrour and example of all others within this realme, may be furnished of mynisters and officers, elect, tried, and picked, for the King's honour, as to good reason and congruence doth apperteyne'.³⁷ When Catherine Parr was acting regent in England while the king was at war in France in 1544, she wrote to her husband directly to ask 'his pleasure as to accepting certain ladies into her chamber in lieu of some that are sick'. Henry was quite clear in that he felt the women his wife had chosen to replace them were themselves too weak and 'not be meete to serve'. 'You maye take them into your chamber to passe... with you at playe', the king remarked. On this occasion, Henry conceded, and left it to her 'owne choyse'.³⁸ Although the evidence is fragmentary, this letter suggests that queens shared in the custody of appointments with the king, and may have consulted, or negotiated, with the king for their own preference in personnel.

The queen's servants too were reluctant to advance suits without the king's knowledge or approval. In 1540, shortly after the king married Anne of Cleves, Lady Lisle solicited Lady Rutland to prefer her daughter, Katherine Basset, 'to be one of the Queen's maids', but Rutland refused, knowing 'the King's Highness' pleasure to be such that no more maids shall be taken in'.³⁹ In knowing that Henry could appoint servants at will to his queens' households, petitioners would circumvent the queen – and her servants – and solicit the king directly. When Anne Basset approached the king on her mother, Lady Lisle's, behalf, to find

³⁷ *HO*, p. 146.

³⁸ BL Cotton MS, Caligula, E, IV, f. 55. (*LP* XIX, ii., 201).

³⁹ *Lisle*, V, 1574, pp. 681-2 (*LP* XIV, ii., 436); *Lisle*, VI, 1649, p. 25 (*LP* XV 215). It would appear that this suit did reach Anne of Cleves through Dr. Henry Olisleger, Vice-chancellor of Cleves, but perhaps knowing the king's pleasure, and anxious still to have his consent, asked that the Vice-chancellor, 'with the Queen's good will', petition the king and Cromwell instead.

preferment for her sister, Katherine, she found that ‘divers other hath spoken to his Grace for their friends’, but that the king ‘sayd a wolde nott grant me nor them as yte’, and that ‘hys grase sayd that a wollde have them that showlde be fayre and as he thoght me[e]tt for the rome’.⁴⁰ Like the queen’s servants, the king’s servants too were inundated with petitions for preferment to the queen’s household.⁴¹ Shortly before Mary Zouche was appointed maid-of-honour, she solicited her cousin John Arundell, to have pity on his ‘poore kynyswoman’ and ask Cardinal Wolsey, lord chancellor, ‘speke to the kyng and to the quene’ that she ‘may do her grace serves’.⁴² When Lord Lisle petitioned Thomas Cromwell, the king’s secretary, in 1539 to be appointed as lord chamberlain to the queen, he was informed by his agent, Husee, that ‘no suit will profit in that behalf’, as Cromwell, regrettably, admitted that it ‘lay in the King’s disposition and not in his’.⁴³ The office of lord chamberlain to the queen was evidently far too important, and lay outside even Cromwell’s jurisdiction. What is also clear is that appointments, even to the queen’s side of the court, were significant, or of interest, and thus required the care and attention of the sovereign.

Social status, familial ties and geographical origins too were all factors in determining their appointment, yet there were very few qualifications or prerequisites for serving in the household of a queen. Offices required little prior training or knowledge. The duties of the lord chamberlain were both manifold and diverse, and as such, educated and conscientious men might have been sought after for the position. Yeomen of the Chamber surely had to be

⁴⁰ *Lisle*, VI, 1653, pp.33-34 (*LP* XV 229). Arthur Plantagenet, lord Lisle, Katherine’s father, was informed that ‘the ladies of the privy chamber were appointed before the coming of Madame’. Lisle’s patron in this suit, Henry Olisleger, vice-chancellor of the Duchy of Cleves, had ‘begged that an exception be made in her favor’, but regrettably informed him that ‘it has been of no avail’. *LP* XV 22; *LP* XV 23; *LP* XV 33.

⁴¹ The gentlemen of the king’s Privy Chamber were often solicited for his favour: Sir Francis Bryan, William Coffin and Thomas Heneage, were all petitioned by Lady Lisle for preferment to the queen’s household.

⁴² BL Cotton MS, Vespasian, F, XIII, f. 210 (*LP* IV 3479); Wood (ed.), vol. 1, pp. 313-4. The letter is addressed to ‘cosen Arundell’. This letter is dated 1527 in *LP*, but it may be misdated, given Mary Zouche later received an annuity for service to Jane Seymour, not Catherine of Aragon.

⁴³ *Lisle*, V, 1593, pp. 701-703.

fit, and stout, and possessing certain ‘wisdom and discretion’ if they were to guard the queen’s innermost chambers and properly discern who should and should not be granted access.⁴⁴ Maids-of-honour ‘showlde be fayre’ and, in the words of the king himself, ‘me[e]tt for the ro[o]me’.⁴⁵ Certainly for ladies, gentlewomen and maids it would have helped if they excelled at ‘all goodly pastimes’,⁴⁶ to ‘entertain with dancing, music, games, laughter, witticisms’ and more.⁴⁷ A girl who could not sew, weave, sing, dance or even play a musical instrument was quite unremarkable, and would not have fit in at the court of a king or in the chambers of a queen. On the other hand, almost any man or woman could have ably undertaken the comparatively menial role as one of the queen’s grooms, pages, or chamberers, who were all unskilled and their duties rather straightforward. Perhaps the most important prerequisite, however, was loyalty, or, in other words, appointments could be made on the basis that they could be trusted to be loyal to them, and thus whose interests were aligned with their own, and no other.⁴⁸

Composition of the queen’s household, and length of service

Upon being sworn in, for how long did they serve? Men and women left the service of a king or queen if they grew too old, or became unwell, or upon the death of their master or mistress, at which time the household was discharged. All servants had to be in good health, to have the strength and vigor to meet the often strenuous demands of royal service. The Eltham ordinances were clear in that any servants who were ‘found impotent, sicklie, unable

⁴⁴ *HO*, p. 144.

⁴⁵ TNA SP 3/1, f. 84 (*LP XV 229*).

⁴⁶ *HC*, p. 703. This described Elizabeth Blount, maid-of-honour to Catherine of Aragon.

⁴⁷ Castiglione, *Courtier*, p. 182.

⁴⁸ This is perhaps why Henry VII appointed men from the lower gentry, with smaller fortune and, relative to his councillors, of comparatively obscure birth, and why Henry VIII appointed his ‘boon companions’. To appoint was to oblige, yet men and women with pre-existing ties were already ‘bound’ to be ‘good’ servants. See chapter 5 for more on loyalty, and allegiance.

or unmeete persons' had to be discharged, though not to be 'left without some competent living'.⁴⁹ An office could be made vacant when the servant who held it became sick, or worse, if they died. In 1517, 'there came a plague of sickenes, called the Swetyng sickenes', which was 'so feruent and infeccious' that 'many died in the kynges Courte'.⁵⁰ Occasionally, young women serving as maids-of-honour left the household of a queen when they married, though this was not for certain. On 22 January 1537, John Husee informed Lady Lisle that Margery Horsman, one of the queen's maids, 'shall be married, but as far as I can learn she shall keep her old room still'.⁵¹ After marrying Sir Michael Lyster, Margery continued to serve Jane Seymour in her household as one of her gentlewomen. All servants in the royal household were also routinely discharged upon the death of a monarch. Their duty of service ceased, symbolised by the ceremonial breaking of staffs of office, which were then buried in the graves of their deceased master or mistress.⁵²

Household ordinances acknowledged that servants could 'give themselves many times to idleness, evill rule and conversation', and were warned that their misconduct would be 'to the King's great dishonour'.⁵³ The queen's lord chamberlain and vice-chamberlain were to read aloud the ordinances of her household 'openly in ye comptynghouse beffore all ye sayd seruantes', for 'thintent yt none of them by ignoraunce or for lacke of knowlege shall excuse him selfe'.⁵⁴ They were 'to serche and ouersee' the queen's chambers, and 'if they shall finde any disorders therein, then they to see the same reformed, as it shall require', punishing her

⁴⁹ *HO*, p. 146.

⁵⁰ During this time, Henry dismissed almost all household servants, 'both his own and that of the most serene Queen', Catherine of Aragon, and kept but 'a small compaignie'. *HC*, p. 592; Giustinian, *Four Years*, vol. 2, p. 136. In 1535, when a gentlewoman in the service of Anne Boleyn was '[sic]kened of the measles'. *Lisle*, II, 365, pp. 453-4.

⁵¹ *Lisle*, IV, 865, p. 117; *Lisle*, IV, 864, pp. 111-112; *Lisle*, IV, 891, pp. 156-7.

⁵² Braddock, 'Queen', p. 225.

⁵³ *HO*, pp. 145, 160.

⁵⁴ BL Harleian MS 6807, f. 11.

servants ‘for any offence or outrage’.⁵⁵ If a servant did not abide by these ordinances, or the oath by which they were sworn, they could be discharged. In most circumstances, queens could dismiss servants as and when they felt it was necessary. When Francisca de Cáceres, Catherine of Aragon’s gentlewoman, was caught acting as an informant – or a gossip – for the resident Imperial ambassador, Luis Caroz, she was ‘forbidden to enter the Palace’ by the queen.⁵⁶ On 28 May 1510, Caroz reported that Cáceres had been put out of the queen’s service and that Catherine refused to see her. ‘She is so perilous a woman that it shall be dangerous’, the queen later remarked, ‘...I have no more charge of her’.⁵⁷ Likewise when Catherine Howard’s chamberers, Margaret Morton and Maude Lufkyn, rather impudently defied the queen’s strict orders that neither Lufkyn ‘nor no nother’ should come into her bedchamber unless called, Catherine angrily threatened ‘to put them away’, or discharge them, from her service.⁵⁸

The king could, and often did, exercise his prerogative as sovereign, and where he saw fit, punished and discharged his queens’ servants at will. In 1510, when Elizabeth Stafford was caught ‘about the palace, insidiously spying out every unwatched moment, in order to tell the Queen’, an enraged Henry intervened and, for her ‘suspected tale-bearing’, Elizabeth was discharged from the queen’s Chamber, which, reportedly, left Catherine ‘vexed’.⁵⁹ In 1525, the king discharged three of her Spanish ladies, known to be her ‘chief counsellors’, suspecting them of encouraging the queen to protest the elevation of Henry Fitzroy, the king’s bastard child, as duke of Richmond and Somerset. ‘A strong measure’,

⁵⁵ *HO*, pp. 139, 147, 229-230; BL Harleian MS 6807, f. 12.

⁵⁶ CSP Sp Supp I and II, 8 (*LP* I 474). These reports by the Spanish ambassador state that it was Catherine’s confessor, Friar Diego Fernandez, who prevented Cáceres from entering the palace, but it seems clear that he was acting on the queen’s orders.

⁵⁷ Ellis, vol. 1, pp. 88-89.

⁵⁸ TNA SP 1/167, f. 133 (*LP* XVI 1338).

⁵⁹ ‘The king would have liked to turn all of them out’, reported Caroz, ‘only that it has appeared to him too great a scandal’. CSP, Sp, Supplement to I and II, 8 (*LP* I 474).

remarked Lorenzo Orio, the Venetian ambassador, ‘but the Queen was obliged to submit and to have patience’.⁶⁰ Jane, lady Rochford, Anne Boleyn’s sister-in-law, servant and confidante, was banished from court by the king in 1534 for meddling in his affair with ‘a very beautiful damsel’.⁶¹ Anne was greatly unnerved by the presence of the ‘damsel’ – whom the king had placed in her household – and began scheming with Jane to contrive a way to oust her rival.⁶² It is significant that the queen could not herself discharge the ‘damsel’. Such matters were not so straightforward. Anne could see no other way to extricate herself from what must have been an uncomfortable situation but to provoke the rival to insult or attack her. But the plot backfired, and it was Jane who, having incurred the king’s indignation, was discharged from the queen’s service.⁶³

Notwithstanding this, few were punished so severely as to be deprived of their office or banished from court. Deconstructing the queen’s household, and breaking down its composition, reveals that the period from 1487 to 1527 was, for its servants, characterised by stability in office. Records may be fragmentary, but those which do survive taken together indicate that serving the queen in this period could mean a sustained, lasting career: of the 74 men and women of ‘the Quenes chambr’ who can be identified as attending upon Catherine of Aragon at her coronation on 24 June 1509, 43 of them remained in her service for at least ten, some even twenty years or more. An additional 41 men and women who were appointed shortly after Catherine’s coronation had the same longevity in their careers serving the queen.⁶⁴ Foremost among them were William Blount, baron Mountjoy, her lord chamberlain,

⁶⁰ CSP Ven III 1053.

⁶¹ CSP Sp V, i., 118; *LP* VII 1554.

⁶² *LP* VII 1193. Chapuys observed that Anne was ‘visibly losing part of her pride and vainglory’. CSP Sp V, i., 90; CSP Sp, V, i., 97.

⁶³ CSP Sp V i 90. CSP Sp, V, i., 97; *LP* VII 1193; CSP Sp V i 118; *LP* VII 1554.

⁶⁴ For the household of Catherine of Aragon, see TNA LC 9/50, ff. 182v-216r for her coronation in 1509; TNA E179/70/116 for a subsidy list assessing the queen’s Chamber in 1512; BL Add MS 21116, f. 40 (*LP* II 3446) for a banquet held at Greenwich in 1517; HMC Rutland, pp. 21-22 for ‘Ordinaunces and appoyntmentes’ of 1517; TNA SP 1/19, f. 267r-269v and Bodl. MS Ashmole 1116, f. 99r, for the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520;

who had served Catherine for 21 years, Maria de Salinas, lady Willoughby, 32 years, Francis Phillip, her sewer, 26 years, Elizabeth Stafford, duchess of Norfolk, 22 years, and Jorge de Athequa, bishop of Llandaff, her confessor, 21 years, all of whom were intimate servants of the queen, and thus were secure in their position and could expect to remain in service. In the medieval and early modern period, families of English nobility and gentry, with long traditions of royal service, were honoured with successive appointments to the households of kings and queens, providing a marked sense of continuity and stability between reigns. When Elizabeth of York died on 11 February 1503, Henry VII discharged her household.⁶⁵ Some of them were granted annuities, or pensions,⁶⁶ but many of the queen's servants retained their offices: more than six years lapsed between the death of Elizabeth and the crowning of her successor, Catherine, yet Henry VIII appointed at least 29 of her servants to the household of his first wife.⁶⁷ To serve their queen was to serve their sovereign. The king gave recognition to their loyal and enduring attendance, and this kept them in office.

TNA SP 1/73 f. 70 (*LP* V 1711) for a list of plate, with the names of recipients of the gifts of plate and those who delivered them, c. 1520; *LP* Addenda I, 367 for a similar record in 1522; BL Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV ff. 269-70 for the Eltham Ordinances of 1526; TNA E101/420/4 for the New Year gift roll of 1528, and BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, ff. 216-217 for Catherine's will.

⁶⁵ The king 'sent the best comfort to all the Queens servants', many of whom had been in her service since her coronation. Henry VII married Elizabeth on 18 January 1486 at Westminster Abbey. Elizabeth was crowned on 25 November 1487, and was queen of England for seventeen years until her death on 11 February 1503. Jefferey (ed.), *Antiquarian*, IV, p. 242. Although fragmentary, the list of attendants at Elizabeth's coronation in 1487 and those who were paid wages in 1503, among other records, indicate that Joan, lady Guildford, Katherine, lady Bray, Eleanor, lady Verney, Bridget, or Anne Crowmer, Elizabeth Denton, Hamlet Clegg, etc. served Elizabeth throughout her seventeen years as queen.

⁶⁶ Her gentlewomen, Joan Stuarde and Elizabeth Chamber, were granted an annuity of 20l., (*LP* I 709 [44]; *LP* I 3324 [36].) Mary Redyng and Sir Ralph Verney were granted 50l., (*LP* I 3324 [14]; *LP* I 3324 [39]) Anne Hubberd received a modest 5l., (*LP* I 784 [11]) and Elizabeth Catesby, 40 marks (*LP* I 3324 [12]).

⁶⁷ For the household of Elizabeth of York, see BL Add MS 21481, ff.15r-20r; *PPE*, Eliz, pp. 11, 13, 17, 21, 23, 38, 40, 49, 51, 52, 59, 62, 64, 70, 98-99, 181, 214; William Campbell (ed.), *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry the Seventh*, 2 vols. (London, 1873-77), pp. 118, 294. At least four of Catherine's servants can be traced back to the household of Henry VII (*CPR*, Hen. VII, II, pp. 317, 348; TNA LC 2/1, ff. 122v-123r), as well as at least thirteen men and women who had previously served Henry VIII's grandmother, Lady Margaret Beaufort ('Officers, servants and scholars in Lady Margaret's household, c. 1499-1509', in Michael K. Jones and Malcolm G. Underwood, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 268-287. This continuity between the households of Elizabeth of York, and the households of Catherine of Aragon, Henry VIII, and Margaret Tudor, is examined in detail in Beer, 'Queenship', pp. 27-44.

Yet Henry VIII married six times. This meant that six queens' households were established during his reign, and that on no less than five occasions, it had to be discharged, its servants disbanded, and many of their careers cut short. Deconstructing the queen's household, and, again, breaking down its composition, reveals that the period from 1527 to 1547 was, for its servants, characterised by instability. Of the 235 men and women who served Catherine of Aragon between 1509 and 1533, only 8 can be traced to the household of Anne Boleyn. The rest of Catherine's servants did not survive the king's 'Great Matter', and were each, in turn, discharged. Why did so few of Catherine's servants make the transition between households?

Like the king's household, the queen's household was a complex network of overlapping familial, even factional, social, political and religious affiliations, and obligations. Both English queens (Elizabeth of York, Anne Boleyn, Jane Seymour, Catherine Howard, Catherine Parr) and foreign-born queens (Catherine of Aragon, Anne of Cleves) retained servants with whom they had pre-existing ties, and as such whose interests were likely aligned. Anne Boleyn's accession, for instance, led to the sudden and conspicuous promotion at court of men and women with ties to the new queen. Whereas some appointments were made in response to pressure by petition, others gave way to pressure unspoken, as there were servants who felt they had rightful a claim to office. At the crucial turn of Anne's rise to queenship, many such crown or 'civil' servants were already tied, or 'bound' to the household of Catherine of Aragon. Satisfying these lineages, retaining and rewarding 'civil' servants, might otherwise prove a burden.⁶⁸ The choice, or selection of servants, of a new king or queen, and their own preference, contended with, and was thus

⁶⁸ Matthew Hefferan, 'Family, Loyalty and the Royal Household in Fourteenth-Century England', in D. Green and C. Given-Wilson (eds), *Fourteenth Century England*, XI, pp. 129-154 (p. 146). In appointments, 'the royal initiative should not be overemphasised'. Hibbard, 'Consort', in Asch (ed.), *Princes*, pp. 399-400.

likely constrained, and somewhat restricted, by the many obligations owed accrued by the crown. On this occasion, Anne and Henry were thus somewhat relieved of the usual constraints and appointed whomsoever they wished to serve the new queen.

Reconstructing the household of Anne Boleyn, more specifically her ‘Chamber’, or household ‘above-stairs’, from 1528 to 1536 reveals that many of her servants had ties to the new queen. The household was a familial institution. It comprised, first, the principal family of the householder, and second, a large body of servants.⁶⁹ Such a distinction was obscured, however, when the family of the householder served them in office, or when servants developed close, personal relationships with the householder and were considered like family. In the household of a queen, there was virtually no distinction. As a gesture towards ensuring her comfort, a queen’s family were often the first to be appointed to serve, though such a marriage also functioned as an instrument by which the family could extract maximum advantage.⁷⁰ Anne fulfilled familial or dynastic ambitions by advancing her kinsmen and women.⁷¹ Elizabeth Howard, countess of Wiltshire, her mother, Mary Boleyn, lady Carey, her sister, Dorothy Howard, countess of Derby, Anne Boleyn, lady Shelton, and Elizabeth Wood, lady Boleyn, her aunts, were all appointed as ladies-in-waiting, whereas Sir James Boleyn, her uncle, became her Chancellor.⁷² More distant relatives in the Parker, Tylney and

⁶⁹ Peter Laslett, ‘Mean Household Size in England since the Sixteenth Century’ in Peter Laslett (ed.) *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 151.

⁷⁰ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, pp. 101-121.

⁷¹ For the household of Anne Boleyn, see BL, Add MS, 71009, ff. 57v-59r for her coronation; TNA E179/69/28 for a subsidy list assessing the queen’s Chamber in c. 1535; *LP* V 1484 for Anne’s visit to Calais in 1532; and TNA E101/420/15 for New Year gift roll for 1532; TNA E101/421/13 for 1534; BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, ff. 209-225 for letters from Sir William Kingston to Thomas Cromwell, and TNA SP 1/103 ff. 318-320, TNA SP 1/104 f. 1, and TNA SP 1/104, f. 257 for various accounts of the queen’s debts.

⁷² Catherine Howard’s household too was staffed with many kinsmen and women: Margaret Howard, Lady Arundell, her sister; Isabel Legh and Anne Howard, her sisters-in-law; Sir Edward Baynton, her brother-in-law; Agnes Howard, the dowager duchess of Norfolk, her step-grandmother; Mary Howard, duchess of Richmond, Jane Boleyn, lady Rochford and Joan Champenowne, lady Denny, her cousins; Katherine Daubeney, lady Bridgewater, her aunt, and her uncle, William Howard’s wife, Margaret Gamage, lady Howard, all held prestigious offices. Jane Seymour’s brother, Henry Seymour, became her carver, while Catherine Parr’s uncle, William Parr, 1st baron Parr of Horton, was appointed as her lord chamberlain.

Howard families, like Jane Parker, lady Rochford, her half-sister, Alice Parker, Jane's mother, and Agnes Tylney, dowager duchess of Norfolk, Anne's step-grandmother, Sir Phillip Tylney, Margaret Gamage, her maid-of-honour who married William Howard in 1533, found preferment too,⁷³ as well as friends, confidantes and companions of the queen, in particular Bridget Wiltshire, lady Wingfield, Anne Savage, lady Berkeley, and Margery Horsman.⁷⁴ A cross-section of prominent local families in Norfolk and its neighbouring counties in the East and South-East of England, like the Sheltons, Gainsfords and the Ashleys, who had geographical ties to the queen and were firmly aligned with the Boleyns, were all represented in the queen's household. Sir John Shelton the younger, became her sewer, and his sisters Mary and Madge Shelton, were her maids-of-honour, as did Anne Gainsford, who served the queen alongside of her father Sir John Gainsford, her would-be husband Sir George Zouche, and Mary Zouche, his kinswoman. George Taylor, Anne's receiver-general, was the nephew of George Gainsford. Jane Ashley became her maid-of-honour, Rafe Ashley, her gentleman usher, John Ashley, her sewer, and Thomas Ashley too attended upon the queen.⁷⁵ The new queen even patronised and promoted men, known

⁷³ See also Katherine Boughton, lady Howard, and Katherine Howard, lady Daubeney. In addition to her uncle, William, and to Anne Parr, Lady Herbert, her sister, and Maud Parr, Lady Lane, her cousin, both ladies of her Privy chamber, Catherine Parr was served by George Herbert, her brother-in-law William Herbert's elder brother, as a gentleman waiter; Margaret Neville, the queen's stepdaughter from her first marriage to John Neville, 3rd baron Latimer, one of her chamberers; her first husband's brother, Marmaduke Neville, as her gentleman usher; Lucy Somerset, the wife of Catherine's stepson, John Neville, 4th baron Latimer, a maid-of-honour; and the Throckmortons, Clement, her cupbearer, and Nicholas, her sewer, were the queen's distant cousins. Mary Woodhull, servant to Maud Green, Lady Parr, Catherine Parr's mother, who must have spoke of Mary fondly as many years later, she was appointed by the queen as one of her chamberers. Mary was also the daughter of Catherine's first cousin, Elisabeth Parr. In addition, Catherine Parr brought with her to court a select few of the men and women who, before she was queen, served at her former household in Snape, North Yorkshire, where she resided with her first husband, John Neville, as Lord and Lady Latimer. James, *Parr*, p. 123.

⁷⁴ Catherine Howard was able to surround herself with old acquaintances, companions and 'bedfellows' from her youth.

⁷⁵ Shortly after she became queen in 1509, many of Catherine of Aragon's servants from Spain who attended on her as a princess were sent back, to be replaced by English clientele. But Catherine retained more than a few of the servants who came with her from Spain to attend on her as a princess: Katheryn de Montoya, María de Guevara and Francisca de Cáceres were appointed as her gentlewomen servants; Inéz de Venegas and María de Salinas as her maids-of-honour; Isabel de Vargas as one of her chamberers; Juan de Montoya, Katheryn's son, as a gentleman usher; Ocheo de Salcedo, as a yeoman of her chamber, and Friar Diego Fernández as her confessor. Also John de Quero, and possibly Alonyus de Squirvell, in unknown positions.

‘evangelicals’ who shared in her religious convictions to serve her. Nicholas Shaxton was appointed as her almoner, and Hugh Latimer, William Betts, Matthew Parker and William Latymer all served as the queen’s chaplains. Service not only created but reinforced ties of obligation, and a queen’s household formed the core of her support. Queens, sharing in the custody of appointments with the king, might surround themselves as far as possible with men and women whom they knew well, liked and cared for, could trust and confide in and whom they felt would serve them loyally and faithfully.

What this case study suggests is that, in this period, new queens brought in their own servants, who displaced those of former queens. When a queen’s household was discharged, all of her servants gave up their offices. Anne Boleyn was arrested on suspicion of committing adultery on 2 May 1536. Within two weeks of her arrest, on 13 May, the king sent Sir William Fitzwilliam and Sir William Paulet to Greenwich, where they ‘deposed and brooke upp the Queenes househoulde... and so discharged all her servantes of their offices clearlye’.⁷⁶ Anne was executed on 19 May, on which day John Husee reported that ‘most of the late queen’s servants are set at liberty to seek service elsewhere’,⁷⁷ whereas a poem written shortly after described her servants as ‘sheep without a shepherd’.⁷⁸ Of the 98 men and women who served Anne Boleyn between 1533 and 1536, 32 of them can be traced to the household of Jane Seymour. Servants who likely owed their appointments to their mistress, like her family, friends and clientele, whose ties were strictly to the queen, were most vulnerable, and nearly all of them had their careers cut short. Lacking any claim to

⁷⁶ *WC*, vol. 1, pp. 36-37. Similarly, on 13 November 1541, the household of Catherine Howard was discharged when Thomas Wriothesley ‘came to Hampton Court to the Quene, and called all the ladies and gentlewomen and her servautes into the Great Chamber, and there openlye afore them declared certeine offences that she had done in misuing her bodye with certeine persons afore the Kinges tyme, wherefore he there discharged all her househould’. *WC*, vol. 1, pp. 131-2.

⁷⁷ *Lisle*, III, 698, pp. 365-6 (*LP* X 919); *Lisle*, IV, 846, pp. 47-8 (*LP* X 920).

⁷⁸ *LP* X 1036.

office, these servants had been firmly aligned with the fallen queen, and thus they could not properly attend upon her rival and successor, Jane Seymour. Few of the Boleyn kinsmen and women survived the scandal, though one exception was George Taylor,⁷⁹ Anne's receiver-general, who, it was observed, was 'merry', for he had clearly been given some assurance of his place. 'I trust the King's Highness will be good and gracious lord unto me', he remarked, shortly after being discharged, 'and so I have a special trust in his Grace.'⁸⁰ And he was not the only one. Husee had heard that 'the King's Highness of his goodness hath retained, as is said, some of them'.⁸¹

Anne had built a network of support and obligation with her household at its core – though, infiltrating this network, it was the king who ultimately had charge of administering and appointing the new queen's household. Servants appointed by the queen were far outnumbered, and their presence at court overwhelmed, by servants who were more closely affiliated with the king. Henry could appoint whomsoever he wished to serve his wives. In the household of Anne Boleyn, the king appointed many men who had previously served in his own household. Thomas Burgh, baron Burgh, her lord chamberlain, served as one of the king's spears, and Sir Edward Baynton, who had served the king as a squire of the body, was now vice-chamberlain (and his wife, Isabel Legh, lady Baynton, was also appointed to serve the new queen). Sir William Coffin was a gentleman of the king's Privy Chamber before becoming the queen's master of the horse (at which time, his wife, Margaret Coffin, née Dymoke, became her gentlewoman), whereas William Oxenbridge served the king as a page before advancing to serve Anne as a groom porter. Henry Webbe and Richard Dauncy, her gentleman ushers, Edward Floyd, yeoman of the robes, William Smith, yeoman of the

⁷⁹ A nephew of George Gainsford.

⁸⁰ *Lisle*, IV, 846a; Shortly after George was appointed to serve as one of Henry's gentleman ushers. *LP* XIII, ii, 249 (14).

⁸¹ *Lisle*, III, 698, pp. 365-6 (*LP* X 919); *Lisle*, IV, 846, pp. 47-8 (*LP* X 920).

chamber, Richard Bartlett, her physician, John Uvedale, her secretary, and Sir Thomas da la Lynde can all be traced to the king's household before serving on the queen's side. The wives, sisters and daughters of Henry's own courtiers and councillors, such as Elizabeth Browne, countess of Worcester, sister of Sir Anthony Browne, gentleman of the king's Privy Chamber, Elizabeth Cheney, lady Vaux, the wife of Thomas, lord Vaux, Elizabeth Hill, chamberer, wife of Richard Hill, Sergeant of the Wine Cellar for the king, and Elizabeth Holland, maid-of-honour and mistress of Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk, also found preferment. The king's family, like his niece, Lady Margaret Douglas, and his daughter-in-law, Mary, duchess of Richmond, wife of Henry, duke of Richmond, the king's illegitimate son, and even his mistresses, Jane Seymour, and the aforementioned unnamed 'damsel' identified by Chapuys, attended upon the queen.⁸²

Henry VII married once, but Henry VIII married six times, which meant that there were as many as seven households established for a queen throughout the early Tudor period. Henry VIII's marital instability exposed the vulnerability of his queens' hold on their own households, as the king could strip them of their prerogatives as queen and altogether discharge their servants. It is difficult to measure its impact on the lives of servants who were discharged, as they often disappear from the record. Some would have retired to their estates,

⁸² For the household of Henry VIII, see TNA LC 9/50, ff. 182v-216r for his coronation; TNA E101/417/3, f. 33 (*LP* I 228), f. 57 (*LP* I 640), TNA E101/417/6, f. 54, (*LP* I 1015), TNA E101/418/5, f. 27 for various warrants for the king's Chamber; HMC Rutland, vol. 1, p.22, for 'Ordinaunces and appoyntmentes to the Kinges' syde', BL Harleian MS 433, ff. 294v-295r (*LP* II 4409) for the visiting French embassy in 1518; TNA SP 1/18, f. 65 (*LP* III 151) for 'Names of certain personnes put owt of their Rowmes by the king's grace and other by his grace in there Rowmes appointed' in 1519; TNA SP 1/19 f. 269 and Bodleian MS Ashmole 1116, f. 99r for the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520; BL Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV ff. 267-8 for the Eltham ordinances of 1526; BL Egerton MS 2604 for wages of the king's household c. 1525-6; BL Royal MS 7 F XIV, f. 100 (*LP* II 2735) for a book of the king's servants, c. 1536; BL Add MS 45716A, ff.4v – 8v for The Ordynary of the King's Syde, 1540; *LP* XVI 394 [6] for the king's Privy Chamber, 1540; BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38 for the king's 'ordinary' from 1544-45; BL Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV 1 ff. 107-107v (*LP* XXI, i., 969) and BL Royal MS App. 89 f. 105 (*LP* XXI, i, 1384) for the visiting French embassy in 1546; TNA LC 2/2 for his funeral in 1547, and TNA E179/69/27, 29, 32, 45, 56 for various subsidy lists assessing the king's Chamber and Privy Chamber throughout his reign.

whereas others struggled to find preferment. In 1547, Princess Mary would take pity on her late mother Catherine of Aragon's servants, and petition Anne Stanhope, duchess of Somerset on their behalf. Richard Woode, Catherine's page of the robes, had, Mary observed, 'sustained great losses without recompense'.⁸³ A man named Crofte, Jane Seymour's cousin who served the queen in her household, could not find a foothold for many years after her death. Wymond Carew, who was Jane's receiver-general, wrote on Crofte's behalf to Anthony Denny and John Gate, of the Privy chamber, in 1543, asking that he might be appointed as a gentleman waiter to Prince Edward, the late queen's son, 'even without wages': 'I am bound to do for this gentleman, Mr. Crofte, all I can', Carew began, reminding them that Crofte had served Jane 'honestly', and the queen 'did favour him well'.⁸⁴ Unfortunately, when their mistress was divorced, beheaded, or if she died in the midst of their service, many of their careers were abruptly cut short.

Yet the households of Henry's queens ran almost consecutively. This meant that there was an opportunity for the queen's servants to retain their offices and secure their position by transitioning between households. Servants who kept in the king's favour were strategically well-placed to find preferment not if, but when, he remarried. The queen's household was, again, discharged, when Jane Seymour died on 24 October 1537.⁸⁵ 'All the ladies and gentlewomen' who were in attendance at her funeral 'knelt about the hearse during mass afore noon', struck with grief, before they were discharged from their offices.⁸⁶ Anne Basset,

⁸³ BL Cotton MS Otho, C, X, f. 276r.

⁸⁴ LP Addenda II 1593; LP Addenda II 1594.

⁸⁵ LP XII, ii., 1020. 'Queene Jane departed this lyfe, lyeinge in childe bedd, aboute 2 of the clocke in the morninge', which 'caused great sorrow'. WC, vol. 1, pp. 69-70; SC, pp. 72-3; LP XII, ii., 1060. For the household of Jane Seymour, see *Lisle*, III and IV, *The Lisle Letters* dating from 4 June 1536 to 24 October 1537, for various entries identifying her servants; TNA E179/69/27 for a subsidy list assessing the queen's Chamber in c. 1536; TNA LC 5/31 ff. 1-6 for wardrobe warrants 'for the Quenes grace', 1536-37; BL Royal MS, 7, C, XVI, ff. 18-32 (LP XII, ii., 973) for 'A boke of the Quenes juelles' from 1537, and BL Additional MS, 45716A, ff. 91v-92v for those in attendance for Jane's funeral in 1537.

⁸⁶ LP XII, ii., 1060.

Jane's maid-of-honour, was sent to stay with her kinswoman and one of the queen's ladies, Mary Arundell, countess of Sussex: 'I perceive my lord and you have taken my daughter Anne', Lady Lisle wrote to the countess on 14 November, 'until, by your good suit, she may obtain place again'.⁸⁷ A month later, Husee reported that the king had assured him that he would be a 'good lord' to Anne, and 'promised she shall have her place whensoever the time shall come'.⁸⁸ 'I trust we shall have a mistress shortly', Anne wrote to her mother on 5 October 1539.⁸⁹ Shortly thereafter Anne of Cleves arrived at Greenwich, where her 'ladies and gentlewomen that were apoynted for dailie waiters on her Grace in the court' were gathered, and 'welcomed her Grace'.⁹⁰ Of the 83 men and women who served Jane Seymour between 1536 and 1537, 46 can be traced to the household of Anne of Cleves.⁹¹ There was no queen to attend upon, nor was there a household in which to serve in the intervening period, yet surviving accounts, which were kept by Sir Wymond Carew, Anne's receiver-general, begin with a list of wages 'payde at Mydsomer quarter In the xxxith yere of the Reigne of our Soverayne Lorde Kyng Henry theyght'. This was more than six months prior to Anne's arrival in England), indicating that Henry retained some of his late queen's servants,⁹² and kept them at court.⁹³

⁸⁷ TNA SP 1/126, f. 124 (*LP* XII, ii., 1084).

⁸⁸ TNA SP 1/127, f. 49 (*LP* XII, ii., 1209); *Lisle*, V, 1249, pp. 250-1 (*LP* XIII, ii., 591). As for her 'finding', or 'board', the king 'will recompense it one way or other', Husee was told. TNA SP 3/12, f. 94 (*LP* XIV, i., 1120).

⁸⁹ TNA SP 3/1, f. 83 (*LP* XIV, ii., 284).

⁹⁰ *HC*, pp. 832-838; *WC*, vol. 1, pp. 109-111. The king may have felt responsible for Dorothy Fitzherbert, Anne Joscelyn and Elizabeth Rastall, three chamberers 'that were with Queen Jane afore' (TNA SP 3/6, f. 88 (*LP* XV 135)) and Mary Norris, maid-of-honour, who was the daughter of Henry Norris, the king's dear friend and servant before he was executed alongside Anne Boleyn in 1536. An orphan, Mary was taken into the care of John Norris, Henry's elder brother and a gentleman usher serving in the king's household, who consequently could ensure that Mary was kept at court.

⁹¹ For the household of Anne of Cleves, see TNA SP 1/155 ff. 36-37 (*LP* XIV, ii, 572 (4)) for the names of those appointed to receive Anne at Dover; TNA E101/422/15 for an account book of her expenses; TNA E101/422/16 for a similar book, with payments made to her receiver-general concerning her lands; BL Add MS 45716A, ff.15v-18r for 'Ordynary of the Quene's Syde' of 1540, and TNA SP 1/161 f. 81 (*LP* XV 872), *LP* XV 850 (14) for the proceedings of the annulment of her marriage with the king.

⁹² Sir Edward Baynton, vice-chamberlain, for example, received £6. 13s. 4d. a quarter, and Anne Basset and Mary Norris, maids-of-honour, 50s., and Dorothy Fitzherbert, chamberer, 50s., among several others who were paid wages through the year 1539, before Anne of Cleves' arrival or the establishment of her household. TNA E101/422/15; TNA E101/422/16.

⁹³ At a banquet held at Westminster by the king on 19 November 1538, for example, many of the late queen's servants 'lay all night in Court and had banquets in their chambers, and the King's servants to wait upon them,'

Henry VIII's queens came and went, yet the king was a constant. The succession of a new queen did not necessarily require an overhaul in personnel as many of them were kept in his favour. Of the 86 men and women who can be traced to the household of Anne of Cleves, at least 49 of them served Catherine Howard,⁹⁴ and of the 77 men and women who served in the household of Catherine Howard, 36 can be traced to the household of Catherine Parr.⁹⁵ Foremost among the servants who made the transition between households in this period were men who administered his queens' households; their wives and the wives of the king's courtiers and councillors;⁹⁶ maids-of-honour in whose company the king spent much of his time; his own kith and kin; and gentlemen, yeomen, grooms and pages who were paid and provided for by the king. This meant that, when the queen's household was discharged, it could, at least, in part, almost immediately, reconstitute itself. It also meant that successive queens inherited many of their predecessor's servants who were loyal and could be trusted to

and reportedly, 'did not take leave till four o'clock after dinner next day'. *LP* XIII, ii., 884. When the household of Catherine Howard was discharged on 13 November 1541, the king's Privy council declared that 'order must be taken with the maidens, that they repair each of them to their friends, there to remain', acknowledging that, if there were 'any of the Quenes servants unprovided for, whereof they think the Kings Highness should have consideration' (*LP* XVI 1331). It was reported that the king, finding himself inclined 'to make feasts to the ladies', retained a few of the late queen's servants. *LP* XVI 267. Chapuys reported on 15 January 1543 that Princess Mary, 'in default of a Queen, was called to Court triumphantly, accompanied by many ladies', *LP* XVIII, i., 44. It is possible that some of the late queen's servants were lodged with Mary in her chambers by the king, and as one chronicler observed, 'until he married again, they remained in attendance on her'. *SC*, pp.72-73.

⁹⁴ For the household of Catherine Howard, see TNA SP 1/157, ff. 13-17 (*LP* XV 21) for 'A book of certain of the Queen's Ordinary' of 1540; BL Stowe MS 559, ff. 55r-68r for a book of the queen's jewels from 1540-41; TNA E101/127/21 for an account book of the queen's stables; TNA SP 1/167 ff. 120-140 for a series of documents – letters, ambassadorial reports, indictments and, most importantly, depositions – concerning the fall of Catherine dating from 5 November 1541 to 13 February 1542.

⁹⁵ For the household of Catherine Parr, see *HO*, pp.162-170, TNA LC 5/178, ff. 23-26 for 'The Queen's ordinary' of 1544-45; TNA E179/69/40, 41, 47, 48, 55, 56, for various subsidy lists assessing the queen's Chamber from 1543 to 1547; TNA E315/161 for an account book, BL Cotton Vespasian C XIV 1 ff. 107-107v (*LP* XXI, i., 969) and BL Royal MS App. 89 f. 105 (*LP* XXI, i, 1384) for two lists drawn up of the queen's household for the visiting French embassy in 1546; *Foxe*, vol. IV, pp. 547-561 for an account of the conspiracy against Catherine in 1546, in John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*; TNA LC 2/2 for those in attendance for the funeral of Henry VIII in 1547, and TNA E101/426/2 for Catherine Parr's household as queen dowager in 1547.

⁹⁶ Eleanor, countess of Rutland, served until her husband's death in 1543, and Isabel, lady Baynton, until her husband's death in 1544. Their careers did not survive their husbands. Without a patron to assure them of their office, they retired from court.

align firmly with their master and sovereign. Their careers were not inextricably caught up with the fate of their mistress, providing a measure of continuity between households.

This statistical analysis demonstrates that the queen's servants could and did transition between households, and that this transition became crucial, and ties to the king essential, in surviving Henry VIII's marital instability. Yet it must be observed that a strictly statistical analysis is insufficient. It may reflect relative stability in office, but it remains to examine the full extent of the impact of his marital instability on *service*.

Chapter 3

Office-holding merely laid the foundation for a career in service. It was relationships, between the master, or mistress, and their servants, in the household – the ways in which they interacted, and were ‘bound’ to one another – which developed their careers and advanced them beyond the role and position to which they were formally circumscribed. Queens consort were judged by how effectively they managed their households. This was considered by their contemporaries, and is often cited today by historians, as a measure of their queenship. Yet we know very little about how queens actually did this. Power, authority, and/or command, in the early modern household, was not a simple, undifferentiated binary model of domination and subordination, order and obey.¹ It must be understood as an ‘exchange’ between individuals, which necessarily had to be established, or negotiated. This chapter closely examines interactions within the queen’s household to draw out the structures, exercise and nature of her authority. Central to this analysis is the relationship between institutions and royal personality, though thus far this has focused strictly on the sovereign, and his or her household, council, and the wider court.² A queen’s authority, specifically her ‘capacity to secure obedience in or conformity to a hierarchical chain of command’, often came from her ‘personal attributes – intelligence, force of personality, will, charisma’.³

Everything in and of the household was characterised by the personalities of its master, or mistress, and of the servants who attended upon them. The Privy Chamber and its servants, for instance, ‘marked the frontier between the public and private lives of the monarch’.⁴ Yet this frontier, the institution of the household, was sensitive to adjustments

¹ Braddick and Walter, ‘Grids of Power’, in Braddick and Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power*, p. 17.

² Asch (ed.), *Princes*, pp. 8-9, 44.

³ Earenfight, ‘Without the Persona of the Prince’, p. 13.

⁴ Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 8.

from monarch to monarch, and different styles in kingship or queenship. ‘Few institutional barriers’, it has been observed, ‘are strong enough to resist the pressures of personality and circumstance’.⁵ A new sovereign, a change in person, or personality, saw fundamental change in the royal household.⁶ Henry VII’s death and the accession of his son, for instance, saw ‘radical change’ in the royal household when Henry VIII, who was ‘as unlike his father as could be in looks, disposition, tastes, pastimes and choice of company’, with revelling, jousting and feasting on a scale unprecedented, and a boisterous, athletic young king who participated enthusiastically, threw out his father’s oldest servants and replaced them with his own circle of intimates, ‘the kynges minions’.⁷ The queen’s household was no exception. Six women wore the crown from 1509 to 1547, and this revolving door of queens provides the opportunity to address the impact of personality on the household, widening the scope of analysis from monarch to monarchy. There are difficulties, however, in this approach, as the surviving source material documenting the interactions of queens and their servants is, in many ways, insufficient. And discerning the impact of personality is not so straightforward. As will be demonstrated, the queen’s household was susceptible to and characterised by not strictly the personality of the queen, but of the king and the wider court too, and these could be in harmony, or contend in conflict.

This chapter begins first by examining access to the queens’ chambers, determining when and where servants interacted with their mistress outside of performing their regular duties, tasks and functions. It then considers *how* they interacted, and in what contexts. It

⁵ Starkey, ‘Intimacy’, in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 76.

⁶ ‘Cutting across the continuity of institutions and offices of the household was the change of royal personality’. Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 6-7. In the seventeenth century the succession of a new monarch was still the fundamental change in the political climate – the event which decided who would grow in the sun of royal favour and who would wither in the cold of obscurity’. Sharpe, ‘Charles’, in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 226.

⁷ Starkey, ‘The development of the Privy Chamber, 1485-1547’ (University of Cambridge, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1973), pp. 64-72.

concentrates on intimacy in the queen's Privy Chamber to measure the depths and significance of relationships between 'mistress' and 'servant', which constituted the 'functioning' household.

Access

All royal residences had a king's side and a queen's side. John Norris, Henry VIII's gentleman usher, drew up instructions in c. 1545 for preparing the king and queen's lodgings, in which he observed that, when 'the kinge and the Quenes lodgings shalbe made', Henry's queens were to 'have as many Chambers as the kinge hathe'.⁸ The queen's side was established separately and distinct from, but adjacent to, the king's side, often 'mirroring' its structural layout, and both of their servants were accommodated in close quarters, occupying physical space – quite literally – under the same roof. An inventory taken at Hampton Court in 1547 illustrates the queen's apartments, comprising a 'with drawinge chambre on the Quenes syde', followed by 'the privey chambre' and 'the kinges bedchambre on the Quenes syde', leading to the 'Quenes galorie'; and from there 'the Quenes bedchambre', a second 'with drawing chambr on the Quens syd', another 'privey chambre', and finally, the 'privey Galorie'.⁹

It is not difficult to conceive of when or where servants might have had the opportunity to interact with the queen. All of the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber staff had access to their mistress as servants who were personal and intimate. Access, 'nearness' or proximity of the servant to their master or mistress was crucial in determining when and

⁸ BL Add MS 71009, f. 19r.

⁹ BL Harleian MS 1419A, f. 257; Hamilton, 'Parr' p. 12.

where they interacted outside of performing their regular duties, tasks and functions. Theoretically, this access varied from servant to servant, corresponding to the office they held, and thus the ‘chamber’ to which they were sworn. The significance of the development of the ‘Privy Chamber’ was that, upon its establishment, all of the queen’s Chamber servants were excluded from the queen’s Privy chamber and bedchamber.¹⁰ This created a ‘hierarchy’ of space in the queen’s chambers, with access, now institutionally-defined, carefully regulated and controlled, and entry to the Privy and bedchambers closely guarded by its servants. A useful distinction can be made between the ‘inward’ chambers and ‘outward’ chambers of the queen’s side: the ‘outward’ chambers, where virtually all of the queen’s Chamber servants, and occasionally visitors, moved without restriction, were the Presence and Guard chambers,¹¹ whereas the ‘inward chambers’, the space ‘from the door of the privy chamber onwards’, constituted the queen’s Privy chamber and bedchamber, and any additional rooms, lodgings or galleries built on this side of the palace, access to which was restricted to servants of the Privy Chamber, and a privileged few granted entry by the queen herself.¹² If the right of *entrée* or admission to the queen’s Privy Chamber was granted only by the queen herself, the formal, ‘institutional’ hierarchy of her household could be circumvented, and that access to their mistress could for the servant be indicative of their favour.¹³

¹⁰ The development of the ‘Privy Chamber’ began under Henry VII in the 1490s. In 1519 *ad hoc* changes were made under Henry VIII which saw its offices increasingly defined. This became *institutionally* defined, in the Eltham ordinances of 1526, and the Cromwellian ordinances of 1539-40. Starkey, ‘Intimacy’, in Starkey (ed.) *Court*, pp. 71-118.

¹¹ Also known as ‘Great Hall’, ‘Great Chamber’, or ‘Watching Chamber’.

¹² This distinction is made by Simon Thurley. Thurley, *Palaces*, pp.135-6. In larger royal residences, between the queen’s Presence and Privy chambers, there may even have been a ‘withdrawing’ chamber and additional ‘galleries’ or hallways.

¹³ This would suggest that the significance of the institutional ‘exclusion’ of the Chamber servants from the Privy Chamber has been exaggerated.

Nor is it difficult to conceive of when or where the queen's servants might have interacted with the king. In many royal palaces there was to be a 'large passage' between the king and the queen's chambers.¹⁴ Henry VIII treated his queens' chambers as an extension of his own. Unlike the king's chambers, however, wherein Henry often transacted affairs of state, his queens' chambers were a place of comfort for him to relax and take solace.¹⁵ This distinction is reflected in the arrangement and architectural layout of many royal palaces. Wherein the 'outward' chambers of a queen were a stage for court ceremonial, her 'inward' chambers were 'less permeable than those of the king', with greater seclusion, and often, and almost without exception more 'isolated from public buildings and from ceremonial routes'.¹⁶ In preparing the king's and queen's lodgings, John Norris wrote that 'where the kinge and the Quene be in one house the kinges pleasure is that the Quene shall have the ffayreste and the largest romes for the kinge woll alwaie resorte unto the Quenes Chamber for his comfort pastime solas and disporte'.¹⁷ If a queen met, dined or slept with the king in his chambers, her own servants would accompany her there.¹⁸

Establishing the measure of access to which servants in office could claim by right is thus straightforward. More difficult is determining *how* these servants interacted with the queen and the king. All of the servants in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber had to know their place, acting always with deference towards their mistress. The Eltham ordinances

¹⁴ *HO*, p. 146. See also, a letter from Sir Nicholas Vaux to Cardinal Wolsey concerning preparations for building of a temporary palace, or 'castle', at the Field of Cloth of Gold: 'And the queenes grace shall have iij. chambres as large or larger. There shalbe a galerye going owte of the kinges lodging... to convey the kyng to the queenes secrete chambre.' BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VII, f. 186.

¹⁵ Simon Thurley, *Houses of Power: The Places That Shaped the Tudor World* (London, 2017), p. 223.

¹⁶ Richardson, 'Gender and Space', pp. 132, 163.

¹⁷ BL Add MS 71009, f. 20r.

¹⁸ This was corroborated by the English martyrologist John Foxe, who observed that 'in the tyme of this his sicknes, he had left his accustomed maner of comming and visiting the Queene', Catherine Parr, who 'sometymes of her selfe would come to visite him, either at after dinner or after supper, as was most fit for her purpose'. Catherine Parr's ladies accompany her to the king's bedchamber. *Foxe*, vol. V, p. 555. See also, Giustinian, *Four Years*. The Venetian ambassador remarked that Henry 'hears the office every day in the Queen's chamber, that is to say, vespers and compline' (pp. 312-313).

of 1526 declared that servants had to ‘be of good towardnesse, likelyhood, behaviour, demeanour’ and ‘be humbly reverent, sober, discreete, and serviceable, in all their doings’.¹⁹ Ordinances for the household of Princess Mary in 1525 instructed the ‘lades gentlewomen and maydens being about her persone and also her chambers with others attendant vpon herr,’ to ‘vse themselves sadlei, honorable, vertuously and discreetly in words, countenance, gesture, behavior and deed with humility, reverence, lowliness, due and requisite, so as of them proceed no manner of example of evill or vnfiltinge manners or conditions, but rather all good and godly behauior’.²⁰ Interactions between mistress and servant were thus ritualised, and potentially constrained, by custom and protocol, with ordinances dictating how far and in what manner, physically, or emotionally, they could behave.

Yet ordinances and instructions for the household were prescriptive, and not necessarily descriptive. Like conduct books in this period, it is difficult to know how far men and women acted in accordance with the advice laid out to them.²¹ Such evidence provides strictly the ‘institutional’ context to the relationships between mistress and servant, and thus has merely laid the foundation for this analysis of their interaction: what is missing is what occurred *in between*. Ordinances could not, and did not, govern their every word or gesture. Servants were not altogether restricted to ‘monarch worshipping’ in fear and circumspection.²² Nor was access strictly formal, and institutional, measured physically, and in terms of proximity. It was informal, and could be measured emotionally, or psychologically, and perhaps more sensitively, in terms of intimacy, and trust. How far servants could ‘access’ the queen or her chambers was thus determined by the personality, and character, of the queen herself, as mistress of the household. Likewise how far they could

¹⁹ *HO*, p. 157.

²⁰ BL Cotton MS Vitellius, C, I, f. 7r., quoted in McIntosh, ‘Sovereign Princesses’, pp. 132-3.

²¹ Suzanne W. Hull, *Women According to Men: The World of Tudor-Stuart Women* (London, 1996), p. 195.

²² Elton, ‘Court’, pp. 48-50.

‘access’ the king was determined by his personality and character, as their master and sovereign. Acknowledging this tension between the ‘formal’ and the ‘informal’, it must be asked, how did masters, or mistresses, and their servants, reconcile the ordinances, structures and conventions of the household with their own personal interactions?²³

Character and personality

Relationships within the queen’s household can be difficult to trace in the evidence. To reconstruct them with some meaning, these relationships must be interpreted in the context of their respective roles as ‘mistress’ and ‘servant’. Near-contemporary accounts on Anne Boleyn provide a view of the interactions between the queen and her household. Such accounts were informed by the testimony of the men and women who attended upon her. In the *Actes and Monuments* (1563-1583), the English martyrologist John Foxe attributed his description of Anne Boleyn to ‘the chiefe and principall of her waiting maides about her’, and ‘especially the Duches of Richmond’, Mary Howard, Anne’s cousin and lady-in-waiting, as well as her silkwoman, Joan Wilkinson.²⁴ Anne Gainsford, the queen’s maid-of-honour, informed George Wyatt’s *Life of The Virtuous Christian and Renowned Queen Anne Boleigne* (c. 1605).²⁵ What made their accounts so compelling – and what makes them compelling today – is that, as the women who knew and served the queen, their testimony carried weight. We must be cautious, however, in using this evidence. As will be demonstrated, the testimony of Anne’s servants could have been distorted, if not by their own biases, memory or hindsight, then by those who conveyed the information in their accounts

²³ As observed by Curtis Perry in his study of access: ‘the strict regulation of access to the king crystallizes a tension built into the institutions of the period, emphasizing the personal and corruptible aspects of a system of government forced to become increasingly bureaucratic to meet the needs of a centralised’. Perry, ‘Access’, p. 1057.

²⁴ Foxe, IV, pp. 62-63.

²⁵ Wyatt, pp. 445-446.

second or third-hand.²⁶ More useful is *A briefe treatise or cronickille of the moste vertuous ladye Anne Bulleyne late quene of England* (c. 1564), by William Latymer, as it was written first-hand and, although Latymer was determinedly-onesided in exaggerating Anne's pious and 'godly' rule,²⁷ his account more accurately represents the idyllic, or 'good' mistress.²⁸ To explain how and why queens and their servants interacted as they did, here Latymer's *Cronickille* and others provide a framework to interpret this evidence and reconstruct the relationship between them.

Ordinances and instructions for the queen's household laid out the rules by which her servants were governed. Yet it remained for the queen to uphold and enforce them day-to-day. To command service was in itself powerful and prestigious. Queens consort ruled and presided over their own servants, commanding their obedience and conformity as mistress of the household. This status is reflected in the book of Richard Justice, groom of the robes to Catherine of Aragon, and the accounts of Anne of Cleves, kept by her receiver-general, Sir Wymond Carew. Both Justice and Carew made payments and rewards explicitly 'by her graces commaundment', with many entries in the latter bearing Anne's signature, indicating that they required her approval.²⁹ Anne Boleyn's chaplain, William Latymer, recalled how the queen gave 'carefull charge' to her officers, her lord chamberlain and vice-chamberlain, to supervise her servants and communicate her orders. Her officers 'reprehended dyvers and sondrye persons... for their horrible swearing as for their inordinate and dissolute talke, together with their abhomynable incontynencye'. Crucially, Latymer observed that, her lord chamberlain and vice-chamberlain reported to Anne herself: 'fynding certayne persons

²⁶ Thomas S. Freeman, Research, rumour and propaganda: Anne Boleyn in Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs', *Historical Journal*, 38, 4 (1995), pp. 797-819.

²⁷ Dowling, 'Latymer', pp. 30, 43.

²⁸ Latymer, *Cronickille*.

²⁹ TNA E101/418/6, f. 22v, f. 34r, f. 41r; TNA E101/422/15. See also the privy purse expenses of Elizabeth of York, TNA E36/210, f. 38, f. 45, f. 63, etc. for entries 'by the commaundement of the quene'.

incorrigible', they 'denowned their onhoneste demanour to the quenes majestie, whoo either pryncely rebuked them or sharpely punisshed, or els utterly exilide them her majesties courte for ever'.³⁰ The authority of a queen as mistress of the household was reinforced by the obedience of servants to her command. In attending upon her person and performing menial or routine tasks on her behalf, the queen's servants were a visible and tangible expression of her status and authority.

Queens and their servants were 'governed' not strictly by ordinances of the household, but by the expectations upon them in their roles as 'mistress' and 'servant'. As mistress of the household, the queen's authority had to be continually practised and constantly legitimated, sometimes through ritual and ceremony, though more often through discourse. It had to be constructed *socially*, by her interaction with servants. The 'good' mistress, in the view of William Latymer, presided over her servants, and gave them moral guidance, 'to instruct them the waye to vertue and grace, to charge them to abandone and eschue all maner of vice', 'vigilantly to wache their doinges', to 'suffer noo contencion emonges them, admitt noo brawling altercacions nor sedicious quarrels'.³¹ Anne herself would, apparently, on occasion, 'call before her in the prevy chambre' her ladies and gentlewomen and 'wolde many tymes move them to modestye and chastertie'. She 'wold geove them a longe charge of their behaviours', warning them that they 'shoulde not consume time in vayne toyes and poeticall fanses'.³² Anne gave her maids-of-honour 'a booke of prayers' to hang from their girdles for each of them to use as 'a myrroure or glasse wherein she might learne to addresse her wandering thoughtes'.³³ When Anne learned that her

³⁰ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 25r.

³¹ Latymer, *Cronickille*, ff. 24v-25r.

³² *Foxe*, V, pp. 62-63; Wyatt, pp. 442-3; Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 25r, ff. 26v-27r, ff. 31r-32v. 'time' here corrected from 'the'.

³³ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 32v. The Primer, Psalter, and the Book of Hours, were devotional literature for personal use.

maid-of-honour, Mary Shelton, had ‘writton certeyne ydill poeses’ in her book of prayers, she called Shelton before her and ‘rebuked her that wold permitte suche wantone toyes in her book of prayers’.³⁴ This view or memory of a strict, ‘matronly’ Anne, or more accurately, of the ‘good’ mistress, is corroborated by at least two more of the queen’s servants. Joan Wilkinson, Anne’s silkwoman, would tell John Foxe that ‘in all her time she neuer saw better order amongst the ladies and gentlewomen of the Courte, then was in this good Queenes dayes’,³⁵ whereas Anne Gainsford, her maid-of-honour, informed the account of George Wyatt, who observed that the queen ‘had in court drawn about her, to be attending on her, ladies of great honour, and yet of greater choice for reputation of virtue’ whom the queen had ‘trained upon with all commendations of well ordered government’.³⁶ It was the responsibility of queens as mistress of the household to govern her servants, and govern them well.

If, institutionally, the queen’s household remained firmly integrated with, and was treated as an extension of, the king’s household, in the eyes of contemporaries it had its own identity, separate from the king’s side. A queen’s household was thought, felt and understood to be her own, and its servants were seen to be firmly under her charge. This is reflected in Latymer’s *Cronickille*, as Anne repeatedly describes her household as ‘my courte’, observing that ‘the prince is bounde to kepe his awne persone pure and undefyled, his house and courte so well ruled that all that see it may have desyre to follow and do thereafter’, and ‘as I have attayned unto this highe place nexte unto my sovereigne, so I might in all godlynes goodnes duely administre the same’.³⁷

³⁴ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 32v.

³⁵ Foxe, V, pp. 62-63.

³⁶ Wyatt, pp. 442-3.

³⁷ Latymer, *Cronickille*, ff. 22r-22v.

Ordinances for the household laid out much of the day-to-day itinerary of queens and their servants. Life in the queen's chambers was governed by ritual, and all servants had to be in attendance at morning, afternoon, evening and night, at mealtimes,³⁸ or, for instance, religious services. Publicly, queens, at least once, often twice or even three times a day, emerged from their private apartments with their ladies and walked in procession from their Privy chamber to their Presence chamber, through their Guard chamber and then by a gallery to the Chapel Royal, where they heard mass 'before the highe aulter', and on occasion, gave confession and received penance.³⁹ Eustace Chapuys reported on 15 April 1533, the day before Easter Sunday, that Anne Boleyn, by then a queen lacking only a crown, 'went to mass in Royal state, loaded with jewels, clothed in a robe of cloth of gold friese'.⁴⁰ Mary, duchess of Richmond, carried her train, and in attendance were as many as sixty young women who conducted her 'to and from the church with the same or perhaps greater ceremonies and solemnities than those used with former queens on such occasions'.⁴¹ Privately, in their Privy chamber, the queen and her servants heard mass, prayed, and would take confession in the queen's closet. Ordinances for the household of lady Anne of Cleves drawn up in 1551 indicate that services were ministered by one of her own chaplains, who was to be ready at eight o'clock in the morning every day 'in suche place as shalbe appoynted' to say 'suche divine service'; and again between nine and ten o'clock 'in her chapell closet to say like service before her grace's gentylwomen and other of her famylie'; and finally, before five o'clock in the afternoon 'to say like service', and otherwise 'at all tymes' to be 'declared within her sayd house'.⁴² 'If anny of the said servaunts or other of the

³⁸ *HO*, p. 146.

³⁹ *HO*, pp. 188-189. 'The distinctions between public (chapel) and private (privy closet) devotional spaces and the attendant staff were apparent'. Fiona Kisby, "'When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547', *Journal of British Studies*, 40, 1 (2001), pp. 51-56; Kisby, 'Office-Holding', p. 2.

⁴⁰ *LP* V 351.

⁴¹ *CSP Sp*, IV, ii., 1061.

⁴² BL Harleian MS 6807, f. 10r. An ordinance drawn up for the household of lady Anne of Cleves, dated 1 July 1551 on f. 18r. In the ordinances for Henrietta Maria, it was written that the queen's privy closet 'shall bee kept

sayd famylve absent hymselfe from the sayd divine service', they were 'to be charitably monishyd and reconsyld', or, for a second offence, 'ought to have to be discharged'.⁴³

Queens and their households could be drawn into their own, distinct, patterns of piety. Servants often shared in the religious convictions and personal faith of their mistress.⁴⁴ 'Household' piety, or the daily routine of religious observances and ceremonial, engaging in theological debates, prayer sessions and the study of scripture, attending sermons from visiting preachers, and possessing or exchanging of religious texts, was led by the master or mistress of the household. Anne Boleyn preferred many known reformers to her household, and this characterised the nature of religious life in her chambers.⁴⁵ Queens and their ladies and gentlewomen servants attended divine services in her privy closet. Private sermons and devotions were ministered by her chaplains, who were appointed by the queen herself. William Latymer and Nicholas Shaxton, her chaplains, with Thomas Burgh, the queen's lord chamberlain, Sir Edward Baynton, her vice-chamberlain, Sir James Boleyn, her chancellor, and others 'of her sidd', 'in all their denars and suppers' in the queen's Presence chamber 'gave them selves wholie' to 'the discussing of some one dought or other in scripture'. This was, occasionally, done in the company of the king: 'Wherin the kinge his majestie to some tyme such pleasure', Latymer recalled, 'that dyverse and sondry tymes he wolde not only

for the ladyes and gentlewomen that attend the Queene, and that noe gentleman or waiting gentlewomen be suffered to come into it when wee are at prayers or sermon'. *HO*, pp. 340-351. The Friars Observant who 'came at divers feasts and sundry places to confess the ladies and gentlewomen' of Catherine of Aragon's household-in-exile, 'sometimes saying it was their way from one of their houses to another'. (*LP* XIV, i., 190.)

⁴³ BL Harleian MS 6807, f. 10r.

⁴⁴ A full discussion of the religious activities of queens consort is outside of the scope of this study. For more on religion in the household see Elizabeth Ann Culling, 'The Impact of the Reformation on the Tudor Royal Household to 1553' (University of Durham, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1986) for a broad overview.

⁴⁵ Hugh Latimer, William Betts and Matthew Parker, all of whom were implicated in the circulation of forbidden books from 1528, were all appointed as her chaplains, as were William Latymer and Nicholas Shaxton. When William Betts died in March 1535, Anne actively recruited Matthew Parker to replace him. Through John Skip, her almoner, she exhorted Parker to be one of her chaplains ('I pray you resist not your calling, but come in any wise to know further of her pleasure. John Bruce and Thomas Perowne (eds.), *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, Parker Society (1853).

here them but somtyme wolde argue and reason hym selfe.’⁴⁶ Queens and their servants might recite and debate scripture, read, study and exchange books for learning and devotion. If queens went on pilgrimage, they were accompanied by their servants, and in traveling from palace to palace, both mistress and servant could be engaged in almsgiving and poor relief.⁴⁷ This bond of service between mistress and servant itself was sacred. ‘What euer service I do vnto him, the same do I vnto Christe,’ Cognatus remarked, ‘who byddeth vs with all our good hertes to obeye our maisters, and wyll therefore him selfe rewarde vs’.⁴⁸ Anne Boleyn, Latymer observed, felt that ‘it pleased allmightye God to call her to be ladye over manye’.⁴⁹

The ‘good’, or ‘godly’, mistress, kept her servants constant and conspicuous in their piety. The ‘good’ mistress, in the words of Latymer, ruled her servants ‘in moste godly wyse and princely maner’, and ‘beganne ymediatly after her royall coronacion to conuerte her whole thought, ymaginacion and indeavour to the godly order, rule and goverment of suche as was committed to attende her highnes in all her affayers’.⁵⁰ As queen, Anne Boleyn apparently ‘kepte her maides and suche as were about her so occupyed in sowing and woorking of shirts & smockes for the poore’;⁵¹ ‘yelding herein example to others to the like indeavour’, she kept an English bible in her chambers for her servants ‘to rede upon when they wold’, and even urged her chaplains to ‘exhorte them to feare God,’ and ‘cause them dayly to

⁴⁶ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 30v.

⁴⁷ Pilgrimages and almsgiving – the *public* practice, and display, of piety – are reasonably well-documented. Records of her itinerary indicate that Catherine of Aragon and her servants, routinely, or, on at least four occasions, in 1515, 1517, 1519 and 1521, visited the shrine of Our Lady at Walsingham. ‘The Itinerary of Henry VIII and Cardinal Wolsey 1514-1530’, Appendix I in Neil Samman, ‘The Henrician Court During Cardinal Wolsey’s Ascendancy, c. 1514-1529’ (University of Wales, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1988), pp. 327-438. Account books indicate that queens and their servants regularly distributed alms. Catherine of Aragon handed out £195 7s. 7d. in alms between 1525 and 1526. LP IV 6121. See also Eliz. PPE., and Anne of Cleves.

⁴⁸ Cognatus, *servauntes*, doc. 19.

⁴⁹ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 32v.

⁵⁰ Latymer, *Cronickille*, ff. 22r-22v.

⁵¹ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 25r.

heare the devine service.’⁵² In *Actes and Monuments*, Foxe writes that Anne ‘caried euer about her a certaine little purse, out of the which she was wont daily to scatter abroad some almes’, engaging her servants in poor relief, with the queen urging them to ‘commaunde mynne almes liberally’ and to ‘take esspeciall regarde in the choise of suche poore peopell as shalbe fownde moste nedye’.⁵³

Yet it is difficult to determine if, and how far, queens *actually* kept their servants constant and conspicuous in their piety, as much of the evidence which survives is determinedly one-sided, even hagiographic, in nature. The most useful and descriptive accounts for Anne and her servants’ religious activity were written during in the reign of Elizabeth I, Anne’s daughter, and as such may have been written in an attempt, firstly, to rehabilitate or retrieve her reputation, and secondly, if indirectly, influence the Elizabethan religious settlement.⁵⁴ It is significant that these accounts of Anne Boleyn are strikingly similar to – and perhaps, even echo – those on Catherine of Aragon by Catholic authors, who invoked the same imagery and rhetoric. In *The history of Grisild* (1558), William Forrest, who served Mary I as a chaplain, remembered her mother, Catherine of Aragon, as a ‘godly’ mistress who kept order amongst her servants, and described her ‘Courte’ as ‘Religious’, avoiding all manner of ‘vayne’ and ‘idle’ pastimes.⁵⁵ In *A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce Between Henry VIII and Catharine of Aragon*, Nicholas Harpsfield, a Catholic priest writing in Mary I’s reign, (c. 1553-1558), described Catherine ‘in much prayer, great alms, and abstinence’, and ‘when she was not this way occupied, then was she and her gentlewomen

⁵² This was probably Tyndale’s New Testament (1534). Latymer, f. 23v and f. 32v, for Anne. See ODNB entry for William Latymer for the dating of his *Cronickille*.

⁵³ Foxe, V, pp. 62-63. This we are told by those ‘daily acquainted with her doings’, ‘by the relation of certain noble personages which were chiefe & principall of her waiting maides about her, especially the Duches of Richmond by name’. George Wyatt echoes Latymer and Foxe in his description of Anne: the queen ‘caused her maids and those about her daily to work in shirts and smocks for the poor’. Wyatt, pp. 442-3.

⁵⁴ G. W. Bernard, ‘Anne Boleyn’s religion’, *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), pp. 1-20 (pp. 3-4).

⁵⁵ William Forrest, *The history of Grisild the Second: a narrative, in verse, of the divorce of Queen Katharine of Arragon*, ed. by W. D. Macray (London, 1875), pp. 28-29.

working with their own hands something wrought in needlework costly and artificially, which she intended to honour of God to bestow upon some churches'.⁵⁶ Nicholas Sanders' *The Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism* (1585) had Catherine 'present every morning in church for six hours together during the sacred offices', and 'in the midst of her maids of honour, she read the lives of saints'.⁵⁷ Certainly these authors intended to preserve strictly the most idyllic image and 'pious' representations of these queens in the reigns of their respective daughters, Elizabeth and Mary.⁵⁸ Although the accuracy of these accounts has been questioned, and closely scrutinised,⁵⁹ the parallels which can be drawn between them establishes the 'good', or 'godly' mistress was a strict, pious, devout and sombre figure who kept herself and her servants, in the words of Latymer, in 'vertuous demeanour, godly conversacion, sobre comunicacion and integritie of lyf'.⁶⁰

Life in the queen's chambers was not all prayer books and private devotions. It is not plausible that queens always ruled their households so firmly, and piously, their servants 'so occupied' in moral discipline as to avoid all manner of 'vayne' and 'idle' pastimes. There was time for dancing, singing, writing and reciting poetry, idle conversation, and playing music, cards and wordgames.⁶¹ Like Henry VIII and his gentlemen servants, who would

⁵⁶ Nicholas Harpsfield, *A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce Between Henry VIII. and Catharine of Aragon*, ed. by Nicholas Pocock, (London, 1878), p. 200. See also ODNB entry for Nicholas Harpsfield by Thomas S. Freeman.

⁵⁷ Nicholas Sander, *The Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, ed. by David Lewis (London, 1877), p. 7. This is reiterated or copied out in *The Life of Jane Dormer, duchess of Feria* (1613), Henry Clifford, secretary to the duchess, who had herself served in Mary I's household, records that Catherine 'was the most part of the morning in the Church at holy service and after dinner read the life of that day's Saint to her maids standing by'. Joseph Stevenson (ed.) *The Life of Jane Dormer, Duchess of Feria by Henry Clifford, Transcribed from the Ancient Manuscript in the possession of Lord Dormer* (London 1887), p. 73.

⁵⁸ Alternatively, see Freeman, 'Anne Boleyn', pp. 797-819.

⁵⁹ Thomas S. Freeman rigorously analyses Foxe's source material, and traces his anecdotal evidence on Anne Boleyn to her servants. It has been convincingly argued that this evidence cannot be dismissed as mere hagiography. Freeman, 'Anne Boleyn', pp. 808-810, 817; Maria Dowling, 'Anne Boleyn and reform', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35 (1984), pp. 30-46; Dowling, 'Scholarship, Politics and the Court of Henry VIII' (Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of London, 1982), p. 155.

⁶⁰ Latymer, *Cronicille*, ff. 24r-24v.

⁶¹ Wyatt, pp. 425-8.

engage in hunting, hawking and archery, his queens and their ladies had their own ‘recreacion’, during which they would ‘passe tyme’ and ‘playe’.⁶² These women would have sewn not only shirts and smocks for the poor, but costumes for court revelry, theatrical spectacles which incorporated verse, music and dance, in which they often took part. Catherine of Aragon kept her maids occupied with needlework. When Henry VIII was at war with France in 1513, the queen and her women in England were ‘horible besy with making standerds, banners and bagies’.⁶³ When in 1527 Catherine was visited by cardinals Wolsey and Campeggio, who sought her answer or consent in the king’s ‘Great Matter’, ‘she came out of her Privy chamber with a skein of white thread about her neck’, and excused herself: ‘but to make answer to your request I cannot so suddenly, for I was set among my maidens at work, thinking full little of any such matter’.⁶⁴ Of Anne Boleyn’s handiwork, George Wyatt wrote that many of the ‘rich and exquisite works’ which adorned Hampton Court were apparently ‘for the greater part wrought by her own hand and needle, and also of her ladies’.⁶⁵ Certainly the material culture of the queen’s household espoused the feminine virtues of the crown,⁶⁶ yet it is difficult to discern the nature of, or motive behind, their activity. Did the ‘booke of prayers’ hanging from the girdles of Anne’s maids-of-honour, for instance, function as intended, or was it an item for self-fashioning?

Ordinances forbade ‘vnlawfull geemes as dyce, cardes & suche other p[ro] habited by ye Kinges Lawes’.⁶⁷ Yet in the queen’s chambers, like in the king’s chambers, this was likely

⁶² BL Cotton MS, Caligula, E, IV, f. 55. (*LP* XIX, ii., 201).

⁶³ BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VI, f. 93.

⁶⁴ Cavendish, pp. 227-228.

⁶⁵ Wyatt, pp. 442-3.

⁶⁶ Whereas the king and his men ‘leadership, martial virility, courage, rationality, and paternal care and protection’, the queen and her women represented ‘piety and chastity, compassion, charity, obedience to male authority, and motherhood’. Beem, ‘Queenship’, p. 4.

⁶⁷ BL Harleian MS, 6807, ff. 10-12.

broken without fear of sanction.⁶⁸ Anne of Cleves regularly played cards and dice with her gentlewomen, as her accounts reveal that she laid out on separate occasions, on 12 April 1540, 33s. 4d. for ‘playng at cards’, and the next day, 60s., for ‘playng at blanke dycce’, 40s. ‘for Cards’, and 20s. for ‘grots to play’, which were often delivered to and kept in the hands of one of her chamberers.⁶⁹ There are similar entries in the accounts of Elizabeth of York, with her servants carrying and delivering sums of money for the purpose: for example, 13s. 4d. by Joan, lady Guildford, and 6s. 8d. on another occasion by Elizabeth Lee, her gentlewoman, for ‘playng at Dyce’.⁷⁰ Elizabeth frequently had her minstrels play in her chambers,⁷¹ and retained a fool, named William, as evidenced by entries in her accounts for his wages, livery, etc. ‘for keping of the said fole’.⁷² Catherine Parr laid out money for three geese and a hen ‘for Jane Foole’,⁷³ who had familiarity without deference to the queen, providing her and her servants with entertainment and merriment.

Neither queens nor their servants could maintain strictly the ‘good’, or ‘godly’ household. Paradoxically, a queen’s household had to be the epitome of morality, and virtue, yet this was a difficult, if not impracticable, ideal to reconcile with the king and his court in all its worldliness and splendour.⁷⁴ In 1510, Henry VIII and twelve of his men ‘came sodainly in a mornyng, into the Quenes Chambre’ at Westminster, ‘all appareled in shorte cotes...

⁶⁸ See, for instance, Henry VIII playing cards and dice with Richard Hill, sergeant of the cellar. *PPE*, pp. 33, 144.

⁶⁹ The accounts reveal that the groats were on more than one occasion delivered ‘to Mestres Jostelyns hands’, Anne Joscelyn, one of the queen’s chamberers. TNA E101/422/15; TNA E101/422/16; Other amounts are recorded, wherein over one month the queen lost 9s. at cards, 9s. at dice, and on another occasion, 37s. 4d. for dice. Catherine of Aragon owned a chess set, carved in ivory, though this could have been a gift and there is no record of her playing it. BL Royal MS 7 F XIV, f. 136r.

⁷⁰ TNA E36/210, ff. 56-7.

⁷¹ TNA E36/210, f. 29, f. 52, f. 85, for instances of rewards laid out for the queen’s minstrels.

⁷² TNA E36/210, f. 43, f. 64.

⁷³ *LP* XIX, ii., 688. See also, entries in the accounts of Anne of Cleves: on 21 January 1540, Anne’s household was entertained by a tumbler, whom the queen rewarded with 5s., and on another occasion, Anne Stanhope, countess of Hertford, had her minstrels play before the queen, for which they were rewarded with 45s. (TNA E101/422/15).

⁷⁴ Not to mention immorality, corruption, ‘pride, envy, indignation and mocking, scorning and derision’. Lisle, IV, 152.

with hodes on their heddes, and hosen of the same, euery one of them, his bowe and arrows, and a sworde and a buckler, like out lawes, or Robyn Hodes men', before 'certeine dances and pastime' were made.⁷⁵ During a pageant held on 13 February 1511, a few riotous and unwelcome guests 'ranne to the pagent, and rent, tare, and spoyled' it, even 'to the kyng, and stripped hym into his hosen and dublet', while 'the ladies likewyse were spoyled'. After 'the kyng with the quene and the ladyes returned to his chamber, where they had a great banket, and all these hurtes were turned to laughyng and game... and so this triumphe ended with myrthe and gladnes'.⁷⁶ In 1514, Elizabeth Blount and Elizabeth Carew, maids-of-honour to Catherine of Aragon, exchanged letters and tokens with Henry and his favourite, Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, who wrote to the king reminding him 'to [tell my]sstres Blount and mysstres Carru [the] next tyme yt I wreth un to them [or se]nd them tokones thay schall odar [wre]th to me or send me tokones agayen'.⁷⁷ Henry VIII's gentlemen servants in one instance played 'shouffulborde' in 1519, with various sums owed and laid out 'for playing money in the queen's chamber'.⁷⁸ Though the account is badly mutilated there are several entries for 'playing money' used in the queen's chamber. The gentlemen with whom Henry Courtenay, earl of Devon was playing were Sir Christopher Garneys, Henry Sherbourne and a Mr. Darcy. Later Henry Courtenay, quite literally, 'lost' his hat 'in the Queen's chamber', specifically, a white hat worn for the revels.⁷⁹ At a banquet held at Greenwich on 7 July 1517, Giustinian observed that 'the ladies, indeed, sat alternately, that is to say, a gentleman and then a lady',⁸⁰ while at a banquet held by the king at Beaulieu on 4 September 1519, there once again 'sat a Ladie and a Lorde' who 'were plenteously served'.⁸¹ A court was not a

⁷⁵ *HC*, pp. 513-14.

⁷⁶ *HC*, pp. 516-9. See also, in the same year, when 'the kynges grace and the ladies had daunsed acertayne tyme' and 'made great chere' after a banquet. *HC*, pp. 513-4.

⁷⁷ BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VI, f. 152 (*LP* I 3387).

⁷⁸ *LP* III 152.

⁷⁹ *LP* III, pp. 1550-1553.

⁸⁰ Giustinian, *Four Years*, vol. 2, pp. 97-8; *LP* II 3446; *LP* II 3455.

⁸¹ *HC*, p. 599.

court without its women, as was clear when Catherine of Aragon and her ladies and gentlewomen had been exiled: ‘All men sayde that there was no myrthe’ at the Christmas festivities held at Greenwich in 1531, ‘because the Queene and the Ladies were absent’.⁸²

The Tudor court had an unprecedented veneer of luxury and extravagance that consciously perpetuated magnificence, majesty and grandeur. Henry VIII’s enthusiasm for such festivities and merriment at court saw an increase in the frequency in which these events were staged. At a banquet held in the queen’s chambers on 24 February 1533, ‘the King was so much engaged in play and conversation with the ladies that he scarcely talked to the rest of the company’.⁸³ When the king received Chapuys in the queen’s Presence chamber in 1536, the Imperial ambassador observed that, while he was congratulating Jane Seymour on her marriage, the king busied himself ‘talking to the other ladies’.⁸⁴ When ‘the kyng was yong and lusty, disposed all to myrthe and pleasure’, he was known to be ‘more given to matters of dancing and of ladies’ than his predecessors.⁸⁵ Even as late as 1546, a year prior to his death, though his health was deteriorating quickly, Henry was ‘still inclined to pay his court to ladies’,⁸⁶ and continued in ‘banqueting and huntinge, and rich maskes everie night with the Queene and ladies’.⁸⁷

The queen’s ladies and her gentlewomen servants were at the centre of the court’s tradition of chivalric pursuits, as the objects of rescue and desire. At a masque held on 3 October 1518, twelve ‘ladyes disguysed’ with twelve ‘knightes disguysed’ together ‘daunced at one tyme and after they had daunced, they put of their viziers, & then they were all

⁸² *HC*, p. 784.

⁸³ *LP* VI 212; *CSP Sp* IV ii 1055.

⁸⁴ *LP* X 1069.

⁸⁵ Cavendish, p. 12; *LP* VIII 1018.

⁸⁶ *CSP Sp*, V, ii, 43.

⁸⁷ *WC*, vol. 1, p. 173.

knowne', and all the company 'had high chere' until two o'clock in the morning.⁸⁸ At the mock siege of Château Vert, or 'Castle of Virtue' a masquerade held at York Place on 4 March 1522, the queen's maids-of-honour performed a carefully-rehearsed dance in elaborate costume, cast as one of the many qualities or 'virtues' deemed fit for the mistress of chivalric tradition: Beauty, Honour, Perserverance, Kindness, Constancy, Bounty, Mercy and Pity.⁸⁹ Edward Hall's account of the pageant had 'the lordes' take 'the ladies of honor as prisoners by the handes, and brought them doune, and daunced together verie pleasauntly, which much pleased the straungers, and when thei had daunced their fill then all these disvisered themselves and wer known.'⁹⁰ At the jousts celebrating the coronation of Henry and Catherine of Aragon in 1509, it was observed that their many 'feats' were done 'for the loue of ladies', while at a tournament held at Greenwich in 1512, the queen and her ladies introduced the king and his men before they 'ran their courses'.⁹¹ Sir Edward Baynton, Anne Boleyn's vice-chamberlain, reported to her brother, George, on 9 June 1533, that, 'as for passe tyme in the queens chambers', there 'was never more'.⁹² 'Yf any of you that bee now departed have any ladies that ye thought favoured you, and somewhat wold moorne att parting of their servauntes,' Baynton continued, 'I can no whit perceyve the same by their daunsing and passetyme they do use here, but that other take place, as ever hath been the custume'.⁹³

⁸⁸ *HC*, pp. 594-5. See also Giustinian, *Four Years*, vol. 2, pp. 225-228. The same observation of seating arrangements – 'there set a lady and a nobleman, or a gentleman and a gentlewoman, throughout all the tables in the chamber' – was made by George Cavendish, gentleman usher to Cardinal Wolsey. Cavendish, pp. 115-116.

⁸⁹ *LP* III pp. 1548-1599. The Revels accounts indicate that the ladies who participated in the mock siege on Château Vert kept the rich garments commissioned for their performance.

⁹⁰ *HC*, pp. 630-2. See also courtiers 'who danced and masked with these fair ladies and gentlewomen, every man as his fantasy served', in Cavendish, pp. 201-202. This account has ladies interacting with ambassadors at court, in this instance, they would 'accompany them at mumchance, and then after to dance with them and so to have of them, acquaintance on another such occasion'.

⁹¹ *HC*, pp. 533-4.

⁹² *LP* VI 613.

⁹³ TNA SP 1/76, f. 168 (*LP* VI 613); Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland, was apparently known to 'resort for his pastime unto the queen's chamber, and there would fall in dalliance among the queen's maidens'. Cavendish, p. 123. Wyatt, pp. 425-428.

These interactions, or ‘fantasyes’ as Baynton describes them, between the queen’s women and ‘their servauntes’, gentlemen at court, represent *amour courtois*, or the ‘courtly love’ tradition, an integral element of chivalric culture in which gallant knights would, feigning their love, court and flatter their ladies with dances, poems, songs and gifts and other ‘favours’ in an unending pursuit for her affection.⁹⁴ This tradition ran through the Devonshire manuscript, an anthology of nearly two-hundred poems of courtly verse, and other riddles and ‘tokens’, many of which were composed and circulated by women in Anne’s innermost circle.⁹⁵ The manuscript illustrates a courtly circle-in-action – led by Lady Margaret Douglas, Mary Shelton and Mary Howard, the duchess of Richmond, three of Anne’s servants – and is a material witness to how they interacted with one another in the queen’s chambers.⁹⁶ By their literary expression, annotation and circulation of the manuscript, the queen’s servants provide a view not only of the pastime enjoyed and pleasure taken in ‘poeticall fanses’ and amorous repartee,⁹⁷ but also of the impassioned and unrestrained environment in which even Anne herself incautiously flirted with gentlemen at court. Thematically, forbidden, or improper love, loyalty, and fidelity, are contextualised by the scandals which arose in the queen’s chambers. Lady Margaret Douglas conducted her liaisons with Thomas Howard, the younger son of the duke of Norfolk, in secret. But when their affair was discovered, it was the queen’s Chamber servants who were examined: John Ashley, Anne’s sewer, apparently ‘perceyved love between them’ for at least ‘a quartr of a yere’, while Thomas Smyth, clerk of the council, remarked that often the duke ‘wold watche tyl my lady bulleyn was goon and

⁹⁴ Ives, *Anne*, pp. 20-22 for more on the nature of courtly love. Lancelot de Carles, Anne’s contemporary biographer, illustrates the queen as presiding over a court of pleasures, while others repeat the legend that she did pastime ‘most in masks, dancing, plays and such corporal delights’. Clifford, ‘Dormer’, in Stevenson (ed.), *Dormer*, p. 78.

⁹⁵ BL Add MS 17492; Irish, ‘Devonshire’, pp. 82-3.

⁹⁶ The names and hands of these women can be identified in the manuscript.

⁹⁷ *Devonshire*, p. 7.

thenne stele in to her chambre'.⁹⁸ Reflecting the conventions within which they interacted, the poems often evoke paranoia, and vulnerability, and the difficulty, even danger, for women to, in the words of Castiglione, keep 'a certaine meane verie hard', and in their interactions with men to 'come just to certaine limittes, but not to passe them'.⁹⁹

Clearly there was tension between the queen's household and the wider court to which it belonged. Christine de Pizan urged that the queen must 'take upon herself the responsibility for the care of her women servants and companions, who she will ensure are all good and chaste'. Pizan recognised that the behaviour, demeanour and virtue of all women at court was subject to scrutiny, and thus 'whether in dances or other amusements', they must 'divert and enjoy themselves decorously and without wantonness'.¹⁰⁰ Anne Boleyn herself acknowledged the potential for 'wantones', 'pleasurs' and 'licencious libertie' in her chambers, and was acutely aware of such dangers in her own 'courte', and as such urged her chaplains to admonish her servants if they were to 'yelde to any maner of sensualitie'.¹⁰¹ Pizan advised queens to 'so enforce her regulations that there will be no visitor to her court so foolhardy as to dare to whisper privately with any of her women', nor would they 'disobey her commands in any respect or to question her will'.¹⁰² A woman's capacity to rule and govern, in view of her contemporaries, could be judged from her ability to keep the ladies and gentlewomen of her household chaste and virtuous. Queens thus had to be so strict with their ladies and gentlewomen as to maintain order and, crucially, evoke both respect and fear in all who regarded them, 'for there is no doubt that a lady is more feared and respected and held in

⁹⁸ TNA E36/210, ff. 53r-55v, f. 65r. (*LP* XI 48); Irish, 'Devonshire', pp. 82-3. Both were arrested after news of their marriage surfaced, and on 9 July 1536, servants of Anne Boleyn's household were interrogated as to the nature of their relationship.

⁹⁹ Castiglione, *Courtier*, p. 176.

¹⁰⁰ Pizan, *Treasure*, 1 / 18.

¹⁰¹ Latymer, *Cronickille*, ff. 24r-24v.

¹⁰² Pizan, *Treasure*, 1 / 18.

greater reverence when she is seen to be wise and chaste and of firm behaviour'.¹⁰³ Jane Seymour may have been eager to set herself apart from her predecessor and rid the queen's household of its previously wayward influence, by consciously and carefully constructing her own image – and that of her servants – as gentle and virtuous. Thomas Cromwell remarked that 'his grace I think chose the vertuost lady and the veriest gentlewoman that lyveth and oon that variethe asmoche from the conditions of thother as the daye varietie from the night'.¹⁰⁴ If Anne Boleyn's household was flirtatious and given to vanity, Jane's would, by her rigid enforcement of discipline and decorum, maintain an outwardly virtuous and incontestably high moral standard. Anne Boleyn's maid-of-honour, Besse Harvey, was discharged, and wrote to Sir Francis Bryan, gentleman of the king's Privy Chamber, asking 'why she was discharged of the Queen's service', soliciting him to find her preferment. Bryan 'sent her word that he had moved it', but 'the King bade him meddle with other matters'.¹⁰⁵ Perhaps Besse, whose reputation was far from beyond reproach, was discharged, and kept out of the queen's household on account of Jane's rigidly-enforced morality. Certainly a woman whose reputation had been brought into disrepute was unfit to serve in the queen's household.¹⁰⁶ Jane gave strict orders to her maids-of-honour regarding their formal attire. Shortly after her arrival at court in the autumn of 1537, Anne Basset was instructed by the queen that she must 'wear no more her French apparel', and instead 'must have a bonnet or two with frontlets, an edge of pearl, a gown of black satin, and another of velvet'.¹⁰⁷ 'I thought became her nothing so well as the French hood', wrote Husee in a letter to Anne's

¹⁰³ Pizan, *Treasure*, 1 / 18.

¹⁰⁴ Roger Bigelow Merriman (ed.), *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*, vol. 2 (1902), p. 21. Sir John Russell described Jane as 'gentle', and similarly remarked that 'The king hath come out of hell into heaven'. *Lisle*, III, 713, pp. 395-6.

¹⁰⁵ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 174 (*LP* X 1134 [4]). Besse may have been reappointed later. She is later among the women who visit the king's ship in Portsmouth.

¹⁰⁶ See also, Jane Poppingcourt, who was discharged from the household of Mary, queen of France, in 1514. BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VI, f. 200 (*LP* I 3331); TNA SP 1/9, f. 114 (*LP* I 3378).

¹⁰⁷ *Lisle*, IV, 896, pp. 167-8 (*LP* XII, ii., 808).

mother, ‘but the Queen’s pleasure must be done’.¹⁰⁸ ‘To serve God and to be virtuous’, the agent observed, was ‘much regarded’ in Jane’s household.¹⁰⁹ ‘Here is a very great and triumphant court’ with ‘many ancient ladies and gentlewomen in it’, another observed remarked, shortly after Jane’s household was established, suggesting that she had recruited more matronly, ‘sober’ ladies to serve her.¹¹⁰ This marked change in environment and culture between these two households reflects how far influenced the nature of service was by the personality, character and demeanour of the mistress.

Unlike her predecessor, Anne of Cleves was ‘lowly’, modest and homely, and had an amiable, relaxed temper.¹¹¹ On 22 December 1539, Honor Grenville, lady Lisle, informed her daughter, Anne Basset, who had been appointed to serve the new queen as one of her maids-of-honour, ‘of her Grace, that she is so good and gentle to serve and please’. This reassured Basset, who herself acknowledged ‘it shall be no little rejoicement to us, her Grace’s servants here, that shall daily attend upon her’.¹¹² But the young, frivolous, often juvenile and quick-tempered Catherine Howard who succeeded her was reportedly ‘more imperious’, ‘commanding’, ‘troublesome’, and could be ‘difficult to serve’.¹¹³ While Anne was known to ‘occupieth her time most with the needle’, Catherine ‘did nothing but dance and rejoice’.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁸ *Lisle*, IV, 895, pp. 163-5 (*LP* XII, ii., 711).

¹⁰⁹ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

¹¹⁰ *Lisle*, IV, p. 196.

¹¹¹ Nicholas Wotton wrote to Henry on 11 August 1539 regarding Anne: ‘of very lowly and gentle conditions’ or disposition; and ‘she canne reede and wryte her [in German]...’, though ‘Frenche, Latyn, or other langaige she [hath no]ne, nor yet she canne not synge nor pleye [upon] enye instrument, for they take it here in Germanye for a rebuke and an occasion of lightenesse that great ladyes should be lernyd or have enye knowledge of musike’. BL Cotton MS, Vitellius, B, XXI, f. 203 (*LP* XIV, ii., 33).

¹¹² *Lisle*, V, 1620, pp.730-1 (*LP* XIV, ii., 718).

¹¹³ This report was dated 29 January 1542, after Catherine had been moved to Syon, shortly after her indiscretions had been uncovered by the king’s Privy council. *LP* XVII 63; *LP* XVII Appendix B, 4; CSP Sp VI, i., 223. For Catherine’s quick temper, see TNA SP 1/167, f. 133.

¹¹⁴ BL Cotton MS, Vitellius, B, XXI, f. 203 (*LP* XIV, ii., 33). *LP* XVI 1332. We must take these assessments of queens and their character cautiously, as they are often inconsistent. The French ambassador Charles de Marillac observed that, shortly after the annulment of her marriage with the king, Anne of Cleves would take ‘all the recreation she can in diversity of dress and pastime’ (*LP* XVI 11). Marillac was struck also that Catherine Howard had ‘taken no kind of pastime but kept in her chamber’ since the king had learnt of her indiscretions.

Unsurprisingly, her household was so unruly that, on 18 September 1540, to restore ‘sobre and temperat ordyr’, the Privy council had to summon Sir Edward Baynton, Catherine’s vice-chamberlain, among other servants in her household, to reprimand them for their behaviour in the queen’s Presence chamber, and towards the king’s own servants.¹¹⁵

If the queen’s household in this period was *actually* ‘godly’, pious and virtuous, if it was judged as such by its contemporaries, or if this was merely constructed later, the evidence remains ambiguous. What is clear is that how far or how strictly their servants were kept in this manner would have varied considerably from household to household. Certainly this is what queens would have aspired to, the expectation against which all queens would be measured.¹¹⁶ The character and demeanour of the queen’s servants, like that of the queen herself, had to be irreproachable. As Pizan observed, they ‘must preserve their honour more than other women because their honour or dishonour reflects and rebounds upon their mistress’.¹¹⁷ Latymer’s Anne, the ‘good’ mistress, understood that she was ‘bounde to kepe her owne person pure and undefyled her house and Courte so well ruled that all that see it may have desire to follow and do thereafter, and all that heare therof may desire to see it’.¹¹⁸ She urged her chaplains ‘to omitt nothing that may seeme to apperteinge to my honour’: ‘in this wyse you may preserve my courte inviolate, and garde it from the obloquie of the envyous’.¹¹⁹ How their servants led their own lives, in what they said, what they did, where they went and with whom, even what they wore, reflected upon queens as their mistress.

Although such reports may not accurately or fairly represent the personalities of these queens, they can here provide a view of how their demeanour or temperament might, even temporarily, affect the nature of service.

¹¹⁵ *PCP*, VII, p. 39 (*LP* XVI 62).

¹¹⁶ Certainly it was not an innovation of Catherine of Aragon or Anne Boleyn. See the ‘pious’ and ‘godly’ household of Margaret Beaufort.

¹¹⁷ Pizan, *Treasure*, 2 / 3.

¹¹⁸ Her servants were to be of such ‘quiet and godly lyvinge’ that they ‘may be a spectacle to others’. Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 23v.

¹¹⁹ Latymer, *Cronickille*, ff. 22v-23v.

Even Catherine of Aragon, whose piety is reasonably well-documented,¹²⁰ could be accused – slandered¹²¹ – by the king in the midst of the ‘Great Matter’ of exhorting her ladies and gentlemen far too often ‘to dance and pass time’.¹²²

Queens were held accountable for their servants – a queen who failed to censure her servants’ behaviour and instruct them in moral discipline might be judged incapable of governing her own.¹²³ In the words of Pizan, ‘the lady who is chaste will want all her women to be so too, on pain of being banished from her company’.¹²⁴ In this context it is not unreasonable to suggest that queens could have kept up a pious appearance or ‘façade’,¹²⁵ to construct and protect their own reputations and that of their households. Upholding piety, virtue and godliness was the responsibility of all queens as the mistress of the household. Its practice maintained strict moral order in the household, establishing authority and status, whereas the *performance* of piety by queens and their servants met its secondary function of display and, as exemplars to the wider court and kingdom, was crucial for its reputation.

Intimacy, and the queen’s Privy Chamber

The public and the private were somewhat inextricable in the early modern period. Defining the public and the private in the household and at court is difficult, as these spheres were often blurred, and activity, particularly that of women, often overlapped them. Although it

¹²⁰ The Venetian ambassador, Sebastian Giustinian, described Catherine as ‘religious, and as virtuous as words can express’. Giustinian, *Four Years*, vol. 2., Appendix II, pp. 313-314. Catherine was known to observe ‘holy oaths and prayers, fasting, abstinence and pilgrimage, and continues to strive after these’, even to endangering her own health and gave rise to concerns that she could be unlikely to conceive and bear children. Stefan Ehses (ed.), *Römische dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Dokumente Heinrichs VIII von England, 1527-1534* (Paderborn, 1893), p.xliii, transcribed in Tremlett, *Catherine*, p. 115.

¹²¹ That this was a ‘slander’ to the name of the queen is revealing in itself.

¹²² BL Cotton MS, Vitellius, B, XII, f. 68 (LP IV 4981).

¹²³ Russell, *Catherine*, p. 216.

¹²⁴ Pizan, *Treasure*, 1 / 18.

¹²⁵ Freeman, ‘Anne Boleyn’.

has been suggested that in this period ‘concerns that we would label as either personal or political... virtually ignored the distinction between the public and the private’,¹²⁶ it is clear that there was, at least institutionally, a line, or ‘frontier’, as it has been termed, which separated them at court: the Privy Chamber.¹²⁷ A king or queen’s Privy Chamber functioned for privacy, or, broadly, as it was understood by contemporaries, ‘less public’, ‘not public’, or ‘the negative of public: secrecy or separation from that which is open, available, or pertaining to the community or nation as a whole’.¹²⁸ Unlike the king’s Privy Chamber, which, for the king, established a clear distinction between his public and his private lives,¹²⁹ the queen’s Privy Chamber in this period more often failed in this most essential function.

Publicly, interactions between queens and their servants necessarily met set expectations and conventions. But privately, queens could engage and interact with their servants in ways that were more relaxed, personal and intimate. The nature of these interactions means that they are yet more difficult to uncover. The evidence occasionally provides an extraordinary, if tantalising, view, of how queens and their servants might have interacted more intimately. Queens often treated their servants familiarly. When Anne Boleyn was served Ipocras ‘and other wyne’ at her coronation, she had them ‘sent doune to her ladyes, and when the ladyes had dronke’, Anne ‘withdrew her selfe with a fewe ladyes’ to relax in her chamber.¹³⁰ Mary Woodhull, Catherine Parr’s chamberer, shared the queen’s bed during her pregnancy, and Mary, Catherine would later recall, ‘beyng abed with me had layd her hand vpon my bely to fele yt styre’.¹³¹ The evidence, albeit anecdotal, and fragmentary as

¹²⁶ Harris, ‘Politics’, p. 260.

¹²⁷ Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 8.

¹²⁸ Erica Longfellow, ‘Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England’, *Journal of British Studies*, 45, 2 (2006), pp. 313-334 (pp. 315, 333).

¹²⁹ ‘Only by separating the staff of the Secret Chamber from that of the Chamber was he able to establish a firm and clear distinction between his private and his public lives’. Starkey, ‘Privy Chamber’, p. 63. The king’s affairs could be carried out with the utmost discretion. Starkey, ‘Representation’ in Guy (ed.), *Monarchy*, p. 61.

¹³⁰ *HC*, pp. 798-805.

¹³¹ Mueller, pp. 169-170.

it is, would indicate that queens often spoke candidly with their servants: Anne Gainsford, Anne Boleyn's maid-of-honour, would later recall that, before her marriage to the king, when her mistress came upon a book of 'old prophecies' in her chambers, she 'called to her maid': 'Come hither, Nan', 'see here a book of prophecy; this he saith is the king, this the queen, mourning, weeping and wringing her hands, and this is myself with my head off.' 'I would not myself marry him', Gainsford remarked, before her mistress assured her, 'I am resolved to have him whatsoever might become of me.'¹³² When Catherine Parr lay on her deathbed, she confided in her gentlewoman Elizabeth Tyrwhitt that 'she did fear such things in herself, that she was sure she could not live'. "'My Lady Tyrwhit, I am not well handled, for those that be about me careth not for me, but standeth laughing at my grief. And the more good I will to them, the less good they will to me.'" 'I perceived she spake with good memory,' Tyrwhitt recalled, 'and very sharply and earnestly, for her mind was unquieted'.¹³³

This intimacy did not necessarily defy or break conventions laid out in didactic literature on service. Queens were warned not to be autocratic in governing their servants, but benevolent, so that they might obey with reverence, and without contempt or resentment from oppression. Servants were to 'be cheryshed' by their master, or mistress, Cognatus observed, so that 'frendship may knit betwixe them'.¹³⁴ 'You must love your mistress... as you love yourself', Pizan urged, before tying affection between mistress and servant to the general order and conduct of the household. A lady or gentlewoman in service was 'expected to love her lady and mistress with all her heart (whether the mistress is good or bad or kind), or otherwise she damns herself and behaves very badly'.¹³⁵

¹³² Wyatt, pp. 429-30.

¹³³ Mueller, pp. 177-178.

¹³⁴ Cognatus, *servantes*, doc. 9-10. William Latymer's Anne Boleyn would show her servants 'tendre affection... then ever they durste have hoped or wysshed for'. Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 33r.

¹³⁵ Pizan, *Treasure*, 2 / 2.

Queens and their servants provided each other with comfort in difficult times. In 1515, Catherine of Aragon remarked that her maid-of-honour, María de Salinas, whom she loved ‘more than any other mortal’,¹³⁶ had ‘always comforted her in her hours of trial’.¹³⁷ At Blackfriars in 1529, in the midst of the king’s ‘Great Matter’, after making an impassioned speech knelt before the king, Catherine ‘rose up’ and, strikingly, ‘took her way straight out of the house, leaning (as she was wont always to do) upon the arm of her General Receiver, called Master Griffith’, or Griffith Richards.¹³⁸ When Anne Boleyn suffered a miscarriage in 1536, it was, surprisingly, the queen, who ‘consoled her maids who wept, telling them it was for the best, because she would be the sooner with child again’.¹³⁹ In 1540, when Anne of Cleves heard that her marriage to the king was to be annulled, Thomas Manners, earl of Rutland, the queen’s Lord Chamberlain, commiserated with her: ‘And for that I dyd see her to take the matter hevely, I desired her to be of good comfort’.¹⁴⁰ Catherine Parr wrote a letter of condolence to Jane, lady Wriothesley, in 1544, upon learning of the death of her son: ‘my lady wreseley’, the queen urged, ‘put away all immoderate and vniuste hevynes... yt hathe pleased hys mayeste to accepte and able hym to hys kyngdome then that yt fyrst pleased hym to comforte you wythe suche agyfte’.¹⁴¹ This may often have amounted to more than the strictest obligations of service, though strikingly, Pizan characterised the queen’s women as caretakers of her welfare, who in their own state and demeanour should even act as extensions of and represent her body, mind and soul:

¹³⁶ *LP* I 3524.

¹³⁷ *CSP Sp*, II, 238.

¹³⁸ Cavendish, p. 217.

¹³⁹ *LP* X 352.

¹⁴⁰ *LP* XV 844.

¹⁴¹ Mueller, pp. 80-81; BL Lansdowne MS 76, 81, f. 182r; See also, for Catherine Parr, in 1546, the funeral of ‘mistress Nevell’, who was one of the queen’s servants, and for which ‘the Queen’s highness’ provided expenses. *LP Addenda* II 1878.

If she is ill or unhappy, you must be as sad as if it were your own misfortune, and likewise joyous at her well-being and prosperity. When you see her displeased, be sad with a sorrowful expression, and when good comes to her be joyful, and not just in front of her, but even more when you are out of her presence.¹⁴²

Relationships, between ‘mistress’ and ‘servant’, could thus have emotional significance, with such evidence revealing ties of companionship and friendship which were distinctive of service. This is perhaps most clear when these bonds were severed. William Forrest, Mary I’s chaplain, in a poem in 1558 dramatised the moment that Catherine of Aragon’s servants were discharged against their will, ‘her lamentabl takinge her leave of her olde moste trustye and lovyng servauntys’:

At whois departure, when they tooke their leave,
At her (their olde and reverende Mistresse)
Tendrenes of harte her powers did bereave,
As tearys from the same did playnlye expresse,
Sayinge unto them in her great heavynes,
‘Halas! youre servyce to mee of longe date,
That I (no waies) can oughtes remunerat!’¹⁴³

This mirrored the ‘hevynes’ into which Catherine fell when her servants were taken away by Henry VII and sent back to Spain in 1502.¹⁴⁴ This outpouring of emotion from servants is perhaps most striking in their grieving for their mistress. William Latymer, Anne Boleyn’s chaplain, remarked that ‘wee that did attende her majestie muste nedes justly lamente the soudaine departinge of so god a princes’, so much so that their ‘hertes might seeme for

¹⁴² Pizan, *Treasure*, 2 / 2.

¹⁴³ Forrest, ‘Katharine’, pp. 17-18.

¹⁴⁴ *Receyt*, pp. 77-78.

sorrow to pynne and melte awaye'.¹⁴⁵ Lancelot de Carles, the French ambassador in England, wrote that, on the scaffold, moments before Anne's execution in 1536, her ladies were 'half dead themselves', describing them as 'bereft of their souls, such was their weakness'. The queen 'consoled her ladies several times', as one of them 'in tears came forward to do the last office and cover her face with a linen cloth'.¹⁴⁶ At least one account corroborates this, recording that they then 'withdrew themselves some little space, and knelt down over against the scaffold, bewailing bitterly and shedding many tears'.¹⁴⁷ In a Latin epigraph on Catherine Parr, John Parkhurst, her chaplain, wrote that, upon the death of their 'most gentle mistress' in 1548, her servants were struck with bitter grief. 'For the departed, we her household flow with watery eyes; Damp is the British earth from moistened cheeks'.¹⁴⁸ Albeit undoubtedly exaggerated in accordance with contemporary literary and cultural conventions, such accounts illustrate the potential depth of relationships between mistress and servant.¹⁴⁹

In this the queen's Privy Chamber was crucial. Royal palaces were labyrinthine, often crowded, essentially public spaces. Henry VII's increasing concern for privacy in the 1490s saw the development of the 'Privy Chamber'. Privacy in the early-modern period was rare. Of course, the definition, or concept of 'privacy' varies in our understanding according to the function and nature of the space itself, and the intended purpose for that space by the individual, as well as the status of the individual themselves.¹⁵⁰ For queens, the ability to withdraw to a separate, personal, and private space or chamber, restricted from the wider

¹⁴⁵ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 33r.

¹⁴⁶ Lancelot de Carles, secretary to the serving French ambassador in England, 'A letter containing the criminal charges laid against Queen Anne Boleyn of England', 2 June 1536 (*LP* X 1036, translated in Susan Walters Schmid, *Anne Boleyn, Lancelot de Carle, and the uses of documentary evidence* (2009), lines 1219-1250, 1270).

¹⁴⁷ Samuel Bentley (ed.), *Excerpta Historica, or, Illustrations of English History* (1831), copied from an Italian account by 'P. A.', perhaps a Venetian ambassador (pp. 265-266).

¹⁴⁸ Mueller, pp. 183-84.

¹⁴⁹ In their letters, queens often spoke of their servants with affection. Catherine Parr, for instance, on many occasions referred to her men and women as being 'our trusty and well-beloved servant'. BL Cotton MS, Vespsian, F, III, f. 38 (*LP* XIX, i., 967). Mueller, pp. 83-84.

¹⁵⁰ Audrey M. Thorstad, *The Culture of Castles in Tudor England and Wales* (Suffolk, 2019), p. 155.

court, or the act of doing so, was seen as a privilege, and reflected the queen's rank and authority. Like the king's Privy Chamber, the queen's Privy Chamber created an atmosphere which encouraged familiarity and the forming of close bonds between mistress and servant. Its attendant staff were necessarily women, who made more suitable companions for queens than their male counterparts at court. The physical, spatial, and architectural separation of women and men often perpetuated gender stratification, though not to exclude women from power, but rather to facilitate it, namely the relationship between the queen and her women.¹⁵¹ The queen's Privy chamber, bedchamber and privy closet, and any additional galleries or lodgings in her 'inward' chambers, constituted a strictly *female* space, wherein women, both the queen and her ladies and gentlewomen servants, had the opportunity to engage in their own affairs and advance their own interests.

The evidence for all of this, however, is also fragmentary. Such a lack of evidence may indicate that the queen's Privy Chamber functioned, and functioned well. Yet there are cracks, providing an unprecedented insight into the personal, private lives, conversations, interactions and affairs of queens (and their servants) in this period, due in measure to Henry VIII's marital instability. Anne of Cleves would confide in Eleanor, countess of Rutland, Jane, lady Rochford, and Katherine, lady Edgecombe, of her Privy chamber, all of whom later journeyed from Richmond to Westminster on 7 July 1540, swore to and signed a deposition relating their conversation with the queen. Anne's servants maintained that the queen herself admitted to them one night the truth of the king's contention that the royal marriage had not been consummated:

First, Al they being together, they wished her Grace with child. And she answered and said, She knew wel she was not with child. My Lady Edgecomb said, How is it possible

¹⁵¹ Thorstad, *Castles*, p. 167; Spain, 'Gendered', p. 139.

for your Grace to know that, and ly every night with the King? I know it wel I am not, said she. Than said my Lady Edgebomb, I think your Grace is a mayd stil. With that she laughed. And than said my Lady Rocheford, By our Lady, Madam, I think your Grace is a mayd stil, indede. How can I be a mayd, said she, and slepe every night with the King? There must be more than that, said my Lady Rocheford, or els I had as leve the King lay further. Why, said she, whan he comes to bed he kisses me, and taketh me by the hand, and byddeth me, Good night, swete hart: and in the morning kisses me, and byddeth me, Farewel, darlyng. Is not thys enough? Than said my Lady Rutland, Madam, there must be more than this, or it wil be long or we have a Duke of York, which al this realm most desireth.¹⁵²

This conversation, supporting the claim that Henry and Anne had not consummated the marriage, would secure for the king the annulment of their marriage.¹⁵³ It is almost incredible that Anne would have spoken so openly with these ladies, having met them only six months prior. Yet in the intimacy of the queen's chambers it is plausible that she could have been caught off-guard.¹⁵⁴ It may be suggested that the intimacy shared in by queens and their servants was strictly institutional, and this institution – the queen's Privy Chamber – was controlled by the king. Its attendant staff provided intimacy, but this was constrained by the presence of the king, if not physically, then by proxy, in servants whom *he* could trust. On this occasion, it was the king who had appointed these women, and they had known him for much longer than the queen, their mistress. This raises the question of if, and how, queens could have their own affairs, or if the queen's affairs were necessarily the king's affairs?

¹⁵² LP XV 850; John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials relating chiefly to religion, and the reformation of it, and the emergences of the Church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary I*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1822), vol. 1, pp. 462-3. The conversation was dated to 22 or 23 June, at Westminster Palace.

¹⁵³ The remaining four in attendance when they swore this deposition were Susan Parker, née Hornebolt, who was sent by the king to Cleves to meet Anne and prepare her prior to her journey to England, Sir Thomas Denny, chancellor, Sir John Dudley, master of the horse, and Dr. Oglethorpe, chaplain.

¹⁵⁴ Did this conversation happen at all? Retha Warnicke expresses doubt as to the validity of their deposition, and suggests that they 'conspired together to create fictitious conversations with her'. Retha Warnicke, *The Marrying of Anne of Cleves: Royal Protocol in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 234-236.

Could queens maintain their own separate domain, withdrawn from the wider court, and with their servants achieve ‘true’ intimacy? Did queens have privacy, or did the queen’s Privy Chamber fail to function?

All servants ‘owe vnto their master, good and true seruice’, and in this, above all else, the ‘good’ servant, in the words of Cognatus, had ‘to be trustye’.¹⁵⁵ The reason for this is obvious. Servants were intimate, and personal, and in admitting them to her chambers, her person, her mind, and her favour, the mistress necessarily put her trust in her servants. The ‘good’ servant kept that trust and remained loyal and faithful to their mistress. As Pizan remarked, ‘love will prompt her to have faith and loyalty in all circumstances’.¹⁵⁶ Catherine Howard’s affair with Thomas Culpeper, gentleman of the king’s Privy Chamber, in 1541 demonstrates how queens might judge and discern in her servants who she could, and who she could not, trust, circumventing the ‘institutional’ Privy Chamber for ‘true’ intimacy. Culpeper was arrested on 12 or 13 November and interrogated by the king’s council. In his surviving deposition, Culpeper recalled how, in April, the queen had sent for him by Henry Webbe, her gentleman usher, to ‘the entry between her Privy Chamber and the Chamber of Presence’. Here Catherine ‘gave him by her own hands a fair cap of velvet garnished with a brooch and three dozen pairs of aglets and a chain’.¹⁵⁷ ‘Put this under your cloak’, Catherine warned him, ‘[and let] nobody see it!’ ‘Alas, Madam,’ Culpeper sighed, ‘why did not you this when you were a maid?’¹⁵⁸ She could not have been unaware of how her actions might be misconstrued by others: why else did she exhort him to conceal her gift under his cloak?

¹⁵⁵ Cognatus, *servauntes*, doc. 8, doc. 10.

¹⁵⁶ Pizan, *Treasure*, 2 / 2.

¹⁵⁷ Thomas Culpeper remembers he was summoned in April by the Queen through her servant, Henry Webbe. TNA SP 1/167/157-9.

¹⁵⁸ TNA SP 1/167/157-9.

Later when Culpeper had fallen ill, Catherine became anxious to see or hear from him,¹⁵⁹ but she could hardly visit him herself without arousing suspicion. She dispatched Morris, her page, with food to aid his recovery.¹⁶⁰ This may be the same ‘pore felowe’ who she sent thereafter with a letter to Culpeper: ‘on of the grefes that I do felle,’ the queen wrote, ‘to departe from hym for than I do know noone that I dare truste to sende to you’. Clearly Catherine was cautious, even astute in judging which of her servants could be trusted to undertake this sensitive, if otherwise menial task. ‘I pray you take hym to be wyth you’, the queen urged, ‘that I may sumtym here from you’, before advising Culpeper that he ‘instruct my man to tare here wyt[h] me still, for he sas wat so mever you bed hym he wel do et’.¹⁶¹

In her letter to Culpeper, Catherine solicited him to ‘com whan my lade Rochforthe ys here, for then I shalbe beste at leaysoure to be at your commaundmant.’ Jane, lady Rochford, of the queen’s Privy Chamber, contrived the queens’s clandestine trysts with the king’s gentleman. The surviving depositions of the accused and of eyewitnesses are worth quoting at length to illustrate the extent to which a servant might be involved in, and in turn, acquire influence over, the queen. It was Jane who ‘moved her for hym’,¹⁶² and it was Jane who sent word to and received Culpeper in the queen’s chambers.¹⁶³ Jane chaperoned them on at least three occasions at Lincoln, one of them until ‘three of the clock in the morning or

¹⁵⁹ ‘Yt was showed me that you was sike, the wyche thyng troubled me very muche tell suche tyme that I here from you praying you to send me worde how that you do’. TNA SP 1/167 f. 14; *LP* XVI 1134.

¹⁶⁰ ‘At Greenwich’, Culpeper recalled in his deposition, ‘[she] sent to him, being sick, at diverse times flesh or the fish dinner by Morres the Page’. TNA SP 1/167/157-9.

¹⁶¹ TNA SP 1/167 f. 14. Although Catherine’s letter to Culpeper is undated, it was likely written between either 12 and 31 May or 4 and 18 June, i.e. while the court was at Greenwich, during which time we know that Culpeper had fallen ill. The letter is undated, but Culpeper by his own admission in his deposition he was ill when the court was at Greenwich, which was in April. Calendared in *LP* at the end of August, although the editors later considered that it should be placed in early August and ‘probably written from Lincolnshire’ during the summer progress. More likely, it was written from Greenwich in April or early May, because of its corresponding with Culpeper’s illness. Of course, it is entirely possible that Culpeper would fall ill again much later, during the summer progress, to which period this letter is often dated. Russell, *Catherine*, p. 248.

¹⁶² Historical Manuscripts Commission, Bath, vol. 2, pp. 9-10 for the deposition of Catherine Howard. Jane ‘made instans’ – urgent solicitation or entreaty, to the queen, to meet with him.

¹⁶³ TNA SP 1/167 f. 14; *LP* XVI 1134; See also how Jane ‘appointed him to come’. TNA SP 1/167/157-9.

thereabout',¹⁶⁴ and 'every night' at Pontefract, 'the queen being in her bedchamber having no nother with her but my Lady of Rochford'.¹⁶⁵ At York, Jane even accommodated them in her own bedchamber.¹⁶⁶ Jane 'wold at eevery lodging serche the bak doors & tell hir of them if there were eny',¹⁶⁷ and even had one of her own servants 'watch the door one night and the next to see if any of the watch or any other went in or out'.¹⁶⁸ She carried and exchanged letters, gifts and tokens between them,¹⁶⁹ and even advised the queen to 'gyff men leave to looke for they woll looke uppon yowe'.¹⁷⁰ Jane warned the queen that 'if yowe confesse yowe undo both your selff and others',¹⁷¹ though it was she who later provided the king's council with their most incriminating evidence, in remarking that 'she thinketh that Culpeper hath known the Queen carnally, considering all things that she hath heard and seen between them'.¹⁷² Jane was not merely Catherine's confidante. In the words of one of her chamberers, 'my lade off Rochfor the prynsy a casyoun off har ffoley' ('my lady of Rochford was the principal occasion of the queen's folly').¹⁷³ Catherine restricted access to her bedchamber to Jane, and explicitly forbade the attendance therein of the rest of her servants.

Yet, what remains in the surviving depositions is Catherine's paranoia, a sense of the terrifying vulnerability of her position. The king's council could not prove Catherine Howard had committed adultery, but in their own view – and their own words – it was sufficiently damning that the queen had met Francis Dereham 'in her secret chamber and other suspect places', and Thomas Culpeper, 'five or six times in secret and suspect places' where 'they

¹⁶⁴ TNA SP 1/167/157-9; TNA SP/1/167/149.

¹⁶⁵ TNA SP/167/153-4; *LP* XVI 1338.

¹⁶⁶ HMC, Bath, vol. 2, pp.9-10; TNA SP 1/167/157-9.

¹⁶⁷ HMC, Bath, vol. 2, pp. 9-10.

¹⁶⁸ TNA SP 1/167/157-9.

¹⁶⁹ TNA SP 1/167/157-9; *LP* XVI 1338; *LP* XVI 1339.

¹⁷⁰ HMC, Bath, vol. 2, pp. 9-10.

¹⁷¹ HMC, Bath, vol. 2, pp. 9-10.

¹⁷² TNA SP/1/167/159-60.

¹⁷³ TNA SP/167/153-4.

were closetted together'.¹⁷⁴ For 'the better and more secretly to pursue their carnal life', Lady Rochford was retained by Catherine as a lady of her Privy chamber 'to contrive meetings in the queen's stole chamber and other suspect places'.¹⁷⁵ The queen's Privy chamber was 'secret' and 'suspect', wherein privacy away from the prying eyes of the court was maintained by her most intimate servants, who concealed limitless indiscretions, untold acts and motives which could, and would, be misconstrued.¹⁷⁶ Catherine was hesitant, and anxious, in meeting with Thomas Culpeper for late night rendezvous. Although they were conducted in her privy lodgings, she felt yet vulnerable. Her fear was and is palpable: Catherine stated that she knew her relationship with Culpeper would 'be spyed oon day and then we be all ondone'.¹⁷⁷ 'It wold out, what hold your own I warraunt yowe,' the queen warned Jane, 'be yowe afrayd'.¹⁷⁸

The separation and division of male and female in the queen's chambers often aroused suspicion and encouraged gossip, fostering an atmosphere of mistrust. The first entry in the miscellany the 'Devonshire Manuscript', an anthology of courtly verse circulated by women in Anne Boleyn's household, is a poem by Sir Thomas Wyatt, which warned a lover of his indiscretions, and concerns the lack of privacy and unrelenting surveillance at court:

Take hede be tyme leste ye be spyede
 yo^r lovyng I yee can not hide
 at last the trwthe will sure be tryde
 therefore take hede.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴ LP XVI 1395; LP XVI 1342.

¹⁷⁵ LP XVI 1395.

¹⁷⁶ Bradley J. Irish, "The Secret Chamber and Other Suspect Places": Materiality, Space, and the Fall of Catherine Howard, *Early Modern Women*, 4 (2009), pp. 169-173 (pp. 171-172).

¹⁷⁷ HMC, Bath, vol. 2, pp. 9-10.

¹⁷⁸ HMC, Bath, vol. 2, pp. 9-10.

¹⁷⁹ Irish, 'Devonshire', p. 92.

In the words of William Latymer, ‘nothing canne longe escape the percinge eyes of princes, esspecially in their awne pallacies’.¹⁸⁰ Pizan warned women at court that they ‘ought not to defame’ their mistress, ‘either among themselves or elsewhere, for words can never be said privately enough that they may not be reported’.¹⁸¹ Was it Catherine Howard’s infatuation with and overwhelming desire for Culpeper that led to her to abandon caution? Or should it be asked *who* led the queen to abandon caution, as it was Jane who reassured the queen to ‘feare not’ and ‘badd the quene hold her own’.¹⁸² Queens could be drawn in by the presence of servants whom they trusted, but who facilitated only the *illusion* of privacy, feigning an atmosphere of intimacy. This is what saw the candid confession of Anne of Cleves, the recklessness of Catherine Howard’s adulterous affair, and the heretical, reformist zeal of Catherine Parr.

Henry VIII’s break with Rome marked the beginning of the Reformation in England. Although the use of scripture and the ‘new learning’ to support the king’s ‘Great Matter’ was adopted through the 1520s and 1530s, Henry himself was seemingly ambivalent towards reform, and his reign was characterised by confusion, uncertainty, and apprehension, as to what constituted ‘heresy’. Its prosecution became increasingly vigorous in the 1540s. At Windsor, on 4 August 1543, a group of men were found guilty of heresy under the Six Articles and were burnt at the stake. At a trial held in Berkshire, an accusation was levied against, to have ‘privily indicted’, alongside these men, certain of the king and the queen’s servants for having ‘abetted, aided, favoured, counselled and consented’ them in committing these heresies. A man identified by John Foxe as ‘Fulke’, a servant of Catherine Parr, namely Foulke Langley, yeoman of the queen’s Chamber, ‘had lain at Windsor all the time of the

¹⁸⁰ Latymer, f. 32v.

¹⁸¹ Pizan, *Treasure*, 2 / 7.

¹⁸² HMC, Bath, vol. 2, pp. 9-10.

business and had got knowledge what number were privily indicted', before reporting back to Thomas Cawarden, of the king's Privy Chamber and one of the accused.¹⁸³ Be it on the orders of the queen, or acting on his own initiative, Foulke's presence at Windsor protected the queen's servants: the 'privy indictments' were intercepted and seized by Cawarden, and all those accused were pardoned by the king at Ampthill on 31 August.¹⁸⁴ Yet this incident, and others,¹⁸⁵ demonstrate that neither queens nor their servants were invulnerable to accusations, or charges, of heresy in this period.

Strict laws forbade, for instance, the purchase and possession of prohibited books of a heretical nature. Anne Boleyn had in her chambers a copy of William Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man*, which she had lent to one of her maids, Anne Gainsford, some time in 1529. George Zouche, one of the queen's servants, 'plucked' the book from the maid, which was then snatched from Zouche by Dr. Richard Sampson, dean of the king's Chapel, who confiscated and delivered it to Wolsey. A fearful Anne Gainsford 'wept', because 'she could not get the book back from her wooer'. She knew that possession of the book in question 'was enough to make a man a heretic, and reading of it a dangerous article against any in

¹⁸³ *Foxe*, V, pp. 494-5.

¹⁸⁴ *LP* XVIII 241 [6]. The king could and often did protect his own: George Blage, of the Privy Chamber, was condemned to death for heresy against the sacrament. *Foxe* records that others in the Privy Chamber brought this to the king's attention, who was 'sore offended' that the prosecution of heresy had 'come so near him, and even into his privy chamber', and Blage escaped death (*Foxe*, V, p. 564) 'The true centre of influence and protection in these final years was the King's Privy Chamber. It is to that institution, rather than to the queen's household, that one must look for intervention in religious matters' (Dowling, 'Scholarship', p. 263.)

¹⁸⁵ On 3 May 1540, a young man named Mandeville, groom of the chamber in the household of Anne of Cleves, was burnt at the stake in St. George's field, by Southwark, 'for heresie against the sacrament of the aulter' ('one was a groome to the Queene named Maundevild'. *WC*, vol. 1, p. 118. Mandeville was a Frenchman and is identified in separate accounts as a servant of the queen. *LP* XVI 578 for Richard Hilles' account, in which he names Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester as responsible for the burnings, see also John Bale who wrote in 1544 that Gardiner had 'broyled in saynct Georges felde beyonde Sothwarke one gyles a Ioynar with one of the quenes seruantes and a paynter before fyue a clocke in the morninge, least the common people shuld haue knownen your lewde legerdemayne ouer theyr last confessions'. John Bale, *The Epistle exhortatorye of an Englyshe Christiane* (STC 1291: Antwerp, 1544), ff. 14v-15r. A man identified as 'Worley' by the Privy council who was committed to the Tower in 1546 'for erronyous opinions' may have been Richard Worley, yeoman of the queen's Chamber. *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, vol. 1, 1542-1547, ed. John Roche Dasent (London, 1890), p. 418. A man named 'Johan Bette', was condemned to death for violation of the Six Articles. (*APC*, vol. 1, p. 400). John Bettes, yeoman of the Chamber to Parr's three predecessors, and likely to Parr herself? This Bettes is not listed in the records for Henry VIII's funeral in 1547 (TNA LC 2/2).

these days'.¹⁸⁶ Wolsey sent for and examined Zouche, who informed him that 'it pertained to one of the queen's chamber'.¹⁸⁷ But before the cardinal could report it to Henry, the queen herself went to him. 'Upon her knees she desireth the King's help for her book', and even 'besought his Grace most tenderly to read it'.¹⁸⁸ Some years later, in 1536, the queen entrusted William Latymer, her chaplain, and Joan Wilkinson, her silkwoman, to purchase and import what were, potentially, forbidden books to her chambers.¹⁸⁹ Latymer was apprehended upon his return from Flanders. The titles of these books and the nature of the material cannot now be known, though it may reasonably be speculated that 'the irregularity of the shipment', in that 'silkwomen were not normally purveyors of books to the royal household', indicates that such works were of a 'radical religious character'.¹⁹⁰ Clearly there were limits to what and how queens and their servants could engage in and advocate for reform. Whereas many would have outwardly conformed, as an overzealous, or even unorthodox faith, could risk attracting hostility and incurring the king's wrath, behind this conformity, a religious, reformist zeal, which may otherwise be seen and judged as heretical, could be practised, and potentially hidden, in the cloistered chambers of the queen.

More dangerous perhaps was their activity which was concealed from the wider court and kingdom, its nature unknown. A few years later, Catherine Parr and her servants were at

¹⁸⁶ Cardinal Campeggio remarked on 3 April 1529 that, 'certain Lutheran books, in English, of an evil sort, have been circulated in the King's court'. *LP* IV 5416. The account is in both John Louthe's written memorandum, by Strype, found among the Foxe papers, and by George Wyatt, whose informant was Anne Gainsford herself. See Strype, vol. 1, pp. 171-3; J. G. Nichols, *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation* (London, 1859), pp. 52-7 for Louthe's account.

¹⁸⁷ Wyatt, pp. 438-40. The source for this account is surely Anne Gainsford herself, who told it to Wyatt.

¹⁸⁸ Strype, vol. 1, pp. 171-3. This incident is attested to by John Lowthe, archdeacon of Nottingham, who told it to John Foxe. Lowthe had served in the Zouche household. George Wyatt recounted the incident in his biography of the queen, learning of it directly from Anne Gainsford.

¹⁸⁹ TNA SP 1/103, f. 259 (*LP* X 827).

¹⁹⁰ Freeman, 'Anne Boleyn', pp. 804-5. Wilkinson was later forced under exile under Mary I. The husband of another of Anne's silkwomen, Stephen Vaughan, a merchant, was sympathetic to reformers and, in 1529, was even vulnerable to charges of heresy. Vaughan was sent by Henry VIII to William Tyndale in 1531 to urge him to retract his heretical opinions, but his efforts came to nothing, and the king suspected that Vaughan was sympathetic to Tyndale.

risk yet again. The queens' chambers had become an environment wherein forbidden books were read and exchanged, and the debate of scripture encouraged between her servants. On 7 May 1546, Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk, had been brought before the Privy Council and examined 'for disputing indiscreetly of Scripture with other young gentlemen of the Court' in 'the *Quenes* chambre'.¹⁹¹ This might have been enough to arouse the suspicion of Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, Thomas Wriothesley, lord chancellor, 'and others more aswell of the kings priuie chamber, as of his priuie councell', who were charged with prosecuting this heresy.¹⁹² 'There is a great examination and punishment of the heretics here, no class being spared', François van der Delft, the Imperial ambassador, reported on 6 July.¹⁹³ There were further reports circulating at court that the queen's ladies had 'infected' her with heresy.¹⁹⁴ A royal proclamation was issued on 8 July to purge books which had 'sundry pernicious and detestable errors and heresies', in possession of anyone, 'what estate, degree, or condition, soever they or he be'.¹⁹⁵ The queen's chambers were to be searched to uncover 'what bokes, by law forbidden, shee had in her closet',¹⁹⁶ some of which were thought to have been sent to Catherine by Anne Askew, a Lincolnshire gentlewoman and

¹⁹¹ *APC*, I, pp. 400-408; *LP* XXI, i., 759. My italics, for emphasis.

¹⁹² *Foxe*, V, p. 554. As the 'conspirers and practisers of her death' intending 'to reuiue, stirre vp and kindle euil and pernicious humours in their Prince and soueraigne Lord, to the intent to depyue her of thys great fauour, which then she stooode in wyth the king' 'almost to the extreme ruine of the Queene and certaine others with her'.

¹⁹³ *CSP Sp*, VIII, 291; Freeman, 'Katherine Parr', p. 243, dates the incidents recorded by Foxe to between the end of March and the beginning of August, 1546.

¹⁹⁴ Eustace Chapuys reported to Mary of Hungary on 29 January 1547, that the queen, 'instigated' by her ladies, was 'herself infected, words and exhortations', and these servants as 'stirrers of heresy'. *LP* XXI, ii., 756; *CSP Sp*, VIII, 386, for Chapuys' report on her ladies. The ladies mentioned here are Catherine Willoughby, duchess of Suffolk, Anne Stanhope, countess of Hertford, and Jane Guildford, viscountess Lisle. Their husbands were known to be advocates of the reformed faith. *Foxe*, V, pp. 553-561. James, *Catherine Parr*, p. 239, suggests that there is a hint Catherine was smuggling illegal books into her chambers. When prosecutions for heresy intensified, Catherine gave these books to her uncle, and retrieved them by Richard Aglionby in April 1547 'concerning books of the garderobe had to the Lord Chamberlain'. TNA E101/424/12, f. 157. If she had forbidden books in her possession, it would explain why she had new locks, hinges and bands ordered to keep them secure. James, *Catherine Parr*, p. 237; TNA E314/22, f. 44.

¹⁹⁵ Culling, 'Reformation', p. 171.

¹⁹⁶ *Foxe*, V, p. 557.

known heretic who was acquainted with her servants.¹⁹⁷ When Askew was arrested and tortured in 1546, she was examined as to their involvement as agents of radical religious dissent. It is clear enough from the interrogation that the target was the queen and her servants.¹⁹⁸ The king's councillors specifically named and questioned Askew on the queen's ladies and gentlewomen, Catherine Willoughby, lady Suffolk, Mary Arundell, countess of Sussex, Anne Stanhope, countess of Hertford, Joan Champernowne, Lady Denny, and Lady Fitzwilliam, of whom she stated, 'if I should pronounce any thing against them, that I were not able to proue it.' All that Askew admitted to under torture was having received money, ten shillings from 'a man in a blew coate', apparently from the countess of Hertford, and eight shillings delivered by a man 'in a violet coat', sent from lady Denny.¹⁹⁹ Askew could not have been mistaken in that the king's councillors were targeting the queen's servants: 'they did put me on the racke,' she felt, 'because I confessed no Ladies or Gentlewomen to be of my opinion'.²⁰⁰

This focus on the queen and her women may, again, reflect male anxieties of the unknown: on this occasion, what was occurring in the 'female' space behind bolted doors between women in the queen's Privy Chamber, bedchamber and privy closet. There were higher-ranking, male officers in the queen's household who were reformers, yet the focus of their attention was the queen, her Privy Chamber and its attendant staff of women.²⁰¹ It was

¹⁹⁷ Robert Parsons believed that Anne Askew sent heretical books to the queen's chamber, and that she was known to 'corrupt divers people, but especially weomen'. Robert Parsons, *A treatise of three conversions of paganisme to Christian religion*, 3 vols., by N. D. (1603-1604), vol. 2, pp. 493-494.

¹⁹⁸ *LP XXI*, ii, 756. Joan Champernowne, lady Denny, and Anne Stanhope, lady Hertford in particular were accused of sending her money (Anne Askew did admit that she was sent 8s. from a man who claimed to have been sent by lady Denny). *LP XXI*, i, 1181.

¹⁹⁹ *Foxe*, V, p. 547. These coats were likely the personal liveries of their servants.

²⁰⁰ *Foxe*, V, p. 547. 'The latter examination' of Anne Askew, dated to July 1546, in *LP XXI*, i, 1181, is transcribed verbatim as in *Foxe*.

²⁰¹ William Parr, the queen's brother and her lord chamberlain, and John Dudley, lord lisle, previously serving in the queen's household as master of the horse, begged Askew 'earnestly' to recant and 'confess the sacrament to be flesh, blood and bone', she retorted that 'it was a great shame for them to counsel contrary to their knowledge'. (*Foxe*, V, p. 544; *LP XXI*, i, 1181; David Loades, *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504-*

not unusual for men in this period to exhibit fear or insecurity and grossly exaggerate the ‘threat’ posed by a feminine subculture which was either ungoverned or unsupervised.²⁰² It is thus significant that Foxe situated this activity between Catherine Parr and her servants as specifically ‘in her *priuie* Chamber’.²⁰³ How many conversations, exchanges, letters, or petitions were there that went unnoticed? Engaging in theological debate, prayer sessions and the study of scripture in the queen’s chambers, attending sermons from visiting preachers and possessing forbidden books on the new religion, Catherine Parr and her servants were drawn together by their commitment to defining, developing and advocating for reform.²⁰⁴ The queen ‘at al times conuenient’, would ‘haue priuate conference touching spiritual matters’ in her chambers. ‘Euery day in the after noone for the space of an houre, one of her sayd Chaplains in her priuie Chamber made some collation to her and to her Ladies and Gentlewomen of her priuie Chamber, *or other that were disposed to heare*’,²⁰⁵ Foxe recorded, ‘in which sermons, they oft times touched suche abuses as in the churche then were rife’.²⁰⁶ The queen, accompanied by the ladies and gentlewomen of her Privy Chamber, ‘oftentimes’ would exhort the king, as

‘shee did with all painfull endeuer apply her selfe by all vertuous meanes, in all thynges to please hys humour’, and ‘sometymes of her selfe would come to visite him, either at after dinner or after supper, as was most fit for her purpose. At whiche tymes shee woulde not fayle to vse all occasions to moue him, according to her maner, zelously to proceede in the reformation of the Church’.²⁰⁷

1553 (Oxford, 1996), p. 84. See also Sir Robert Tyrwhit, her master of the horse, Dr Robert Huick, her physician, Sir Phillip Hoby, John Parkhurst, her chaplain.

²⁰² Capp, *Gossips*, pp. 25, 376. The bonds between women could be threatening, in that they ‘undermined structures of power’. Gowing, ‘Friendship’, in Gowing, Hunter and Rubin (eds), *Love, Friendship and Faith*, p. 147.

²⁰³ Foxe, V, p. 553. My italics, for emphasis.

²⁰⁴ The queen had fourteen copies of the Psalmes of prayers ‘gorgeously bound and gilt on the leather’ apparently for distributing as gifts to her servants. TNA E315/161/46.

²⁰⁵ My italics, for emphasis.

²⁰⁶ Foxe, V, p. 554.

²⁰⁷ Foxe, V, p. 554.

Here the queen's Privy Chamber created a defined, restricted space, which functioned to facilitate and potentially conceal forbidden religious practices. Yet, clearly Catherine and her servants had endangered themselves by their activity in the queen's chambers.²⁰⁸ A warrant for her arrest was produced,²⁰⁹ but a draft of the articles drawn up against her was mislaid, and 'some godly person', namely Thomas Wendy, her physician, as Foxe records, brought it to the queen.²¹⁰ Like Foulke before him, Wendy protected her by taking this document to his mistress, and not his sovereign. When the queen learned of it, 'for the sodayne feare therof, [she] fell incontinent into a great melancholy and agony, bewailing and taking on in such sorte, as was lamentable to see'.²¹¹ Her physician, 'for the comforting of her heauy minde, began to breake with her in secrete maner, touching the said articles deuised against her' and 'exhorted her somewhat to frame and conforme her selfe vnto the kings minde'. The queen panicked, 'commandyng her ladies to convey away their bookes which were against the law'. 'The next night followyng after supper', ladies of the queen's Privy chamber, lady Herbert and lady Lane, 'who carried the candle before her', accompanied Catherine 'unto the kynges bead chamber', where, by pleading ignorance and acting with the utmost deference, the queen was able to convince Henry of her innocence. When Wriothesley

²⁰⁸ Their activity caught the attention, and often praise, of the rest of her household staff and the wider court. Francis Goldsmith, her gentleman usher, remarked in 1544 that the queen made every day like a Sunday in her 'holy' household, 'where Christ is daily celebrated'. (BL Lansdowne MS, 97, f. 43. In Latin. In Mueller, pp. 75-78 (*LP* XVIII, ii., 531). Anthony Cope, master of the hawks, and later, her Vice-chamberlain, in 1547 praised Catherine's 'gracious intent and godly purpose in the reading and study of holy Scripture'. Mueller, pp. 122-125; BL Harleian MS 5087, 27, f. 11r.

²⁰⁹ Foxe, V, p. 556. The Privy Council arranged for Queen Catherine Parr's auditors to bring in her accounts, which would show all that she owned, including any books in her closet.

²¹⁰

²¹¹ Foxe, V, p. 558. On 24 October 1546, Thomas Wendy was granted a valuable manor and rectory for his services as the queen's physician. It has been speculated that the manor granted to her physician a few months after this incident may have been a reward for his loyalty. Starkey, *Six Queens*, p. 762. Freeman, 'Katherine Parr', p. 245.

later confronted the queen to arrest her, Henry intervened: ‘Knave! Arrant knave, beast and fool!’ the king berated him.²¹²

Perhaps Catherine and her servants would not have escaped arrest if the articles drawn up against the queen were not mislaid. It is not known if the queen’s servants had yet been interrogated by the king’s council. Certainly this was their intention, and this testimony would have been taken to secure a conviction against their mistress. Crucially, only Catherine’s ladies and gentlewomen, ‘being of her priuie chamber’, and thus those who were ‘priuie to all her doings’, could produce the evidence that the prosecution required. Foxe observed that the king’s councillors knew that ‘the better to bring theyr purpose to passe, because they would not vpon the sodaine but by meanes deale wyth her, they thought it best, at the first, to begin with some of those Ladies whom they knew to be great with her, and of her bloud’.²¹³ Anne Parr, lady Herbert, countess of Pembroke, the queen’s sister, Maud Parr, lady Lane, her cousin, and Elizabeth, lady Tyrwhitt, all of whom were in her Privy Chamber, were to be accused, apprehended, questioned, and their coffers searched, ‘wherby the Queene myght be charged’ and ‘caried by barge by night vnto the Tower’.²¹⁴ It must be observed that the nature and full extent of their activity only became apparent when it was documented by Foxe, some time later. And crucially, this came to Foxe ‘as certayne of her Ladies and gentlewomen being yet alyve, which were then present about her, can testifie’.²¹⁵

²¹² Thomas Freeman asks if the story was accurate and requires both ‘an examination of the veracity of Foxe’s story’ and to question the assumption that ‘there was a carefully planned campaign to destroy Katherine and other evangelicals led by Stephen Gardiner’. Freeman, ‘Katherine Parr’, pp. 238-245, showing that this account must surely have come from her ladies and gentlewomen servants.

²¹³ Foxe, V, p. 557.

²¹⁴ Foxe, V, p. 557.

²¹⁵ Foxe, V, p. 558.

The significance of the development of the Privy Chamber in this period is that it maintained the privacy of the master, or mistress, by restricting access. Unlike the king's Privy Chamber, which, for the king, established a clear distinction between his public and his private lives, the queen's Privy Chamber more often failed in this most essential function. Its attendant staff often facilitated only the *illusion* of privacy, and this 'institutional' intimacy was constrained and controlled by the presence of the king, if not physically, then by proxy, in servants whom *he* could trust. Yet it has been demonstrated that the queen's Privy Chamber encouraged the forming of close bonds between mistress and servant, which could be social, political, emotional, even religious. Certainly the queen's innermost chambers were a 'female' space, if not necessarily 'feminine', providing a physical domain for networks of support and obligation.

Offices – the title and position held by servants, formally, and institutionally, defined – conferred status, measured authority, and denoted rank and precedence in the hierarchy of the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber. But this order was, inevitably, circumvented by the queen, and those to whom she did, or did not, show her favour, grant access or trust. As the mistress of the household, the queen could herself restrict access, circumventing the 'institutional' hierarchy and preserving her own 'inner circle' of trusted servants. And this personal, or 'true' intimacy, obliged the servant to their mistress. Clearly it was *relationships*, between mistress and servant, that constituted the 'functioning' household.

Chapter 4

What made royal service, a viable, if not attractive, and potentially lucrative career in the medieval and early modern period, was advancement. Patronage, or the use of influence to bestow privilege and honour, was 'ubiquitous, normal and unavoidable' in the early modern period.¹ The growth of the court in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries 'transformed the relationship between the crown and the aristocracy'.² In this period the expansion and concentration of resources in the hands of the crown, and the relentlessness of monarchical influence, saw many increasingly focus their attentions on the sovereign. Demonstrating that royal service facilitated the interaction of, and created ties between, the crown and its subjects, historians have concentrated on the household of the sovereign, and specifically, on the development of the 'Privy Chamber'. Its staff of body servants and 'boon companions' became institutionally-defined, and their proximity to the sovereign saw them engage in 'politics of intimacy'. It has been suggested that to be near about, or nearest, to the king, and his Privy Chamber, was what mattered.³ Such studies, however, examine strictly the king's side, and thus are limited in scope, yielding a distorted and incomplete view of the early Tudor court. As a result, our understanding of royal service is predicated on the king's men, and the English royal household and wider court is often reconstructed as if it were 'exclusively male': the court, we are told, was a male-dominated society, the archetypal 'courtier' is male,⁴ and its politics was strictly a *masculine* preserve.⁵ It must be observed

¹ Ives, *Faction*, p. 6.

² Harris, 'Chamber', p. 236; Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, pp. 211-212; Gunn, *Government*, p. 24.

³ Starkey, 'Intimacy', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, pp. 71-118; Sharpe, 'The image of virtue', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 248. The significance of access, and intimacy with the monarch, is well-established. Perry, 'Access', p. 1057; Mears, 'Courts', pp. 703-704; Mears, *Queenship*, pp. 54-55, 66, 71.

⁴ Loades, *Court*, pp. 41, 95. See also Gunn, *New Men*; Horrox, *Richard III*; Wilson, *Lion's Court*; Brock, 'Courtier'; Sil, *Tudor Placemen and Statesmen*.

⁵ Harris, 'Women and Politics', p. 259; Starkey, 'Intimacy', in Starkey (ed.), *Court*, p. 102; E. W. Ives, 'Egerton of Ridley' ('Ralph Egerton stands as the example of what success at court could mean, how it could be won and how it could be lost. To understand what it was drew the English gentry to the royal court in such numbers and with such persistence, it is hardly necessary to look further than Ralph Egerton.'), p. 371.

that, simultaneously, there developed, alongside the king's side, on the queen's side, her own 'Privy Chamber', and that the queen's side was firmly integrated with, and treated as an extension of, the wider court. Did the queen's household provide additional opportunities for power, patronage and preferment? Could a woman cooperate, or co-exist, in a political sense, without causing 'friction' with her male counterparts, or deviating from the role to which she was formally circumscribed?⁶ In other words, did women have careers at the early Tudor court?

This chapter examines wages, livery, advancement and other perquisites of serving in the queen's household. It situates the advancement of men and women at court within the context of office-holding, and their relationships with their master, or mistress, conceptually known as 'good lordship'.⁷ From c. 1350 to 1550, this concept lay at the heart of the household.⁸ The socio-political structure in this period transitioned from 'bastard feudalism', with ties rooted in land tenure, territorial strength and military service, to 'service' relationships in royal and noble households, wherein 'good lordship' honoured the dignity of noblemen and women, reinforcing their status with patronage.⁹ Dual 'corporate' elements of 'good lordship', which functioned in the royal household as before, were wages, as a retainer, and livery, worn by its servants.¹⁰ It mandated too the involvement and continual interference of masters, or mistresses, in the lives and careers of their servants, and their families.¹¹ Like the king's household, the queen's household exhibited 'good lordship', and queens too were

⁶ Levine, 'Women',

⁷ J. M. W. Bean, *From Lord to Patron: Lordship in Late Medieval England* (Manchester, 1989), pp. 236-237; Peter Coss, 'An age of deference', in Rosemary Horrox and W. Mark Ormrod (eds), *A Social History of England, 1200-1500* (Cambridge, 2006).

⁸ Starkey, 'Age', p. 265.

⁹ For more on 'bastard feudalism' and its decline in tradition in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries, see Michael Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism* (London, 1995); K. B. McFarlane, 'Bastard Feudalism', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 20, 61 (1945), pp. 161-80.

¹⁰ Starkey, 'Age', p. 265.

¹¹ Harris, 'Chamber', p. 227.

personally responsible for advancing their servants to oblige them to be loyal, faithful, and to obey.¹² Serving in the household of a king or queen kept up familiarity and ensured that they were represented at court, reinforcing their influence and protecting their interests, as the crown responded to all manner of appeals, made in person or by petition.

Extending new theories emphasising access and intimacy from the king's side of the court to the queen's, this chapter also examines politics in the queen's Chamber, Privy Chamber, and the wider court. It builds on the pioneering research of women at court, investigating their potential for career-making in this period to show that the archetypal 'courtier' was not strictly male, but could be female.¹³ As will be demonstrated, women serving the queen engaged in 'politics of intimacy', and their participation in petitioning, patronage, and providing 'counsel', be it for their own careers, and their own interests, or on behalf of their clientele and kinship networks, mirrored that of men serving the king.¹⁴ More difficult to discern is their involvement, intervention or influence in matters of 'high' politics, yet this chapter begins to address their role in Henry VIII's marital crises, which had severe consequences not only for his queens but their servants too.

Wages

¹² Certainly there must be a distinction between 'good lordship' and 'good ladyship', as Catherine Mann has demonstrated through the letters of John Husee, who negotiated differently with his master and mistress Mann, 'Lisle', in Broomhall (ed.), *Emotions*, p. 125. Queens, however, were an exception. They were heads of their own households, and as such adopted an identical ideology to the king of 'good lordship', and in many respects acted much more like a master than a mistress to their servants.

¹³ Harris, 'Their Brilliant Careers' in Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, pp. 210-240; Clark, 'Courtiers', in Clark, *Gender*, pp. 92-115; Beer, *Queenship*; Hamilton, 'Katherine Parr'; Graham-Matheson, 'Parr', p. 22.

¹⁴ It has been shown that women could be central to the process of patronage. Sharon Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers, and Clients in Seventeenth-Century France* (Oxford, 1986); Kettering, 'The Patronage Power of Early Modern French Noblewomen', *The Historical Journal*, 32, 4 (1989), pp. 817-841 (p. 819).

All of the queen's servants had to be paid and provided for. Servants in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber received wages, an annual salary which was paid monthly, quarterly or yearly, recorded in accounts of her income and expenditure by her receiver-general. These records are fragmentary. The privy purse expenses of Elizabeth of York, are extant only for the last year of her life (24 March 1502 to 11 February 1503),¹⁵ whereas for Henry VIII's queens, only the account books of Anne of Cleves survive, and her reign was a mere six months, from 6 January 1540 to 9 July 1540.¹⁶ There are a few wage lists in these accounts, though they are far from exhaustive in detail. A list of 'wagis payde' on 25 March 1540 to 'the servauntts of oure moost gracious Ladie Quene Anne' records only their last names and the amounts that each of them were paid that quarter.¹⁷ Stipends were calibrated against the rank or office of a servant: the queen's lord chamberlain was paid £40 a year, whereas his deputy, the vice-chamberlain, received only £26. 13s. 4d; her maids-of-honour were paid £10 per annum, whereas her chamberers received £6. 13s. 14d.¹⁸ Knowing the annual wage of a servant can give some indication of which office they held. A letter written to her mother shortly after her appointment to the queen's household as a maid-of-honour indicates that Anne Basset was promised £10 a year for her service in 1537.¹⁹ In the 'wagis payde' to Anne of Cleves' servants, a list of six women, among them a 'mistress Basset', all paid at 50s. a quarter, or £10 a year, can thus be identified as her maids-of-honour.²⁰ Subsidy lists survive in a greater number and are of inestimable value. A handful of them specifically assessed 'the Quenes chambre'. A list dated 15 June 1546, for example, contains the names of eighty-four men and women who served Catherine Parr, and the amounts by which they were to be taxed,

¹⁵ TNA E36/210, f. 29 ('Thies ar the payementes made by Richard Decons').

¹⁶ TNA E101/422/15; TNA E101/422/16.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ TNA E101/422/15; TNA E179/69/44; Hamilton, 'Parr', p. 34; Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, p. 225.

¹⁹ *Lisle*, IV, 894; *Lisle*, IV, 887.

²⁰ TNA E101/422/15.

which provides some indication as to which offices they held.²¹ Although there are certain limitations to this evidence,²² all of the men and women who were in receipt of a wage, and whose names occur in the few accounts which are extant for queens consort, can be identified as servants.

Wages were modest, if not meagre, but there were many nonmonetary perquisites accrued from royal service. Certain gratuities, otherwise known as ‘tips’ or ‘fees’, varied from office to office. A queen’s messenger or pages of the chamber, for example, often received a ‘tip’ from the person to whom they delivered or for whom they carried a message or gift. Gentlemen ushers received ‘tips’ for preparing the queen’s lodgings in advance of her coming when her household was itinerant. In 1540, Richard Dauncy ‘and others’ received 14s. 8d. ‘for their preparacion at Rychmond’,²³ whereas in 1544, Andrew Wadham received 5s. 4d. ‘to view Hampton Court against the Queen’s coming thither’.²⁴ Servants were regular recipients of additional cash payments or rewards, for performing their duties, tasks and functions satisfactorily, or if they ran an errand, which involved going out of court on horseback to deliver a message, letter or gift on behalf of the queen. On many occasions in 1502, Thomas Woodnote and John Felde, Elizabeth of York’s grooms of the chamber, were paid between 6d. and 10d. a day ‘for thaire costes wayting upon the Quenes joyelles’.²⁵ In 1540, William Oxenbridge, Anne of Cleves’ groom porter, received £30 3s. 4d. ‘for certeyne things by hym provyded for the Quenes Chamber’, and Cornelius Doone, groom of the chamber, was rewarded with 2s. 8d. for ‘comyng with the Quenes Coffers frome grenewyche

²¹ TNA E179/69/56.

²² Not *all* of the queen’s servants received wages. Few subsidy lists are dated, and most of them contain strictly the names of individuals and the amount by which they were taxed, not the office which they held. Rates varied and were calculated accordingly, though the values given in these assessments are more likely rough estimates, not precise valuations, and as such ‘describe reputed wealth rather than real wealth’. R. W. Hoyle, *Tudor taxation records: a guide for users* (P.R.O. Readers Guide, 5, London, 1994), pp. 31-32.

²³ TNA E101/422/15.

²⁴ TNA SP 1/195, f. 167 (*LP* XIX, ii., 688).

²⁵ *PPE*, Eliz, pp. 28, 40, 44, 60, etc.

to London'.²⁶ When Anne was gifted a parrot, she rewarded her servants, John Osborne, with 12*d.* for fetching it and providing hempseed, and Thomas Chare, with 8*d.* for carrying it by water to Greenwich.²⁷ In 1544, John Hickman and Adam Betton, Catherine Parr's yeomen, received 2*s.* 8*d.* for carrying the queen's coffers from Westminster to Hampton Court. John Grove, her messenger, received 2*s.* for riding from Westminster to Hanworth to visit the queen's sister, Anne Parr, Lady Herbert, and Edward Fox, Catherine's yeoman usher, rode to London 'with the Queen's clocke' for it to be amended and received 3*s.* in reward.²⁸ Notwithstanding the cost incurred by their attendance at court, these nonmonetary perquisites granted to the queen's servants could supplement their income.

Ladies and gentlewomen servants often kept articles of clothing taken from the queen's Wardrobe.²⁹ The Revels accounts recorded in great detail the various ornate gowns, bonnets, hoods, frontlets, garments, ribbons, satins, cloths and jewels commissioned for ladies who were participating in court festivities, and often indicate that performers 'kept their corresponding articles of attire' as payments in kind. One entry, for example, explicitly states that '24 yds of fine yellow satin' for 'the 8 ladies' garments', and the '8 caul's of Venice gold for the ladies' heads' were to remain with those who had participated in the mock siege of Château Vert at York Place on 4 March 1522.³⁰ Jane Parker, lady Rochford, who performed in the pageant when she was a maid-of-honour, kept her attire of a rich gown of white or yellow satin³¹ with 'her name embrauder'd with golde' and a matching gold bonnet adorned 'with jwelles'.³² Inventories for Jane's possessions taken in 1536, and later in

²⁶ TNA E101/422/15; TNA E101/422/16.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ TNA SP 1/195, f. 167 (*LP* XIX, ii., 688).

²⁹ The terminology here is taken from Braddock, 'Household', pp. 32-33: 'tips were gratuities paid by suitors for favours received, while fees were payments in kind made by the crown as part of the servant's normal wage'.

³⁰ *LP* III, pp. 1548-9.

³¹ The Revels accounts say it was made with yellow satin, but Hall observed that ladies were apparelled in 'gounes of white satin'. *HC*, pp. 630-1.

³² *LP* III, pp. 1548-9.

1541-1542, when her goods were confiscated, indicate that, by the end of her career, she had accumulated in 'fees' an elaborate wardrobe.³³

In addition to wages and nonmonetary perquisites, many of the queen's servants were given their own lodgings in royal palaces, and were entitled to stabling for their horses, and beds for their own servants, calibrated to their rank in the Chamber or Privy Chamber.³⁴

Servants were permitted to 'eate and drinke in the Quenes Chambr'.³⁵ The Eltham Ordinances of 1526 laid out 'Everie Particular Thing to be Served to Everie Person' ordered 'Accordinge to Their Degrees', or, in other words, corresponding with the office they held. Maids-of-honour, for instance, were served

among them for their Bouch in the morning, one chet lofe, one manchette, one gallon of ale; for afternoon, one manchette, one gallon of ale; for after supper one chet lofe, one manchette, two gallons of ale, dim' pitcher of wyne; and from the last day of October unto the first day of Aprill, three lynckes by the weeke, by the day six sises, one pound white lights, six talshides, six faggots... amounting by the yeare to the sume of xxiiiii. xixs. xd.³⁶

The queen's servants were entitled to 'bouche of court', the right to retrieve rations of food and drink, such as bread, ale and wine, as well as fuel and candles provided for at the expense of the crown. William Paget, secretary to Anne of Cleves, for example, handled her correspondence, and was thus was entitled to 110s. in 'paper ynke parchment and for other thyngs as here to fore hath byn accustomed', whereas John Grice, Elizabeth of York's

³³ TNA E 315/160, ff. 104-105.

³⁴ *HO*, p. 199.

³⁵ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 3v.

³⁶ *HO*, p. 164. A peasant's diet consisted of dairy produce and vegetables such as beans, peas and onions, while kings, queens and servants in the royal household were treated to an 'ostentatiously exotic' diet consisting largely of fresh fruit, meat and fish, including game birds and venison. Lucy Wooding, *Henry VIII* (Oxford, 2015), pp. 40-1.

apothecary, was granted £9. 13s. 4d. on one occasion ‘for certain stuff of his occupation by him delivered to the quenes vse’.³⁷

There is some confusion as to *who* paid and provided for the queen’s servants. The master, or mistress, in the medieval and early-modern household, was responsible for providing some form of remuneration, be it wages, board or diet, or *ad hoc* rewards, fees and perquisites for services rendered. All queens had sufficient income and revenue for their own expenditure to meet the ‘greate Costes Expences and Charges’ which she was to ‘susteyne and bere in her Chambre’.³⁸ As the author of the *Liber Niger* recommended in 1471,

a Quene... endowed with livelihode sufficient... if it please the King and highnesse... pay a certaine dayly for theyre diets, when she cummyth to this court, and after the numbyr of personages, of lordes, ladies, gentyllwomen, knyghtes and squiers, and other officers, such of her servaunts as shall be appointed, be etynge within this courte, or yit taking any lyveres at the King’s charge within his household.³⁹

Records kept by Griffith Richards, Catherine of Aragon’s receiver-general, indicate that the queen was responsible for the costs incurred in maintaining her household. From 1525 to 1530, Richards recorded ‘household expences’, with payments made to the queen’s wardrobe, stables, and ‘fees and wages of knights, ladies, maids, and lawyers’. The totals varied from £789. 4s. 10d. in 1525-26 to as much as £902. 12s. 6½d. in 1529-30.⁴⁰ Anne Boleyn’s receiver-general, George Taylor, too kept clear records. Accounts for the year 1534-5, records her expenditure, of £976. 13s. 4¼d. in ‘fees, wages and annuities’ and £186. 8s. 7d.

³⁷ TNA E101/422/15; TNA E36/210, f. 33.

³⁸ A. Luders et al. (eds), *The Statutes of the Realm: Printed by command of his Majesty King George the Third in pursuance of an address of The House of Commons of Great Britain, from Original Records and Authentic Manuscripts*, 10 vols. (1831), vol. 3, p. 480.

³⁹ *BB*, pp. 96-97. It has been suggested that this recommendation ‘does not appear to have been acted upon’ in the late medieval period. Laynesmith, *Queenship*, p. 236.

⁴⁰ BL Cotton MS, Appendix, LXV; *LP* IV 6121; TNA E101/417/2; Catherine of Aragon also made provisions explicitly for wages to various of her servants in her will. *LP* X 40.

in ‘gifts and rewards’, out of an income of £6,381. 8s. 9¾d.⁴¹ ‘Out of her privy purse’, one of Anne’s maids-of-honour later remarked, ‘went not a little’.⁴² Yet more explicit is a remark made in 1537 by John Husee in a letter to Honor, lady Lisle, whose daughter, Anne Basset, would be appointed a few months later to serve as a maid-of-honour in the household of Jane Seymour. Husee was warned by Jane’s ladies in July that ‘the Queen will be at no more cost with her but wages and livery’;⁴³ the agent reiterated in September that ‘the Queen will give her *but* x a year’.⁴⁴

Yet there is evidence that, at least some of the queen’s servants, were paid, and provided for, by the king.⁴⁵ In a document entitled ‘the ordynary of the Quenes syde’ of 1540, for the household of Anne of Cleves, and in the ‘ordinarie’ of 1544, for the household of Catherine Parr, some distinction was made between servants who had ‘wages within the *king’s* household’, and those who had ‘no wages within the king’s household’.⁴⁶ It is clear that some of the queen’s servants – specifically her carver, cupbearer, sewers, gentlemen ushers, gentleman waiters, yeomen ushers, yeomen, grooms and pages of the chamber, robes and beds, and her messenger – were paid by the king.⁴⁷ It is striking that so many of the queen’s servants were paid by the king, not least because the wage acted, practically, and symbolically, as a retainer. Wages were a part of the contractual obligation of service,

⁴¹ *LP* IV 6121; *LP* IX 477.

⁴² Wyatt, pp. 442-443.

⁴³ *Lisle*, IV, 887.

⁴⁴ *Lisle*, IV, 894. My italics, for emphasis: this may have been some remark by Husee acknowledging that her wages as a servant of the queen would be meagre.

⁴⁵ In 1533, Henry sent William Mountjoy, Catherine of Aragon’s lord chamberlain, to the queen to inform her that ‘he would not defray her expenses, nor the wages of her servants’, indicating that the king had previously subsidised them. *LP* VI 351; *LP* VI 1018. The king laid out £282 12s. 3d. on wages alone for her servants from 19 December 1533 through 30 September 1534. *LP* VII 1208. It was reported on 13 October 1535 that ‘if she would undertake to maintain her own household’, Henry would allow her ‘to keep what servants she pleased’. *LP* IX 594.

⁴⁶ My italics, for emphasis.

⁴⁷ BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 15v-16r, and ff. 16v-18r, for Anne of Cleves; *HO*, pp. 167-171 for Catherine Parr. It is perhaps no coincidence that all of these servants were men, who could, and did, on occasion, transfer their services between the king’s and the queen’s Chamber.

meaning that these servants might have considered that they were effectively employed by the king, not the queen. The rest of the queen's Chamber servants – her lord chamberlain, vice-chamberlain, chancellor, master of the horse, physician, apothecary, her ladies and her gentlewomen servants – were paid by the queen, as indicated by the account books of Anne of Cleves, which itemises payments for wages strictly to servants who held these offices.⁴⁸ Nor were Henry VIII's queens the only source of remuneration for their servants, as, throughout his reign, the king rewarded them with gifts, grants, and other nonmonetary perquisites. An account book for the king dated to the year 1540 shows that Henry met the expense of 'diets' (£4,747.), 'bouche of court' (£337. 3s. 6½d.) and 'wages and livery coats' (£571. 2s. 3½d.) for the queen's side.⁴⁹ Such records are fragmentary, yet it is clear that the king paid and provided for many of his queens' servants.

Although the queen's Chamber servants were entitled to wages, livery, accommodation, 'bouche of court', and certain 'fees' or nonmonetary perquisites, the evidence indicates that in all they received *less* than the king's servants. As the author of the *Liber Niger* observed in 1471, 'the officers for the quene hyghe and lowe taken in seruise and lyuerey som what lesse in euery thing than dothe such an officer beyng of the kynges propyr

⁴⁸ TNA E101/422/15; TNA E101/422/16, for Anne of Cleves' accounts; The king's accounts have annual entries for payments made to yeomen of the queen's Chamber (see, for example, BL Add MS 21481, f. 167r, 207r, TNA E36/216, f. 93v, f. 98v, etc.) but also on occasion, to servants who were usually paid by the queen (for example, Mary Reading, Catherine of Aragon's gentlewoman, was paid £20, TNA E36/215, f. 410, and Dr. Ferdinand de Victoria, her, was paid £33. 6s. 8d. by the king on at least two occasions in 1519-20, TNA E36/216, f. 51r, f. 97r).

⁴⁹ BL Cotton MS, Vespasian, C, XIV, 247 (*LP* XVI 394). Warrants issued to the Great Wardrobe bearing the king's signature indicate that Henry often provided his queens' servants with livery; estimates drawn up in the Eltham ordinances of 1526 and the Cromwellian ordinances of 1540 show that the king gave them board and 'bouche of court', accounting for the expense of their entitlements and 'everie particular thing to be served to everie person' of the queen's household. 'A Declaration of Bouche of Courte' in the Eltham Ordinances of 1526, and the 'Declaracion of the Particular Ordinances of Fares for the Dietts' for the Cromwellian ordinances of 1540. *HO*, pp. 162, 174; *LP* III 491; *LP* III 577, which provide a view of the king's expenses for the year of 1519, showing that maintained at least the officers, ladies, gentlewomen and yeomen in 'ordinary breakfasts' and 'daily liveries'. Elizabeth Darnet, Catherine of Aragon's gentlewoman, was granted £20 'upon a warrant of the King's reward' in 1521. TNA E36/216, f. 130r.

house holde to whom he is lykened by office'.⁵⁰ Reflecting the status of the queen as a *consort*, the wife of the king and sovereign, and the queen's household as a subsidiary of the king's household, servants in the queen's Chamber, for example, were paid less than their equivalent in the king's Chamber: her lord chamberlain received £40 per annum, while the king's received £100; the queen's vice-chamberlain received £26. 13s. 4d., and the king's, £66. 13s. 4d. Gentlemen ushers for the queen were paid £11. 8s. 1d., yet those for the king earned £20. Carvers, cupbearers and sewers to the king received £33. 6s. 8d., but those who waited on his queens received a comparatively modest £11. 8s. 1d. per annum. Even yeomen, grooms and pages were paid more if they served in the king's Chamber.⁵¹

A large retinue of servants marked the status, authority and magnificence of the householder. Queens consort had a sizeable household, and the only woman throughout the kingdom to command such a large retinue, though necessarily smaller still than the king's household.⁵² It is difficult to determine more precisely the size of the queen's household, as it varied between 1485 and 1547, and number of personnel between households is inconsistent. Yet it is clear enough that queens necessarily had fewer servants than the king himself. In the ordinances of 1540, Anne of Cleves had twenty-four yeomen in her Chamber, Henry had eighty-three; Anne had four grooms, Henry had twelve; Anne had three pages and one messenger, Henry had four of each. Likewise there were no more than twelve servants in the queen's Privy Chamber, yet the king had at least twenty-one in total.⁵³ The size of the

⁵⁰ My italics, for emphasis. *BB*, pp. 92-93. 'Lyueray', in this instance, taken to mean entitlements to food and drink.

⁵¹ See Appendix 1.

⁵² The author of the *Liber Niger* observed in 1471 that the queen's household was accountable to the king's, remarking that 'keping ij housholdes so honorable with the groundez of one' meant that potentially 'one mought hurt andminishe the othyr his greate fame'. *HO*, pp. 23-24. Rodrigo de Puebla, Spanish ambassador observed in 1488 that 'There is no country in the world where Queens live with greater pomp than in England, where they have as many court officers as the King'. This may be as it appeared to visitors, but the evidence shows that Henry's queens had less servants. *CSP Sp*, I, 21.

⁵³ *BL Add MS 45716A*, ff. 1r-18v; Appendix 1 for minimum and maximum statistics.

household did fluctuate with the seasons of the liturgical calendar. Through the autumn, winter and spring, the household was in its full, 'itinerant' form, and in the summer, it was reduced to a retinue of around one half or less for its 'progress form', a peripatetic, 'riding' or 'travelling' group of servants to accompany the queen as she visited smaller royal or noble houses, like when Catherine Howard and her household went with the king to Lincoln on his summer progress in 1541.⁵⁴

Livery

'Livery', or clothing, was issued to men and women upon their being sworn in to mark them publicly as servants of the queen's household.⁵⁵ All of the queen's servants had to be 'apparelled according to their degrees',⁵⁶ and 'at alle tymes clenlye and decentlye', but livery differentiated them with marked variations in colours and fabrics.⁵⁷ It was the responsibility of the master or mistress of the household to ensure that their servants were appropriately attired.⁵⁸ Livery was issued to the queen's servants *en masse* at coronations and royal funerals:⁵⁹ At the coronation of Catherine of Aragon on 24 June 1509, warrants were issued for gowns, coats etc. for 'the Quenes chambr', and 'livereies of silke and scarlet for lades and gentlewomen', measured in yards, were issued to the women who attended to Anne Boleyn in

⁵⁴ LP XVI 1088; Fiona Kisby, 'Kingship and The Royal Itinerary', *The Court Historian*, 4, 1 (1999), pp.29-39 (pp. 29-32); 'Procession', p. 48.

⁵⁵ The term 'livery' often referred to a nonmonetary payment, the provision of food, drink and board, but by its strictest definition 'livery' meant clothing, specifically the marked clothing worn by and issued to servants of the household.

⁵⁶ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp.150-152 (LP XII, ii., 271).

⁵⁷ BL Harleian MS 6807, f. 12r; A memorandum drafted for the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520 ordered that 'All noblemen and others are to be apparelled according to their degrees, and no man must presume to wear apparel above his degree'. LP III, i., 704.

⁵⁸ 'If therefore servants be attired unseemly, ...all that see them will think their masters and mistresses are of such a mind as the servants are, or at least, too remiss and careless of their government.' William Gouge, *Of Domestical Duties*, 2nd ed. (London, 1626).

⁵⁹ Hayward, *Dress*, p. 246. Red cloth for coronations, black cloth for funerals. Records of livery given to the queen's household consist chiefly of the Lord Chamberlain accounts (TNA LC).

her coronation procession on 1 June 1533.⁶⁰ At the funeral procession for Jane Seymour in 1537, following the chariot which held Jane's coffin were 'lordes and gentlemen rydinge all in black gownes and cotes', as well as 'ladies and gentleweomen' who were 'ridinge all in blacke',⁶¹ while Catherine Parr's servants were issued yards of black cloth when they attended Henry VIII's funeral on 16 February 1547.⁶² Livery was otherwise issued as and when it was required by the queen's servants. Queens were responsible for the purchasing of silks, satins, damask, velvet, linen, cloth of gold, etc. for the making of gowns, kirtles, petticoats, coats, doublets and more. On one occasion, Elizabeth of York laid out 12*d.* 'for making of a kirtell' for Bridget Crowmer, her gentlewoman, a further 3*d.* 'for hemmyng of a kirtell of the same', 12*d.* 'for lynyng of a gowne' for a 'Maistres Zouche', and 8*d.* 'for mending of twoo gownes' for Jane Poppingcourt, her maid-of-honour.⁶³ A book kept by Richard Justice, groom of the robes to Catherine of Aragon, itemised entries for livery to be distributed to the queen's servants from 1515 to 1517, such as 'a gowne of tawne velvet' for 'mastres mary Solanis', Maria de Salinas, Catherine's maid-of-honour, 'iii yerds blake for a nyght gown' for Isabel de Vargas, her chamberer, and 'vii yerds' of 'blake velvet' for Roger Radclif, her gentleman usher.⁶⁴ Likewise Anne of Cleves laid out 18*s.* 5*d.* on behalf of Bryan Lyon, yeoman of her chamber, 'for hys Lyvery cote', and a further £20 'for the ffote mens cots'.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ BL Add MS 71009, ff. 57v-59r, *HC*, pp. 798-805, and *WC*, vol. 1, pp. 17-22, for the coronation of queen Anne Boleyn.

⁶¹ *LP* XII, ii., 1060; *WC*, vol. 1, pp. 70-72 for Jane Seymour. All the ladies in Jane's procession were ordered to ride to Windsor for the burial. *Lisle*, IV, 903, p. 182.

⁶² TNA LC 2/2.

⁶³ TNA E36/210, f. 41.

⁶⁴ The account book of Richard Justice is dated 7 and 8 Hen. VIII (22 April 1515 – 21 April 1517), TNA E101/418/6, see for these entries f. 8r, 20v, 22v. For records of Justice as Catherine's groom of the Robes, see TNA LC 9/50, f. 209v (1509); TNA SP 1/19 f. 272r; TNA E315/242 (1520); *LP* III 2214 (1522).

⁶⁵ TNA E101/422/15.

Livery could be embroidered with the queen's heraldic badge or motto. Spanish emblems of pomegranates and sheaves of arrows were sewn into Catherine of Aragon's livery, while Catherine Parr's ladies and gentlewomen wore the queen's badge on their caps displaying the head of St Katherine. John Glynn, a yeoman of the chamber to Catherine of Aragon, for example, was given a green velvet gown with sleeves lined with cloth of gold, 'of the Spaynysh faccion', and Agnes, duchess of Norfolk, received a gown of crimson velvet with 'spaynesh sleveys' lined with 'grene clothe of gold of damaske'.⁶⁶ A servant's livery could even be fashioned to make pointed, politically-charged statements. Anne Boleyn had her livery embroidered with the motto, 'Ainsi sera, groigne qui groigne' ('What will be, will be, grumble who may'), in reaction to murmurs at court against the king's 'Great Matter'. Shortly after the king married Anne in 1533, Catherine of Aragon provocatively had her servants 'arrayed entirely in new apparel', embroidered with the letters 'H' for Henry and 'K' for Katherine.⁶⁷ A document listing various items of clothing provided by Elys Hylton, yeoman of the robes to Catherine of Aragon, recorded items made for the queen's guard which Catherine 'did not like', suggesting that she was 'more personally invested in the appearance of her household than records suggest'.⁶⁸

In the sixteenth century, there was a correlation between clothing and rank which accentuated the status of those who were retained in royal service. There is near-contemporary evidence demonstrating that the king's and his queens' livery was given to strictly men and women who were sworn in to serve in the royal household. On 10 January 1547, the French ambassador in England reported an incident wherein two merchants had 'made themselves servants of the King and wear the livery coats of his household'. The

⁶⁶ TNA E101/418/6, f. 9r; James, *Parr*, p. 123.

⁶⁷ CSP Ven IV 923; Ives, *Anne*, p. 142.

⁶⁸ LP III 852; Beer, *Queenship*, pp. 88-9.

ambassador felt their wearing of the coats dubious and was suspicious, however, as he did not think they had been sworn in to the king's household, nor were they in receipt of wages.⁶⁹ Certain furs, fabrics, textiles and colours, and exclusive access to them, were associated with various ranks in the social hierarchy.⁷⁰ Men and women who were issued with the queen's livery can be identified from the evidence as her servants, and often the type of livery they wore can even provide some indication of the office they held. Catherine of Aragon's yeomen ushers and yeomen of the chamber, for example, wore 'watchinge lyverey', a gown of tawny camlet furred with black budge, a doublet of black velvet and a jacket of damask; her footmen wore gowns of crane cloth, jackets of crimson velvet, and doublets of black velvet and russet satin with arrows appropriately sewn onto them, and her chamberers, gowns of russet damask furred with miniver pure and edged with lettice.⁷¹ This evidence, too, has its limitations: an account dating from 1536 to 1537, when Jane Seymour was queen, states that 'watchinge lyverey' was 'boughte for yeomen, gromes and page of the Quenes chambre', though, without distinguishing between them or specifying who of the thirty-nine men were yeomen, who were grooms, and who were pages.⁷²

Livery, worn by the queen's ladies and gentlewomen, had to meet specific expectations, or customs. When Anne Basset was appointed to serve Jane Seymour as a maid-of-honour in October 1537, John Husee wrote to Anne's mother, Honor, lady Lisle, urging that she ensure that her daughter was properly attired. Anne 'must have such apparel' as 'a bonnet of velvet and a frontlet of the same';⁷³ Husee reiterated that 'she must have a bonnet or ij, with frontlets and an edge of pearl, and a gown of black satin, and another of

⁶⁹ *LP* XXI, ii., 684; Braddock, 'Household', pp. 12-13.

⁷⁰ Maria Hayward (ed.), *The Great Wardrobe Accounts of Henry VII and Henry VIII* (Suffolk, 2012), p. xii; Hayward, *Rich Apparel: Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII's England* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 137-70.

⁷¹ TNA E101/418/5, f. 50; TNA E101/418/6; TNA E101/417/6, f. 85 (*LP* I 908); TNA LC 5/31, ff. 4-7.

⁷² TNA LC 5/31, ff. 4-7.

⁷³ *Lisle*, IV, 887 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

velvet'; 'she must have cloth for smocks and sleeves, for there is fault founden that their smocks are too coarse'⁷⁴ and 'she must have against the Queen's churching a new satin gown, and against Christmas a new gown of lion tawny velvet'.⁷⁵ Anne Basset wrote to her mother on 16 February 1538 urging her to send her 'an edge of pearl'.⁷⁶ Within a few weeks, on 6 March, Anne reiterated that she 'must needs have her pearl, as shortly as is possible',⁷⁷ and again on 15 March, 'if you would send me an edge of pearl... I shall be much bound to you'.⁷⁸ The pearls were soon conveyed to Anne, yet she complained still as 'six score are not enough'. 'Indeed they are not to be worn in the Queen's service', she complained, 'unless they can be set full'.⁷⁹ Lady Lisle received another letter a day later informing her that Anne 'saith that the vj score pearls which she hath received be all rags, and too few to serve'.⁸⁰ The urgency with which Anne requested the pearls indicates the importance of proper attire for the queen's servants.

The wearing of rich clothes and jewels reflected and perpetuated the magnificence of the queen whom they attended upon, accentuating the status of the queen, as mistress of the household. Livery was materially, and culturally, significant. Visitors and foreign ambassadors at the court often described in detail the appearance of queens and their ladies, specifically noting the richness of their attire. Nicolo Sagudino, secretary to Sebastian Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador, observed in 1515 that Catherine of Aragon was 'richly attired, and had with her 25 damsels mounted on white palfreys, with housings all of one fashion, most beautifully embroidered with gold; and all these damsels wore dresses slashed

⁷⁴ *Lisle*, IV, 895 (*LP* XII, ii., 711).

⁷⁵ *Lisle*, IV, 896 (*LP* XII, ii., 808). All this was prescribed in a 'book', kept by a silkwoman or seamstress, mistress Pole, which was to her 'pointed', or perhaps dictated, 'by my Lady Rutland and my Lady Sussex', of the queen's Privy Chamber. *Lisle*, IV, 887 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

⁷⁶ *Lisle*, V, 1102, pp. 36-7.

⁷⁷ *Lisle*, V, 1117, pp. 58-9.

⁷⁸ *Lisle*, V, 1126, pp. 70-2.

⁷⁹ *Lisle*, V, 1136, pp. 92-4.

⁸⁰ *Lisle*, V, 1137, pp. 95-6.

with gold lama in very costly trim, and were attended by a number of footmen in excellent order'.⁸¹

All of the queen's servants wore her livery, creating visual, social cohesion and an almost 'corporate' identity to her household. The power of livery to draw together, mobilise or rally individuals is clear, as the distribution of livery, and retaining, was restricted by parliamentary acts, first enacted through the fourteenth and fifteenth-centuries in England and thereafter enforced throughout the Tudor period by Henry VII and Henry VIII.⁸² Outwardly a servant's livery was a visual, symbolic representation of their identity as a servant to the queen at court and in the wider kingdom, conferring upon them social status, a mark of the protection they were assured, and the royal favour which they enjoyed. It strengthened their identification with, and ties to, their mistress and to their household, reinforcing the queen's right to command service and extending her presence and authority, which could be represented through the court and wherever else her servants went.

Advancement, or preferment, and other perquisites

Advancement, or preferment, of a servant, was the responsibility of the master or mistress of the household. In addition to retaining their servants in wages, clothing them in their livery, and providing them with food, drink, and shelter by accommodating them in their chambers, queens could maintain their servants by caring for their physical wellbeing, lending or leaving them money, giving them gifts, or granting them rewards. Yet, unlike wages and other perquisites, which were specific to the offices they held, this advancement was

⁸¹ CSP Venetian, II, 624.

⁸² Gordon McKelvie, *Bastard Feudalism, English Society and the Law: The Statutes of Livery, 1390-1520* (Suffolk, 2020), pp. 57-80. Chiefly, that none should retain or distribute livery but to servants in their households who were in receipt of wages.

undefined, non-institutional, and depended on the whims and will of the queen, their mistress, and the king, their sovereign. The most essential prerequisite to career-making for all servants was favour. When the master or mistress of the household was the sovereign, or the wife of the sovereign, favour became *royal* favour, and between them gave maximum scope to the advancement of even the most lowly and humble of servants.

Upon being sworn in, ‘the seruante endeuerith hym selfe towards his maister, soo he againe in greter matters doth his parte no lesse, findinge him bothe howserome, fode, and clothing’.⁸³ In other words, the ‘good’ servant performed their duties, tasks and functions competently and faithfully,⁸⁴ whereas the ‘good’ mistress maintained, rewarded and advanced her servants. The word ‘servant’ implies onerous and laborious work, but the ‘service’ they performed, exalted, humble or menial, was honourable, and, as will be demonstrated, could prove to be rewarding and quite profitable. As demeaning as their duties might appear to be, it was their privilege – and to their advantage – to perform them. Relationships between master, or mistress, and servant, were thus reciprocal. Gilbertus Cognatus maintained that mistress and servant had to ‘haue a well willing mynde towards thother, thone to deserue, thother to rewarde’.⁸⁵ William Latymer too acknowledged this connexion between a ‘good’ mistress, and the ‘good’ service she could expect to receive in return. ‘I may not here forgett’, he began, ‘the loving kyndenes of this gracious prince towards her trustye servauntes, whose necessities, siknesses and other adversities she releved so abundantly that they all protested them selves more bownde to her highnes for her gracious benevolence then they might be hable in any kynde of service to acquitt.’⁸⁶ Latymer understood the obligations of Anne as mistress to her servants in much the same terms as Cognatus: ‘to be ladye over manye’ for

⁸³ Cognatus, *servantes*, docs 9-10, 19-20.

⁸⁴ *HO*, p. 144.

⁸⁵ Cognatus, *servantes*, docs. 9-10.

⁸⁶ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 32v.

the queen meant ‘that principally she was bounde to provide for suche as were in her awne housholde’.⁸⁷

The ‘good’ mistress maintained the physical wellbeing of their servants, ensuring that they were kept in good health and properly cared for when they fell ill. ‘If eany mishappe chaunce vnto the seruaunt, as by slaunder or violence done apon hym,’ Cognatus asked, ‘who but the master is ready to support him, if he fall in eany greuous malady, what thought (trow ye) wyll a louinge maister conceiue for his recouerey?’⁸⁸ In 1502, Elizabeth of York covered the cost of boarding for eight weeks for her gentlewoman, Anne Say, ‘being sikke’ at Woodstock, and later at Abingdon. On another occasion later in the year, Elizabeth laid out 26s. 8d. for Nicholas Matthew, yeoman of her Chamber, ‘towardses his charges whan he was hurte by the seruauntes of sir William Sandes’.⁸⁹ Latymer recalls how, in 1533, when one of Anne Boleyn’s servants fell ‘greviouslye sick’, he, ‘feling his maladye to increase, sente for his wyefe to come unto him’. His wife, Anne Joscelyn, ‘attended the quenes highnes in her prevy chambre’. Joscelyn, Anne’s chamberer, had been ‘denyed licence to visitt her weake husbande’, and thus ‘moved one of her chapellayns to solícite her cause to the quenes majestie’.⁹⁰ Upon hearing the request, the queen ‘not only graunted her licence to departe, to the comforte of her weake and sicke housbownde, but also most bountyfullye commaunded to be prepared for her sufficiente furniture of horse and other necessarys for her jorney, and tenne poundes in monye towarde the charge of her travaill’.⁹¹

⁸⁷ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 32v.

⁸⁸ Cognatus, *servavntes*, docs. 19-20.

⁸⁹ TNA E36/210, f. 54 for Anne Say, f. 70 for Nicholas Matthew. Elizabeth even covered the cost ‘for the burying of Griffith late yeoman of the quenes Chambre’ (f. 90).

⁹⁰ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 26r. Spelt ‘Mr Jaskyne’ and ‘Mrs. Jaskyne’. As Maria Dowling observes, there is no record of ‘Jaskynes’ in the queen’s service. But this must surely be the Joscelyns, as Anne only had a handful of servants in her privy Chamber, and Anne Joscelyn was listed as one of her chamberers.

⁹¹ Likewise the queen’s servants were to preserve the health and assure the rest and comfort of their mistress. Catherine of Aragon commended her confessor, Jorge de Athequa, bishop of Llandaff, her physician, Dr. Ferdinand de Victoria, and her apothecary, John Sotha, all of whom she acknowledged had been with her for

Anne Boleyn lent her servants various sums of money: a book of debts which were ‘due to the Late Quene Anne’, and which, after her death, were owed to the king, show that Sir Edward Baynton, her vice-chamberlain, owed her £200, John Ashley, her sewer, owed her £100, Sir James Boleyn, her uncle and chancellor, owed her £50, George Taylor, her receiver-general, owed her £30, and Elizabeth Browne, countess of Worcester, a lady of her Privy chamber, owed her the sum of £100.⁹² ‘As tochyng the some off one hundryth pownds whych I dyd borrow off quene Ane’, the countess of Worcester wrote to Thomas Cromwell, the king’s secretary, some time after, ‘I dowte yt not but she wold have bene good to me’.⁹³ The late queen Anne, the countess felt, was unlikely to have called in the debt of £100, and that this was an informal loan between friends is indicated by the fact that she had borrowed it in confidence: even her husband, Henry Somerset, earl of Worcester, was ‘otterly ignorant both off the borowyng and usyng off the sayd hundryth pownds’. ‘And yff he should now have knowlege tharoff’, the countess feared, ‘I am in dowt how he wold take yt’.⁹⁴ In the book kept by Richard Justice, groom of the robes to Catherine of Aragon, there were many entries for ‘redy money’, of varying amounts, often lent to her household servants, and others, meaning that the queen’s Wardrobe may otherwise have retained something of its medieval function, having previously accounted for not merely the order and purchase of necessities but her day-to-day income and expenditure.⁹⁵ In contrast, Elizabeth of York often had to borrow money, pledging her own plate to secure repayment, as her own income was insufficient to cover her expenditure. Often the queen borrowed small sums from her

‘many yeres’ and had ‘takyn much payns’ with her, as she was ‘often tymes sykely and dyseasyd’. BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 206 (*LP* VII 786).

⁹² TNA SP 1/103, f. 318r (*LP* X 912); TNA SP 1/104, f. 262r (*LP* X 1257); BL Royal MS, 7, C, XVI, f. 76 (*LP* XI 117).

⁹³ TNA SP 1/129, f. 174 (*LP* XIII, i., 450).

⁹⁴ TNA SP 1/129, f. 174 (*LP* XIII, i., 450).

⁹⁵ TNA E101/418/6, ff. 15-16 in particular contains various entries for ‘redy money’, to the queen’s servants, and others, with at least one item to one of the king’s servants ‘lent to Thomas Willys on of the kyngs messyngers’ and another to Justice’s kinswoman ‘lent to my cosyn marget walles in redy money’ (f. 16).

attendants: 20s. 'lent to the quene' by lady Verney on 28 April 1502, 26s. 8d. by lady Bray on 5 June, and £13. 6s. 8d. by Mary Ratclif on 9 November.⁹⁶

Queens took care to provide generously for their servants. Catherine died at Kimbolton on 7 January 1536, and in her last will and testament, she rewarded their loyal and enduring service.⁹⁷ Francis Phillip, her sewer, was granted £40 and 'all that I owe him', Isabel de Vargas, was given £20, and Mary Victoria, the wife of her physician, £40. Elizabeth Darrell received £200, Blanche Twyford, £100, Margery Otwell and Dorothy Wheler, £40., Dr Miguel de la Sá and John Sotha, a year's wages each, and Philip Greenacre, Anthony Rocke and Bastian Hennyocke, £20, all of whom were discharged from her service for the loyalty they had shown to their mistress when they refused to swear an oath to her as 'Princess Dowager'.⁹⁸ Anne of Cleves was more explicit in her will, urging her executors 'to be good lords and masters to all our poor servants', to whom she left each a year's wages, as well as, among others, £100 'to every one of the gentlewomen of our privy chamber, for their great pains taken with us', £20 to Otho Wyllik, a servant from Cleves, and £20 to Dr. Symonds, her physician, 'towards his great pains, labors and travails taken oftentimes with us'.⁹⁹ Catherine Howard, upon learning of her fate, pleaded with Henry 'to bestow some of her clothes on those maid-servants who had been with her from the time of her marriage, since she had nothing else left to recompense them as they deserved'.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ TNA E36/210, f. 32, f. 39, f. 60; As observed by the editor of the *PPE*, 'these probably arose from her not carrying money about her person, and desiring the lady in waiting to purchase some object which attracted her notice, or to gratify a spontaneous feeling of benevolence'. *PPE*, Eliz, p. ciii.

⁹⁷ *HC*, p. 818; *WC*, vol. 1, pp. 32-33.

⁹⁸ *LP X 40*. It is significant that those ladies provided for in her will were those who refused to swear an oath to her as Princess Dowager, as this shows the exchange of loyalty and advancement.

⁹⁹ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 216 (*LP X 40*) for Catherine of Aragon. Bentley (ed.), *Excerpta Historica*, pp. 96-98 for Anne of Cleves.

¹⁰⁰ Starkey, *Six Queens*, p. 683.

Gifts from queens to their servants could vary from money, food, drink, clothes, jewels, plate or tokens, affirming their ties of obligation and loyalty. These gifts were exchanged annually between them to celebrate New Year. The gift roll which has survived for 1528, for example, likely represents the gifts which were given by the queen, Catherine of Aragon, that year.¹⁰¹ It contains many entries for the queen's 'Chamber' servants, like Roger Radclif, her gentleman usher, who received a pot of gilt weighing 24 ½ oz, Francis Phillip, who received a 'salt' of gilt weighing 20 1/8 oz, Sir Robert Dymoke, her chancellor, who received cup of gilt weighing 36 ½ oz, Maria de Salinas, Lady Willoughby, who received a 'cense' of gilt, weighing 28 oz, Alice Davy, one of her gentlewomen servants, received gilt spoons weighing 10 3/8 oz, and Lacy, gentlewoman, received £4 'in money'. If the weight of the gift was an indication of the recipient's relationship or favour with the queen, it is not surprising that, of all the lords who received gifts, William Blount, lord Mountjoy, her lord chamberlain's cup of gilt was the largest, at 32 ¼ oz, and of all the knights, Sir Edward Darrell, her Vice-chamberlain's cup of gilt was the largest, weighing 27 ½ oz.¹⁰² Plate, commissioned and then prepared by goldsmiths contracted to the crown was the traditional gift given at New Year, though not always, as in 1534, for example, when Anne Boleyn gave her ladies palfreys and saddles for their horses.¹⁰³

The inventories of Henry's queens demonstrate their overwhelming generosity towards their servants. 'A boke of the Quenes juelles' for Jane Seymour from 1537, and an inventory of Catherine Howard's jewels taken in 1541, show that both queens gave an entire

¹⁰¹ Gift rolls are extant for the years 1528, 1532, 1534 and 1539, but the 1528 roll retains an unusual structure. Maria Hayward has suggested that it may be a draft copy list of gifts given by the queen. Hayward, Maria Hayward, 'Gift-Giving at the Court of Henry VIII: The 1539 New Year's Gift Roll in Context', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 85 (2005), pp.125-75 (pp. 129, 142n).

¹⁰² Hayward, 'Gift-giving', p. 132 for the significance of weight in the gift.

¹⁰³ BL Cotton MS, Titus, B, I, f. 493 (*LP* VI 1194). For New Year's Day celebrations, wherein the queen sat and received gifts in her chamber, see *HO*, p. 120.

catalogue of precious jewels, beads, brooches, chains and girdles to their ladies.¹⁰⁴ The account books of queens in like manner indicate that serving them could prove to be quite a lucrative proposition. From 1525 to 1526, Catherine of Aragon's receiver-general Griffith Richards accounted for £325. 13s. in rewards and £366. 16s. 10½*d.* in presents, while George Taylor, Anne Boleyn's receiver-general, accounted for £186. 8s. 7*d.* laid out by the queen on gifts and rewards between 1534 and 1535.¹⁰⁵ Such royal generosity, or 'largesse', functioned to strengthen and reaffirm the bonds between master and servant.¹⁰⁶ Servants often kept up their familiarity and seized the opportunity in gift-giving for conspicuous prestation. The accounts of Elizabeth of York illustrate that her servants often sent her gifts: for example, on 6 July 1502, William Bulstrode, her gentleman usher, sent her 'a present of Cakes Apulles and Cherys',¹⁰⁷ and a few days later, Elizabeth Lee, her gentlewoman, sent 'conserua cherys'.¹⁰⁸ Between 1528 and 1537, Eleanor, countess of Rutland, lady of the Privy Chamber, gifted her mistress(es) altogether 'a kirtill of saten blacke', 'twoo rolles of cambrik', 'bandes of pyrles of golde', 'soveraignes' and 'golde and sylke' for 'the enbroderinge of a payer of sleeves and frontelette'.¹⁰⁹ Such gifts, often indicative of concern or affection, maintained emotional ties and reaffirmed a sense of obligation between mistress and servant.

Rewards, often miscellaneous, occur frequently in the account books of Elizabeth of York and Anne of Cleves. On 23 October 1502, Anne Buknam, Elizabeth of York's

¹⁰⁴ BL Royal MS, 7, C, XVI, ff. 18-32 (*LP* XII, ii., 973) for Jane Seymour; BL Stowe MS 559, ff. 55r-68r (*LP* XVI 1389) for Catherine Howard.

¹⁰⁵ *LP* IV 6121 for Catherine of Aragon, *LP* IX 477 for Anne Boleyn.

¹⁰⁶ Not unlike the ideology of royal 'bounty', which was central to the practice of kingship, and queenship. Perry 'Access', p. 1057.

¹⁰⁷ A few months later the queen closed the exchange with 'venyson', on 11 November 1502 (TNA E36/210, f. 62).

¹⁰⁸ TNA E36/210, f. 45.

¹⁰⁹ 'Accounts of Eleanor, Countess of Rutland' in *Historical Manuscripts Commission, The Manuscripts of His Grace, The Duke of Rutland, Preserved at Belvoir Castle*, 4 vols. (London, 1888-1905), vol. 4, pp. 268-339. Felicity Heal, *The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2014), p. 93 for more on gift-giving.

gentlewoman, was granted 66s. 8d. ‘in rewarde by the quenes commaundement’.¹¹⁰ Likewise Catherine Carey, Anne of Cleves’ maid-of-honour, received in one instance £15.¹¹¹ On occasion, these entries for rewards granted to the queen’s servants record their purpose: Elizabeth of York laid out 40s. ‘in Rewarde’ to William Paston, page of the beds, ‘towardses the byeng of his Wedding clothing’, Nicholas Grey, clerk of the works, 60s. ‘in reward to him geuen by the quene towardses suche losses as he susteigned at the birnyng of his howse’, and Bridget Crowmer, her gentlewoman, 40s. ‘at hir departing from the courte’;¹¹² Anne of Cleves gave John Wallys, groom of her chamber, a 10s. advance on his wages ‘towards the finding of his poor daughter’, and £7. 10s. to one of her footmen ‘towards hys mariage’.¹¹³ Nor did Anne forget those servants who accompanied her from Cleves, as she gave 40s. each ‘to the dutch maids’, 46s. 8d. in crowns to her messenger, and granted a further £33. 6s. 8d. for her secretary to reward the rest of her servants who were sent back.¹¹⁴ Catherine of Aragon too was often intimately involved in negotiating on behalf of, and providing for her servants in marriage. Part of the negotiation or custom in marriage-making was the condition that women be invested with a dowry. In 1511, the queen gave Anne Weston, one of her gentlewomen, a dowry of two-hundred marks when she married another of her servants, Ralph Verney.¹¹⁵ In 1516, Catherine negotiated a prestigious match between her maid-of-honour, María de Salinas, and William Willoughby, 11th baron Willoughby, providing her maid with a dowry of eleven-hundred marks ‘in tender consideration of the long and right acceptable service to her grace done by the said Mary Salinas to her singular contentation and

¹¹⁰ TNA E36/210, f. 58.

¹¹¹ The reason for this is not stated in the accounts, but this payment was worth more to Catherine than a whole year’s wages, and it may have been a wedding present as it coincided with her marriage to Sir Francis Knollys. TNA E101/422/15.

¹¹² TNA E36/210, f. 31 (William Paston), f. 35 (Bridget Crowmer), f. 39 (Nicholas Grey).

¹¹³ TNA E101/422/15.

¹¹⁴ TNA E101/422/15.

¹¹⁵ Harris, ‘Chamber’, pp. 240-241.

pleasure'.¹¹⁶ What this suggests is that queens became invested in the personal lives and fortunes of their servants.

The relationship between the 'good' mistress and the 'good' servant is clear: by maintaining, rewarding and advancing their servants, queens encouraged, and gave recognition to, 'good' service. Thus the matter of advancing their own servants was treated urgently: Catherine of Aragon was particularly anxious to provide for those who, as she felt, in her own words, were 'good, and taketh labour doing me service'.¹¹⁷ Anne Boleyn 'wolde assuredly preferre her awne servauntes furste', and was, according to Latymer, 'resolved that of duetye her paynfull and aunciente servantes shoulde furste injoye such benifittes as were in her majestie to employe, for they are true servauntes to yeld me their service, take payne to death'.¹¹⁸ 'Sythens I injoye their service', Anne remarked, 'they may have some porcion of my lyving'.¹¹⁹

This relationship can be obscured, however, in the surviving source material. Offices, titles, honours, lands, leases, licenses, wardships and annuities were granted to servants of the queen,¹²⁰ but these were not recorded specifically in her account books, privy purse expenses, or in personal wills, and thus the queen's own hand in this is more difficult to discern. It can be difficult to ascertain or measure their involvement in patronage where records have not

¹¹⁶ Beer, 'Queenship', p. 229.

¹¹⁷ Wood, vol. 1, pp. 260-261 (*LP* IV 1032).

¹¹⁸ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 32v.

¹¹⁹ Latymer, *Cronickille*, f. 32v.

¹²⁰ Due to the longevity of her reign as queen consort, such records survive in greater number for servants in Catherine of Aragon's household. See, for instance, William Mountjoy, Catherine's lord chamberlain (*LP* II 41); George Francis, gentleman usher (*LP* I 682 [4], *LP* I 709 [64], *LP* I 784 [4], *LP* I 1602 [19]); Robert Merbury, yeoman usher (*LP* II 3152); George Sutton, gentleman waiter (*LP* IV 5406 [27]); Robert Newsyke, yeoman usher (*LP* I 519 [21]); Richard Hart, yeoman (*LP* I 784 [28]); Hamlet Clegg, gentleman waiter (*LP* I 3324 [11]); Elias Hilton, yeoman of the robes (*LP* IV 4313 [5]); Thomas Tyrrell, her master of the horse (*LP* I 2484 [14]); Ferdinand de Victoria, her physician (*LP* III 204); John Hasilby, page (*LP* II 1019, *LP* III 2648 [11]).

survived.¹²¹ Certainly, advancement, or preferment, was centred on the king. Yet, queens shared in the custody of this royal patronage. When Sir William Compton, the king's groom of the stool, died in 1528, the various offices which had been granted to him by the queen, Catherine of Aragon, were to be redistributed at her discretion. For 'such offices as Compton had of her', the king was explicit in that he desired to leave Catherine to 'bestow them at hir pleasur, to hir owyn servauntes'.¹²²

Queens consort were granted a large jointure in marriage to the king, inheriting manors, lordships, castles and estates, the core of which comprised their dower, and the acquisition of which made them each in turn one of the principal and wealthiest landowners in England.¹²³ They were guaranteed by law the 'issues profites revenues comodites and advauntages' of their jointure for 'propre use and for mayntenaunce of Estate', the rents due in the properties they owned, the general provisions agreed by indenture with their tenants, and the goods and chattels of any tenants who were convicted as felons or fugitives in their lands.¹²⁴ What is more, queens were made *femme sole*, giving them an independent economic status which allowed them to transact their own affairs 'withoute the consent of the kyng his

¹²¹ 'In most instances, the only evidence of a reward to a servant of the queen is a formal document signed by the king'. Beer, *Queenship*, p. 101.

¹²² TNA SP 1/49 f. 53v (LP IV 4449).

¹²³ See, for example, LP I 94 (35) and (36) for Catherine of Aragon's jointure; LP VII 419 (25), for Anne Boleyn's jointure; LP XVI 503 (25) for Catherine Howard's jointure; LP XIX, i., 141 (65) for Catherine Parr's jointure. Successive queens shared much of the same dower lands. Some distinction is made between the two – dower and treasury: 'her household would be financed from her dower, but the queen's private expenditure on clothes, jewels, gifts, alms were funded from the exchequer, or the 'royal bounty', 'quite separately from her dower'. A. Crawford, 'The King's Burden? The Consequences of Royal Marriage in Fifteenth-Century England', in R. A. Griffiths (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 33-56 (p. 34).

¹²⁴ LP VII 419 (26); LP XVI 503 (26); LP XIX, i., 141 (76). They were also entitled to 'queen's gold', an old prerogative by which they could claim and draw upon a small percentage of voluntary fines or fees which were due to the king. See, for example, Catherine of Aragon receiving 14s 8d. in queen's gold levied upon a fine of £7 10s paid by John Hasilwood. BL Add MS 22308. For other instances in which she received queens gold, see BL Cotton MS, Appendix, LXV, f. 45r, f. 76v. A summary of this document can be found in LP IV 6121. Beer, *Queenship*, pp. 50-1.

heires or successours'. They were entrusted with administering their own resources, each 'at her will libertie and pleasure as a woman soole'.¹²⁵

Queens could thus maintain and reward their servants appointing them as stewards, bailiffs, receivers, keepers and constables, entrusted to administer the queen's lands, exercise local authority, collect fees and arbitrate disputes on her behalf.¹²⁶ A document entitled 'Fees and annuities going out of divers honours, castles, lordships, manors, lands and tenements', dated to 21 March 1534, was drawn up in preparation for when Catherine of Aragon's estate was to be handed over to Anne Boleyn, as the new queen.¹²⁷ It lists the payments made to those administering her estate on behalf of the queen. Catherine laid out £778. 19s. 6d. in total, and of the eighty-four entries listed for payments made to individuals administering the queen's lands, at least thirty of the recipients can be identified as servants of her household. Among them were William Mountjoy, her lord chamberlain, received £25. 2s. 10d. chiefly as steward of Havering-atte-Bower; Sir Thomas Tyrrell, her master of the horse, and William Tyrrell, gentleman usher, were made constables of Hadleigh castle, for which they were paid a fee of £9. 2s. 6d.; Griffith Richards, as the queen's receiver-general, and as steward, porter and keeper of Fotheringhay, and constable of Bridgewater Castle, was in receipt of £82. 8s. 4d.; Sir Robert Dymoke received £54 for his fee as her chancellor, and a further £23. 6s. 8d.

¹²⁵ *Statutes*, vol. 3, pp. 479-481, 824-5; Marjorie K. McIntosh, 'The Benefits and Drawbacks of Femme Sole Status in England, 1300-1630', *The Journal of British Studies*, 44, 3 (2005), pp. 410-438 (p.410). Crawford, 'Council', pp. 1193-1195.

¹²⁶ A close analysis of land indentures reveal that many of the servants of queens were also their tenants. William Blount, baron Mountjoy, leased the queen's manor of Standen in Hertfordshire; Anthony Carleton, her Clerk of the Avery, and John Glynne, a yeoman of her Chamber, leased lands in Havering-atte-Bower (the only property in Henry's reign which was reserved exclusively for the queen's use). Thurley, *Palaces*, p. 78. John Poyntz, her sewer, leased the park of Hundon, Suffolk. TNA E315/176 for Catherine of Aragon's land indentures; Michelle Beer, 'A queenly affinity? Catherine of Aragon's estates and Henry VIII's Great Matter', *Historical Research*, 91:253 (2018), pp. 426-445, for more on how lands provided for the queen a source of patronage to reward her servants.

¹²⁷ BL Royal MS Appendix 89, ff. 83r-87v (*LP* VII 352); *LP* VII 419 [25] and [26] for grants of land to Anne Boleyn; Griffith Richards, Catherine of Aragon's receiver-general, administered the queen's lands during this transition. See BL Cotton MS Vespasian, C, XIV, f. 252 (*LP* VI 1188, 1189) for a memorandum he drew up for the new queen concerning the status of her tenants and officers in her lands.

as steward of Dedhame, Stratford, Langhame and Clare; John Verney, her cupbearer, was steward of Barkehamstede and Kingeslangle and keeper of the parks, for which he received £3. 2s. 6d.; Richard Justice, groom of the robes, was given £16. 11s. 3d. in total as receiver of Langleyemers, Wyrardesburye, Cokeham and Braye, and as bailiff of Swalowefeld and Shenfeld; Thomas Mynors, page of the chamber, received £5. 9s. 4d. as keeper of Broxstey park, Kyngeswode and Kepernehale woods, and bailiff of Marwarden. Some of these were undoubtedly sinecures, and could prove to be quite lucrative. For many of the queen's servants these positions paid more than their wages. Richard Wood was paid a meagre £1. 6s. 8d. as a page of the chamber, yet received £6. 1s. 8d. as keeper of Cosham parks, whereas Francis Phillip, Catherine's sewer, was paid £11. 8s. 1d. ob. in wages, but between his appointments as steward of lands in Dorset, bailiff of Roughburgh, Rosshmore and Hasylllore, bailiff, reeve and hayward of Cramborne, reeve of Cramborne Holwell, Cramborne Alderholt, Wylkeworth, and keeper of Baynard's Castle, received a total of £30. 10d.¹²⁸ The evidence suggests that women serving the queen were only rarely recipients of this specific form of patronage. Few women were appointed to administer the queen's estate. Margaret, lady Grey, marchioness of Dorset, received £9. 2d. 4d. as keeper of Lytley and Donmore parks, and bailiff of Donmore, but she was the only woman listed.

Queens consort often acted as patrons for their servants, showing them favour in all manner of suits for the advancement of their careers. Anne Boleyn was likely responsible for securing bishoprics for her chaplain, Hugh Latimer, who was made bishop of Worcester, and her almoner, Nicholas Shaxton, who was made bishop of Salisbury, during her time as queen. 'By her meanes and continuall mediacione', these men, according to Latymer and Foxe,

¹²⁸ BL Royal MS Appendix 89, ff. 83r-87v (*LP* VII 352).

‘were brought in fauour wt the king’.¹²⁹ Neither Latimer nor Shaxton could meet the charges, or ‘first-fruits’, for their elevation to the episcopate, and thus Anne lent them each the sum of £200.¹³⁰ John Smyth, one of the canons of St. Paul’s, writing to Sir Edward Baynton, Anne’s vice-chamberlain, for her intervention with infighting over offices: ‘in the matere with the Queenes Grace for me, consyderinge my tender and moste faithfull and diligente love and servis alwaies shewed unto hir Grace... and at all other tymes in expeditioun of hire honorable letteres for the promossyones of hir chaplenes and servants’.¹³¹ Anne was not the only queen to act as patron on behalf of her clerics for promotions to ecclesiastical office. Catherine Howard wrote to Archbishop Lee on 13 November 1540, who shortly thereafter acknowledged her suit ‘for the advowson of the archdeaconry of York for one of your chaplains, Dr. Mallett’. Although this suit ‘took no effect’, Lee ‘promised Mr. Lowe’, another of the queen’s chaplains, ‘the next promotion of 40*l.* or thereabouts that should fall’.¹³² On the other hand, Catherine of Aragon patronised learning and scholarship. Elys Hilton, Catherine’s yeoman of the robes, in c. 1518 introduced a young John Ainsworth, priest, to the queen, who acted as patron for his early education.¹³³

Patronage created, sustained and strengthened bonds of obligation and goodwill between the queen and her household, the court, and nobility and gentry throughout the wider kingdom. It did not always require a petition – patronage could be unsolicited, for instance, as a reward in recognition of their service. When patronage was in the custody of the king, the insufficiency of surviving grants, as evidence, particularly where it concerns women, is

¹²⁹ Anne was known to patronise those of her servants who were ‘professors of Christ’s gospell’. *Foxe*, IV, pp. 62-63; Latimer, *Cronickille*, p. 59.

¹³⁰ These debts which were yet unpaid at her execution in 1536.

¹³¹ BL Harleian MS 295, f. 149v; TNA SP 1/92, f. 150 (*LP* VIII 722).

¹³² TNA SP 1/164, f. 34 (*LP* XVI 316).

¹³³ TNA SP 1/130 f. 77 (*LP* XIII, i., 533).

apparent.¹³⁴ Rarely these records are more precise, and the queen's intervention on behalf of her servants is clear enough, as in the case of Elizabeth Lysle, who in 1514 was granted the field or enclosure of Northburghilles, among other lands, specifically 'at the Queen's request'.¹³⁵ Yet, more often it remains unclear if the initiative to reward and advance them come from the queen, or the king.

Henry VII and Henry VIII too were 'good' to their queens' servants, acknowledging and rewarding their 'good' service. Henry VIII made the connexion between the 'good' master and 'good' service, urging his servant, Sir William Bulmer, who had been retained by Edward Stafford, 'that he was aswel able to maintain him as the duke of Buckyngham': 'if you serue vs hartely, you shall not be forgotten'.¹³⁶ In 1486, Nicholas Gaynesford, Elizabeth of York's gentleman usher, was granted an annuity of £20.¹³⁷ In 1508, an annuity of £10. was granted to Joan Stuarde, one of her gentlewomen.¹³⁸ In 1512, William Blount, Catherine of Aragon's lord chamberlain, was granted an annuity of £66., 13s., 4d.,¹³⁹ whereas in 1514, Joan, lady Guildford,¹⁴⁰ Elizabeth Catesby,¹⁴¹ Mary Redyng¹⁴² and Elizabeth Chamber¹⁴³ were still in receipt of their annuities for £20, 40 marks, £50, and £20 respectively for their services to the late king and queen.¹⁴⁴ In 1519, Margaret, lady Bryan, £50 for her service to

¹³⁴ See, for instance, the warrant to grant John Stonor, the king's sergeant-at-arms, and his wife, Isabel Stonor, being in service with the Queen, the farm of the priory of Goring, Oxford. In this grant, Isabel's service is acknowledged, but this reward suggests that women in the queen's household who were married to men in the king's household may not be considered first-hand, and thus their advancement obscured. TNA SP 1/105, f. 268 (LP XI 253).

¹³⁵ LP I 3226 [7].

¹³⁶ HC, pp. 599-600.

¹³⁷ CPR I, 100, 312.

¹³⁸ CPR, II, 585.

¹³⁹ LP I 1221 [29].

¹⁴⁰ LP I 3499 [59].

¹⁴¹ LP I 3324 [12].

¹⁴² LP I 3324 [14].

¹⁴³ LP I 3324 [36].

¹⁴⁴ The accounts which have survived for the Great Wardrobe during Henry VII's reign indicate too that the queen's servants were awarded grants for livery: Lady Anne Percy received £9, 2s. 7d., and Lady Katherine Gordon, £15, 9 ½d., and 51s. 4 ½d. worth in gowns and other materials. Hayward, *Wardrobe*, pp. 9–10, 18, 28–29, 38–39 45–46, 195, 242.

the queen.¹⁴⁵ Catherine's gentlewoman, Elizabeth Saxby, was granted £20,¹⁴⁶ whereas Elizabeth Wolveden and Alice Davy, both received an annuity of £10.¹⁴⁷ In 1526, William Bulstrode, gentleman usher, 'in consideration of his services', was granted an annuity of £20.¹⁴⁸ Even after Blanche Twyford, Catherine's gentlewoman, had refused to swear a new oath to her as 'Princess Dowager', the king, some years later, gave recognition to 'her long and painful service', rewarding her with £66., 13s., 4d.¹⁴⁹ Similarly Mary Zouche, Jane Seymour's maid-of-honour, in 1542 received an annuity of £10 in recognition of her service 'to the King and the late Queen',¹⁵⁰ and Anne Basset, maid-of-honour to Henry VIII's queens, was granted an annuity of £26. 13s. 4d.¹⁵¹ This recognition indicates that to serve his queen truly was to serve the king.

Loyal, faithful and true, or 'good' service, was remembered and rewarded, often by a kinsman or woman acting on behalf of the mistress whom they served. Princess Mary wrote to Sir Thomas Wriothesley in 1536 for Anthony Roke, gentleman waiter to her late mother, Catherine: 'For although he be not my servant, yet because he was my mother's and is an honest man (as I thinke) I do love hym well, and would do hym good'.¹⁵² Sir Thomas Seymour, who married Catherine Parr after Henry VIII's death, made grants to the late queen's servants: Alice Prykett received 40s. a year 'in consyderacion of the greate labors and paynes taken' by her for the late queen, while Elizabeth Clyff received £6. 13s. 4d. a year for life for good service done

¹⁴⁵ *LP* III 361.

¹⁴⁶ *LP* II 470.

¹⁴⁷ *LP* II 123; *LP* III 524.

¹⁴⁸ *LP* I 82; *LP* IV 2132 [16]

¹⁴⁹ BL Arundel MS 97, f. 100r.

¹⁵⁰ *LP* XVII 283 (28).

¹⁵¹ *Lisle*, IV, p.191. Lady Margaret Grey, at 20l. (*LP* IV 6709 [18])

¹⁵² BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 269, printed in T. Hearne (ed.), *Sylloge Epistolarum* (London, 1716)

to the late excellent Prynnesse Katheryne late Quene of England Fraunce and Irland and late my moost deare and entyerly beloved spowse and wyef, as also by the rewarding thereof to move the said Elyzabeth to have in her remembraunce continually duryng her lyef the goodnes of the said late Quene with my good wyll and hertie affeccyon borne nott only unto her highnes but also unto her the said Elyzabeth Clyff for the same her servyce.¹⁵³

When Anne of Cleves died at Chelsea Manor on 16 July 1557, her last will and testament, dictated to, and witnessed by, her household servants, would take the form of an appeal to ‘our most dearest and entirely beloved sovereign lady queen Mary’, that is, Mary Tudor, Henry’s daughter, now queen of England. Her appeal began, ‘beseeching her highness that our poor servants may enjoy such small gifts and grants as we have made unto them in consideration of their long service done unto us’. Anne pleaded with Mary for her favour, on behalf of her servants, invoking her father’s memory: the king had appointed them, and he ‘said then unto us, that he would account our servants his own, and their service done to us as if done to himself’.¹⁵⁴ Even after the annulment of their marriage, Henry provided for Anne’s servants, as indicated by a warrant ‘for the payment to her Officers and certeyn gentilwomen and gentilmen’ in 1543-1544.¹⁵⁵ He paid out a further £22. 16s. to four of Anne’s servants,¹⁵⁶ £11. 13s. 4d. each to Andrew Staill, Anne’s gentleman, and Cornelius Zifford, her physician, as well as 100s. each to Thomas Carew, Thomas Charde and Richard Bloundell, her gentlemen, in 1545.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵³ Deeds, 13443 (Clyff), and 13444 (Prykett), in *A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds*, vol. 5, ed. H. C. Maxwell Lyte (London, 1906), pp. 505-526.

¹⁵⁴ Bentley (ed.), *Excerpta Historica*, pp. 96-98.

¹⁵⁵ BL Add MS 59900, f. 63r.

¹⁵⁶ *LP XX*, ii., 148 [33].

¹⁵⁷ *LP XX*, ii., 1035.

The king and queen might, on occasion, work together as patrons for preferment. This cooperation is clear in arranging and financing the marriages of the queens' servants. On behalf of Inéz de Venegas, Catherine's maid-of-honour, the king wrote to the queen's father, Ferdinand of Aragon, on 30 July 1509, begging for his 'favour' in Inéz's marriage to the queen's lord chamberlain, William Mountjoy.¹⁵⁸ On 25 January 1525, Catherine wrote to Wolsey soliciting him to obtain consent and confirm the jointure of Elizabeth Dannet, one of her maids, for her marriage: 'the goodness of my woman causeth me to make all this haste, trusting that she shall have a good husband and a sure living'.¹⁵⁹ The queen was clear in that the king had already spoken with 'Arondell, the heyre', who must be Sir John Arundell, the eldest son and heir of Sir John Arundell and Eleanor Grey, 'for a marriage to be had between him and one of my maids'. Their marriage was contracted on 10 July 'in agreement' with the queen, Mountjoy, and Robert Beckensall, her almoner.¹⁶⁰ Similarly Henry had urged a 'Mr Broke', probably Thomas Broke, yeoman usher, 'not to marry without his advice, as he is intended for one of the Queen's maidens'.¹⁶¹ On 6 March 1537, the marriage between Jane Ashley, Jane Seymour's maid-of-honour, and Peter Mewtas, of the king's Privy chamber, was 'as yet uncertain', because 'it dependeth on the King's goodness to look towards their living'.¹⁶² This cooperation extended to petitions to secure grants for his queens' servants which were in the custody of the crown. On 23 July 1544, Catherine Parr wrote directly to Henry on behalf of one of her gentleman ushers, Henry Webbe, for the house and demesnes of the nunnery of Hallywell.¹⁶³ 'We shall hartely desire, and pray you, to be so favourable to hym,' writes the queen on Webbe's behalf, 'at this oure earnest request, as that he may for his

¹⁵⁸ CSP Sp II, 20 (*LP* I 128). Henry felt it was 'very desirable' that Spanish and English families 'should be united by family ties'.

¹⁵⁹ Wood, vol. 1, pp. 260-261 (*LP* IV 1032). In her will, Catherine left £10 each 'to the little maidens', and £200 to Elizabeth Darrell 'for her marriage'. *LP* X 40.

¹⁶⁰ TNA AR/19/37/1, 2.

¹⁶¹ BL Cotton MS, Galba, B, VIII, f. 150 (*LP* IV 882).

¹⁶² *Lisle*, IV, 870, pp. 125-6 (*LP* XII, i., 586).

¹⁶³ Or 'Holywell', a nunnery located in Flintshire, northeast Wales, dissolved in 1536.

monye have ye purchase at your hands, of the saide vj li. whereof he hath thindenture'.¹⁶⁴

Queens could petition the king in suits on behalf of their servants: composed in c. 1571, a poem on the life of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, Catherine Parr's sewer, in which the servant would recall of the queen that:

She, willing of herself to do us good,
Sought out the means her uncle's life to save;
And, when the King was in the pleasing mood,
She humbly then her suit began to crave.
With wooing times denials disagree,
She spake, and sped: my father was set free.¹⁶⁵

Queens could intervene on behalf of their servants with the king for their advancement. When the king granted Henry Roper, George Bryggus and Matthew Johns, the yeoman, groom and page of the queen's beds, 'a forfeit of 40l.' in 1511, Catherine of Aragon wrote to Sir John Cutte to ensure that they did, in fact, receive it, urging him 'the rather for our sake that they may enjoy the said forfeit'.¹⁶⁶ A few days later Henry too wrote to Cutte and reissued the warrant for Roper, Bryggus and Johns, 'servants to our dearest wife the Queen'.¹⁶⁷

The relationship between the queen and the king was thus crucial for the advancement of their servants. This raises the question, what if there was a conflict between them? On 4

¹⁶⁴ BL Cotton MS Vespasian F III f.38 (*LP* XIX, i., 967). The king rewarded his queens' servants, and his queens rewarded the king's servants.

¹⁶⁵ Mueller, p. 189.

¹⁶⁶ TNA E/404/87, 108 (*LP* I 683 [1]).

¹⁶⁷ TNA E/404/87, 114 (*LP* I 683 [2]). 'The rare survival of multiple royal warrants for one reward reveals how Catherine and Henry worked together to reward her servants and demonstrates the potential of hidden queenly intervention in royal patronage.' Beer, 'Queenship', p. 223.

September 1531, Catherine and her servants were sent ‘to a little house near at hand’ where she was ‘scantly visited’, shortly before her household was moved to The More in Hertfordshire.¹⁶⁸ Exile had severe consequences for the queen’s servants, as they were ostracised from king and court. Mario Savorgnano, who visited the queen in her exile, observed that ‘she had some thirty maids-of-honour standing round the table, and about fifty who performed its service’, but that they were ‘not so much visited as heretofore’.¹⁶⁹ Nor did Catherine’s household receive a gift from the king at the celebrations for New Year. In the gift roll for 1532, Catherine and her servants are conspicuous by their absence.¹⁷⁰ Chapuys reported on 4 January 1532 that the king ‘used to send New Year’s presents to the ladies of the Queen’, and although ‘this custom, hitherto’ had been ‘faithfully observed’, he observed that ‘this has not been done this year’.¹⁷¹ What is more, Chapuys reported that Henry explicitly forbade courtiers and councillors from sending the queen and her household gifts.¹⁷² Gift-giving was often indicative of who was, and indeed, who was not, in favour.

Clearly the fortune, or misfortune, of the queen’s servants, was closely aligned with her own. ‘The Queen dreads most, and which causes her most pain and sorrow,’ Chapuys reported, that ‘...her marriage portion’, or estate, ‘be taken from her’. Catherine feared that if the king deprived her of her estates and ‘dispossessed of her rank and dignity’ as queen, her servants would suffer for it. ‘She is the more afraid’, as a result, ‘that her servants and domestics, besides other people whose fidelity she has rewarded with sundry offices in her household, will henceforward be deprived of their pensions and salaries’.¹⁷³ Here, again, the

¹⁶⁸ *LP* V 401; *CSP Sp* IV, ii., 786; *HC*, pp. 781-782; *LP* V 375; *LP* V 594.

¹⁶⁹ *CSP*, Ven, IV, 682.

¹⁷⁰ TNA E101/420/15 (*LP* V 686) for the gift roll of 1532.

¹⁷¹ *CSP Sp* IV ii., 880 (*LP* V 696). Chapuys ‘had acute political antennae and watched the rituals of New Year for signals of favour and disfavour’. Heal, *Gifts*, pp. 93-5.

¹⁷² *CSP Sp* IV ii., 880 (*LP* V 696). Anne and her ladies and gentlewomen all received gifts, engaging in the ritual of exchange at court on 1 January. *Lisle*, II, 302, pp. 373-374 (*LP* VIII 15).

¹⁷³ *CSP Sp*, IV, ii., 1123.

relationship between queens, the ‘good’ mistress, and ‘good’ service is clear. Yet, their power to maintain, reward and advance, and thus to bind, or oblige, her servants, and their loyalty, as the ‘good’ mistress, was constricted by the king, who, as sovereign, the fount of patronage, remained in control of the royal bounty. When Richard Rich travelled to Kimbolton on 19 January 1536 to take inventory of Catherine’s jewels, plate and wardrobe, these servants claimed ‘divers apparel’ and other materials for their fees. Rich advised that the king ‘cannot seize her goods’ as she was a ‘sole’ woman and ‘it would not be honorable to take the things given in her lifetime’.¹⁷⁴ Having sworn to serve Catherine as ‘Princess Dowager’, these servants were assured of the king’s favour, by which they were ‘greatly comforted’.¹⁷⁵ It was ultimately Henry who had custody of the queen’s ‘goods’, and it is unclear if her servants ever received what was bequeathed to them. Nearly six months after Catherine’s death, Elizabeth Darrell had not received what was owed to her, and wrote to Sir Francis Bryan, a gentleman of the king’s Privy chamber, on 14 June, requesting the ‘300 marks which the Dowager gave her by her will’.¹⁷⁶

It must be observed that the fortunes, the fates of mistress and servant, albeit closely aligned, were *not* inextricable. Certainly Anne Boleyn would have, in the words of Latymer, ‘rewarded with greate sommes of monye, some with offices, baylywickes and other places of charge wherento was annexed commodittis’ her own servants upon inheriting the queen’s lands,¹⁷⁷ but it is unlikely that these would all have been immediately or straightforwardly confiscated from the servants of her predecessor, Catherine of Aragon, in favour of the ‘new’ queen’s household. It was not strictly the queen but the king too with whom these servants were acquainted, tied, and by whom they could be maintained, rewarded and advanced.

¹⁷⁴ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 220 (*LP* X 128); TNA SP 1/101, f. 112 (*LP* X 151).

¹⁷⁵ TNA SP 1/101, f. 21 (*LP* X 37); BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 219 (*LP* X 41).

¹⁷⁶ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 174 (*LP* X 1134 [4]).

¹⁷⁷ Latymer, *Cronickille*.

Service was not strictly duty and obedience owed to the queen, as their mistress, as servants had their own interests too. Much of the evidence here examined alludes to a process – informal, conversations between mistress and servant, their interactions with the queen, and the king – whereby these servants made their interests known. How else did queens know when their servants had a ‘poor daughter’, required clothing for their wedding, or had sustained ‘such losses... at the birnyng of his howse’?

Politics in the queen’s Chamber, Privy Chamber, and the wider court

In the early modern period, politics was increasingly defined by access to the monarch. This is reflected in the remarks made by the Imperial ambassador, Eustace Chapuys, who, upon visiting court in 1531, had hoped ‘to speak to the king’, yet ‘...could not obtain either his ear or his eye’.¹⁷⁸ ‘Nearness’, or intimacy, is what distinguished the men and women who served in the queen’s Chamber and Privy Chamber. As the queen’s ‘body’ servants, they were in a position, physically, attending upon her person, to know what, where and when she ate, drank, dressed, bathed and slept, and emotionally, to know who or what she liked or disliked, and what she felt, thought, said and did, so much so that by only her ‘looke or countenance’, they ‘may know what lacketh’, and her ‘pleasure to be had or done’.¹⁷⁹ This intimacy was central to the manner in which politics were conducted, when politics is defined as the taking of consequential action for advancement, the process by which individuals made their interests known and acquired favour, the pursuit of power, patronage and profit, be it for their own careers, and their own interests, or on behalf of their clientele and kinship networks.

¹⁷⁸ *LP* V 614.

¹⁷⁹ *HO*, p. 156.

Politics in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber was centred on the queen herself. Power and influence lay in access to, and intimacy with, their mistress. Like the king's Chamber and Privy Chamber, the nature of the service they provided to the queen as her 'body servants' meant that they were in regular and close proximity, facilitating their own interactions, be it polite but opportune exchanges with her person, or hushed, self-seeking whispers in her ear that led to their own advancement, which extended to a servant's family, friends and clientele when they acted on their behalf to secure the queen's favour.¹⁸⁰ This power – which, in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber, was intimate, and personal – circulated between many hands. It has been demonstrated that the queen herself could maintain, reward and advance her servants – yet crucially, these servants could, in turn, mediate, recommend, and broker that power. This potential for servants in the queen's household to engage in politics is illustrated in the Lisle Letters, the surviving correspondence of a sixteenth-century English gentry family. This evidence demonstrates how relationships between the master, or mistress, and servant, and moreover, the relationship between the household, and the wider court and kingdom, were central to the politics of the household.

Service in the queen's household provided an opportunity to build one's own prestige, reputation, and standing with the crown, which in itself drew in clientele. It was their relationship *with* power that established servants as relevant to the wider court and kingdom. Like the king's servants, the queen's servants enjoyed formal recognition of their status as members of the household and wider court. They came to represent in the minds of her

¹⁸⁰ For an explanation of patronage and clientelism, see Akkerman and Houben (eds), *Ladies-in-waiting*, p. 4 ('A patron-broker-client relationship was a tripartite transaction in which the broker acted as an intermediary for the patron and the client. In other words, a broker was mediator in an indirect exchange, and an agent who did not own what was being exchanged, but who influenced the quality of the exchange.' Such a relationship was 'was uneven, vertical and reciprocal'.)

subjects her own person, as her ‘body’ servants, their presence could be taken as a personification of her own.¹⁸¹ As ‘body’ servants, they functioned as an extension of the will of their mistress, and her orders were communicated and facilitated through them.¹⁸² In 1534, a young man named James Billingford visited abbeys and priories in Warwickshire, Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire to ‘extort money’ from them, calling himself the ‘quenys chapelayn’. He was not Anne Boleyn’s chaplain, but acting in the queen’s name, and invoking her authority, Billingford ‘yn many places’ was able to take various sums of money, and their horses, even making threats to punish and depose those who did not comply with his demands, ‘to the great dishonor and slaunder of the quenys grace’.¹⁸³ A witness to his extortion later recalled how Billingford, a ‘crafty witted fellow’, by appropriating the office of chaplain to her household, inferred that he knew the queen personally, and as such, warned him ‘to take care how I meddled with him’. Billingford’s extortion reflects the status held by the queen’s servants, and illustrates their ability to act essentially as an extension of her authority.

In the English royal household, the scope of activity for the servant, with privileged access to, and intimacy with the crown, became much wider, and increasingly significant. And thus such politics were an extension of court politics. It will be shown that these politics were not strictly a masculine preserve, but that women too could operate in this manner. In the queen’s household, it was women who had the advantage. Operating between the centre and the periphery, the queen’s servants strengthened their position as patrons by broadening

¹⁸¹ Starkey, ‘Privy Chamber’, pp. 60-61.

¹⁸² The body of the sovereign was sacrosanct, and their intimate attendance upon that body meant that ladies and gentlemen of the Privy chamber were considered extensions of the monarch. Catherine Louise Howey reveals that women ‘often appropriated their bodies, clothes, and service’ to construct the queen, Elizabeth I’s monarchical image. Howey, ‘Bodies’, pp. 3, 295-296.

¹⁸³ TNA SP 1/83, f. 185 (*LP* VII 600); *LP* VII 641; TNA SP 1/89, f. 50 (*LP* VIII 81); *LP* VIII 94; *LP* VII Appendix 22. Billingford reportedly ‘lay hid there two or three days, altering his name’. He also went by the alias ‘Kett[ilb]ye’. TNA SP 1/83, f. 185 (*LP* VII 600).

their networks and forging ties throughout the court and wider kingdom. By virtue of their 'nearness' or proximity to the crown, the queen's servants functioned as 'points of contact' for their mistress, and even the king, their sovereign, and his councillors.¹⁸⁴ William Oxenbridge, Anne Boleyn's groom porter, reported treasonous words spoken in the parish of Rolvynden, Kent to Thomas Cromwell in 1535. 'Knowing that I wase the quene's grace's servaunt', he wrote that a man named William Lawless had informed him that the vicar of the parish had preached 'Ye shall not follow the saying of evil princes, nor evil rulers, but rather put on your harness and fight against them.'¹⁸⁵ The queen's servants were her eyes and ears on the periphery, as a bridge between the queen, the wider court and the localities throughout the kingdom.

Servants in the queen's Chamber acted as patrons who were solicited by would-be clients as a 'way in' to their mistress. The significance of the development of the queen's Privy chamber is that it restricted, or controlled, access to the queen. Each of the queen's chambers were closely guarded, allowing fewer and fewer people access, and right of entry was restricted to her servants, who were often responsible for regulating who and what came through them. Those who visited the court were received, and their own access facilitated by, the queen's servants in her Guard and Presence chambers. Thomas Warley, Honor Grenville, lady Lisle's servant, met in Anne Boleyn's Presence chamber with Margery Horsman, her maid-of-honour, who had arranged for Warley to receive a kirtle from the queen. When Warley returned there later to thank her, he found that Horsman had 'returned into the Privy chamber, so that since I could not speak with her'.¹⁸⁶ On another occasion, when Thomas Wynter, archdeacon of York, met with the queen, she had kept him 'a long time', and was

¹⁸⁴ Elton, 'Court'.

¹⁸⁵ TNA SP 1/99, f. 7 (*LP IX* 786).

¹⁸⁶ *Lisle*, III, 658, pp. 300-1 (*LP X* 499).

sent for only upon ‘being reminded by her attendants’, who received him ‘very kindly’.¹⁸⁷

Persons and petitions alike had to go through these servants, whose authority was reflected in their intimacy with their mistress.

In this women had the advantage: access to the queen’s Privy chamber, for example, was strictly for her most intimate servants, who necessarily had to be women.¹⁸⁸ John Husee, Lady Lisle’s agent in London, advised her that, to find preferment for her daughters, Anne and Katharine, to the queen’s household, it was ‘no meet suit for any man to move such matters, but only for such Ladies and women as be your friends’.¹⁸⁹ On 6 June 1536, Husee wrote to Lady Lisle promising to move ‘the preferment of your ladyship’s daughter unto the Queen’.¹⁹⁰ The agent had to petition Eleanor Paston, countess of Rutland, a lady of the queen’s Privy chamber, and Margery Horsman and Mary Arundell, both maids-of-honour: ‘I shewed my Lady Rutland that your ladyship would gladly have one of your daughters with the Queen, and so I showed Mrs. Margery and Mrs. Arundell in like manner, but I am sure none of them never motioned the Queen’s grace therein’.¹⁹¹ Upon hearing that the matter for her daughters’ preferment had not been moved, Lady Lisle began courting the queen’s servants more aggressively for their favour. She was exhaustive in her efforts to secure them as her patrons, petitioning them through Husee, with whom she kept close correspondence and by whom she conveyed various gifts, tokens and sums of money. The countess of

¹⁸⁷ TNA SP 1/85, f. 43 (*LP* VII 964).

¹⁸⁸ ‘The power of the court was concentrated and articulated in the hands of the Privy Chamber’, and requests might be received more favourably if its staff were to convey them. David Starkey, *The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics* (London, 1986), p. 28.

¹⁸⁹ *Lisle*, IV, 896, pp. 167-8 (*LP* XII, ii., 808). This was reiterated by Henry, lord Montague, who told Lord Lisle that, although he would do his best to petition for the appointment of Lisle’s daughter Anne to the queen’s household, ‘if you would write to my mother yourself, it would take effect sooner’. TNA SP 3/6, f. 76 (*LP* XII, i., 1229).

¹⁹⁰ *Lisle*, III, 717, pp. 408-9.

¹⁹¹ *Lisle*, IV, 850ii, pp. 109-110. Among others who were petitioned in the first instance were Thomas Heneage, the king’s groom of the stool, Henry Pole, 1st baron Montague, his mother, Margaret Pole, countess of Salisbury, and Sir John Wallop. *Lisle*, III, 718, pp. 409-10. *Lisle*, IV, 863, pp. 107-9. *LP* XII, i., 354. *Lisle*, IV, 880, pp. 144-5.

Rutland, for example, received ‘cherries and peasecods’, a token ‘heart of gold’ and later ‘a pipe of Gascon wine and two barrels of herring’; Elizabeth Harleston, Lady Wallop, received a ‘little diamond’; Sir William Coffin, Master of the Horse, received a hawk; Margery Horsman, received a ‘casket of steel and flower’, and a ‘a ring of gold’, and John Powes, a yeoman usher, received 20s.¹⁹² Tokens were usually a personal, treasured possession of the sender, not often kept by the recipient but accepted in recognition of their relationship and returned in due time.¹⁹³ After receiving a token from Lady Lisle, Margery showed her gratitude to Husee, Lisle’s agent, before closing the exchange. ‘I ensure you, madame, she sets not a little by it’, reported Husee, ‘and she delivered to me a cramp ring of gold for your ladyship, which ye shall receive herein closed.’¹⁹⁴

The queen’s servants did not always have their own axes to grind, but their position meant that they were often solicited by those who wished for them to act as intermediaries on their behalf, as a means to the specific ends of another. On 20 March 1534, John Grainfield, who was later sergeant-at-arms to Henry VIII’s queens, promised lord Lisle ‘I have moved a friend of mine about the Queen in Haward’s matter’.¹⁹⁵ Elizabeth Staynings, whose husband had been imprisoned, in 1534 asked lady Lisle ‘to write to any lady she knows at Court who

¹⁹² *Lisle* IV 882, p. 146 (*LP* XII, ii., 66); *Lisle*, VI, 1649, p. 25 (*LP* XV 215) for the countess of Rutland; *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271) for Elizabeth Harleston, Lady Wallop; *Lisle*, IV, 895, pp. 163-5 (*LP* XII, ii., 711) for Sir William Coffin; *Lisle*, III, 668, pp. 315-6 (*LP* X 573). *LP* X 1165 for Margery Horsman; *Lisle*, IV, 870, pp. 125-6 for John Powes. Others of queen Jane Seymour’s servants who received tokens were Margaret Dymoke, Lady Coffin, and Mary Arundell, countess of Sussex. Among other tokens sent by Lady Lisle to the queens’ households in England were ‘a buck and another small deer’ (*Lisle*, I, xxxiii, pp.334-335 (Summer 1532). *LP* VIII 939. *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp.150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271), and *LP* XII, ii., 424 for gifts and tokens exchanged with the queen’s servants. *Lisle*, III, 673, pp. 323-4, *Lisle*, III, 741, p.449, and *Lisle*, IV, 863, pp. 107-9 for correspondence and messages conveyed through Lady Lisle’s servants.

¹⁹³ The countess of Rutland and her husband, Thomas Manners, earl of Rutland, the queen’s lord chamberlain, commended Lady Lisle to the queen after receiving her tokens and, on 18 June 1536, sent her a token of their own in return. *Lisle*, IV, 863, pp. 107-9.

¹⁹⁴ *Lisle*, III, 668, pp. 315-6 (*LP* X 573); *Lisle*, II, 299, p. 330. Margery Horsman also advised Lady Lisle that ‘the Queen’s Grace setteth much store by a pretty dog’. *Lisle*, II, 299a, p.331 (*LP* IX 991), dated 1535 in *LP* but *Lisle* shows that the correct date is 1534.

¹⁹⁵ TNA SP 3/3, f. 136 (*LP* VII 349).

is familiar with the Queen, that she may resort to her sometimes'.¹⁹⁶ On 17 July 1537, Thomas Raynolds wrote to lady Lisle, who was responsible for securing his appointment as chaplain to Jane Seymour, asking, 'if lord Lisle or she have any other friends about the King or Queen, as he is sure they have many now, a good word may do him great pleasure'.¹⁹⁷

Thus the patron-client system shifted to their advantage. Upon learning that Thomas Culpeper, a gentleman of the king's Privy chamber, was to be given a hawk by Lady Lisle, Mary Arundell, countess of Sussex, by then a lady of the queen's Privy chamber, intervened, suggesting that Culpeper 'should not have the hawk, saying that he can do your ladyship small pleasure'.¹⁹⁸ 'By her advice', Lady Lisle then gifted the hawk instead to the countess' husband, Robert Radcliffe, 1st earl of Sussex.¹⁹⁹ Shortly after Jane became queen, Husee had learnt that she 'had appointed all her maidens already'.²⁰⁰ Lady Lisle kept close correspondence in the meantime with her agent, who was informed of potential vacancies from within the queen's household. On 30 April 1537, Husee reported to Lady Lisle that Jane Ashley, one of the maids, was shortly to be married, and that if one of her daughters 'had been now here she might have chanced to have furnished her room, but she must first be seen or known ere she be taken into the Queen's service'.²⁰¹ Margery Horsman, her faithful patron, had contrived a way for one of her daughters to be 'seen or known' by, to be near to her mistress, promising to 'receive her and lay her in her chamber, or else with young Mrs. Norris',²⁰² and to 'bring her with her into the Queen's chamber every day'. 'Madam, your ladyship is not a little beholding unto this gentlewoman,' wrote Husee, in recognition of the

¹⁹⁶ TNA SP 3/13, f. 171 (*LP* VII 734).

¹⁹⁷ *LP* XII, ii., 273.

¹⁹⁸ *Lisle*, IV, 895, pp.163-5 (*LP* XII, ii., 711).

¹⁹⁹ When he refused her, with thanks, the countess redirected the gift of a hawk and 'commanded the same to be given unto' William Coffin, the queen's master of the horse.

²⁰⁰ *Lisle*, IV, 850ii, pp. 109-110.

²⁰¹ *Lisle*, IV, 874, pp. 136-8 (*LP* XII, i., 1069).

²⁰² Mary Norris, one of the queen's maids-of-honour.

young Margery's labour in the suit.²⁰³ Within a year, Husee was able to assure Lady Lisle that her patrons in the household promised one of her daughters 'shall be immediately preferred unto the Queen's service at the next vacant, which is thought shall be shortly'.²⁰⁴ The opportunity to advance this suit would arise when Eleanor, countess of Rutland, and Mary, countess of Sussex, ladies of the queen's Privy chamber, learned that the queen, who was heavily pregnant, was craving quails. Of this they promptly informed Husee, before receiving and conveying a delivery of two dozen quails to Jane on 9 May 1537.²⁰⁵ Her ladies, seeing that the queen was unsatisfied with them, then warned the agent to inform Lady Lisle, rather bluntly, that 'those that your ladyship shall hereafter send, let them be very fat, or else they are not worth thanks'.²⁰⁶ Two months, and presumably, many quails later, 'the Queen at dinner, while eating the quails,' her agent reported, 'spoke of your ladyship and your daughters before my lady Rutland and my lady Sussex'.²⁰⁷ 'Such communication was uttered by the said ij ladies', it was observed, 'that you shall send them both over, that her Grace may see them herself, and take which she pleases'.²⁰⁸

In this suit 'for her preferment', the queen's servants, in the words of Husee, provided 'counsel'.²⁰⁹ By 'counsel', Husee meant that they, as her servants, were in a position to know and advise them in the process on how they might ensure a successful outcome to their suit. They knew when the queen was in good humour, and how and when she might be

²⁰³ *Lisle*, IV, 868a, pp. 121-3.

²⁰⁴ *Lisle*, IV, 875, pp. 138-9.

²⁰⁵ *Lisle*, IV, 855a, pp. 71-2.

²⁰⁶ Eleanor Paston, countess of Rutland, conveyed the quails. *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271). See also *Lisle*, IV, 878, p. 141.

²⁰⁷ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

²⁰⁸ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

²⁰⁹ *Lisle*, IV, 850ii, pp. 109-110. It has been shown that 'counsel', the act of giving and receiving advice, is one form of interaction indicative of trust held by and between individuals, irrespective of gender or position. Mears, *Queenship*, p. 50; Helen Matheson-Pollock, 'Counselloresses and Court Politics: Mary Tudor, Queen of France and Female Counsel in European Politics, 1509-15', in Helen Matheson-Pollock, Joanne Paul and Catherine Fletcher (eds), *Queenship and Counsel in Early Modern Europe* (London, 2018).

approached or solicited for favour. The queen's servants facilitated the process by which one of Lady Lisle's daughters would be appointed by giving Husee explicit instructions as to 'the Queen's pleasure': both Anne and Katharine 'must be sent over about vj weeks hence';²¹⁰ that they should arrive 'before the Queen takes her chamber, because her Grace would see them before then';²¹¹ that 'the Queen will be at no more cost with her but wages and livery';²¹² that the queen had to know their 'manners, fashions and conditions';²¹³ that they had to be 'apparelled according to their degrees' with 'ij honest changes they must have, the one of satin, the other of damask, and that whichever of her daughters would be appointed 'must have a servant to wait on her and the Queen will give her but 10*l.* a year'.²¹⁴ By 17 September, Anne Basset 'was sworn the Queen's maid'.²¹⁵ Shortly thereafter, on 2 October, Husee was informed by her ladies that 'the Queen's pleasure is that Mrs. Anne shall wear no more her French apparel' and 'must have provided a bonnet or ij, with frontlets and an edge of pearl, and a gown of black satin, and another of velvet'.²¹⁶ 'Your ladyship must provide a gown of tawny velvet for Mrs. Anne', Husee reiterated weeks later.²¹⁷ In the meantime, the countess of Sussex let Anne 'lieth in her chamber', and gave her a 'velvet bonnet' and 'a kirtle of crimson damask and sleeves' until her proper attire could be made.²¹⁸

Like many others, this potential for advancement with the queen meant that Lady Lisle was anxious to remain in her favour. The queen's servants, knowing her disposition or state of mind, could assure their client of her position: 'I promise you, madame,' George Taylor, Anne Boleyn's receiver-general, wrote to Lady Lisle in the summer of 1532, 'as far

²¹⁰ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii, 271).

²¹¹ *Lisle*, IV, 891, pp. 156-7.

²¹² *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

²¹³ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

²¹⁴ *Lisle*, IV, 894, pp. 161-2; *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP* XII, ii., 271).

²¹⁵ *Lisle*, IV, 895, pp. 163-5.

²¹⁶ *Lisle*, IV 896, pp. 167-8 (*LP* XII, ii., 808).

²¹⁷ *Lisle*, IV, 901, p. 178 (*LP* XII, ii., 958).

²¹⁸ *Lisle*, IV, 901, p. 178 (*LP* XII, ii., 958).

as I can perceive, she favours you very well, and I trust it shall always continue more and more'.²¹⁹ A few years later, John Husee reiterated that 'all your ladyship's friends in the Court are merry and commendeth them heartily unto your ladyship'. 'It hath been shewed me by one or ij of the Queen's servants', wrote Husee, 'that her Grace hath spoken of your Ladyship divers times since departing from Dover'.²²⁰ Richard Dauncy, the queen's gentleman usher, later assured Lady Lisle in a letter on 22 July 1537 that Jane would show her the same goodwill as did Anne. 'Ye thought the Queen's grace did not favour you', Dauncy wrote, 'I ensure you Madam it is not so for I have heard her Grace speak of you, and wish for you divers times since your departing'.²²¹ By their privileged access, the queen's servants were apt to gather, facilitate and 'broker' information, knowledge to which they alone were privy. John Husee clearly had a back-and-forth with servants in the queen's household, as is reflected further in his close reports on the progress of Jane's pregnancy: on 9 May 1537, 'it is said the Queen is with child 20 weeks gone. God send her a prince'²²²; on 23 May 1537, 'the Queen is great with child, and will be open-laced with stomacher between this and Corpus Christi Day'²²³; from lady Rutland the queen was 'in good health and merry' on 10 June 1537²²⁴; and further that 'the Queen takes her chamber in 20 days' on 1 September 1537.²²⁵ The queen's servants were often central to a system of communications – networks – which ran through the wider court, and by which all manner of messages, letters, petitions and suits, rumours and gossip were transmitted.²²⁶ The most politically astute of

²¹⁹ *Lisle*, I, xxxii, pp. 332-333. Taylor signed the letter signing 'your assewryd power ffrend'. Like Elizabeth I's ladies of the Privy chamber, who functioned as barometers of the queen's favour. Elizabeth's contemporaries knew well that servants could be trusted to facilitate access to and communications with the queen. Mears, 'Chamber', p. 73.

²²⁰ *Lisle*, III, 753, pp. 468-9.

²²¹ *Lisle*, IV, 890, p. 155 (*LP* XII, ii., 318). Dauncy also thanked Lady Lisle for her 'manifold kindness'.

²²² *Lisle*, IV, 855a, pp. 71-2.

²²³ *Lisle*, IV, 880, pp. 144-5.

²²⁴ *Lisle*, IV, 882, p. 146.

²²⁵ *Lisle*, IV, 894, pp. 161-2.

²²⁶ See also the reports of foreign ambassadors, who often reveal or name their source within the court to be one of the queen's servants: on 9 January 1536, two days after the death of Catherine of Aragon, for example, Chapuys wrote to Charles V, anxiously awaiting news from her servants: 'I cannot relate in detail the

these servants kept their eyes and their ears open at all times for information which was potentially useful or relevant, either to them, the queen, or their own clientele at court, for whom they acted as a 'way in' to her chambers.²²⁷

Relationships between mistress and servant – and the access, intimacy and favour her servants shared in, on which their careers were built – were eradicated when the king remarried, creating an ever-shifting 'inner circle' in the queen's household. Eleanor, countess of Rutland, was an intimate of Jane Seymour, and as such was able to facilitate the preferment of Anne Basset to be her maid-of-honour. But a few years later, when Eleanor, now in the service of Anne of Cleves, was solicited again, on this occasion to advance Lady Lisle's younger daughter, Katharine, 'that she may be one of the Queen's maids', the countess, regrettably, could not move the suit. She wrote to Lady Lisle on 17 February 1540, after receiving 'a pipe of Gascon wine and two barrels of herring' to 'move her Grace in that behalf', to advise her then to 'make some means unto Mother Lowe, who can do as much good in this matter as any one woman here, that she may make some means to get your said daughter with the Queen's said Grace'. The countess reiterated this to Katharine herself: 'For my Ladye of Rutland sayth, that Mother Lowe, the Mother of the Dowche Maydes, maye do muche for my Preferment to the Queen's Highness,' Katharine wrote to her mother, 'so that your Ladyship wold sende her my good Token, that she myght the better remember me'. The countess knew well that Mother Lowe – one of her native-born servants who had known the queen for much longer, and was in her confidence – would be better fit for the purpose.²²⁸ It

circumstances of the Queen's decease', he remarked, '...for none of her servants has yet come'. CSP Sp, V, ii., 3 (*LP* X 59).

²²⁷ John Husee, lady Lisle's agent, trusted that Anne's Receiver-General, George Taylor, could get a suit (as well as gifts) to her. *Lisle*, II, 299, p. 330. *Lisle*, II, 302, pp. 373-4 (*LP* VIII 15).

²²⁸ The countess knew that it was in her interests to make herself an intimate of the new queen. Was the 'fayre flower' that was 'curiously wrought', or wrapped, and sent as a gift to the king on Anne's behalf, an attempt to win her favour? It is unclear from the entry in the accounts: the countess was paid 40s. 'for a Reward which she gave your grace for a fayre flower curiously wrought and sent to the kyngs highnes'. TNA E101/422/15.

is clear that continuity in service, and in office, did not necessarily mean stability, as relationships, between mistress and servant, were yet vulnerable.

Henry VIII's queens came and went, but the king remained a constant, and this relationship, between servant and sovereign, meant that servants could circumvent the queen in their pursuit for preferment. Henry VIII, as a monarch, could be affable, friendly, cheerful and gracious in his manner,²²⁹ more accessible, and in his demeanour more approachable, in the relaxed atmosphere of his queens' chambers. Of all his queens' servants, it was clearly their ladies and gentlewomen in whose company the king was known to take the most pleasure in, affording them unprecedented access to their sovereign. At the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520, both kings of England and France were determined to achieve parity in numbers, as to avoid either entourage exceeding the other,²³⁰ though exceptions may have been made for women, whose attendance at the summit was greatly welcomed, even encouraged. As Sir Richard Wingfield assured Francis I, remarking of Henry, 'I never sawe your highnes encombrd or fynde defaulte with over grete presse of Ladyes'.²³¹ It was observed the king might be more receptive to female petitioners: 'be not idle', Sir Thomas Wyatt would urge and advise gentlemen at court, 'thy niece, thy cousin, thy sister or thy daughter, if she be fair, if handsome by her middle, if thy better hath her love besought her, advance his cause, and he shall help thy need'.²³² Shortly after Anne Basset, Lady Lisle's daughter, was appointed to serve in the queen's household, her mother began advising her closely on how to remain in Henry's good graces. 'I have declaryd vnto the kynges highenis

²²⁹ Sebastian Giustinian, having resided at the king's court as an ambassador, described Henry VIII as 'affable, gracious' and 'harms no one'. Giustinian, *Four Years*, pp. 313-5. The king appears to have treated his servants with familiarity too. See, for instance, his card-playing with Richard Hill, sergeant of the wine cellar. BL Add MS 20030, ff. 16-19.

²³⁰ It was ordained that 'neyther of theym shall bryng with theyme a mor nombre of Noblemen and women servants and horsis than is conteyned in a bill indented'. 'Memoriall', p. 184.

²³¹ TNA SP 1/20 f. 41 (*LP* III 806).

²³² Sir Thomas Wyatt, *Collected Poems*, ed. by J. Daalder (Oxford, 1975), CVII, p. 112.

all thynges, as your ladeship wyllyed me to dow,’ Anne wrote to her on 22 December 1539, acknowledging and expressing her gratitude ‘for the good and motherly counsell your ladeship dothe gyve me, concernyng my contynuans in the kyngs ffavor’.²³³ ‘Ffor I knowlyge myselff most bounde to his Highenes of all creatures’, Anne wrote, ‘if I shold, therfor, in anny thing offende his Grace willingly, yt were pitte I sholde lyve’.²³⁴ Anne had shown herself reluctant to approach him on account of his ill-temper. Lady Lisle sent to her various gifts and tokens for her to convey to the capricious king: ‘Madam, the kyng dothe sowell lyke the conserves you sent hym last,’ Anne observed, ‘that his grace comandyd me to wrytte vnto you for more of the codynack of the clerest making, and of the conserve of damessyns, and this assone as may be’.²³⁵ Anne wrote again to her mother on 19 February 1540 to inform her that she had received and presented the codiniac²³⁶ to the king, and that ‘hys grace douse lyke hyt wondyrse well’. When the king ‘had tastyd’ his codiniac in her presence, Anne was urged to ‘move hys grace for to send you some tokyn of rememrans’.²³⁷ ‘And whereas you do wrytte to me that I shoulde remembyr my syster’, Katharine, for her preferment to the queen’s household, Anne assured her mother, ‘I have spokyn to the kyngs hyghenes for her’.²³⁸

The king received petitions and granted requests from the queen’s servants in all manner of suits, demonstrating their potential to exploit their relationship with the sovereign

²³³ *Lisle*, V, 1620, pp. 730-1 (*LP XIV*, ii., 718).

²³⁴ *Lisle*, V, 1620, pp. 730-1 (*LP XIV*, ii., 718).

²³⁵ *Lisle*, V, 1620, pp. 730-1 (*LP XIV*, ii., 718).

²³⁶ Cognac.

²³⁷ *Lisle*, VI, 1653, p. 33-4 (*LP XV* 229).

²³⁸ *Lisle*, VI, 1653, p. 33-4 (*LP XV* 229). On 9 October 1537, Peter Mewtas, one of the king’s gentlemen, informed Lord Lisle that, of his two daughters, ‘his Grace thought Mistress Anne Basset to be the fairest’. *Lisle*, IV, 899, pp. 171-2. See also, for example, when lady Lisle asked Anne to ‘sue for the pardon of John Harryse’, Anne wrote back on 8 August 1539, stating that although she herself was not at court, ‘if I can get any one to speak to the King for his pardon, will be sure to do so’. *LP XIV*, ii., 22. Arthur Plantagenet, Lord Lisle, Anne’s stepfather, had been arrested on suspicion of treason on 19 May 1540. When Lord Lisle was suddenly released after being kept prisoner in the Tower for two years, Chapuys observed on 9 February 1542 and attributed it to the king’s affection for Anne. *CSP Sp*, VI, i, 230.

and engage in the wider network of patronage and clientelism. In 1522, Henry VIII granted a pardon to, and restored all the the 'forfeited goods, chattels and lands' of Gawin Lancaster, 'on the supplication' of Maud Parr, lady to Catherine of Aragon.²³⁹ When Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1534, sought to move the suit of one of his servants, he wrote, not to the king himself, but to Agnes Howard, dowager duchess of Norfolk, lady to Anne Boleyn, asking her explicitly to 'cause sune of your speciall frendes nygh aboute the kynges highnes' for his preferment'.²⁴⁰ The queen's servants may have been solicited as a patron on account of their 'nearness' to the king's courtiers and councillors. A cleric named William Forster regarded Lady Rochford, in his words a 'most special patroness of [his] stody', as a potential patron in his suit with Thomas Cromwell for the advowson – or patronage – of an ecclesiastical benefice in Swaffham, Norfolk. In a letter to Cromwell, Forster acknowledges and expresses his gratitude for the Secretary's 'gret favoors and singuler goodnes' in the matter, first moved by 'my laydy of Rechforthe'.²⁴¹

Access, or 'nearness', to the king, their sovereign, both physically, and emotionally, was crucial. The separation of the king's side from the queen's side meant that they could live apart if they so wished. For instance, Henry VIII rarely visited Anne of Cleves in her chambers during the six months that she was queen, which would have, in turn, restricted, the access of her servants. Henry married Anne at Greenwich on 6 January 1540,²⁴² but 'ever since the King saw the Queen, he had never liked her', and reportedly 'often as he went to bed with her, he mistrusted the Queen's virginity'.²⁴³ The king himself confided in Cromwell

²³⁹ *LP* III 2356 (20).

²⁴⁰ BL Harleian MS 6148, ff. 44r-44v; Clark, *Gender*, pp. 41-63 for more on Agnes, dowager duchess of Norfolk as a patron.

²⁴¹ TNA SP 1/104, f. 282. Rowley-Williams, 'Image and Reality', p. 165.

²⁴² *HC*, pp. 832-8.

²⁴³ Sir Thomas Heneage reported that this mistrust was because of 'the looseness of her breasts and other tokens', and that 'he could have none appetite with her to do as a man should do with his wife'. *LP* XV 850.

that, 'I liked her before not well, but now I like her much worse', after having 'felt her belly and breasts', Henry came to believe that she 'was no maid'.²⁴⁴ Soon the king became infatuated with the young, diminutive but vivacious beauty, Catherine Howard, and began seeking an annulment.²⁴⁵ It must have been discouraging for the servants in the household of Anne of Cleves, for instance, when the king no longer visited the queen in her chambers, and yet moreso when Anne and her household were exiled to Richmond Palace.²⁴⁶ On 6 July 1540, the queen sent for the earl of Rutland, her lord chamberlain, to inform him that the king's council had declared unto her that her marriage to the king to be unlawful, and that they required her consent: 'she called us into her chambre and dec[lare]d by the Imbassador that the Kynges highnes had sent to her a c[ertai]n message which required awnswer agayn'.²⁴⁷ The marriage was declared null and void a few days later. Thomas Wriothesley, of the king's council, arrived at Richmond 'to discharge the officers and servants who attended on her as Queen, and appoint and swear others to serve her as the King's sister'.²⁴⁸ Anne would no longer be known as queen, but 'the Lady Anne of Cleue', and in addition would be kept 'in honourable estate', receiving a generous settlement. The king's councillors were dispatched once again a few days later, 'to see her household fully established', with its size and status appropriately reduced.²⁴⁹ On 12 July, the king's councillors visited her at Richmond and presented her with the settlement for the annulment. They 'went straight to the Lady Anne's chamber to discuss 'matters of her household', reporting later that 'it seemeth she can n[ot] but be conte]nt to have such as your M[ajesty] by your] commandment shall

²⁴⁴ *LP* XV 823.

²⁴⁵ Marillac later reported on 3 September 1540 that 'the king is so amouros of her that he cannot treat her well enough and caresses her more than he did the others'. *LP* XVI 12. *LP* XV 901.

²⁴⁶ *HC*, p. 839. The king, 'purposyng it to bee more for her health, open ayre and pleasure', had, in fact, began seeking an annulment.

²⁴⁷ *LP* XV 844.

²⁴⁸ TNA SP 1/151, f. 116 (*LP* XV 925).

²⁴⁹ *HC*, p. 839; *WC*, vol. 1., pp. 119-20; *LP* XV 901; TNA SP 1/161, f. 203 (*LP* XV 930).

app[oint her]’, though she did ask on behalf of her gentlewomen servants that they should remain.²⁵⁰

Serving ‘the king’s sister’ was not nearly as prestigious nor as advantageous as serving the king’s wife. On 4 December 1541, Jane Rattsey and Katharine Basset were apprehended and examined by the king’s Privy council.²⁵¹ Jane and Katharine were servants to lady Anne of Cleves, who was residing with her household at Richmond Palace. When Catherine Howard was accused of ‘misusing her bodye with certeine persons afore the Kinges tyme’, and the queen’s household was discharged, Jane hoped that Anne might be reinstated.²⁵² ‘What if god workith this worke to make the ladie Anne off Cleves quene again?’ Jane asked Katharine, who herself presumed ‘that she sholde shortly se a chawnge, whiche she gatherid for that she saw the mayds room sadly downe’.²⁵³ ‘What a man is the king, how many wifys will he have?’ Jane uttered, rather incautiously, to Katharine. All this Jane later maintained was no more than ‘idle convercacion’, yet it is clear from her deposition that she and Katharine aspired to the queen’s Chamber.²⁵⁴ In addition to Anne’s gentlewomen servants, who had hoped for her reinstatement as queen, Sir Wymond Carew, her receiver-general, too, complained of his new status to John Gates, groom of the king’s Privy chamber, and requested an increase in wages.²⁵⁵ Reflecting her new status, one of Anne’s own servants,

²⁵⁰ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 248 (*LP XV* 874).

²⁵¹ TNA SP 1/168, f. 50 (*LP XVI* 1407). The deposition of Jane Rattsey names ‘Elizabeth Basset’, but all of the evidence indicates that the Basset daughter who was appointed to attend upon Anne was Katharine.

²⁵² *WC*, vol. 1, pp. 130-131.

²⁵³ TNA SP 1/168, f. 50 (*LP XVI* 1407). Catherine Howard would be succeeded not by Anne, but by Catherine Parr, Henry’s sixth wife and queen, who appointed her own maids-of-honour.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.* Perhaps it was for this that William Goring, Anne’s lord chamberlain, and Jasper Horsey, her lord steward, were on 11 December 1541 summoned by the king’s Privy council, and ‘the matter declared wherefor they were sent for’, before they were dismissed. *PCP*, VII, 281, 282. Jane Rattsey made such remarks, she, and apparently Frances Lilgrave and Dorothy Wingfield were questioned. In 1541, rumours circulated that Anne had conceived a child by the king (*CSP Sp VI*, i., 213). Henry apparently remarked that, if it proved true that Anne was pregnant, he ‘imputeth a great default in her officers, for not advising his highness thereof’.

²⁵⁵ Carew and his wife received £20 a year, whereas Jasper Horsey, the queen’s steward, and his wife received £26, 13s., 4d.. ‘I pray you learn of my lord Privy Seal whether I and my wife shall have the same allowance as Mr. Horssey and his wife have, for I think myself no meaner than he’, Carew wrote to Gate. Anne, Carew complained, ‘esteems my wife two degrees under Mrs. Horssey’. TNA SP 1/162, f. 66 (*LP XV* 991).

Sir Thomas Cawarden, was able to wrest from her the palace of Bletchingley into his own possession. The palace was granted to Anne for life as part of the settlement. Cawarden, in recognition of his service as a gentleman of the king's Privy chamber, granted the reversion of Bletchingley in 1546.²⁵⁶ Henry had not intended for Cawarden to have the property until Anne's death. But within months of Edward VI's accession, Cawarden, as an intimate of the young king, was able to convince him to make Anne 'surrender unto him of all your title and interest at Bleachinglegh for the mannour and thappurtenances'.²⁵⁷

The queen's servants kept up their familiarity with the king by exchanging gifts and sending correspondence. The king's Privy Purse accounts, which survive from 1529 to 1532, at which time both Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn were rival queens, demonstrate that he was regularly sent gifts from their servants: of Catherine's household, lady Bulstrode, sent Henry cheeses in 1529, and in 1530, she sent apples; that same year, lady Darrell sent capons and puddings, lady Parr sent him a coat cloth, and Robert Hasilrig sent him a doe; of Anne's household in 1530, lady Berkeley and lady Wiltshire both sent the king hawks, and in 1531, lady Marques of Dorset gifted Henry two hounds and two geldings.²⁵⁸ On 4 August 1539, shortly after visiting Henry VIII's fleet of ships at Portsmouth, the late Jane Seymour's ladies and gentlewomen servants wrote a letter to the king to express their awe, wonder and gratitude. The letter is so unsubtle in its purpose that it is worth quoting at length:

Most gratiouse and benigne sovraigne Lorde, please it your Highnes to understonde that wee have seene and beene in your newe Greate Shippe,²⁵⁹ and the rest of your shippes at Portismowth, wiche arr things so goodlie to beeholde, that, in our liefs wee

²⁵⁶ *LP* XXI, ii., 648 (50).

²⁵⁷ *ACP*, II, pp.471-472. Anne also had to surrender Richmond to the king on 3 June 1548.

²⁵⁸ *PPE*, Hen., pp. 4, 36, 42, 48, 50, 91, 92, 149.

²⁵⁹ Perhaps the 'Henri Grâce à Dieu', or 'Great Harry', the flagship of Henry VIII's fleet, an English carrack which had been completely rebuilt between 1536 and 1539.

have not seene (excepting your royall person and my lord the Prince your sonne) a more pleasaunt sight; for wiche, and the most bountiful gifts, the chere and most gratiouse enterteignment, wich your Grace hath vouchsavid to bestowe upon us your most unworthie and humble servaunts and bedewomen.²⁶⁰

It was outright flattery of this nature that appealed to Henry's own sense of majesty and self-image, assuring that he would remember them.

Of course, as their sovereign, the king demanded from his queens' servants due respect, and overt displays of subservience and humility. The king could also be ruthlessly cynical, suspicious, and fickle in his favour. Servants of the queen may have been wary of interaction with Henry VIII for fear of incurring the king's wrath. This became worse still when his health deteriorated, and a 'humour' that had fallen upon his leg leaving it swollen, which caused him so much pain that he became irritable and often cruel.²⁶¹ Henry had to be approached cautiously, though that the queen's servants did approach him, and often, is clear. Politics in the queen's chambers mirrored politics in the king's chambers. Indeed, they were the same, and often represented a marked deviation in reality from the formal, or the institutional. The Eltham ordinances of 1526 stated that no servant shall attempt to 'advance himself further', 'nor presse his Grace in makeing of sute, nor intermeddling of causes or matters, whatsoever they be'.²⁶² Yet, it is clear that his servants did so, as did his queens' servants, so much so that the king's Privy council in 1540 had to reiterate and command 'the Vicechambrelains of the King's and Quenes syde w[ith] diverse other gent[lemen of] the

²⁶⁰ Ellis, vol. 2, pp. 126-7. *Lisle*, V, 1513a, p. 616.

²⁶¹ John Husee wrote to Lord Lisle in 1537 informing him 'the King seldom goes abroad because his leg is so sore', and a few months later, the king wrote to the duke of Norfolk informing him that a 'humour' had fallen upon his leg. The French ambassador Charles de Marillac in 1540 observed his 'distrust and fear', and his 'lightness and inconstancy', which often led to dramatic reversals in fortune for those in his favour. *LP* XV 954. Wooding, *Henry VIII*, p. 85.

²⁶² *HO*, p. 157.

King's and the Quenes s[e]rvants... from hensforth in no wise molest his persone w[ith] any maner [or] sute'.²⁶³ It is apparent that servants could and did interact and engage with the king for their own interests, though this order establishes again the significance of personality, as by 1540 the king had grown increasingly irritable, and impatient with such politics.

In all, these politics might be felt to be fairly inconsequential, but in the view of the wider court, particularly when an aging and ill king was increasingly impatient and inaccessible, queens and their servants could be vital in facilitating their interactions and intimacy with the English monarchy, in matters highly personal, political, and even religious (though, of course, these were often inextricable, as Henry VIII's break with Rome and royal supremacy over the Church meant that no longer could there be a 'privatised sphere of apolitical piety'.²⁶⁴ On 26 October 1536, Christopher Askew, gentlemen usher to the king, was brought before and examined by his 'moste honorable counsaill'.²⁶⁵ Some three weeks earlier, Askew had been sent by Thomas Cromwell, the king's secretary, to Lincolnshire to gather intelligence on a popular uprising against the dissolution of the monasteries.²⁶⁶ On his journey, Askew was urged by the abbess of the Benedictine nunnery of Clementhorpe in York to move the queen, Jane Seymour, to prevent its dissolution, promising him £30 'for his labor if the mater were brought to'.²⁶⁷ Jane was known to be strictly orthodox,²⁶⁸ and there is evidence that the queen was committed to monasticism.²⁶⁹ Thus the abbess of Clementhorpe

²⁶³ *PCP*, VII, pp. 51-52.

²⁶⁴ Peter Marshall, *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England* (London, 2005), p. 5.

²⁶⁵ TNA SP 1/109 f. 198 (*LP* XI 879). His servant, Harry Sais, was also examined. Askew may be linked to the queen's household in the time of Catherine of Aragon. *LP* III 852. Not to be mistaken with Sir Christopher Askew, who led an army of 500 troops.

²⁶⁶ TNA SP 1/106, f. 291 (*LP* XI 567).

²⁶⁷ 'To be a solicitor'. TNA SP 1/109 f. 198 (*LP* XI 879). Previously Clementhorpe was dissolved but had lately been restored by insurgents.

²⁶⁸ Reginald Pole regarded her as 'full of goodness'. Martin Luther regarded Jane as 'an enemy of the gospel'.

²⁶⁹ The queen had intervened on behalf of the nunnery of Catesby in Northamptonshire to save it from dissolution. Joyce, late Prioress of Catesby, wrote to Thomas Cromwell to ask him intervene with Henry to save

had Christopher Askew act as a go-between to solicit the queen for her protection. In this Askew could not go immediately to the queen. He had to go through her servants at her ‘outward’ chambers, and rely on them to move the request on his behalf. This the abbess must have known, as the insurgents in Yorkshire, working alongside her, urged Askew to bring the matter to ‘the Quenes counsaill’ and ‘bade hym offer... money to theym’. On 25 October, Askew travelled to Windsor Castle and arrived at the queen’s chambers. This was the occasion on which Askew was examined by the king’s council. A transcript of Askew’s testimony survives, though the document is mutilated. On 26 October, Askew told the council how he had went the day before ‘into the Quenes chamber within the Castell of Wyndesore, and there mett with’ Sir Edmund Bedingfield, the queen’s chancellor, and William Paget, her secretary, and ‘shewed vnto theym’ the matter of Clementhorpe. He told them that the abbess would give 300 marks to the queen, which ‘she may yet have if ye think... mete for her grace to take them’. When Askew advised how the insurgents might convey the 300 marks safely from York, assuring them of their bribe, the queen’s servants ‘p[ro]missed to move the Quenes g[ra]ce’. Askew told ‘the same tale... after to Margerie Horsman, the Quenes gentlewoman’, who ‘asked of hym what co[mmuni]cation he had with the Quenes counsaill’.

270

An intensely personal faith shared by queens and their servants could attract the attention of the wider court and kingdom. After the Pilgrimage of Grace, Jane was solicited by Sir Robert Constable, one of the leading Yorkshire rebels, to move the king for his pardon. Constable wrote to his son, Marmaduke, begging him ‘to entreat my lord of rutland’, Thomas

the nunnery, and in that letter noted ‘that the queen’s grace hath moved the king’s majesty’, and ‘hath offered his highness two thousand marks in recompence of that house of Catesby’. Wood, vol. 2, pp. 184-186. Though the charitable efforts of the queen here have been attributed to Anne Boleyn, as the letter had been previously misdated as being written in 1535.

²⁷⁰ TNA SP 1/109 f. 198 (*LP* XI 879).

Manners, 1st earl of Rutland, the queen's lord chamberlain, 'to be meane vnto the queyn hir grace of petye to sew vnto the kynge his majesty to p[ar]don me my lyff w[i]th as as poor a lyvyng as may be to thentent that may all my lyff tym lament myne offencis'.²⁷¹ The rebel trusted that the queen's lord chamberlain would, like Jane, be sympathetic to his cause and move the matter. In this he was quite clear: 'yf he canne get my lord of rutland and hym both to labor vnto hir grace than... al shalbe well'. 'I entend to lyve by god's grace who levyth noe good deid unrewardid', 'if ye offer a some of money', Constable added, 'ye shalbe no lossier'.²⁷²

It is unknown if Jane, or the queen's servants, intervened or attempted to intervene, but the Benedictine nunnery of Clementhorpe in York was dissolved in 1536, and Sir Robert Constable was executed for treason in 1537. Discerning and determining the nature – and relative success, or failure – of these interactions is vital in establishing what necessarily, or potentially, lay within the jurisdiction of queens as consorts (and thus, by extension, what lay in the jurisdiction of their servants). Here, again, the personalities of and the relationship between the queen and the king are relevant, and on this occasion, they were in contention. 'At the beginning of the insurrection', Jane, profoundly upset, apparently 'threw herself on her knees before the King and begged him to restore the abbeys, but he told her, prudently enough, to get up', warning her 'not to meddle with his affairs'.²⁷³ The matter would be quite different, however, when it was the *king* who was 'meddling' in his queens' affairs.

²⁷¹ TNA SP 1/120 f. 136 (LP XII, i., 1225). If the earl of Rutland approached the queen, or if Jane intervened with the king on his behalf, it is nowhere recorded. Although Constable was confident of their intervention and of his own pardon, he went to his death a traitor in 1537.

²⁷² TNA SP 1/120 f. 136 (LP XII, i., 1225).

²⁷³ LP XI 860. 'Perhaps God permitted this rebellion', Jane apparently remarked, somewhat contemptuously, 'for ruining so many churches'. LP XI 1250.

Households were politicised by their intimacy, and relationships, or more specifically, the relationship between mistress and her servant, constituted the ‘functioning’ household. Paradoxically, whereas politics within the household were characterised by trust, integrity and loyalty to their mistress, politics *at court* was characterised by pride, envy, flattery, lust, avarice, intrigue and corruption. ‘It is hard trusting this wyllye worlde’, one man sighed, ‘...every man here is ffor himsylff’.²⁷⁴ Integrated fully with the wider court, the queen’s servants were not impenetrable, nor invulnerable to these tensions. ‘Your ladyship knoweth the Court is full of pride, envy, indignation and mocking, scorning and derision’, John Husee warned lady Lisle on 17 July 1537, shortly before the arrival of her daughters, Anne and Katharine. Husee promised her that the queen’s servants, Eleanor, countess of Rutland, Mary, lady Sussex, and Margery Horsman, would ‘exhort them to be sober, sad, wise, and discreet and lowly above all things, and to be obedient’, as well as ‘to serve God and to be virtuous, for that is much regarded, to serve God well and to be sober of tongue’.²⁷⁵ Castiglione too remarked in his *Book of the Courtier* that ‘many faculties of the mind are as necessary to woman as to man’ if they were ‘to avoid affectation, to be naturally graceful in all her doings, to be mannerly, clever, prudent, not arrogant, not envious, not slanderous, not vain, not quarrelsome’.²⁷⁶

Self-interest and profit-seeking was well-documented by the king’s servants. Sir Anthony Denny some time in 1548 regarded the court as ‘a place so slipperie, ...where ye shall many tymes repe most unkyndnesse where ye have sown greatest pleasures, and those also readye to do yow moch hurt, to whom yow never intended to think any harme’.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁴ TNA SP 3/11, f. 99 (*LP XI* 467); *LP Addenda I* 1144.

²⁷⁵ *Lisle*, IV, 887, pp. 150-152 (*LP XII*, ii., 271); *Lisle*, IV, 895, pp. 163-5 (*LP XII*, ii., 711).

²⁷⁶ Castiglione, *Courtier*, pp. 175-6.

²⁷⁷ Henry Ellis, *Original Letters of eminent literary men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1843), p. 14.

Thomas More remarked that it was ‘hard for any person eyther man or woman, in great worldly welth & rich prosperitie, so to withstand the suggestions of the devill and occasions given by the world, that they kepe them selfe from the desier of ambiciouse glorie’.²⁷⁸ Sir Edward Neville uttered to Sir Geoffrey Pole that ‘the King keepeth a court of knaves here that we [dare no]ther loke nor speak, and I were able to live I wolde rather [live any] lyfe in the world than tary in the pryvy Chamber’.²⁷⁹ Rivalry, infighting, competition and conflict was rife, as patrons and clients alike vied for advantage.²⁸⁰ Castiglione’s *Courtier* urged that ladies and gentlewomen at court must ‘know how to win and keep the favour of her mistress’.²⁸¹

As Christine de Pizan acknowledged, favouritism in the court of a queen was almost inevitable, and ‘however great a lady may be, if she sees or notices or if it is drawn to her attention that her mistress shows someone else more favour than she does her, or often confides in another person and prefers her to know her secrets and be around her more’, the ‘vice of envy’ might ‘overcome her’.²⁸² In the midst of Catherine Howard’s affair with Thomas Culpeper, Jane, lady Rochford, was her confidante, but her ascendancy in the queen’s affections provoked the jealousy of those less fortunate servants who did not share in her mind and favour. When Margaret Morton and Maude Lovekyn, the queen’s chamberers, defied her orders that they, ‘nor no nother’, should come into her bedchamber unless called, Catherine angrily threatened to ‘put them away’. Morton grumbled that, if she and Lovekyn were, in fact, discharged from the queen’s Chamber, then Catherine would have ‘taken other

²⁷⁸ Culling, ‘Impact’, p. 27. George Boleyn, Lord Rochford, warned ‘every man to beware of the flattering of the Court’. TNA SP 3/11, f. 99 (*LP* XI 467).

²⁷⁹ TNA SP 1/138, f. 177 (*LP* XIII, ii, 804 [7]).

²⁸⁰ Ives, ‘Brereton’, p. 10.

²⁸¹ Castiglione, *Courtier*, pp. 175-6.

²⁸² Pizan, *Treasure*, 2 / 5.

off my lade off rochfordes pouttyng'.²⁸³ So intimate and secure was lady Rochford in Catherine's favour that, it was felt, at least by Morton, she could exercise – perhaps, undue – power over the queen, and her Privy chamber, to her own advantage. Queens could not advance all of their servants equally. Nor could their favour be distributed evenly or fairly. When Catherine appointed Francis Dereham, an old acquaintance, to serve in her Chamber, for example, the queen 'had him in notable favour above others', and 'gave him divers gifts and sums of money'.²⁸⁴ Inevitably, favour led to favouritism, and in this context it is not difficult to conceive how tensions could arise between servants in the household, leading to concerns or even accusations of corruption. This was escalated by the irreverent Dereham, who felt that 'men dispised hym by cause they perceyved that the quene ffavored hym'.²⁸⁵ An incident occurred one evening at supper in the queen's chambers when Dereham was sat at the table 'after all other were rysen', the custom being that strictly the queen's council were to remain after supper. Henry Johns, gentleman usher of the queen's Chamber, sent a messenger to take Dereham away, who retorted, 'go to Mr. Johns and tell hym I was of the quenes cownsell beffore he knew her and shalbe when she hath fforgotten hym'.²⁸⁶

If a servant could elicit her confidence, the most eminent of the queen's servants were intimate, trusted, and as such, controlled access to, and could influence his or her mistress. Diego Fernández, Catherine of Aragon's confessor, was so secure in his position as a trusted servant of his mistress from 1509 to 1514 that the Castilian-Aragonese ambassador in England, Gomez de Fuensalida, *and* his successor, Luis Caroz, complained of his undue influence over the queen. Regarding him as 'light, and haughty, and scandalous', even 'pestiferous', Fuensalida reported to Ferdinand I of Aragon, Catherine's father, that 'the

²⁸³ TNA SP/167/153-4 (*LP XVI* 1338).

²⁸⁴ *LP XVI* 1470.

²⁸⁵ TNA SP 1/167, f. 144r (*LP XVI* 1339)

²⁸⁶ TNA SP 1/167, f. 144r (*LP XVI* 1339)

household is governed by a young friar' who 'makes a sin of all acts, of whatever kind they may be, if they displease him, and thus causes her to commit many faults'.²⁸⁷ 'May God destroy me', the ambassador remarked, 'if I see in the friar anything for which she should have so much affection'. Catherine was 'submissive' and determined 'not to displease him'.²⁸⁸ A few years later, Caroz reiterated that 'the principal fault rests with her confessor', and that he had 'never seen a more wicked person', recommending that Ferdinand appoint in his place 'some discreet and intelligent person who could take care, as well of her soul as of the government of her house'.²⁸⁹ Fernández, Caroz observed, 'keeps the Queen engaged, so that I cannot make use of her in anything, so much so, that if I wish to send to ask a favour of the Queen, I find no one to send'.²⁹⁰ Both ambassadors warned that Fernández had monopolised the queen's favour, even to the extent of constraining relationships within the household and with the wider court: the queen's servants were reluctant to facilitate Caroz, 'from fear of him, do not dare to do it, nor have the few who are there dared to come and see me, or to speak to me when they meet me at court'.²⁹¹

Catherine was at pains to protect her confessor, describing him as 'faithful', and 'the best confessor a woman could want'.²⁹² On 9 March 1509, she wrote to her father. 'What afflicts me most is that I cannot in any way remedy the hardships of my confessor, whom I consider to be the best that ever woman of my position had... it grieves me that I cannot maintain him in the way his office and my rank demand, because of my poverty, during

²⁸⁷ CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 2.

²⁸⁸ CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 5, CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 4.

²⁸⁹ CSP Sp II, 201.

²⁹⁰ CSP Sp II, 201.

²⁹¹ CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 8; *LP* I 474. Fuensalida felt the confessor had put him 'so much out of favour' with Catherine. CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 2. Fernández had apparently convinced her household that he gave out rewards and punishments on the queen's authority. Ferdinand of Spain even informed Luis Caroz to try and get the queen to persuade the king Henry to war with France, 'and if she refuses, the Friar, her confessor, is to be used to persuade her' (*LP* I 483).

²⁹² CSP Sp I, 603, 604.

which he has always served me with such labour and fatigue as no one else would have undergone.’ She wrote again to her father on 20 March, this time urgently refuting the ambassador’s report and defending Fernández: ‘my confessor’, she stated, ‘...serves me well and loyally’.²⁹³ Once more, on 29 July, Catherine tried to dissuade her father from recalling Fernández to Spain.²⁹⁴ Ferdinand reassured his daughter on 28 November that he was ‘glad to hear that her confessor has served her so faithfully’, and that ‘if he continues to do so, he will have a good preferment’.²⁹⁵ ‘I do not consent that my confessor be treated in such a manner’, Catherine urged her father,²⁹⁶ declaring the reports of Caroz to be false.²⁹⁷

It is not difficult to conceive of how dangerous such tensions could be when it became in the interests of the servant to make the personal, political. When Fernández was later accused by members of the queen’s household to have been involved in amorous relations with the women at court, her confessor was summoned by the king. Henry VIII had him brought before a tribunal, prosecuted and convicted of fornication, deprived of his office, and banished from court in 1515, though the confessor remarked, ‘if I am badly used, the Queen is still more badly used’, and warned the king that he had it in his power to divulge secrets.²⁹⁸ There may be no proof of this otherwise but Catherine, in her affection for Fernández, may have done and said enough to leave herself open to suspicion, and as her intimate, her confessor’s words would have carried weight. Knowledge of the personal, and the intimate, lay in the hands of the servant, and possession of this knowledge made servants at once

²⁹³ CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 6.

²⁹⁴ *LP* I 127.

²⁹⁵ CSP Sp II 28. Ferdinand wrote to Catherine’s confessor recommending he ‘continue to be a faithful servant to the Queen, and promises to recompense him by a good preferment’. CSP Sp II 29.

²⁹⁶ CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 3.

²⁹⁷ Even when Fernández was recalled to Spain in 1515, Catherine reminded her father that the confessor had served her ‘faithfully’, and ‘begs him to show favour’. CSP Sp II 238. In 1510, Catherine remarked to her father that she ‘considers all favours done to her confessor as done to herself’. CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 6, CSP Sp II, 43.

²⁹⁸ CSP Sp Supp to I and II, 9.

powerful, and dangerous. When the interests of the queen and the king, or, more accurately, the queen and her servant, did not align, or no longer aligned, when servants had a choice, it politicised them, and as will be demonstrated, such politics fostered an environment which was not always conducive to loyalty to the queen, destabilising the relationship between mistress and servant, and the ‘functioning’ queen’s household.

Chapter 5

Was service, in the household of a queen, and more broadly, royal service, characterised by stability, or instability? Stability, or instability, is often measured in terms of length of service, and survival, or in other words, who kept their offices, and who did not. In this chapter, it will be shown that stability must be measured in terms of how *service* itself functioned, or was stabilised or destabilised, by loyalty. The careers of the king's servants in this period show that there was stability in loyalty, and that survival, against successive political and religious crises, could be assured for those who remained unwaveringly, unflinchingly, loyal to their master, the sovereign.¹ But was this enough for servants of the queen? As Henry VII experienced a crisis of kingship,² which led to 'a redefinition of the pattern and meaning of loyalty and service to the king',³ did Henry VIII's queens endure 'a crisis of queenship' from 1527 to 1547?⁴ What led to these crises? It has been suggested by Theresa Earenfight that the households of women were 'far more likely to be precarious, unstable, and at risk when death, anxiety over succession, marital troubles, or factions at court render uncertain a woman's personal and financial status'.⁵ Was this the case for the

¹ Simon Lambe, 'Towards God religious, towards us most faithful': The Paulet Family, the Somerset Gentry and the Early Tudor Monarchy, 1485–1547' in Matthew Hefferan and Matthew Ward (eds), *Loyalty to the Monarchy in Late Medieval and Early Modern Britain, c.1400-1688* (London, 2020), pp. 85-106 (pp. 85-6). Sir William Paulet, lord chamberlain of Henry VIII's household, who served the king and all three of his heirs in office, was asked by an intimate friend how, in his career, he had survived so many political and religious convulsions, Paulet apparently remarked, 'I was made of the plyable willow, not of the stubborn oak'. (In Latin, '*ortus sum ex falice, non ex quercu*'.) Paulet, metaphorically, meant loyalty, his loyalty, his realignment with whomever his master or mistress was.

² Henry VII's household was 'a centre of political strife', characterised by treasonable plots and factional struggles. The king remained suspicious of his servants, in spite of the oath they had sworn to him, which Grummitt describes as the development or redefinition of 'political morality' in his reign, the conventions that governed political behaviour 'shaped the nature of the relationship between the king and his servants', manifested through changes in the institution of the royal household itself (the development of the privy chamber) and through conflict over the role and meaning of the household. Grummitt, 'Household', pp. 393, 398.

³ David Grummitt argues that deep-rooted tensions within Henry VII's household saw the rise of a 'new dynamic in the relationship between the king and his servants'; a political culture where loyalty and steadfastness were in danger of being displaced by suspicion and rumour'. Grummitt, 'Household', p. 401.

⁴ As described by Laynesmith, *Queenship*, p. 6.

⁵ Theresa Earenfight (ed.), *Royal and Elite Households in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: More than Just a Castle* (Leiden, 2018) p. 11.

queen's household in England? Is it true, as Nicola Clark briefly observed, that the 'turnover of queens' created 'opportunity for divided loyalties among women at court', and if so, what were the consequences?⁶

Emotions are crucial in determining stability, or instability, and thus the nature of service in this period, though it can be difficult to uncover the nature of emotional exchange in the household. Emotions came in the form of words, behaviours, practices, and expressions, either representing their mind, intention and meaning, or reflecting the conventions found in didactic literature. Differentiating between rhetoric and feeling, this chapter investigates how the queen's household fostered an environment wherein certain emotions were felt. Here, loyalty is conceptualised as an emotion, experienced and shared between mistress and servant, and closely connected with emotions of fear, and anxiety, arising from lack thereof. Such emotions were stabilising, and destabilising, forces upon the household.

Determining what words such as 'loyal', 'faithful', 'trusty', and 'good' meant to contemporaries in the context of the early modern household is important to interpreting their actions and explaining how the rhetoric of service might differ from, or correspond with, actual feeling.

This chapter investigates the nature of loyalty and allegiance in the queen's household from 1485 to 1547. It begins by analysing closely the oath sworn by the queen's servants, and concluding that it is insufficient as evidence of loyalty. It then examines the 'rival' households of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn from 1527 to 1536. From 1527 to 1533, Anne Boleyn required an attendant staff befitting her status as Henry's 'queen-in-waiting'.

⁶ Clark, *Gender*, p. 100.

We must consider the circumstances behind and consequences of this unprecedented phenomenon, which saw the queen's household at the heart of the king's 'Great Matter', thus establishing its relevance to the study of early Tudor monarchy, the wider court and its politics. It demonstrates that loyalties, or allegiances, of servants in the queen's household, became a matter of royal policy, and were managed, or manipulated by, the king to create one queen and, simultaneously, dethrone the other. It has been shown in previous chapters *how* loyalty could be won, *how* servants could be obliged, *how* and *why* servants were 'good': it remains to examine the significance, and consequences, of such relationships when loyalties, or allegiances, were in conflict. This chapter also raises fundamental questions on agency, and autonomy. Were servants merely pawns of the crown, or did they have a hand in their own careers? In this emotions are, again, significant, as, in many ways, emotions, and politics, were inextricable. Emotions could be politically-charged. There were emotional dimensions to making what was essentially a political decision. Loyalty, for a servant, as will be shown, was not always pragmatic. In this, the fall of Anne Boleyn in 1536 proves an invaluable case study, and none have fully or critically investigated the role of her household, which was at the centre of the scandal.⁷

Oaths

Servants were obliged by the swearing of an oath.⁸ In a ceremony administered by the queen's lord chamberlain, to whom a customary fee was paid, men and women were sworn in to the household, pledging their fidelity and allegiance to their mistress, as her loyal and faithful servants, to obey her in everything. This oath was a formal invocation of the loyalty

⁷ Starkey, 'Intimacy', in Starkey, (ed.), *Court*, p. 108.

⁸ Evidence for the 'taking' of an oath is scarce, but John Husee could report to lady Lisle, that her daughter, Anne Basset, was 'sworn the Queen's maid' on 15 September 1537. *LP* XII, ii., 704; *LP* XII, ii., 711.

they owed to the queen, to the king, and to the crown. Like the king's servants, the queen's servants swore an oath to be 'good' and 'true', pledging their allegiance.⁹ Great sanctity was placed on the sworn word. An oath sworn by the servant was a sacred and irrevocable act, an act of faith, binding on their conscience, even citing God to witness the truth, sincerity and integrity of their statement, and thus was highly regarded, and would not have been taken lightly.¹⁰ In the medieval and early-modern period oaths could be powerful in coercing, or 'binding', an individual or subject into obedience, and were often central to the functioning of government and polity.¹¹

The king, as their sovereign, embodied order, commanded respect, and ought to be obeyed. This is reflected in the oath sworn by servants in the queen's household. Traditionally, servants were retained by a master *or* a mistress, with their allegiance sworn to them, and strictly no other. In 1519, Sir William Bulmer, for example, 'beyng the kynges seruaunt sworne', was summoned to the Star Chamber for 'diuerse riottes, misdemeanors and offences'.¹² Upon learning that Bulmer had 'refused the kynges seruice' and was retained by Edward Stafford, third duke of Buckingham, Henry VIII, who presided over the trial in person, was enraged, exclaiming 'that he would none of his seruauntes should hang on another mannes sleue'.¹³ The reason for this is, again, obvious. To guard against multiple or

⁹ For an oath sworn by the king, Henry VIII's servants, see BL Cotton MS Vespasian, C, XIV, f. 438v. For an oath sworn by the queen, Catherine Parr's servants, see TNA SP 1/196, f. 32.

¹⁰ Thea Cervone, *Sworn Bond in Tudor England: Oaths, Vows and Covenants in Civil Life and Literature* (London, 2011), p. 6.

¹¹ The break with Rome, the succession and supremacy, was enforced by the taking of an oath. Paul Cavill, 'Perjury in Early Tudor England', *Studies in Church History*, 56 (2020), pp. 182-209 (pp. 186-187); Jonathan Michael Gray, *Oaths and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2012).

¹² TNA STAC 2/2, f. 134.

¹³ Bulmer 'kneled still on his knees crying the kyng mercie', having so far incurred his wrath that 'neuer a noble man there durst entreate for him'. *HC*, pp. 599-600. It has been suggested that this outburst was 'probably premeditated' and 'orchestrated', staging it publicly to make those standing by that Bulmer's display of loyalty to the duke of Buckingham was unacceptable. McKelvie, *Statutes*, pp. 26-27.

conflicting allegiances, the oath sworn by the king's servants was explicit in that they must 'be reteyned to no manner a person but onlie to the kinge highnes'.¹⁴

Unlike the king's servants, the queen's servants were sworn to the queen *and* to the king. The oath sworn by Catherine of Aragon's servants does not survive, but in a report written on 10 October 1533, the king's servant, Thomas Bedyll, observed that 'those who appertain to the chamber were sworn to king Henry and queen Katharine'.¹⁵ It is likely that this oath was similar, if not identical, in its language and purpose to that which was sworn by servants in the household of Princess Mary in 1525, which is extant, and illustrates that her servants too were sworn to the king. It begins:

Ye shalbe true and faithful vnto the Kinge our Soveraigne lord kinge Henry the eight
and vnto his heires and successor kings of England And ye shalbe failhfull and true
vnto my lady princesse grace.¹⁶

It has been suggested by J. L McIntosh that the proviso here was 'to clarify a point which would otherwise be in doubt': to whom did Mary's servants owe their loyalty first?¹⁷ This oath would apparently direct them to focus upon their obligations to the king, as his subjects. The king would not have his servants sworn to another – yet, his queens' servants were sworn to him. By 1544, the oath sworn by servants to Catherine Parr bound them to 'our sayde soveraine Ladie the Quene', to 'withstonde every and anny person or persones of what condicion state or degre they be of that woll attempte or entende vnto the contrarie *except our*

¹⁴ BL Cotton MS Vespasian, C, XIV, ff. 144r-144v; BL Add MS 71009, ff. 60-61.

¹⁵ BL Cotton MS Otho, C, X, f. 213 (*LP* VI 1253). Bedyll was a clerk of the king's council.

¹⁶ BL Cotton MS Vitellius, C, I, f. 7r, quoted in McIntosh, 'Sovereign Princesses', p. 119. The oath sworn by the queen, Anne of Denmark's servants, too required them to be 'true and loyall' to the king, and then to 'faithfullie trulie serve' Anne 'in that place whereunto it hath pleased her majestie to admit'; BL Stowe MS 547, f. 64, quoted in Payne, 'Jacobean', p. 48. As did the oath to Henrietta Maria, whose servants were sworn 'to beare truth and allegiance unto our Soveraigne Lord the King's Majestie' and 'doe alsoe sweare to serve or gracious Lady Queen Mary faithfully and truly'. *HO*, p. 345.

¹⁷ McIntosh, 'Sovereign Princesses', p. 119.

soveraine Lorde the Kyngs moste royall Majestie'.¹⁸ The phrasing of this oath suggests that careful attention was taken to guard or protect against multiple or conflicting allegiances. It was explicit that the Crown was sacrosanct. Loyalty was due first to Henry VIII, as the divinely-appointed sovereign, who had royal prerogative and retained ultimate authority, and the queen's servants, as his subjects, were obliged to obey and to serve *the king* in everything.¹⁹

The potential for multiple, or conflicting, allegiances, remained. Servants were neither strictly loyal to the queen, nor to the king. Upon marrying the king, queens were merely figureheads of their own households, and control of the institution remained firmly in the hands of the sovereign. But control, or more specifically, command, of the servants *within* that household, required loyalty, which could be won.²⁰ And thus oaths are insufficient as evidence of loyalty. They reveal nothing of how oaths were received. Were they taken seriously, passively, or rather too hastily? Was it seen as a formality, and somewhat burdensome, or was it treated with urgency, as a matter of conscience?²¹ Did it invoke emotion, or was it merely routine?

In specific social contexts, particular positive emotions could be invoked to make an individual 'more committed to partners in the exchange, to the network as a whole, and to its

¹⁸ My italics. TNA SP 1/196, f. 32.

¹⁹ Lacey Baldwin Smith, 'English Treason Trials and Confessions in the Sixteenth Century', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 15, 4 (1954), pp. 471-498 (p. 488); Wooding, *Henry*, pp. 24, 30, 85, 146, for instances of Henry VIII's kingship, for winning and retaining loyalty, popular acceptance, admiration and obedience, a 'predominantly personal loyalty; this meant that when the king turned up in person he could command great devotion and enthusiasm' (p. 30).

²⁰ Like the sovereign had to coerce his or her subjects through majesty, magnificence and spectacle to affirm authority, the loyalty, compliance, allegiance of the queen's servants 'needed to be won' by the queen. Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven, 2009), p. 91.

²¹ 'Circumstance, perception and pressure must have dictated whether oaths were treated as urgent and burdensome or as formulaic and vacuous'. Cavill, 'Perjury', p. 184.

culture'.²² Certainly oaths were worded in such a way that might elicit powerful emotional responses from the servant taking it. The affective language invoked positive virtues – to be 'loyal', 'faithful', 'good', 'true' – which could engender feeling, chiefly a sense of duty and commitment, in the individual taking the oath. And thus the rhetoric of the oath upheld and sustained the authority of the master, or mistress, of the household. It will be argued, however, that where this rhetoric found meaning was in relationships, or in other words, the experience of such emotions shared between mistress and servant.

The oath alone conveys a distorted, one-sided view of royal service. Service was not strictly an 'institutional', or contractual, obligation. It was a *relationship* between the master, or mistress, and the servant. It must be asked, why did servants obey, or defy, orders? If, or when, there was a conflict, when a situation arose wherein the interests of the queen, their mistress, no longer aligned with the king, their master and sovereign, to whom were they loyal, and why? To whom did they owe their allegiance first? In other words, to whom were they 'good'? Did they have a choice?

Loyalty and allegiance

From 1527 to 1536, the queen's household was at the centre of the king's 'Great Matter'. Upon learning that Henry VIII was seeking an annulment from his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, 'the Quenes ladies, gentlewomen, and servauntes' murmured, if indiscreetly, that a woman 'called Anne Bulleyne' had 'so entised the kyng, and brought him in such amours, that only for her sake and occasion, he would be divorced from his Quene'. The chronicler

²² J. H. Turner and. E. Stets, *The Sociology of Emotions* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 294.

Edward Hall regarded this as ‘foolische comunicacion’, and ‘contrary to the truth’.²³

However, Anne Boleyn ‘was so moche in the Kynges fauour’ that she was recognised as Henry’s ‘queen-in-waiting’. In 1528, it was reported that the king had ‘lodged her in a very fine lodging, which he has prepared for her close by his own’.²⁴ By 1531, Anne was ‘preparing her state royal by degrees’, appointing men and women to attend upon her as her own servants.²⁵ On the other hand, from 1529 to 1531, Henry scarcely saw Catherine, and kept himself distant,²⁶ before he exiled her to The More in Hertfordshire. Ostracised from king and court, Catherine and her household were ‘scantily visited’,²⁷ whereas Anne was treated ‘more like a queen than a simple maid’.²⁸ By 1532, Anne was reportedly ‘lodged where the Queen used to be’ and was ‘accompanied by almost as many ladies as if she were Queen’.²⁹ Thus a rival household was established and, with Henry acknowledging Anne as his queen, hers was the one that mattered. Reconstructed from the letters of the king’s councillors and the reports of Eustace Chapuys, the Imperial ambassador, and the reports of Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, dating from 1527 to 1536, the ‘rival’ households of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn provide evidence of loyalty in the queen’s household and the problems which arose from the conflicting allegiances of its servants.

Loyalty, and allegiance, were fundamental to the stability of relationships between master, or mistress, and servant, and thus to the stability of the ‘functioning’ household. This

²³ *HC*, p. 759. Catherine, at least, according to Chapuys, felt that it was Anne ‘who has put him in this perverse and wicked temper’. *LP* VI 351.

²⁴ *LP* IV 5016.

²⁵ *CSP Sp* IV, ii., 786 (*LP* V 401); *CSP Sp* IV, ii., 765 (*LP* V 340).

²⁶ *LP* IV 6026; *LP* IV 6199; *CSP Sp* IV ii., 765 (*LP* V 340). ‘The Queen is treated as badly and even worse than ever. The King avoids her company as much as he can. He is always here with the Lady, whilst the Queen is at Richmond. He has never been half so long without visiting her as he is at present...’ (*CSP Sp* IV, i., 257).

²⁷ *HC*, pp. 781-782; *LP* V 375; *LP* V 594.

²⁸ Cavendish, p. 240.

²⁹ *CSP Sp* IV, ii., 880 (*LP* V 696). ‘The Lady’s royal household has been appointed’, it was reported in the spring of 1533, ‘so that nothing remains to be done but to have it publicly celebrated’. *CSP Sp* IV, ii., 1057 (*LP* VI 296). Anne ‘had in her suite sixty young ladies’, and ‘went to mass in Royal state, loaded with jewels, clothed in a robe of cloth of gold friese’. *CSP Sp* IV, ii., 1061 (*LP* VI 351).

much is clear in that loyalties, and/ or allegiances, in the queen's household, were managed, or manipulated by the king, to create one queen, and simultaneously, dethrone the other.

Anne's unpopularity in England, even at court, was problematic for Henry, and an unlikely obstacle to the king's 'Great Matter'.³⁰ Her reputation as the king's mistress, a seductress, the 'other woman' who had dethroned England's rightful queen, was incompatible with queenship. The creation of her household addressed this unpopularity, first, by appointing men and women to serve Anne who were firmly aligned with her and the king, pledging their loyalty and fidelity by oath, and second, by legitimising Anne as 'queen-in-waiting', surrounding her with an attendant staff befitting her new status. Anne's household, often literally, served to legitimise her as Henry's queen. 'I see they mean to accustom the people *by degrees* to endure her', Jean du Bellay remarked in 1528.³¹ 'Greater court is now paid to her every day', the ambassador reported, 'than has been to the Queen for a long time'.³² Eustace Chapuys too observed that Henry was 'very watchful of the countenance of the people, and begs the lords to go and visit and make their court to the new Queen'.³³ Foreign ambassadors, dignitaries and other visitors to the court were received in Anne's chambers, and petitioners now courted Anne, and her servants, for their favour. Anne and her ladies and gentlewomen all received gifts, engaging in the ritual of New Year exchange at court on 1 January 1532. Honor, lady Lisle, aggressively courted Anne's household with letters, tokens, and gifts that summer,³⁴ and accompanied Anne and her attendants when she and the king met with Francis I in October at Calais, an occasion which granted Anne recognition as Henry's wife on an international stage.³⁵ The new queen's servants thus began assuming the

³⁰ E. W. Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: 'The Most Happy'* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 199-202, 293-295. The most vociferous reviled and slandered her as a 'whore' (*LP* VI 1254; *LP* VIII 196) and a 'harlot of her living' (*LP* VII 840). Eustace Chapuys referred to Anne as 'the concubine'. CSP Sp V ii 43.

³¹ My italics, for emphasis. Yet 'the people remain quite hardened, and I think they would do more if they had more power'. *LP* IV 5016.

³² *LP* IV 5016.

³³ CSP Sp IV, ii., 1061 (*LP* V 351).

³⁴ *Lisle*, I, p. 332, p. 518; *Lisle*, II, pp. 331, 373-4; Harris, 'Women and Politics', pp. 265-266.

³⁵ *HC*, pp. 793-4.

responsibilities and socio-political functions of Catherine of Aragon's household, but for the practice, construction and display of Anne's queenship. Some time in May 1533, in the days before Anne's coronation, Thomas Burgh, her lord chamberlain, reportedly seized the barge of queen Catherine, and 'mutilated' her coat of arms. He 'rather ignominiously', had it 'torn off and cut to pieces'. When Chapuys learned of this, he informed Cromwell, and advised that in ordering 'the tearing off of her escutcheon from her Royal barge' the king and his council risked upsetting the Emperor Charles V. It appeared to be taken almost out of spite, as 'there were in the river many others equally fit for the Lady's service'. Cromwell apparently 'knew nothing about that', though he was surely feigning ignorance. As was the king, who was apparently 'grieved to hear that the Queen's arms had been removed from her barge'. For his part Burgh was reportedly 'severely reprimanded'. Had Burgh acted excitedly, perhaps rather too hastily, in fit of loyalty for his new mistress? Was it Anne herself who gave the order, as an outraged Chapuys observed, 'the Lady has unscrupulously made use of it at this coronation of hers, and appropriated it for her own use'?³⁶

Catherine's household-in-exile must have feared that their careers were all but over. Few men and women now aspired to serve her. Thomas, lord Vaux, who had been dispatched by Henry to administer Catherine's household, remarked in 1533 that he would 'rather die in some other of the King's service than continue here much longer'.³⁷ Sir Richard Baker refused an appointment to serve Catherine, and was reportedly 'loath now to serve anybody but the King'. He 'hath rather chosen to abide his fortune and so trust unto the King's gracious goodness than to serve' Catherine.³⁸ It must have been clear that, the more viable, or promising, career, for the servant of a queen, was with Anne.

³⁶ CSP IV, ii., 1073 (LP VI 508); CSP Sp IV, ii., 1077 (LP VI 556).

³⁷ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 177 (LP VI 352).

³⁸ *Lisle*, II, 113, pp. 28-29. It was felt by some that the lives of Catherine and Mary were in danger. *Lisle*, II, p. 28.

The queen's household was altogether fractured on 8 April 1533, when the queen and her servants were visited by the king's commissioners, led by Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk, who informed them that Henry and Anne, who was 'greate with childe', had married in a secret ceremony on 25 January.³⁹ Strict instructions were sent from the king, to be declared to Catherine and her household by William Mountjoy, her lord chamberlain, Griffith Richards, her receiver-general, Sir Robert Dymoke, her chancellor, and John Tyrrell, her sewer, urging that he 'would not allow her henceforth to call herself Queen', and that her servants had to take a new oath and be sworn to her as 'Princess Dowager'.⁴⁰ In addition to the king's concerns over Catherine's status, Henry 'felt himself so much aggrieved at the expense of her allowance', and begrudged 'the expense of keeping so many houses'.⁴¹ Henry warned Catherine, who might rethink her obstinacy if it was her servants who would be at risk, that he would 'be compelled to punish' those who refused to comply.⁴² 'He would not defray her expenses, nor the wages of her servants', even if Catherine's own income 'would not suffice for her attendants a quarter of the year'.⁴³ Yet Catherine, who was convinced that the Henry acted not 'by a scruple of conscience, but only by mere passion',⁴⁴ stubbornly refused, maintaining that she was his true wife.⁴⁵ It was, she felt, Anne 'who has put him in this perverse and wicked temper'.⁴⁶ Chapuys remarked on 15 April that if 'there was nothing

³⁹ CSP Sp IV, ii., 1061 (*LP* VI 351); BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 213 (*LP* VI 1253); *HC*, p. 794. It was 'kept so secrete, that very fewe knewe it, til she was greate with child'. *HC*, p. 794. With Catherine in exile, her servants were conspicuously absent from the court, but with Anne's rise as queen, 'the Courte was greatly replenished, with lordes, knightes and with ladies and gentlewomen, to a great nomber, with all solace and pleasure'. *HC*, p. 794-5.

⁴⁰ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 199 (*LP* VI 760); CSP Sp IV, ii., 1061 (*LP* VI 351).

⁴¹ CSP Sp IV, ii., 1041 (*LP* VI 19).

⁴² TNA SP 1/77, f. 139 (*LP* VI 759).

⁴³ CSP Sp IV, ii., 1061. (*LP* VI 351).

⁴⁴ CSP Sp IV, ii., 808 (*LP* V 478).

⁴⁵ Thomas, lord Vaux, informed the duke of Norfolk on 18 April 1533 that he himself had heard Catherine say that she was Henry's wife and queen of England, and rehearsed as much in front of her servants in her Presence chamber. BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 177 (*LP* VI 352).

⁴⁶ CSP Sp IV, ii., 1061 (*LP* VI 351).

left for her and her servants to live upon, she would willingly go about the world begging alms for the love of God'.⁴⁷ 'Though she was grieved at the illtreatment of her servants', Catherine insisted that 'she would not damn her own soul on any consideration'.⁴⁸

And nor would her servants. Thomas, lord Vaux, wrote to the duke of Norfolk from Ampthill, to inform him that, although he and Mountjoy had warned her servants that 'from thenceforth', they would serve Catherine as 'Princess Dowager', they outright refused a new oath.⁴⁹ Thomas Bedyll reported on 10 October 1533 'that sundry persons in this house of the lady Princess Dowager will not desist from calling her Queen'. 'All women, priests, and ministers of the Princess's chamber, as sewers, ushers, and such other, who fetch any manner of service for her,' Bedyll observed, 'call for the same in the name of Queen, for so she has commanded them'.⁵⁰ This was corroborated by Mountjoy, who wrote that 'the gentlewomen, both of her privy chamber and others' could not 'discharge their consciences to call her Princess as they were sworn to her as Queen'.⁵¹ Such reports indicate that, notwithstanding of the king's orders, the queen's servants regarded highly the command of their mistress. Refusing the new oath, Catherine's servants effectively became the embodiment of her will.

Reflecting the king's control of the institution, servants who refused his orders were regarded as unfit to serve, and were necessarily discharged. When Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, arrived at Buckden, near Huntingdon, on 18 December 1533, to 'brake all the ordre of the Quenes Courte', he recommended 'that seche as wer about her' who had shown themselves loyal, encouraging Catherine in her resistance 'and moued her thereto, should be

⁴⁷ CSP Sp IV, ii., 1061 (*LP VI* 351).

⁴⁸ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 199 (*LP VI* 760); CSP Sp IV, ii., 1165 (*LP VI* 1571).

⁴⁹ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 177 (*LP VI* 352).

⁵⁰ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 213 (*LP VI* 1253).

⁵¹ TNA SP 1/79, f. 158 (*LP VI* 1252).

put from her'.⁵² 'Some saied thei were sworne to her as Quene, and otherwise thei would not serue, and so they departed', as Suffolk reportedly 'had great difficulty in inducing servants to be sworn' he 'discharged a greate sorte of her housholde seruauntes'.⁵³ Catherine's servants were so reluctant to take a new oath that Suffolk was 'in despair of having any one of them sworn'.⁵⁴ 'In their conscience', Suffolk observed, they 'were sworn to her as Queen, and they think the second oath would be perjury'.⁵⁵ A few days later, they 'proceeded to take away her chamberlain, chancellor, almoner, master of the horse, and other chief officers', and 'almost all the rest of her servants and ladies'.⁵⁶ The household-in-exile kept up their resistance. Chapuys reported on 29 May 1534 that 'certain maids who had likewise refused the oath had been shut up in a chamber, and that her confessor, physician and apothecary were forbidden to leave the house, and four other servants were put in prison'.⁵⁷ Around a month later, Chapuys reported again that the king had 'sent messengers to her to make the ladies about her swear, with instructions in case of refusal to bring them away prisoners'. 'This the commissioners would have performed altogether', Chapuys observed, 'if it had not been for the difficulty of taking so many ladies away against their will'.⁵⁸ For the king, the matter was quite straightforward. The queen's servants had broken the oath they had sworn to be loyal to him as their master or sovereign.

⁵² BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 210 (*LP* VI 1541).

⁵³ TNA SP 1/81, f. 1 (*LP* VI 1542). On 27 December 1533, Chapuys reported that 'they used great harshness to those whom they drove away, commanding them to avoid the place the same day on pain of death'. CSP Sp IV, ii., 1165 (*LP* VI 1571).

⁵⁴ TNA SP 1/81, f. 3 (*LP* VI 1543).

⁵⁵ Suffolk learned that 'they had that knowledge from Abel and Barker', Catherine's chaplains, who had urged her household servants that 'no man sworn to serve her as Queen might change that oath without perjury'. BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 210 (*LP* VI 1541).

⁵⁶ CSP Sp IV, ii., 1164 (*LP* VI 1558); CSP Sp IV, ii., 1158 (*LP* VI 1510). Another report a few days later reiterated that 'they took away almost all her femmes de chambre'. CSP Sp IV, ii., 1165 (*LP* VI 1571).

⁵⁷ CSP Sp V, i., 60 (*LP* VII 726).

⁵⁸ CSP Sp V, i., 68 (*LP* VII 871).

Yet, it is clear that the medieval, feudal system, by which an oath could ‘bind’ a servant to their master and/or mistress, was fundamentally outdated. The oath implied loyalty, but it did not guarantee it.⁵⁹ Catherine of Aragon’s servants forfeited their careers when they refused to break the oath that they had sworn to their mistress. This, they did, not, as such reports suggest, because of the oath they had sworn to Catherine as queen – that they might have obeyed their sovereign if not for this oath is implausible, as they had sworn to serve him too.⁶⁰ Crucially, these servants refused a new oath because their mistress ‘herself protests against it, and her household *regard less the King’s commandment*’.⁶¹ Certainly the oath sworn by the queen’s servants was invoked for its power to legitimise their resistance,⁶² but this oath alone could not and did not ‘bind’, or oblige, servants, to be loyal and faithful, to be ‘good’.

Confronted with the question of their allegiance, many of the queen’s servants would defy their sovereign and forfeit their careers out of obligation to their mistress. William Mountjoy refused the king’s orders to ‘accuse’, or deliver the names of servants who were loyal to the queen. ‘It shall not lie in me to accomplish the King’s pleasure herein’, Mountjoy informed Cromwell, and begged, ‘without the King’s displeasure’, to be discharged, ‘if it be thought by the King that any other can serve him in this room’.⁶³ He felt that, though Catherine’s servants ‘never ceased to call her by the name of Queen’, they did ‘bere their trewe hertes servyce and allegyaunce to the Kynges grace’.⁶⁴ This was the conflict dealt with by many of the queen’s servants who found themselves in an unenviable position. Mountjoy

⁵⁹ This illusion of loyalty by oath could be fractured. See also, Grummitt, ‘Household’, pp. 410-411.

⁶⁰ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 213 (LP VI 1253). It must be observed that Bedyll was not trusted and thus had no opportunity to read the letter himself.

⁶¹ My italics. TNA SP 1/79, f. 158 (LP VI 1252). BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 177 (LP VI 352).

⁶² LP VI 805. Gray, *Oaths*, p. 212 (‘oaths legitimised resistance by conscience’).

⁶³ TNA SP 1/79, f. 158 (LP VI 1252).

⁶⁴ TNA SP 1/79 f. 158 (LP VI 1252).

was anxious not to upset the king, yet would not betray his mistress, and as such was forced to resign. It is surely significant that Mountjoy began his career as Henry VIII's tutor, and was likely appointed as lord chamberlain by the king in 1512, yet after 21 years of serving Catherine, he was, perhaps unsurprisingly, loyal to her.

Clearly it was not the oath they had sworn but their *relationship* with the queen, built and developed over time, some over two, nearly three decades, which engendered loyalty and fostered familiarity, intimacy, and trust between Catherine and her servants. María de Salinas, lady Willoughby, whom Catherine was known to have loved 'more than any other mortal',⁶⁵ had served for 32 years before being discharged by the king. 'Even a Spanish lady who has remained with her all her life, and has served her at her own expense', Chapuys reported, 'is forbidden to see her'.⁶⁶ María wrote to Cromwell on 30 December 1535 for the king to grant her request to visit Catherine in her exile. 'I heard that my mistress is very sore sick again. I pray you remember me, for you promised to labor with the King to get me licence to go to her,' she wrote, 'before God send for her'.⁶⁷ Even María, who was Catherine's enduring servant, was careful in addressing Cromwell and Henry, appealing to their 'goodness' and, whereas she maintained her devotion to Catherine, she did not refer to her as queen, only 'my mistress'.⁶⁸ She knew well that it was pragmatic to remain, if only outwardly, loyal to the crown, though neither Cromwell nor the king granted her petition, which was, perhaps, indicative of her fall from favour. A few days later, María arrived at Kimbolton, without a licence, forcing her way through to be with her mistress shortly before her death.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ LP I 3524.

⁶⁶ CSP Sp V, i., 75 (LP VII 1013).

⁶⁷ TNA SP 1/99, f. 163 (LP IX 1040).

⁶⁸ TNA SP 1/99, f. 163 (LP IX 1040).

⁶⁹ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 215 (LP X 28).

Servants could be more outspoken in their loyalty to the queen, their mistress, which now brought them into opposition against the king. Whereas previously, there was stability in loyalty, servants who were intimate with and trusted by the queen, and rallied behind her in support, now did so at the risk of incurring the king's indignation.⁷⁰ When Catherine, 'under constraint', was 'compelled under oath', to write a letter to her nephew, 'at the King's dictation', requesting that the original papal bull be sent to England, she asked one of her chaplains, Thomas Abel, to deliver the letter to Charles V.⁷¹ Upon his arrival, Abel handed the Emperor the letter but urged him, on Catherine's behalf, to ignore it, to 'in nowise give up the brief, notwithstanding that the Queen's letter earnestly requests it'.⁷² Abel was later arrested and taken to the Tower for encouraging Catherine to be obstinate. At least two more ladies, who were 'most devoted to the Queen, and in whom she found more comfort and consolation than in any others', were discharged.⁷³

Catherine's servants demonstrated their loyalty to her by their words, and their actions, which, again, put them at risk of incurring the king's wrath. Elizabeth Stafford, duchess of Norfolk, who urged the queen to be 'of good courage', promising to 'remain faithful to her',⁷⁴ and even smuggled to her mistress, secreted within an orange, letters from Gregory Casale, the English ambassador in Rome, was discharged from her service in 1531 'because she spoke too freely, and declared herself more than they liked for the Queen'.⁷⁵ Catherine's physicians, Dr. Ferdinand de Victoria and Dr. Miguel de la Sa, 'divers times helped to close and seal letters from her to the Emperor and to Rome'; her apothecary, John

⁷⁰ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 213 (*LP* VI 1253).

⁷¹ *LP* IV 5346.

⁷² *LP* IV 5154, (i) for Catherine's letter, (ii) for Abel's instructions, which also urged the Emperor to prevent the matter being examined 'anywhere but in Rome'.

⁷³ CSP Sp IV i., 354. This was apparently at the request of Anne Boleyn.

⁷⁴ CSP Sp IV, ii., 619 (*LP* V 700).

⁷⁵ CSP, Sp, IV, i, 509 (*LP* IV 6738); CSP Sp IV, ii., 720 (*LP* V 238); *LP* VI 585.

Sotha, carried letters from Catherine to her daughter, Princess Mary; her page, John Wheler, communicated ‘any matter by mouth’ for the queen, and ‘bore her tokens’; the queen’s footmen, Lancelot and Bastian, conveyed letters to Chapuys, while Griffith Richards, her Receiver-General, arranged for ‘sending to her learned men at Rome’, all of whom were, in turn, discharged from Catherine’s household.⁷⁶

Agency, or instability

A career in royal service raises fundamental questions about autonomy and agency. How far could and did servants, subordinate, subject and sworn to obey their master, or mistress, in everything, exercise their own agency? Could servants act in their own interests, or strictly in the interests of their master or mistress? Did they have the power to act upon their own will, to act, or react, beyond the role to which they were formally circumscribed? Agency can be defined as the ability to take action that either had consequences, or the potential to have consequences, that may or may not affect one’s own course or interests.⁷⁷ Defining agency in this chapter, more specifically, in the household, as the aligning, or realigning, of loyalty, it is clear that the queen’s servants had agency in determining how far, and to whom, they were loyal. Confronted with multiple, or conflicting, allegiances, there was thus potential for servants to act in their own interests, in what would serve them. In other words, it politicised them. The evidence for this survives in state papers – private letters, depositions, trial records, memoranda and reports by the privy council. This material provides a view of the queen’s household from the king and his councillors, namely Cardinal Wolsey, lord chancellor from

⁷⁶ TNA SP 1/142, f. 201 (*LP XIV*, i., 190). This came from an unidentified servant of this queen’s household, who was later examined.

⁷⁷ Theresa Earenfight, ‘A Lifetime of Power: Beyond Binaries of Gender’, in Heather J. Tanner (ed.), *Medieval Elite Women and the Exercise of Power, 1100-1400: Moving beyond the Exceptionalist Debate* (Cham, 2019), pp. 271-294.

1515 to 1529, and Thomas Cromwell, principal secretary from 1534 until 1540. It reveals the relationship between the queen's servants and the crown, establishing their involvement throughout the reign in its affairs and integrating them into political narratives. In this context, the 'art' of transitioning between households to forge a career in royal service will be examined.

Servants in the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber could act as agents, or *double* agents, for the king, his courtiers and councillors, even ambassadors. When Henry VIII began seeking an annulment from his marriage to Catherine of Aragon in 1527, Cardinal Wolsey was meticulous in his efforts to secure for Henry whatever he desired. The king's 'Great Matter' was to be conducted and kept in utmost secrecy, for the king 'considers how important it is in these proceedings to avoid all occasions of suspicion and scandal, and exclude all evil reports'. For this purpose Wolsey intended to prevent the queen from communicating with her nephew, the Emperor Charles V, 'so all objection which might be urged by the Queen might be avoided'.⁷⁸ But when the matter 'reached the ears of the Queen', Catherine immediately dispatched Francis Phillip, her sewer, to her nephew.⁷⁹ It is apparent from Wolsey's letters that Catherine conspired with her sewer to communicate secretly with the Emperor. Phillip requested a license to visit Spain to see his mother, who was apparently 'verai sore syke'. To avoid suspicion, Catherine feigned her disapproval and 'refused to assent unto his goyng', and even 'laboured unto the Kinges Highnesse to empeshe the same'. Henry, however, 'knowyng grete colusion and dyssimulation betwene theym', came to suspect that 'the Queene is thoonly cawse of this mannys goyng into Spaigne'.⁸⁰ The

⁷⁸ TNA SP 1/45, f. 246 (*LP IV* 3693). Wolsey was forced to dismiss early murmurs at court of the annulment as 'false', and 'entirely without foundation, yet not altogether causeless'.

⁷⁹ TNA SP 1/42, f. 252 (*LP IV* 3327).

⁸⁰ BL Cotton MS, Vespasian, F, I, f. 77 (*LP IV* 3265). Charles V received Phillip on 29 July and the queen's servant informed him of 'the king's secret': 'he, in virtue of his credence', the Emperor wrote, 'has told me in substance... respecting the affairs of the said Queen'. *LP IV* 3312; TNA SP 1/45, f. 237 (*LP IV* 3687).

king and Wolsey attempted to ‘turn’ Phillip, with a view of manipulating and exploiting him as an agent on their side. On 15 July 1527, granting Phillip his license to visit Spain, Henry arranged for the queen’s servant ‘be taken by ennymyse’ on his journey through France, so that the king might ‘pay his rawnesome’ and bring him ‘in more ferme confidence’.⁸¹ A few days later, these orders were made more explicit in that Henry wanted Phillip ‘secretly to be stopped and molested in some part of France, that he may not reach Spain’. The king intended to stage his arrest so that he might gain his trust: Henry was quite clear ‘that it be not in anywise known that the said let, arrest, or deprehension’ of Phillip came by his own hand.⁸² Phillip, Henry acknowledged, ‘hath bene allways prive unto the Quene’s affaires and secretes’; it was clearly felt by the king to be to his advantage to have him on side.⁸³ It is unlikely that Phillip’s allegiance could be won, as a few years later he too was discharged from Catherine’s service. Chapuys observed that it was ‘very strange that out of four Spanish servants whom she had they should take away her maître de salle’, as Phillip ‘had followed her from Spain and had now nothing to live on’.⁸⁴

But not all of the queen’s servants were as loyal. In 1528, Wolsey met with the queen’s almoner, Robert Shorton, who had previously served in the cardinal’s Chapel, and asked him ‘to let him know what were the Queen’s intention and purpose in this matter’, urging him ‘to keep their communication secret’. In this Wolsey ‘adjured him, on his fidelity’, reminding him of ‘his obligation to be true and faithful’ not to the queen, his mistress, but to Henry. He even invoked and reminded Shorton of the preferment he had

⁸¹ BL Cotton MS, Vespasian, F, I, f. 77 (*LP* IV 3265).

⁸² TNA SP 1/42, ff. 202-203 (*LP* IV 3278).

⁸³ This is made yet more apparent by the inadequacy of servants whom the queen did not trust: Thomas Bedyll wrote to Cromwell on 10 October 1533, to report that Catherine was informed the Pope had given sentence on her case, ‘but I cannot see the letter’, Bedyll hastily added, ‘because I am partly my[slied] among them’. BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 213 (*LP* VI 1253).

⁸⁴ *LP* VIII 189.

enjoyed at the hands of the king.⁸⁵ The almoner was reluctant,⁸⁶ but ‘protesting his devotion’, duly informed Wolsey of all he had heard in the queen’s chambers.⁸⁷ The cardinal ‘marvelled not a little at her indiscreet and ungodly purposes and sayings, which caused him to conceive that she was neither of such perfection nor virtue as he had once thought her to be’.⁸⁸ William Tyndale accused Wolsey of having ‘gathered unto himself the most subtilewitted’ of the queen’s servants, who were ‘fit for his purpose’, and ‘made her sworn to betray the Queen, and tell him what she said or did’.⁸⁹ These servants were apparently susceptible to the cardinal’s influence, and could be bribed with gifts, financial rewards or other inducements. ‘In like manner, he played with the ladies and gentlewomen’, and ‘whosoever of them was great, with her he was familiar, and gave her gifts’. ‘By these spies, if ought were done, or spoken in Court against the Cardinal,’ Tyndale observed, ‘of that he had word within an hour or two’.⁹⁰

Tyndale’s accusation alone does not substantiate a network of spies in the queen’s Chamber. He was an enemy of the cardinal and later incurred the king’s wrath for his opposition to the ‘Great Matter’.⁹¹ The problem with proving the existence of a spy network is obvious, seeing as its existence should not have been known in a public forum like the court, and Wolsey would have been too careful, shrewd or untrusting to mention it in his own

⁸⁵ *LP* IV 4685.

⁸⁶ Shorton spoke out on Catherine’s behalf in Convocation. It is clear Shorton was conflicted as, a year later, Wolsey asked Shorton ‘to dissuade her from making any further pursuit’, but ‘had no word’ back from him. *LP* IV 5865.

⁸⁷ Chiefly ‘that he had heard the Queen often say that, if in this cause she might enjoy her natural defence and justice, she trusted it would take such effect as would be acceptable to God and man’, as ‘she was never known by prince Arthur’ (that she did not consummate the marriage). *LP* IV 4685.

⁸⁸ *LP* IV 4685.

⁸⁹ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. 1, p. 189; Thomas Russell (ed.), *The Works of the English Reformers: William Tyndale and John Frith*, 3 vols., vol. 1, pp. 453-4.

⁹⁰ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. 1, p. 189; *Expositions and Notes on Sundry Portions of the Holy Scriptures: Together with The Practice of Prelates*, vol. 43, William Tyndale (1849), Practice of Prelates, pp. 308-309.

⁹¹ Gwyn, *Wolsey*, p. 506 (‘since that book consists largely of a diatribe against Wolsey, and since, also, he could have had very little, and certainly no first-hand, knowledge of the workings of the royal households, he can hardly be a reliable source’).

correspondence. Yet, it must be remembered that Wolsey *was* criticised for manipulating the structure and makeup of personnel in the English royal household to his advantage. In a satirical pamphlet written in 1529, John Palsgrave wrote that the cardinal ‘put about the Kyng and Quene’ men and women ‘such as wol[d] never [be] contra[r]ye’ to him, and of having ‘weryeed and put away... all syche officers and counseillours as would do or try any thing frely’.⁹² Similarly Tyndale remarked that one of the queen’s servants was known to have ‘departed Court for no other cause, but for that she would no longer betray her mistress’, indicating that Wolsey – or, at his behest, the king – had the authority to dismiss them.⁹³ On at least one occasion, six servants on ‘the quenes syde’ were ‘put out of there Rowmes’, and their offices redistributed, under Wolsey’s administration.⁹⁴ Tyndale too observed that the cardinal, with the king’s men (and the queen’s women ‘in like manner’), would prefer those who had sworn to be faithful to him before admitting them to royal service.⁹⁵ It is clear that Wolsey liaised with them. In 1518, the cardinal was informed by Richard Pace that ‘the quenes servants have made vnto her grace’ a ‘goodde reaporte’ for the ‘favour shewn... for here sake, vnto them in all there causis’.⁹⁶ What is more, the cardinal did have Catherine under constant observation.⁹⁷ In this context, George Wyatt’s remark that the king, in pursuing Anne Boleyn when she was one of the queen’s maids, ‘had more occasion and

⁹² My italics, for emphasis. TNA SP 1/54, f. 250 (LP IV 5750); Samman, ‘The Henrician Court’, p. 239. Giustinian remarked that the cardinal ‘may in point of fact be styled *ipse rex*’, or ‘the king’, because he ‘rules both the King and the entire kingdom... and all state affairs, likewise, are managed by him’. Giustinian, *Four Years*, vol. 1, p. 155, vol. 2, Appendix II, 1519, pp. 313-315; HC, pp. 703-707; George Cavendish, Wolsey’s gentleman usher, certainly knew his master to have the right to appoint servants of the king: (‘And if I should have promoted you to any of the King’s offices and rooms, then should I have incurred the indignation of the King’s servants, who were not much let to report in every place behind my back that there could no office or room of the King’s gift escape the Cardinal and his servants’.) Cavendish, p. 200.

⁹³ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. 1, p. 190.

⁹⁴ TNA SP 1/18, f. 66 (LP III 151).

⁹⁵ Tyndale, *Practice of Prelates*, pp. 308-309.

⁹⁶ TNA SP 1/16, f. 200 (LP II 4045). Pace assured Wolsey that Catherine’s lord chamberlain, William Mountjoy, ‘doith humbly comfirme your grace’s goodde mynde towardis herre’, and that he did ‘most humbly comende hym selfe vnto your grace’.

⁹⁷ It is clear from the cardinal’s letters that he was well-informed of not merely her whereabouts but her ‘conduct’, her ‘manner’ and her ‘demeanour’, information which he would then report back in great detail to the king. See, for example, TNA SP 1/42, f. 155 (LP IV 3231).

means than any other to note and observe her doings', and that 'by himself and by the eyes of others, there was not any trip but would have been spied', is at least intriguing.⁹⁸ Taken together, the evidence amounts to more than mere suspicion. The logic of such a scenario is clear: Wolsey was powerful, but he did not have immediate access to the queen's chambers. The queen's servants, however, did have access, and thus to consolidate his hold on the court and its politics the cardinal was to solicit them to act as his agents.

Conceptually, what the Wolseyian spy network illustrates is how conflicting allegiances, or interests, could destabilise the relationship between mistress and servant. The queen's servants were sworn to be loyal and faithful, to obey them in *everything*, and the stability of this relationship rested on the obligations of both mistress and servant being met. Service functioned by obliging loyalty from men and women to a master or mistress, and strictly no other, not even to themselves. Service necessarily negotiated freedom with constraint, power with subservience, advancement with dependence. Service 'did not displace' the interests of the servant, but rather 'coexisted with them, and it was able to do so because service largely entailed obedience to *specific* commands'.⁹⁹ All servants had their own interests, but these merely coexisted, aligned in harmony, with the interests of their master, or mistress. If, or when, that loyalty was in doubt, when the interests of the queen and the king, or, perhaps, more accurately, the queen and her servant, did not align, when servants had a choice, it politicised them, destabilising the relationship between mistress and servant, and the 'functioning' queen's household.

⁹⁸ Wyatt, p. 26.

⁹⁹ Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 18.

This is reflected in anxieties concerning the potential ‘doubleness’ of servants. Henry VIII himself was suspicious, even paranoid, urging Wolsey in 1519 to ‘make good wache on the duke of Suffolke, on the duke of Bukyngham, on my lord off Northecomberland, on my lord off Darby, on my lord off Wylshere and on others whyche yow thynke suspecte’.¹⁰⁰ Christine de Pizan warned that women in the service of a queen ‘may well curtsy respectfully to her, with one knee touching the ground, and make deep bows and flatter her’, even ‘agree with and support her’, and yet ‘laugh at her and talk about her behind her back’, and ‘betray the one to whom they are outwardly pleasant and obedient’.¹⁰¹ Rarely would servants outright or publicly oppose, criticise or betray their master, or mistress, and their performance of routine duties, tasks and functions might conceal their duplicity or inauthenticity. On 4 February 1529, the ambassador Inigo de Mendoza, in a letter to Charles V, suggested that the Queen should protest a tribunal investigating the legitimacy of her marriage to the king, but then acknowledged that such a task would be ‘with great difficulty’, fearing that ‘the Queen is surrounded by spies in her own chamber’.¹⁰² A few years later, Montfalconet, Charles’ envoy, reported that Catherine was ‘surrounded by vile persons devoted to the king’.¹⁰³ The fact that Catherine would be forced to contrive a way of communicating with ambassadors, cloak-and-dagger, indicates that ‘those with the Queen’ were indeed ‘guards and spies, not servants’.¹⁰⁴

The duke of Suffolk acknowledged in his report on 19 December 1533 that, in swearing Catherine’s household to a new oath, there were a few servants who did, ‘after

¹⁰⁰ BL Add MS 19398, f. 644.

¹⁰¹ Pizan, *Treasure*, 2 / 7.

¹⁰² *LP* IV 5255.

¹⁰³ *LP* V 1059.

¹⁰⁴ *LP* IX 983; CSP, Sp, IV, i, 509. Even Anne Boleyn apparently saw the advantage of this, as Chapuys reported on 5 September 1530, the rival ‘placed some women about her to spy and report anything she may say or do’, although it is difficult to see exactly how she would have manoeuvred them into the queen’s chamber. CSP Sp IV, i., 422.

some exhortations', comply with the order, and were now 'sworn to accomplish the King's pleasure'.¹⁰⁵ Upon learning this, Catherine 'sodainly in a fury... departed from hym, into her priuie Chamber and shutte the doore'. Those 'that remained to serue her', and 'were sworne to serue her as a Princes Dowager, and not as Quene', were 'vtterly refused' by her.

Catherine 'affirmed that she would not have any others', and 'by her wilfulness may feign herself sick, and keep her bed, or refuse to put on her clothes'.¹⁰⁶ 'She has refused to eat or drink anything that her new servants bring her', Chapuys reported a month later, observing that 'the little food she takes in this time of tribulation is prepared by her maids-in-waiting within her own bedroom'.¹⁰⁷ 'She will not regard them as her servants', Catherine protested, 'but only her guards, as she is a prisoner'.¹⁰⁸ She maintained that if her servants 'took any further oath than they has done to her she would never trust them again', and later asked that she have only a few servants but that they 'shall take no oath but to the King and to her, and none other woman'.¹⁰⁹ Catherine refused the service of those whom she felt were not loyal, reiterating again that an oath sworn only promised loyalty, it did not guarantee it. Henry's control of her household, and his command of her servants, destabilised service. By the time Catherine had fallen ill, few of her own servants remained. It was observed that 'those with the Queen are guards and spies, not servants, for they have sworn in favor of Anne, not to call her highness Queen, nor serve her with royal state'.¹¹⁰ By complying with the king's orders, these 'guards and spies' remained loyal to their sovereign, and what is more, remained in service.

¹⁰⁵ TNA SP 1/81, f. 3 (*LP* VI 1543).

¹⁰⁶ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 210 (*LP* VI 1541); CSP Sp IV, ii., 1165 (*LP* VI 1571); *HC*, pp. 807-8.

¹⁰⁷ CSP Sp V, i., 4 (*LP* VII 83).

¹⁰⁸ CSP Sp IV, ii., 1165 (*LP* VI 1571); CSP Sp V, i., 75 (*LP* VII 1013).

¹⁰⁹ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 206 (*LP* VII 786).

¹¹⁰ BL Add MS, 28588, f. 87 (*LP* IX 983).

Evidently Catherine *was* surrounded, as is testified by Chapuys, who acknowledged in his correspondence that he found it difficult to communicate with her. Chapuys reported on 27 July 1534 that he was restricted from visiting Catherine at Kimbolton. Her chamberlain and steward had been explicitly instructed by the king not to let the ambassador see or speak with her.¹¹¹ Fortunately, Chapuys had his own informants with the Princess Dowager, one of whom urged the ambassador and his party to visit outside of the castle, which they did, to the ‘great pleasure’ and ‘consolation’ of Catherine and her ladies, ‘who spoke to them from the battlements and windows’.¹¹² On 8 May 1535, Chapuys received a letter from Catherine’s physician, who felt that she was in grave danger, having learned that the king intended to ‘propose the oath to our mistress, and if she will not take it she will be put in perpetual prison or beheaded’.¹¹³ Chapuys visited Catherine at Kimbolton again in 1536, and reported on 9 January that the king had sent a man (described by Chapuys as ‘a friend of Cromwell’s’) ‘to spy and note all that was said and done’. Notwithstanding the king’s orders, Chapuys was left alone with Catherine and her physician for ‘nearly an hour’. Sir Edmund Bedingfield, Catherine’s steward, inquired as to the nature of their meetings, but regrettably ‘no one was present except the persons mentioned and her old trusty women’. ‘If the matters were of importance’, Bedingfield wrote to Cromwell, ‘we should get... knowledge by them’.¹¹⁴ Thereafter, the ambassador was informed by ‘one of her chamber’ that she had slept better, and her physician told him that he was in ‘good hope of her health’, and Chapuys was assured by him that ‘if any new danger arose, he would inform me with all diligence’.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ CSP Sp V, i., 75 (*LP* VII 1013).

¹¹² CSP Sp V, i., 75 (*LP* VII 1013).

¹¹³ *LP* VIII 684.

¹¹⁴ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 215 (*LP* X 28).

¹¹⁵ CSP Sp, V, ii., 3 (*LP* X 59).

Service was, in many ways, a ‘performance’, and the performance of duty, and obedience, in ceremonial or ritual, by a servant in ‘office’, could obscure or altogether conceal the interests, or agency, of a servant. Thomas Alvard, a servant of Cardinal Wolsey, who had himself fallen out of favour, expressed this concern in a letter to Thomas Cromwell, when the king’s servants, visited in 1529. ‘My lord of Suffolke, my Lord of Rochford, maister Tuke, and Master Stevyns’, Alvard reported, ‘did as gently [be]have theymselves, with as moche observaunce and humy[lyte to] my Lords Grace’, Wolsey, ‘as ever I saw theym do at any [time] tofor’. ‘What they bere in ther harts,’ he warned, cautiously, ‘I knowe n[ot]’.¹¹⁶ Outwardly, the queen’s servants would have been loyal, necessarily concealing their innermost convictions, and any competing claims on their allegiance. In 1540, when Henry obliged Sir Wymond Carew, Anne of Cleves’ receiver-general, to intercept the letters addressed to and received from her brother, William, Carew was to read them and report back to the king, which he did.¹¹⁷ Carew was instructed by the duke of Suffolk to spy on his mistress, but when Anne learned of his involvement, she became, in the words of Carew, ‘bent with her women to do me dyssplesure’.¹¹⁸ She began to mistrust him, ‘for as I suppose she hath had knowlidge how I procured... suche letters as was sent to her’, Carew reported. He must have felt that he had lost Anne’s faith in him, as he even asked to be discharged from her service.¹¹⁹

Loyalty to the king, their sovereign, had potential to create tensions in the queen’s household between mistress and servant. Henry VIII’s marital instability saw these tensions escalate, with severe, even dangerous, consequences. The intimacy of their position as the

¹¹⁶ BL Cotton MS Vitellius, B, XII, f. 173.

¹¹⁷ Anne received letters from her brother which she had not shown to Henry, and Carew informed him. Letters from Calais for members of Anne’s household it appears were also intercepted (*LP* XVI 1023).

¹¹⁸ TNA SP 1/162, f. 66 (*LP* XV 991). In recognition of his service to the king, Carew was later reinstated as receiver-general to Catherine Parr.

¹¹⁹ TNA SP 1/162, f. 66 (*LP* XV 991).

queen's servants meant that they often became involved in the politics of extricating the king from one marriage, and projecting him into another. In the king's 'Great Matter', much rested on Henry's contention that his brother, Arthur, and Catherine had consummated their marriage. Agnes Tylney, the dowager duchess of Norfolk, for instance, stated that Arthur and Catherine 'were brought to bed the next night after the said marriage', she 'did see them lie... in one bed the same night, in a chamber within the said palace being prepared for them', where she 'left them so [lying to]gether', indicating that their marriage had been consummated.¹²⁰ Katerina Fortes, who was one of Catherine's gentlewomen servants, and Friar Diego Fernández, her confessor, both of whom had returned to Spain, were, among others, sought after to testify on Catherine's behalf.¹²¹ Chapuys urged Catherine, 'either by money or by entreaty', to 'induce some of those who know the truth', but acknowledged that he had 'great difficulty' in persuading the queen's servants to take her side. 'No one dare declare himself', Chapuys remarked, for 'fear' of incurring the king's indignation.¹²² William Mountjoy, on the other hand, protested that he knew nothing 'of the consummation'.¹²³ Catherine herself maintained that she was 'a true maid' when she married the king, and declared that 'women about me at that time' had shown 'the truth of their conscience in this matter'.¹²⁴ Eyewitness testimony of this kind, provided by men and women in service, might appear to leave no doubt as to their allegiance – though it raises the question, again, if they had a choice?

The fall of Anne Boleyn in particular provides a case study for examining agency, and instability, arising from conflicting allegiances in the queen's household. On 2 May 1536,

¹²⁰ *LP* IV 5778 (i) and (ii).

¹²¹ *CSP Sp*, IV, ii., 776 (*LP* V 362).

¹²² *CSP Sp*, IV, ii., 753 (*LP* V 308).

¹²³ BL Cotton MS, Appendix, XXVII, f. 141v (*LP* IV 5774 [11]).

¹²⁴ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 206 (*LP* VII 786).

Anne was arrested for allegedly committing adultery with five gentlemen of the court: Mark Smeaton, Henry Norris, William Brereton, Francis Weston, and her own brother, George, lord Rochford. She was accused of ‘following daily her frail and carnal lust’, having ‘falsely and traitorously procured’ five of ‘the King’s daily and familiar servants’ to ‘be her adulterers and concubines’.¹²⁵ The evidence, however, was inconclusive, and the case against Anne was manifestly weak. No overt act of adultery could be proven. Sir Edward Baynton, Anne’s vice-chamberlain, expressed this concern in a letter to Sir William Fitzwilliam, the king’s treasurer: ‘There is much communication that no man will confess anything against her’, reported Baynton, ‘but only Marke of any actual thing’. ‘It would’, Baynton suggested, ‘much touch the King’s honor if it should no further appear’.¹²⁶ In order to substantiate the charges and secure a conviction, the investigation turned to Anne’s servants. The ladies of her Privy chamber and ‘others of her side were examined’.¹²⁷ Lacking anything like proof, such as an eyewitness account of illicit lovers caught *in flagrante* or a valid confession from the accused, the case against Anne rested on their compliance.

It is clear that many of Anne’s servants complied with the investigation, as Thomas Cromwell wrote to Stephen Gardiner and John Wallop in France on 14 May, that ‘the Quenes abhomynacion was so rank and commen’ that ‘her ladyes of her privy chambre, and her chamberers’ could ‘not conteyne it within their brestes’.¹²⁸ ‘The lady Worsarter’, or Elizabeth Browne, countess of Worcester, ‘Nan Cobham’, Anne Cobham, and ‘one maid mo’, probably Margery Horsman, were identified by John Husee as informants. Husee reiterated a day later,

¹²⁵ LP X 876.

¹²⁶ BL Cotton MS, C, X, f. 209v. (LP X 799).

¹²⁷ BL Add MS 25114, f. 160 (LP X 873); TNA SP 3/12, f. 57 (LP X 953); TNA SP 3/12, f. 37 (LP X 964).

¹²⁸ BL Add MS 25114, f. 160 (LP X 873). ‘It cam soo plainly to the eares of some of his graces counsaill’, Cromwell continued, ‘that with their dieutye to his Majestie they could not concele it from him, but with greate feare, as the cace enforced declared what they harde unto his highnes’.

‘tuching the Quenys accusers my lady Worsetter barythe name to be the pryncypall’.¹²⁹ Her allegations are found in a printed poem entitled *A letter containing the criminal charges laid against Queen Anne Boleyn of England*, written by Lancelot de Carles, secretary to the serving French ambassador in England in 1536, Antoine de Castelnau. The poem describes how ‘a lord of the Privy Council’, Sir Anthony Browne, Elizabeth’s brother, ‘admonished’ or berated his sister after seeing that she ‘loved certain persons with a dishonourable love’. Elizabeth then accuses Anne of ‘a much higher fault’, one which her brother ‘might ascertain from Mark [Smeaton]’. ‘The one thing that seems the worst of all to me’, she would admit, ‘is that her brother often had carnal knowledge of her in her bed’. Upon hearing his sister’s allegations about the Queen, Sir Anthony and two other unnamed gentlemen would inform the king, we can expect, rather gently, that ‘her brother is not among the last in line’, because ‘Norris and Mark would not deny to you that they have spent many nights with her, without having to pursue her’.¹³⁰

In addition, Jane, lady Rochford, and Bridget, lady Wingfield, provided evidence against their mistress. ‘I must not omit,’ Chapuys reported at George’s trial, ‘that among other things charged against him as a crime was, that his sister had told his wife that the King “que le Roy n’estait habile en cas de soi copuler avec femme, et qu’il n’avait ni vertu ni puissance...”’, that is, that Anne had told Jane ‘the King had neither the skill nor the virility to satisfy a woman’, or rather that ‘the King was impotent’. This statement could only have come from Jane. The ambassador is clear in stating that it was not Anne, but George, against

¹²⁹ TNA SP 3/12, f. 37 (*LP X 964*); *Lisle*, IV, 847, pp. 49-50.

¹³⁰ *LP X 1036*. Some remain sceptical of this account: a copy of the poem presented to the King was listed as a ‘French book written in form of a tragedy by one Carle being attendant and near about the ambassador’, suggesting that de Carles was much less an eyewitness than he was merely relating a version of events that correlated with the ‘fullest statement’ made by the English government, or ‘in effect, the government line in translation’. E. W. Ives, ‘The Fall of Anne Boleyn Reconsidered’, *English Historical Review*, CVII (1992), pp. 651-664 (p. 659). Ives, *Anne*, p. 61.

whom the charge was laid, meaning that the accusation itself must have been to the effect that sister and brother had together, in her private chambers, discussed the king's sexual potency. This much was produced on a folded slip of paper and handed discreetly to George and, although he had been warned that, to answer the charge, 'he was only to say yes or no, without reading aloud the accusation', he was bold enough to 'read it aloud'.¹³¹ Bridget, lady Wingfield, died in 1532, apparently leaving a deathbed confession. John Spelman, the residing judge at Anne's trial, identified Bridget, lady Wingfield, as the queen's confidante, who conveyed information about Anne's sexual habits before her accession. Spelman remarked that 'all the evidence was of bawdry and lechery, so there was no such whore in the realm'.¹³² There is a surviving letter written by Anne to lady Wingfield, at which time the queen-in-waiting declared herself to be her 'assured friend': 'And, Madam, thoye at all tymes I have nott shoyde the love that I bar you as moche as ytt was in dyde, ytt noye', Anne wrote, 'I trost that you shall well prove that I lovyd you a gred dell morne then I mayd fayr for'. Tantalisingly, Anne begged Bridget to let alone her 'on descrytte trobble, both for desplesyng of God, and all so for desplesynge off me that dothe love yo so yntyrlly'.¹³³

It has been demonstrated that, for servants, loyalty *was* agency. As was disloyalty. In the queen's household, there was potential for agency in the form of obedience, resistance, or treachery. What makes the evidence of Elizabeth, countess of Worcester, Jane lady Rochford and Bridget, lady Wingfield striking is that these women were, at one time, Anne's nearest friends and confidantes. This illustrates how the intimacy shared between queens and their servants could prove a liability if these bonds of friendship and obligation were no more. The rest of Anne's servants too were interrogated as to her when and whereabouts, whom she was

¹³¹ CSP Sp V, ii., 55 (LP X 908).

¹³² John Hamilton Baker (ed.), *The reports of Sir John Spelman*, vol. 1 (London, 1977), p. 71.

¹³³ BL Cotton MS, Vespasian, F, XIII, f. 198.

with and what she said. Their testimony carried weight, and could substantiate the charges laid against Anne in a damning indictment. Indictments were written statements of the crimes of which the subject or subjects were accused, in explicit detail, for presenting at a trial to a grand jury, who would then deliver a verdict. Quite circumstantial evidence of their conversations and interactions in the queen's chambers, as witnessed by her servants, was deliberately distorted in the indictment to secure a conviction: a chance meeting with Smeaton in her 'chambre of presens' became, for the prosecution, a clandestine rendezvous 'incited' by the queen;¹³⁴ that Anne had given to Norris 'certain medals' was apparently 'indicative that both were bound together' and that Anne had 'procured' him to 'violate her';¹³⁵ her rather imprudent admission that she had on occasion 'given money' to Weston 'as she had often done to other young gentlemen' of the court saw them levy the charge of Anne having encouraged 'several of the King's servants' by 'gifts, and other infamous incitations' in their 'illicit intercourse', until they 'grew jealous of each other' and 'yielded to her vile provocations';¹³⁶ that George was half-dressed in the queen's chambers, even on one occasion 'leaning upon her bed', meant he had 'violated and carnally knew the said Queen, his own sister'.¹³⁷ It is clear from Anne's indictment that her servants, be it willingly or reluctantly, provided full and frank statements, which were quite enough to condemn their mistress to death, placing them firmly on the side of the king.¹³⁸

The question remains, were the charges of adultery fabricated, or had Anne had given rise to suspicions by her own conduct? Intriguingly, Pizan wrote at length on the readiness of

¹³⁴ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 222v (*LP X 798*).

¹³⁵ CSP Sp V, ii., 55 (*LP X 908*).

¹³⁶ The indictment (*LP X 876*), corroborated with BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 222v (*LP X 798*) for Smeaton, and CSP Sp V, ii., 55 (*LP X 908*) for Weston.

¹³⁷ Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 3 vols. (1679), vol. 1, p. 189. The original source for this could be Anthony Anthony, as this particular detail may not survive in another account.

¹³⁸ *LP X 876*.

women at court to ‘whisper scandal to each other’. ‘If they see their lady or mistress merely speaking quietly to a person once or twice, or showing some sign of intimacy or of friendship, or if they see some laughter or some merriment’, these women might ‘jump to the wrong conclusion’, or even ‘embroider the story with invented details’.¹³⁹ If there was a ‘conspiracy’ against the queen, orchestrated by Thomas Cromwell, the involvement and cooperation of her servants must be accounted for. Factionalism is unlikely, as the women who accused Anne were not aligned against the queen – quite the opposite. Why would they substantiate false charges against their mistress? Such a conspiracy could not have been executed without her women. If Anne was guilty, then her ladies and gentlewomen provided statements which condemned their mistress to death. But if Anne was innocent, these servants had ‘turned’ king’s evidence, and it might reasonably be suggested that they did not have a choice. When Anne was first arrested, ‘sundry ladies’ were apparently thrown in the Tower with her, as, reportedly, they were ‘acesari to the sayme’.¹⁴⁰ None of the queen’s servants were charged alongside Anne, but if the king’s council suspected that her women, privy to the queen’s most intimate affairs, must have been aware of her misconduct, or complicit in it, they may well have been in danger. Alexander Alesius, writing in the reign of Elizabeth I, remarked how ‘her servants were bribed’.¹⁴¹ This claim is difficult to substantiate. There are no surviving depositions or statements taken from Anne’s servants, meaning that it is difficult to discern the nature of their testimony.

Yet, it is plausible, and there is some evidence, that they would have been encouraged, and were likely spared, when they turned king’s evidence by providing statements incriminating enough to secure Anne’s conviction.¹⁴² This is corroborated by the

¹³⁹ Pizan, *Treasure*, 2 / 7.

¹⁴⁰ *LP X* 785.

¹⁴¹ Joseph Stephenson (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth I*, 28 vols. (1863), I, 1303.

¹⁴² Bernard, *Fatal Attractions*, p. 158.

investigation into Catherine Howard's adultery. On 7 November 1541, Catherine Howard was accused of concealing from the king her 'familiarity', or indiscretions prior to the marriage, with Henry Manno and Francis Dereham, two male attendants with whom she had served at Lambeth and Horsham. The king's councillors had no difficulty in extracting from her servants testimony to substantiate these allegations. Katherine Daubeney, Alice Restwold, Joan Bulmer, Agnes Howard, her step-grandmother, and Margaret Gamage, her aunt, were apparently examined and all 'agreed in one [tale]'.¹⁴³ The Howard stronghold at court collapsed, however, as it was judged that her family, whose fortunes were closely aligned with Catherine as queen, had 'falsely concealed' knowledge of her indiscretions, and for this they were shown no mercy, thrown in the Tower and charged with 'misprision of treason'.¹⁴⁴ On the other hand, Mary Hall, a chamberwoman who had served at Lambeth with Catherine and who first brought the matter to the king's attention, was not only spared – she was protected.¹⁴⁵ 'She is, as an encouragement to others to reveal like cases,' the Council assured, 'not to be troubled'.¹⁴⁶ Margaret Morton and Katherine Tylney were questioned as to 'whether the Queen went out of her chamber any night late'.¹⁴⁷ At Pontefract, Morton would recall that Catherine, 'being alone with Lady Rochford, locked and bolted her chamber door on the inside' and insisted that 'neither Mrs. Lofkyng nor no nother should come into her bedchamber'.¹⁴⁸ Tylney corroborated her account, adding only that, at Lincoln, she and Morton 'were sent back' on two occasions when the queen went to lady Rochford's

¹⁴³ *LP XVI* 1334.

¹⁴⁴ 'Knowing of the said misconduct of the Queen,' it was judged, 'falsely concealed it, and so commended her pure and honest conditions that the King believed her to be chaste'. *LP XVI* 1469; *LP XVI* 1470. The crime 'misprision of treason' was committed by someone who knows of an act of treason being committed or about to be committed without reporting it. *LP XVI* 1430; *LP XVI* 1470; *LP XVII* 28; *LP XVI* 1422; *LP XVI* 1483.

¹⁴⁵ Hall disclosed her knowledge of the new queen's prior indiscretions to her brother, John Lascelles, who approached the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. The king's councillors confronted Catherine, and Cranmer procured her full written confession. *LP XVI* 1320.

¹⁴⁶ *LP XVI* 1430. In the drafting of the indictment against the accused, it was urged by the Council that it must 'clearly leave out Mary Lascelles'. *LP XVI* 1437; *LP XVI* 1440.

¹⁴⁷ *LP XVI* 1337.

¹⁴⁸ *LP XVI* 1338.

chamber.¹⁴⁹ They were careful not to incriminate themselves, insisting that they had ‘heard or saw nothing of what passed’, though their testimony of bolted chambers and backstairs meetings meant that the prosecution could convincingly levy the charge of the queen having held ‘illicit meeting and conference’.¹⁵⁰ Wriothesley later acknowledged that Tylney ‘hath done us good service’,¹⁵¹ indicating that she may have been offered a reprieve for her cooperation. Even Jane, lady Rochford, who had sworn to her mistress that she ‘woll never confesse it to be torne withe wylde horsez’, under interrogation made a damning statement: ‘she thinketh that Culpeper hath known the Queen carnally’, Jane told her examiners, ‘considering all things that she hath heard and seen between them’.¹⁵²

It is likely that similar assurances were made to Anne Boleyn’s servants in 1536. The letters written from Sir William Kingston, constable of the Tower, to Cromwell, dating from 3 May, the day after Anne’s arrest, to 19 May, the day of her execution, provide further insight into how the queen’s servants acted as agents of the king. These letters are mutilated, some irreparably,¹⁵³ though they remain compelling, as they provide us with an insight into Anne’s final days, and detail the nature of her interactions and candid conversations with her servants, which, otherwise, would not have been recorded or have survived today. The day after Anne’s arrest, Kingston reported to Cromwell that ‘apon the kyngs counsell depart[*inge*] from the Towre [he] went before the queen in to hyr lodgyng, and [*then she*] sayd unto [him], Master Kyngston, shall I go in to a dungyn?’ to which Kingston replied, ‘No, Madam. You shall go into the lodging you lay in at your coronation.’¹⁵⁴ For the duration

¹⁴⁹ *LP XVI 1337; LP XVI 1339.*

¹⁵⁰ *LP XVI 1395.*

¹⁵¹ *LP XVI 1438.*

¹⁵² TNA SP/1/167/159-60.

¹⁵³ Prior to the fire at Ashburnham House in 1731, these letters had been seen and in some measure transcribed by the antiquary John Strype.

¹⁵⁴ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 225r.

Anne would occupy the queen's apartments in the Tower. Anne did not suffer her final days in a cold, dark and barren dungeon, cell or gaol. But a prison was a prison. She could not leave the Tower, and in her final days, Anne was likely restricted to her innermost lodgings, her Privy Chamber, closet and bedchamber. During her imprisonment, Anne was attended by four or five gentlewomen servants – and Kingston's letters provide us with some indication as to who these women were. The first was Mary Scrope, Kingston's wife. The 'lady Boleyn' can be identified as Elizabeth Wood, the queen's aunt, wife of Sir James Boleyn. The 'mistress Coffin' was Margaret Dymoke, wife of Sir William Coffin, gentleman of the king's Privy Chamber and the queen's master of the horse. Kingston also acknowledged that there were at least two other gentlewomen in attendance. One was a 'mistress Stonor', likely Isabel, the wife of Sir Walter Stonor, the king's sergeant-at-arms. Unfortunately, there is no record of the identity of the fifth, unnamed gentlewoman.¹⁵⁵ As Kingston observed, the lady Boleyn and mistress Coffin lay on the queen's pallet, that is, at the foot of her bed, whereas he and his wife lay at the door of her Privy Chamber. Like the constable of the Tower, the gentlewomen, quite purposefully, kept Anne in the dark, as the queen remarked to Kingston, 'my lady Boleyn and Mestres [Cofyn]... coud tell her now thyng of her father, nor] nothyng ellys...' ¹⁵⁶ Thus in the Tower, the queen's Privy Chamber, where Anne would have retreated and relaxed in private, functioned, as it always did, by *restricting* access to the queen. Its attendant staff were responsible too for carefully regulating and controlling this access, though previously, maintaining and preserving Anne's privacy, they now enforced it, and kept her in isolation. They were, effectively, her guards.

¹⁵⁵ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 225r.

¹⁵⁶ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 222r.

The gentlewomen attending upon the queen were instructed by Kingston to record and report back ‘every thyng’ that Anne said.¹⁵⁷ Certainly, the queen spoke unguardedly, as in the first few days of her imprisonment, she was manifestly nervous, increasingly anxious, desperately trying to make sense of her fall. Anne began rehearsing in great detail, if indiscreetly, incidental conversations that took place in her chambers with the gentlemen with whom she was accused. Anne confided in Margaret Coffin that, a few days before her arrest, she had asked Henry Norris, a gentleman of the king’s Privy Chamber, why he did not go through with his marriage to her cousin, Madge Shelton, to which Norris ‘made ansure he wold tary [a time]’. ‘[Y]ou loke for ded men’s showys,’ Anne scolded, ‘for yf owth ca[m] to the King but good], you would loke to have me’. Norris was clearly horrified, fearing that ‘yf he [should have any such thought] he wold hys hed war of’. Anne knew she had misspoke, and fearing that her words could be misconstrued, urged Norris to swear an oath to her almoner that she was a good woman.¹⁵⁸ Later that day, she recalled a conversation she had with Francis Weston, another of the king’s servants; Anne says she spoke to Weston ‘bycause he claimed he did not love hys wyf’, but loved instead Anne’s maid, Shelton. Weston then dared to add that ‘[h]e loved wone in hyr howse better then them bothe’. The Queen asked, ‘[Who is] that?’ ‘It ys yourself’, Weston said, and then, as Anne recalled, ‘she defyed hym’.¹⁵⁹ In the Tower, Anne rehearsed for mistress Stonor another conervation she had with Mark Smeaton, groom of the king’s Chamber. The queen had ‘found hym standyng in the rounde wyndo in her Presence Chamber’, and asked why he wase so sad. He ansured that it was now mater. Here Smeaton’s pitiful state must have vexed the queen, as she then she sayd scornfully, ‘You may not loke to have me speke to you as I shuld do to a nobulle man, because you be an inferor [pe]rson.’ To which he replied, panic-stricken, before taking his

¹⁵⁷ *LP X 793*.

¹⁵⁸ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 225r (*LP X 793*).

¹⁵⁹ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 226r.

leave, ‘No, no, madam, a loke sufficed me, and thus fare you welle.’¹⁶⁰ Anne was clearly struck and taken aback by the familiarity with which Smeaton dared speak with her in public. Unfortunately for Anne, her words were reported back to Kingston, and then to Cromwell, substantiating the charges of adultery and treason laid against her in a damning indictment. This evidence would be quite enough to secure a conviction.

The spatial, emotional, and political dimensions of Anne’s interactions with her gentlewomen in the Tower reflects more broadly on how and why a queen, any queen, might yet feel isolated and alone *even* within such an institution as her own household, surrounded by her servants. A queen’s Privy Chamber in itself could be a prison if it were under the control of the sovereign. ‘I thynke [moche onkindnes yn the] kyng to put seche women about me as I never loved’, the queen said to Kingston, ‘bot I wold have had [of myn owne prevy cham]bre, weche I favor most’.¹⁶¹ Crucially the gentlewomen who were attending upon the queen were chosen by the king, not by Anne herself. More than an ‘onkindnes’, it was calculated, and deliberate. These gentlewomen were the king’s spies, as Kingston says:

Wher I was commaunded to charge the gentelwomen that give thayr atendans apou the Quene, that ys to say thay shuld have no commynycasion with hyr in lese my wyf ware present. Notwithstandynge it canot be so, for my lady Bolen and Mestrys Cofyn lie on the Quenes palet, and I and my wyf at the dore with yowt... I have every thyng told me by Mestrys Cofyn that she thinkes meet for you to know.

Kingston acknowledged further ‘that tother ij. gentelweymen lay without him, and requested to know t[he] Kynges plesure in the matter.’¹⁶² Anne reiterated again days later that ‘the Kyng [knew] what he dyd w[hen he put such] ij. women about hyr as the lady Boleyn and Mestres

¹⁶⁰ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 222v (LP X 798).

¹⁶¹ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 224v.

¹⁶² BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 225r.

[Cofyn]'.¹⁶³ Kingston assured her that the Kyng took them to be honest and gud wemmen.' In other words, that these women could be trusted to watch and inform against her.¹⁶⁴ Like the Wolseyian spy network, such conflicting allegiances destabilised the 'functioning' queen's household.

Why did Anne incriminate herself? She knew herself to be 'creuely handeled' by the king, and yet confessed to, or confided in, women whom she, in her own words, had 'never loved'. Perhaps it was her fragile, nearly hysterical state of mind that saw her unravel. Kingston's letters provide an almost unprecedented insight into the mental, and emotional state of the queen during her imprisonment. Anne was understandably strained and shaken. On the night of her arrest, she declared, 'Jesu, have mercy on me', before she knelt down 'wepynge a [*great*] pace, and in the same sorow fell in to a great laughing, as she hathe done [*so*] many tymes syns.'¹⁶⁵ Kingston reiterated that during her imprisonment, at times Anne was 'mery', and at others she wept, or even laughed uncontrollably: as the constable observed 'for one hour she ys determyned to die, and the next hour meche contrary to that'.¹⁶⁶ Later, when Kingston visited her again, Anne said that she had 'heard say the executioner was very gud, and I have a lyt[el] neck, and [she] put he[r] hand abowt it, lawynge hartely.' "I have seen many men and women executed," Kingston reported, "all of them in gre[at] sorrow, [but] to my knowle]ge thys lady hasse mech joy and plesure in dethe."¹⁶⁷ The terrifying vulnerability of her position might have left an otherwise astute queen desperate, achingly lonely, and incautiously candid. Were these gentlewomen servants merely the king's spies, lying in wait to strike the queen at the slip of her tongue? Certainly her aunt, Elizabeth, lady Boleyn, was

¹⁶³ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 222r.

¹⁶⁴ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 224v.

¹⁶⁵ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 225r.

¹⁶⁶ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 224v.

¹⁶⁷ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 223r.

unsympathetic. As Kingston recorded, she sayd to hyr niece, ‘Seche desyre as you have h[ad to such tales] hase browthe you to thys...’¹⁶⁸ It may be suggested that these women were guilty of almost baiting Anne into revealing more than she should. Margaret Coffin appears to have eagerly obliged and abided by the instructions of the king. On the other hand, it may be suggested that she and the rest of Anne’s gentlewomen reported back only that which they thought or felt was necessary. It must be observed that their interactions, as they survive in these letters, are incomplete, and distorted by the hand of Kingston, recording too only what he felt was pertinent, or in other words, what was *political*. Nor were Anne’s gentlewomen likely to have rehearsed for the constable any interactions in which they had shown her any empathy or compassion. We hear little from mistress Stonor, for instance, who by this account spoke only a few words in seventeen days, and initially neither she nor the unnamed gentlewoman were chaperoned by Kingston or his wife when they attended to Anne.

Perhaps there was agency in their silence, in what they did not disclose, in what remains undocumented, and what is now, unfortunately, impossible to trace. Albeit speculative, it is far from implausible that these their loyalty to, or affection for Anne, as their mistress, may have frustrated the efforts of the investigation. Margery Horsman, Anne’s maid-of-honour, had shown herself reluctant under interrogation to provide evidence. Sir Edward Baynton, the queen’s vice-chamberlain, cooperated directly with the king’s council, and was tasked with extracting testimony from Anne’s servants. On 3 May 1536, in a now mutilated letter to Sir William Fitzwilliam, the king’s treasurer, Baynton admitted that he struggled to wrest a confession from her maid. ‘I have mewsed myche at ...mastres Margery,’ Baynton wrote, ‘whiche hath used her[self] strangely toward me of late being her

¹⁶⁸ BL Cotton MS, Otho, C, X, f. 222r.

fry[nd] as I have ben'.¹⁶⁹ 'But no dowte it cann... but that she must beof counsell therewith', and, Baynton observed, there 'hath ben great fryndeship betwene the Q[ueen and] her of late'.¹⁷⁰ Although the queen's vice-chamberlain and her maid had been familiar, the arrest of their mistress had created a rift between them, reflecting then the divergence of their allegiances and interests. The 'strange' conduct that Horsman was exhibiting, as Baynton reports, was her reluctance to implicate Anne, because of the 'great fryndeship' she had with her mistress. To comply, to conform, or to resist, in all measures, embodied a choice made by the servant. The queen's servants did not obey, or refuse, orders, without making a decision, though it must be observed that such a decision may have been, in some way, intimidated, or coerced, by the threat of incurring the king's wrath, thus constraining their agency.

The gentlewomen who attended upon Anne in the Tower are often characterised as one-dimensional, uncaring and indifferent to Anne's torment. It was these same women who, on 19 May, accompanied the queen from her lodgings to a nearby scaffold. Accounts of Anne's execution vary slightly, but at least three of them record the presence of her gentlewomen. Lancelot de Carles, secretary to the French ambassador residing in England, says they were 'half dead themselves', describing them as 'bereft of their souls, such was their weakness'. Mere moments before death, the queen 'consoled her ladies several times', as one of them 'in tears came forward to do the last office and cover her face with a linen cloth'.¹⁷¹ This last detail is corroborated by an imperial ambassador, who said that Anne 'knelt down, fastening her clothes about her feet, and one of her ladies bandaged her eyes'.¹⁷² Another eyewitness to Anne's execution observed that her gentlewomen 'then withdrew themselves some little

¹⁶⁹ Ellis, vol. 2, p. 61; BL Cotton MS, C, X, f. 209v. (*LP* X 799).

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ *LP* X 1036.

¹⁷² *LP* X 911.

space, and knelt down over against the scaffold, bewailing bitterly and shedding many tears.¹⁷³ In her final moments on the scaffold, Anne apparently addressed her servants:

...my damsels, who, whilst I lived, ever shewed yourselves so diligent in my service, and who are now to be present at my last hour and mortal agony, as in good fortune ye were faithful to me, so even at this my miserable death ye do not forsake me. And as I cannot reward you for your true service to me, I pray you take comfort for my loss... forget me not ; and be always faithful to the King's Grace, and to her whom with happier fortune ye may have as your Queen and Mistress...¹⁷⁴

Certainly these heart-wrenching scenes could have been exaggerated. Neither chronicler Edward Hall or Charles Wriothesley corroborated them, as they did not record the presence of her gentlewomen, though we know that they were in attendance. Though the aside to her ladies is touching, it is likely fabricated. These words, especially her last, pointed and strikingly magnanimous allusion to her rival and successor, Jane Seymour, would surely have been recorded by other eyewitnesses.¹⁷⁵ Though it remains implausible that Anne ever spoke these words, such reports from the scaffold do, however, serve to remind us that the queen's servants were not merely pawns of the king. Servants had complex, often overlapping, obligations, and emotions. Their empathy here needs not be reconciled with their political allegiance. Politically, Anne's gentlewomen were necessarily aligned with the king, their sovereign. Yet emotionally, they shared in this most harrowing experience of the queen, and may even have provided their forsaken mistress with genuine emotional comfort in her final days, easing her loneliness and isolation.

¹⁷³ Bentley (ed.), *Excerpta Historica*, pp. 261-5 (LP X 991).

¹⁷⁴ Bentley (ed.), *Excerpta Historica*, pp. 261-5 (LP X 991).

¹⁷⁵ For accounts of Anne's scaffold speech, see Edward Hall, *HC*, vol. 2, p. 819; Charles Wriothesley, *WC*, vol. 1, p. 42; Lancelot de Carle, *LP* X 1036; An imperial ambassador, *LP* X 911; T. Amyot, 'Transcript of an original Manuscript, containing a Memorial from George Constantyne to Thomas Lord Cromwell.' in *Archaeologia*, 23, pp. 50-78 (pp. 64-66). Perhaps the Venetian ambassador, or his informant, was the only one in attendance near enough to the scaffold and to her ladies to hear and record it clearly.

If servants ‘smoothly’, or passively, transferred their duties from household to household, it would appear that so too did their loyalties, without leaving any discernible trace of difficulty, or scruples of conscience. Yet, even Anne acknowledged in this final speech that her ladies and gentlewomen might have better fortune in serving her successor. It was in their agency to make that transition and move on – to continue in their careers in spite of their loyalty, and allegiance, political or emotional, to their former mistress. There was agency in aligning their loyalties to the king and facilitating his will, which ensured that their careers were not inextricably caught up with the fate of their mistress. Six women who were appointed to serve Jane Seymour gave evidence against Anne. The depositions of Jane, lady Rochford, Anne, lady Cobham, Mary, lady Kingston, Margaret, lady Coffin, Isabel Stoner, and, ultimately, Margery Horsman, may have been enough to secure their position in the household of her successor. These women do not appear to have been necessarily pressurised, or ‘bullied’, by the crown, into providing damning evidence against their mistress. A more accurate, or nuanced, reading of what remains of the transcripts is that they were fearful, and anxious about their own survival. By demonstrating their loyalty and allegiance to the king, these women survived the scandal virtually unscathed.¹⁷⁶ To make the transition between households and remain in office meant aligning oneself, pragmatically, and politically, with the king.¹⁷⁷ Yet, crucially, this chapter has shown that there was agency in emotion, that loyalty was not always pragmatic, and that, although the king could command the allegiance of men and women who served his queens, he could not always dictate how they thought and felt.

¹⁷⁶ In addition to the six women who provided evidence for the charges laid against their former mistress, there was Sir Edward Baynton, who began his career as the king’s servant, before serving five of his queens as their vice-chamberlain. BL Cotton MS, C, X, f. 209v. (*LP* X 799).

¹⁷⁷ Significantly, both Margaret Morton and Maude Lovekyn, who gave evidence against Catherine Howard, can be traced to the household of Catherine Parr.

Conclusion

Reconstructing the queen's household in England and the careers of its servants, from 1485 to 1547, this thesis builds upon the wider historiography on queenship, the court and its politics, and women in this period by addressing fundamental questions on the nature of royal service. What did it mean to serve in the household of a queen consort – a woman, and the wife of the sovereign? How did service function specifically for queens, and queenship? Did serving in the queen's household constitute a 'career'? Was service strictly a matter of politics, or was it personal? In what ways was service 'gendered', or, in other words, what did mean to serve in the household as a woman, and how did this experience differ from that of men?

Like the king's household, the queen's household was a group of servants who performed duties, tasks, or functions on behalf of the queen, their mistress. It mirrored the structural makeup of, and developed gradually alongside, the king's Chamber, sharing in its innovations, like the Privy Chamber, and was governed by the same set of ordinances. Like the king's servants, the queen's servants were entitled to the wages, livery, accommodation, bouche of court, stabling and nonmonetary perquisites. What the queen's servants did, how much they were paid, what they wore, where and what they ate, if they were, or were not, entitled to 'bouche of court', how many horses they had stabling for, how many beds they were given to accommodate their own servants, what perquisites or 'fees' they were entitled to, what room or chamber, and in what capacity, they served in: all corresponded with their office, the title and position held by servants, formally, and institutionally, defined.¹⁷⁸ The

¹⁷⁸ Appendix 1.

institutions of service (offices, ordinances) were created, developed and defined by men, and for men, but few adaptations were felt necessary to accommodate women.

Unlike the king's household, the queen's household was headed – at least, figuratively – not by the sovereign, but by the wife of the sovereign, a woman. This meant that it was smaller in size, its servants were paid less, and many of them necessarily had to be women, who functioned for the practice, construction and display of queenship. Queens consort were to undertake roles specific to their position as wife and mother, and thus her ladies and gentlewomen servants, as the embodiment and extension of her body, will and needs, fulfilled the 'gendered' side of monarchy on behalf of their mistress, and many of the duties and tasks they performed may be described as 'women's work'. This does not mean that these servants could play no meaningful role, nor does it mean that the queen's household was 'doomed to domesticity'. Like the king's servants, the queen's servants demonstrated their importance both practically and culturally, and the power of their presence, visually, materially, and diplomatically, by performing roles which were intrinsically, and essentially, domestic. By their beauty, charm and gaiety, and their participation in the crowded agenda of banquets, feasts, pageants, masques, jousts and tournaments, the queen's women in particular met the functions of her household: hospitality, sociability, and magnificence.

An 'institutional' analysis of the queen's household alone, however, is restrictive and insufficient. Rethinking and reflecting upon royal service more broadly as a career, this thesis has shown that, whereas office laid the foundation, it was access, intimacy, personality, and the interaction of mistress and servant, which built them. Office conferred status, measured authority, and denoted rank and precedence in the hierarchy of the queen's Chamber and Privy Chamber. But this order was, inevitably, circumvented by the queen, and those to

whom she did, or did not, show her favour; those to whom she did, or did not, grant access, and those whom she did, or did not, trust.

The ‘good’ mistress fulfilled her obligations by maintaining, rewarding and advancing her servants: queens were responsible for caring for their servants’ physical wellbeing and emotional comfort; supervising their conduct, instructing them in moral discipline and encouraging them towards virtue; keeping them constant and conspicuous in their piety, and engaging them in pastime; paying and providing for them by clothing them, accommodating them in their chambers; lending or leaving them money, giving them gifts, granting them rewards, or showing them favour in the advancement of their careers. In return, the queen’s servants were sworn by oath to be loyal and faithful to their mistress, to obey her in everything. The nature of royal service was thus top-down, in that service was everything, and anything, at all, which was performed on behalf of, and determined by the will and whims of, their master, or mistress. This meant that nothing was outside of the scope of their activity, and what constituted ‘service’ in this period cannot be strictly or narrowly defined by the duties, tasks and functions performed specific to the offices they held. Servants were drawn in to the queen’s affairs, and could be called upon or engaged in matters more *ad hoc* or further afield, in the wider court and kingdom, whatsoever they may be.

The queen’s servants engaged in ‘politics of intimacy’: they controlled access to the queen, knew her intimately, and thus were in an unrivalled position to provide ‘counsel’, and apt to gather, facilitate and ‘broker’ information, as well as to secure her favour. In this, it was women who had the advantage, as her most intimate servants. The significance of the development of the queen’s Privy Chamber, bedchamber and privy closet was that it maintained the privacy of their mistress, by restricting access. As a result, a ‘feminine’

domain was created, wherein women were effectively in control, with a measure of authority and influence from which their gender would otherwise have restricted them. It was their position nearer to the queen which gave her women the opportunity to acquire a higher status and position than they would otherwise have done strictly by birth or marriage. The patron-client system shifted to their advantage when they were solicited by those who wished for them to act as intermediaries on their behalf, and through them, all manner of petitions and suits were advanced, messages, letters, rumours and gossip transmitted, gifts and tokens conveyed and exchanged, for their own advancement, and those of their family, friends and clientele. The activity, and interests, of the queen's servants thus extended beyond the confines of the queen's chambers, and into the wider court. Service to the queen facilitated their interactions with the king, their sovereign, the wider court and kingdom. These interactions, and the relationships forged between men and women, who were recognised by their contemporaries as having political agency, cut across such institutions, and their cooperation creating opportunities for advancement. This thesis thus challenges the view that the early Tudor court was a male-dominated society, and that careers at court were strictly a *masculine* preserve. In order to conceptualise fully the early Tudor court and its politics, not strictly the king's servants, but the queen's servants too, must be studied. Socially, culturally, politically, religiously, and diplomatically, the queen's household and its servants were firmly integrated with the court.

Yet, this thesis illustrates too that we must distinguish clearly between 'household' and court'. In the view of its contemporaries, the queen's household had its own identity, separate from the king's side. A queen's household was thought, felt and understood to be her own, and its servants were seen to be firmly under her charge. Upholding piety, virtue and godliness was the responsibility of all queens as the mistress of the household. The character

and demeanour of the queen's servants, like that of the queen herself, had to be irreproachable. Yet, inevitably, there were tensions between the high expectations of women serving in the queen's household, and the realities of their attendance at court. The queen's ladies and gentlewomen were situated at the centre of the 'courtly love' tradition, an integral element of chivalric culture in which gallant knights would, feigning their love, court and flatter their ladies with dances, poems, songs and gifts and other 'favours' in an unending pursuit for her affection. Therein they engaged in pastime and pleasure within an increasingly impassioned and unrestrained environment, which proved a rigorous challenge to queens, and their authority, as a woman's capacity to rule and govern could be judged from her ability to keep the ladies and gentlewomen of her household chaste and virtuous. Queens thus had to be so strict with their ladies and gentlewomen as to maintain order and, crucially, evoke both respect and fear in all who regarded them. This tension between 'household' and 'court' was never more apparent in the queen's Privy Chamber. Reflecting the 'gendered' dynamics of the queen's household, the private activities of women, concealed in the cloistered chambers of a queen, aroused suspicion and male anxieties of the unknown, on this occasion, what was occurring in the 'female' space behind bolted doors.

Demonstrating that the study of monarchy must constitute the sovereign and their consort, this thesis restates that queenship, or specifically, 'consortship', functioned as a relationship, or partnership, between king and queen, as husband and wife. Queens consort may have had their own households, but this thesis warns against overstating its autonomy. It is more accurate to treat the queen's household as an extension of the king's household, firmly integrated, or as a subsidiary household within the royal establishment, which was essentially a patriarchal institution, headed by the sovereign, and broadly comprised not only the king's servants, but his queens' servants and the servants of their children, over whom the

king, as sovereign and father of the familial 'household', retained ultimate and absolute authority. In many ways, the queen's servants had a mistress *and* a master. Henry VIII treated his queens' servants as if they were his own: he paid and provided for many of them, gave them orders, and set the rules by which they were governed; he appointed, punished and discharged his queens' servants at will; he had precedence in the oath sworn by the queen's servants, and administered the household to his own ends. In its physical layout, the queen's chambers were treated as an extension of the king's court, accommodating the queen, her servants, and the king, his servants, courtiers and councillors, even ambassadors and foreign dignitaries. In its composition, servants who had some connexion (and likely owed their appointments to, if even, often indirectly) the queen, were far outnumbered, and their presence overwhelmed, by servants who had ties with (and likely owed their appointments to) the king.

Henry VIII's marital instability from 1527 to 1547 exposed the lack of control his queens' had over their own households. The queen's household had to be discharged on no less than five occasions. Its servants were disbanded, and many of their careers cut short, though others could and did transition between households. This transition became crucial, and ties to the king essential, in surviving what his wives did not. The careers of the queen's servants were not inextricably caught up with the fate of their mistress, providing continuity and stability in office – though crucially, *not* stability in service. The careers of its servants, more broadly conceived not strictly as office-holding, but the relationships between mistress and servant, constituted the 'functioning' household. Unlike the king's Privy Chamber, which, for the king, established a clear distinction between his public and his private lives, the queen's Privy Chamber more often failed in this most essential function. Its attendant staff often facilitated only the illusion of privacy, and this 'institutional' intimacy was

constrained and controlled by the presence of the king, if not physically, then by proxy, in servants whom he could trust. Successive queens inherited some of their predecessor's servants, many of whom had shown themselves firmly aligned with their master and sovereign. Upon marrying the king, queens were merely figureheads of their own households, and control of the institution remained firmly in the hands of the sovereign. But control, or more specifically, command, of the servants within that household, required loyalty, which could be won.

Loyalty was the foundation of service. Service in the queen's household functioned by obliging loyalty from men and women to the queen, their mistress, and to the king, their sovereign. The queen's servants were sworn by oath to be loyal, faithful and true, although the oath alone is shown to have been insufficient in 'binding' or obliging servants in this period. Both queens and their servants were 'bound' to be 'good', and the stability of this relationship rested on the obligations of both mistress and servant being met. By maintaining, rewarding and advancing the men and women who were sworn to their service, queens could command their loyalty, trust and fidelity, upon which – often, quite personal – relationships between mistress and servant were built. Queens could not always match the king's individual magnetism, presence and authority, nor could they rival his ability to bind, or oblige, servants, and their loyalty, by rewarding and advancing them. Yet, the relationships with their servants could have emotional significance. Service fostered familiarity, intimacy and trust. The queen's Privy Chamber in particular encouraged the forming of close bonds, ties of companionship and friendship which were distinctive of service. Privately, queens could engage and interact with their servants in ways more relaxed, personal and intimate. Her innermost chambers constituted a 'female' domain, providing a physical space wherein networks of support and obligation were created, sustained, and strengthened over time. To

command service from within, and draw upon the loyalty of those who were sworn to them, queens had to rely on their servants to establish themselves securely, reaffirm their status, and, in crisis, for emotional comfort, even political backing. But if, or when, that loyalty was in doubt, when the interests of the queen and the king, or, perhaps, more accurately, the queen and her servant, did not align, when servants had a choice, it politicised them, destabilising the relationship between mistress and servant, and the ‘functioning’ queen’s household. The potential for multiple, competing, or conflicting allegiances meant that the foundation of service for queens in this period was fundamentally unstable.

Royal service saw men and women caught up in the machinations of monarchy, which could be unpredictable, and meant that such careers were often precarious, perilous, even, potentially, dangerous. Servants were often drawn into the lives and affairs of their master, or mistress. ‘Nearness’, or intimacy, to the crown, situated servants at the centre of intrigue, an advantageous, yet vulnerable position. Loyalty to the queen in this period brought servants into opposition with the king. Such indiscretions were punished severely, and incurring the wrath of the king, their sovereign, who was susceptible to paranoia, and mistrust, could cost a servant not merely their career, but their life. Servants were neither strictly loyal to the queen, nor to the king. This thesis establishes that, for servants, loyalty *was* agency. As was disloyalty. In the household there was potential for agency in the form of obedience, resistance, or treachery. To comply, to conform, or to resist, in all measures, embodied a choice made by the servant. The queen’s servants did not obey, or refuse, orders, without making a decision. In other words, it politicised them. There was agency in emotion. Whereas the king could command the allegiance of men and women who served his queens, he could not always dictate how they thought and felt. Confronted with the question of their allegiance, many of the queen’s servants were at the mercy of the king, and were unlikely to

refuse his orders – others would defy their sovereign and forfeit their careers out of obligation to their mistress. Careers were built and sustained on favour – but royal favour could be fickle, and service to the sovereign witnessed dramatic reversals of fortune. The making and breaking of careers in royal service was often the skill to manoeuvre circumstances adverse, difficult, and dangerous, to their advantage, and the instinct to preserve oneself and one's own position at court, adapting through periods of change. Faced with complex, often unprecedented crises, the outcome of which would affect their lives and careers directly, the queen's servants were forced to act or react in one way or another, to align, or realign their loyalties, to survive.

This thesis reassesses and redefines our understanding of the nature of royal service, providing a framework by which to interpret the evidence more sensitively, and accurately. Examining the institutional, and the non-institutional, offices and relationships, household and servant, sovereign and consort, male and female, access, intimacy and personality, loyalty and agency, stability and instability, this framework will prove useful for the study of royal service in other 'subsidiary' households, households of contemporary Western Europe, queens regnant, even male consorts.

It has been shown that the English royal household, and the wider court, constituted more than strictly the household of the sovereign. An examination of other, 'subsidiary' households throughout this period, be it royal, or 'great', noble households, identifying relationships and mapping networks which branched from the centre, will provide a fuller picture of the court and its politics. When Henry VIII died on 28 January 1547, Edward VI acceded the throne, and Catherine Parr became queen dowager. Catherine and her attendants,

to whom she continued to pay wages, resided at Chelsea Manor.¹⁷⁹ Nicholas Throckmorton, sewer, described Catherine's dowager household as 'a second court', wherein Catherine was maintained in 'her princely royalty' and still attracted the attentions of English nobility. She died prematurely on 5 September 1548, and Sir Thomas Seymour, whom she married shortly after the king's death, would take many of her servants into his own household.¹⁸⁰ Edward Seymour, duke of Somerset, and his wife, Anne, occupied the queen's chambers in royal palaces during the boy king's reign,¹⁸¹ which meant that there was a female household at court, the significance of which has not received due attention.¹⁸² Even a court without a queen had women in attendance, which is some indication of how essential they were to its structural makeup, function and culture.¹⁸³ On the periphery in these years was 'the king's sister', lady Anne of Cleves, who struggled to maintain her servants on her own, even with the settlement granted to her from the annulment. Anne sent Sir John Guildford, Thomas Carew, William Cholmeley, Richard Tomyow and John Hammond to petition the new king's council on her behalf 'for continuance of payement of certaine pencions', for 'the maintenance of her and her familie, promising by his Hieghnes [Henry] letters that the same should be no lesse than fowre thosande markes sterlinges of yerely revenue'.¹⁸⁴ The council did confirm such grants as were made by Henry, but Anne's expenditure still far exceeded her income, with her household creating a deficit of nearly £1000 a year. Jasper Brockehouse, Anne's cofferer, soon began constraining her expenses, which made him unpopular with her servants. When Count von Waldeck, Anne's cousin, returned to Cleves, he urged her brother William to recall Brockehouse, and remarked that his wife, Gertrude, had driven Anne mad

¹⁷⁹ TNA E101/426/2.

¹⁸⁰ Mueller, p. 192. Edward Seymour, duke of Somerset, and his wife, occupied the queen's chambers in royal palaces. Alan Bryson, 'The Speciall Men In Every Shere', *The Edwardian Regime, 1547-1553* (University of St. Andrews, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2001), pp. 16-17; James, *Parr*, p. 291.

¹⁸¹ Bryson, 'Edwardian', pp. 16-17; James, *Catherine Parr*, p. 291.

¹⁸² Graham-Matheson, 'Parr'.

¹⁸³ Payne, 'Jacobean', p. 271.

¹⁸⁴ *ACP*, II, pp. 80-83. Anne remarked 'God knows what will happen next; and everything is so costly here in this country that I don't know how I can run my house'. *ACP*, III, p. 60.

‘by her marvellous impostures and incantations’.¹⁸⁵ William sent Karl Harst to instruct his sister to discharge them from her household, alongside Otho Wyllik and Thomas Charde, but Anne refused. ‘Every exertion’ had been taken ‘to have them removed from her service, but in vain’.¹⁸⁶ The queen, Mary, intervened, and on 14 September 1556 the servants in question were summoned before the council. Brockehouse and his wife were warned to ‘departe from the house and family of the lady Anne of Cleve, and come never after in any of the same lady’s howses, or where she shall for the tyme make her abode, ne do entromedle or busye himself in thadministracion of the government of her howseholde or other her affaires as her servant or officer’. The council determined that Brockehouse, his wife, and Otho Wyllik ‘shulde clerely avoide and departe the realme’, to return only ‘at thier uttermoost perilles’.¹⁸⁷ Evidently, there is potential in unravelling the dynamics of these households to provide further insight into ‘alternative’ spheres of power, and the politics of service.

Royal households in England mirrored the households of nobility and gentry, and their royal counterparts in Spain, Italy, and France. When Mary Tudor, Henry VIII’s younger sister, married Louis XII of France in 1514, most of her servants were, by the king, discharged. ‘On the morne next after oure marriage’, Mary wrote, ‘my chambirlayn, with all other men servants, were discharged, and in lyke wise my mother Guldeford, with other my women and maydyns, except such as never had experien nor knowlych how to advertise or gyfe me counsel in any tyme of need.’¹⁸⁸ The queen of France took action for Joan, lady Guildford, to ‘find the means to have her sent back’. Mary wrote to her brother in England

¹⁸⁵ CSP, Mary, Foreign, 1553-1558, 524.

¹⁸⁶ CSP, Mary, Foreign, 1553-1558, 523.

¹⁸⁷ ACP, V, p. 354.

¹⁸⁸ William Jerdan (ed.), *Rutland papers: Original documents illustrative of the courts and times of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Selected from the private archives of His Grace the Duke of Rutland* (London, 1842), pp. 25-26. Of her servants some ‘had served her longe in hope of prefermente, and some that had honest waies left them to serve her, and now they were without service, which caused them to take thought in somuch some dyed by the way returning, and some fell mad, but, ther was no remedy’.

and his secretary, Cardinal Wolsey, of her abject ‘discomfort’: ‘I humbly requyr you to cause my seyde mother Guldeford to repayr hither once agayn’.¹⁸⁹ Wolsey intervened with Louis XII, but he refused to have her reinstated to his queen’s household.¹⁹⁰ ‘He wold not have hir abought his wife’, wrote Charles, earl of Worcester to Wolsey, as ‘she began to take vppon hir not only to rewle the quene but also that she shuld not come to hym but she shuld be with hir, nor that noo lady nor lord shuld speke with hir but she shuld here hit, and began to sett a murmure and banding amonges ladies of the court’.¹⁹¹ The king ‘hath se[t about her neither] lady nor gentilwoman to be with hir for hir ma[stery but hir] servaunts and to obbeie hir comaundements’. This incident, though anecdotal, shares in many of the themes of this thesis: that servants who were intimate and trusted could be powerful; that the household, institutionally, remained in control of the king; and that service therein was fundamentally unstable. Parallels between the queen’s household in England of this thesis and the queen’s hôtel in France are apparent: Caroline zum Kolk too emphasised the French queen’s household’s socio-political functions and its cultural significance, whereas Sharon Kettering conceptualised the service of French women in households as ‘careers’.¹⁹² More comparative and transnational research must be done to draw out and observe the nuances, similarities and

¹⁸⁹ Ellis, vol. 1, pp. 116-7; *LP* I 3356; A transcription of the severely damaged BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VI, f. 257.

¹⁹⁰ *LP* I 3381.

¹⁹¹ BL Cotton MS, Caligula, D, VI, f. 205r (*LP* I 3416). Upon hearing of the full extent of her misbehaviour, Henry VIII was ‘pleased that she shall not return’ to court and Joan, lady Guildford, was forced to return to England. *LP* I 3440.

¹⁹² Kolk, ‘Household’, pp. 21-22; Kettering, ‘Noblewomen’, pp. 55-85; Ruth Kleinman, ‘Social Dynamics at the French Court: The Household of Anne of Austria’, *French Historical Studies*, 16:3 (1990), pp. 517-535; Murielle Gaude-Ferragu, *Queenship in Medieval France, 1300-1500*, trans. by Angela Krieger (New York, 2016), pp. 153-161; Susan Broomhall (ed.), *Women and Power at the French Court, 1483-1563* (Amsterdam, 2018); Akkerman and Houben (eds), *Ladies-in-Waiting*, remains the most important study in integrating women at European courts, and illustrates the potential of a transnational perspective for female households. For the German (‘*Frauenzimmer*’) and Spanish-Habsburg female households at court, see briefly Jeroen Duindam, ‘The Court as a Meeting Point: Cohesion, Competition, Control’, in Maaïke van Berkel and Jeroen Duindam (eds), *Prince, Pen, and Sword: Eurasian Perspectives* (Boston, 2018), pp. 32-128 (pp. 42-43).

differences, between medieval and early modern royal households and courts of contemporary Western Europe.¹⁹³

There was no ‘queen’s household’ established for a consort in England until James VI and I acceded the throne, and his wife, Anna of Denmark, was crowned in 1603, though Mary I and Elizabeth I had their own households as sovereign, or queens regnant. There may be scope, comparatively, in the study of the households of English male consorts to provide further insight into the gendered dynamics of service.¹⁹⁴ Mary did marry, Philip II of Spain in 1554, and in August his household as king consort was established.¹⁹⁵ Her sovereignty was protected – who was ‘in charge’ of Philip’s household?¹⁹⁶ Like Henry VIII and his queens, their relationship as sovereign and consort must have had some bearing on service. Certainly the question of *who* served Philip caused contention. There were both Spanish and English contingents to his household as consort.¹⁹⁷ Mirroring the treatment of Catherine of Aragon and Anne of Cleves, Philip was actually obliged to take Englishmen into his household: ‘the said noble prince shall receyve and admitt unto the service of his householde and courte gentlemen and yeomen of the said Realme of Englande in a convenyent number’.¹⁹⁸ As Alexander Samson observes, Philip, like Catherine and Anne, had to ‘familiarise’ himself

¹⁹³ See, for instance, Hannah Smith, ‘Court Studies and the Courts of Early Modern Europe’, *The Historical Journal*, 49, 4 (2006), pp. 1229-1238 (pp. 1237-1238), for how this research often overlaps, with many studies drawing similar conclusions on politics, religion, and gender at court.

¹⁹⁴ Christina Strunck, ‘The ‘two bodies’ of the female sovereign: Awkward hierarchies in images of Empress Maria Theresia, Catherine the Great of Russia and their male consorts’, in Helen Watanbe-O’Kelly and Adam Morton (eds), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500-1800* (New York, 2017), pp. 64-83.

¹⁹⁵ CSP Sp XIII, pp. 23, 31, 45.

¹⁹⁶ When Mary I ascended the throne, and in order to restrict Philip II of Spain from interfering, in 1554, Parliament issued the Act declaring that the Regal Power of this Realm is in the Queen’s Majesty as fully and absolutely as ever it was in any of her most noble Progenitors, Kings of this Realm, thereby empowering Mary to sovereignty without Phillip’s involvement.

¹⁹⁷ Alexander Samson, ‘Power Sharing: The Co-monarchy of Philip and Mary’, in Hunt and Whitelock (eds), *Tudor Queenship*, pp. 159-172.

¹⁹⁸ TNA SP 11/1/20, p. 7, quoted in Alexander Samson, *Mary and Philip: The marriage of Tudor England and Habsburg Spain* (Manchester, 2020), p. 70.

with the English household.¹⁹⁹ Service to a ‘king consort’ such as Philip was attractive to men of nobility and upper gentry in offering an additional, or alternative, opportunity for preferment. Yet, much like the households of consorts before him, there was inevitably tensions therein over access, and intimacy, as the English and Spanish contingents of his household rivalled one another for his favour, which in this instance even erupted into violence and resulted in a number of fatalities.²⁰⁰

Albeit outside of the scope of this study, it is clear that there is potential for further examination of royal service. This thesis also recommends ongoing and in-depth research into individual servants and their activities within the household and at court. In particular, the careers of women, such as Eleanor Paston, the industrious countess of Rutland, Jane Parker, the infamous Lady Rochford, and the elusive and unsung heroine, Margery Horsman, Lady Lister, among others, deserve greater academic attention. The evidence indicates that women at court could be as ambitious, tenacious, self-seeking, even unscrupulous, as their male counterparts, in their pursuit of prestige and preferment. These women, many of whom were wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters, who recognised their importance to their own kinship networks, fulfilled many additional roles attending at court: servant, courtier, companion, confidante, patron, client, agent, broker, and informant. Their identities were thus complex, as they negotiated and balanced the idyllic traits of woman with the ruthless pragmatism and astuteness of a politician, subtly redefining the formal constraints put upon her position in a male-dominated society. These women could be influential, or powerful, though often not in their own right but derived from their relationship with the crown. Of course, there were women who did not or refused to engage in court politics or in matters of

¹⁹⁹ Samson, *Mary and Philip*, p. 106.

²⁰⁰ Samson, *Mary and Philip*, p. 71.

state. There were also women who did not have a choice. A career in service necessarily negotiated freedom with constraint, power with subservience, advancement with dependence. It is more often impossible to provide a satisfying, and irrefutable, explanation as to why any one servant would act or align themselves in one way or another – but what is clear is that all servants had to reconcile their office, the professional ethos of serving their master or mistress, their duty, obligations and identity as a servant, with their own interests, convictions, political and religious, their networks and relationships, with their own families, friends, patrons and clientele. Some forged their careers in professionalism, honour, obedience and loyalty, others in ambition, treachery, and opportunism.

This thesis reiterates the importance of studying servants, and women, reinstating them as central to the early Tudor court. It has demonstrated the potential of prosopographical methods in reconstructing the queen's household, and what is more, that there is further scope for a full-scale study of the Tudor court from 1485 to 1603, to uncover, draw out and to better understand its overlapping institutions, relationships, networks, and the careers of all who belonged to it.

APPENDIX 1:

OFFICES IN THE QUEEN'S AND KING'S CHAMBER AND PRIVY CHAMBER, 1485-1547

Unlike the queen's gentlemen, yeomen, grooms and pages, whose titles and respective duties were inherited from the king's side of the royal establishment, and as such, were clearly delineated, those of women on the queen's side can be difficult to define or categorise in precise terms. The documents themselves are inconsistent: from 1509 to 1547, there were not strictly 'Ladies' in the queen's service,¹ but 'Ladies ordynary of the quenes chambre';² 'Ladies of the household Extraordinary';³ 'ladies of her privy chambre'⁴ and 'of the bedchamber';⁵ 'Ladies in presens';⁶ 'grete Ladies';⁷ 'ladies in the quenes great chambre';⁸ 'Ladies of the household lodged within the house with their husbands';⁹ 'Ladies dayly attendant' and 'Ladys quarterly attendant'.¹⁰ As a result, there is a great deal of confusion as to the titles by which these women served, and the specific duties, tasks and functions that they performed.¹¹

¹ See, for example, TNA E179/70/116.

² TNA LC 2/2.

³ BL Cotton Vespasian C XIV I, f. 107v.

⁴ BL Add MS 25114, f. 160.

⁵ CSP Sp, IV, ii., 776 (*LP* V 362). This is taken from a letter written in 1531 by Charles V of Spain to Isabella of Portugal concerning those of the queen Catherine of Aragon's ladies who were deposed in the king's 'Great Matter', which might explain the use of 'bedchamber', but other depositions taken from the English nobility at around this time also used the term (see *LP* IV 5774).

⁶ TNA SP 1/19, ff. 85-7.

⁷ TNA SP 1/157, f. 14.

⁸ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 19v.

⁹ BL Cotton Vespasian C XIV I, f. 107v.

¹⁰ TNA SP 1/37 f.53 (*LP* IV 1939 [7]); TNA SP 1/157, f. 14. All of these terms were increasingly confused by the end of Henry VIII's reign. For instance, compare lists BL Royal MS, App, 89 f. 105 and BL Cotton Vespasian C XIV I f. 107v for the visiting French embassy in 1546. More obscure yet are New Year gift rolls, which do not explicitly identify women by the offices they held, but refer to them only as either 'Lady', 'Mrs' or 'Mistress', with the former rather too obscure in meaning and the latter used invariably to describe both married gentlewomen servants and unmarried maids-of-honour. TNA E101/420/4 for 1528, TNA E101/420/15 for 1532.

¹¹ There are many erroneous statements as to these categories in the existing historiography. In her study of the household of Catherine Parr, Dakota L. Hamilton stated that maids-of-honour were the equivalent of the king's yeomen ushers, because of a letter written by John Husee on 17 September 1537 that Anne Basset, a maid, 'furnesheth the room of a yeoman usher' (*LP* XII, ii., 711; Hamilton, 'Parr', pp. 29-31). It seems unlikely that the queen's maids fulfilled the same functions as a yeoman usher – not least because Henry's queens had their own yeomen ushers, who, in standing guard, performed duties unsuitable for women, and especially young girls. Hamilton concentrates on the queen's ladies, whom she groups together as 'ladies of the household'. It was 'probably among this particular group that Catherine Parr spent much of her time', who 'kept their husbands and male relations abreast of affairs within the queen's establishment', who 'kept alert for opportunities to speak

What is clear is that the titles of individual offices held by women in the queen's household could be derived from the name of the chamber in which they served. Reflecting the architectural layout of many royal palaces, the queen's side, like the king's side, was subdivided physically into Guard, Presence and Privy chambers. Ladies and Gentlewomen of the Privy Chamber attended to their mistress in the queen's Privy chamber, while the 'ladies in presens', or Presence, served the queen in her Presence chamber. The terms 'lady' and 'gentlewoman', denoted the rank of a servant: ladies were the wives of English noblemen, meaning dukes, marquesses, earls, viscounts and barons, while gentlewomen were the wives of knights and men of upper or lower gentility. Ladies and gentlewomen 'in ordinary' were in regular attendance, while 'extraordinary' servants held no formal office, and were in attendance only to honour the queen on grand ceremonial occasions. As I understand it, the women of the queen's Chamber comprised Ladies and Gentlewomen of the Privy Chamber (previously, ladies and gentlewomen, serving 'in ordinary'), Ladies in Presence, Maids-of-Honour (and a Mother of the Maids), Chamberers, and Ladies and Gentlewomen 'attendant', who served 'in extraordinary'.¹²

with the queen on behalf of family and friends', and 'this group of women in particular', Hamilton suggests, 'probably was especially influential with the queen' (Hamilton, 'Parr', pp. 39 and p. 66). This approach can be problematic, however, and in this instance undermines the author's own observations, not least in that the women who could fairly be described as a 'lady' would have had varying roles, responsibilities, degrees of access or intimacy, perquisites etc., and as such, the nature of their relationships with the queen would have varied accordingly. Of course, many of these women, Hamilton observed, were 'not servants in the strictest sense', in that they rarely, if ever, performed 'body service', did not receive wages, were not entitled to *bouche* at court, and nor were they permitted access to the queen's Presence or Privy chambers without her permission. All this warns that the reader must be sensitive to the diverse language with which contemporaries described the queen's women, and at least make some attempt to carefully distinguish between them.

¹² To summarise briefly how I arrived at this general structure: the 'book of Certayne of the Quenys Ordynary' of 1540 is most explicit in that the queen would be served by 'The grete ladies', 'Ladies of the prevy Chambre', 'Gentlewomen of the prevy Chambre', 'Chamberers', 'The mayds', 'The mother of the maids' and 'Ladies and gentlewomen Attendaunt' (TNA SP 1/157, ff. 13-17 (*LP XV* 21)). The term 'great ladies' is used infrequently in Henry's reign. It is apparent, when cross-referencing this document with earlier lists of the queen's 'ordinary' that the 'great ladies' were in essence the 'ladies in presence' (BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 15v – 18r), which predates the former by only a few months.

Notes

If a servant was paid daily, monthly or quarterly, the amount has been calculated as and written in its yearly sum total. If a servant was paid in marks, the amount has been converted to pounds, shilling and pence. This was the case for the king's vice-chamberlain, cupbearer, carver, sewer and esquires for the body. (50 marks = £33. 6s. 8d., 100 marks = £66. 13s. 4d.)

Key

(Q) – Wages paid by the queen

(K) – Wages paid by the king

(N) – No wages

Abbreviations

s. – shillings

d. – pence

ob. – halfpence

APPENDIX 1A: OFFICES IN THE QUEEN'S CHAMBER AND PRIVY CHAMBER, 1485-1547

	No. of servants in the queen's Chamber ¹	Minimum wage per annum (yearly)	Maximum wage per annum (yearly)	Horses ²	Beds ³	'Bouche of Court' ⁴	Lodgings ⁵	Entitled to eat and drink in the queen's Chamber ⁶
Lord Chamberlain	1	£40 (Q) ⁷	—	16	5	Y		Y
Vice-chamberlain	1	£26. 13s. 4d. (Q) ⁸	—	7	2	Y		Y
Gentlemen Ushers	2 – 4	£11. 8s. 1d. ob. (K) ⁹	—	3	1	Y		Y
Yeomen Ushers	2 – 4	£4. 11s. 4d. (K) ¹⁰	£15. 4s. 2d. (K) ¹¹	2	1			
Yeomen of the Chamber	20 – 24	£15. 4s. 2d. (K) ¹²	£18. 5s. (K) ¹³	2	1			
Grooms of the Chamber	4	£2 (K) ¹⁴	—	2	1	N		
Groom Porters	1	11s. (K) ¹⁵	—	2	1	N		Y
Pages of the Chamber	2 – 4	£1. 6s. 8d. (K) ¹⁶	—	2	1	N		N
Messenger	1	£2 (Q) ¹⁷	£4. 11s. 2d. (Q) ¹⁸	2	1	N		N
Ladies of the Privy Chamber	4 – 6	(N) ¹⁹	£33. 6s. 8d. (Q) ²⁰	5 – 20	1 – 7	Y		Y
Gentlewomen of the Privy Chamber	4 – 6	£10 (Q) ²¹	—	5 – 20	1 – 7	Y		Y
Maids-of-Honour	5 – 7	£10 (Q) ²²	—	1	1	Y		Y
Mother of the Maids	1	£20 (Q) ²³	—	1	1	Y		Y
Chamberers	2 – 4	£2. 13s. 4d. (Q) ²⁴	£6. 13s. 4d. (Q) ²⁵	N	N	N		Y
Great Ladies or Ladies in Presence	2 – 6	(N)	(N)	5 – 20	1 – 7	Y		Y
Ladies and Gentlewomen Attendant	8 – 10	(N)	(N)	4 – 8	2	N		Y
Carvers	1	£11. 8s. 1d. ob. (K) ²⁶	£26. 13s. 4d. (Q) ²⁷	3	2	Y		Y
Cupbearers	1	£11. 8s. 1d. ob. (K) ²⁸	—	3	2	Y		Y
Sewers	1	£11. 8s. 1d. ob. (K) ²⁹	—	3	2	Y		Y
Gentlemen Waiters	2 – 4	£11. 8s. 1d. ob. (K) ²⁶	—	3	2	N		Y

Sewers for the Chamber	2	£11. 8s. 1d. ob. (K) ³⁰	—			N		Y
Yeomen of the Robes	1	£4. 11s. 3d. (K) ³¹	—			Y		
Grooms of the Robes	1	40s. (K) ³²	—			Y		
Pages of the Robes	1	26s. 8d. (K) ³³	—			Y		
Yeomen of the Beds ³⁴	1	£4. 11s. 3d. (K) ³⁵	—			Y		
Grooms of the Beds	1	40s. (K) ³⁶	—			Y		
Pages of the Beds	1	26s. 8d. (K) ³⁷	—			Y		
Physicians	1	£66. 13s. 4d. ³⁸	—	4	1	Y		Y
Apothecaries	1			3	1	Y		Y
Confessors	1					Y		Y
Almoners	1					Y		Y
Chaplains	3 – 6	(N) ³⁹	(N)	3	2	N		Y
Chancellor	1	£50 (Q) ⁴⁰	£54 (Q) ⁴¹	7	3	Y		Y
Secretary	1	£10 (Q) ⁴²		5	2	Y		Y
Master of the Horse	1	£40 (Q) ⁴³	£60. 16s. 8d. ⁴⁴			Y		Y
Receiver-General	1	£62. 6s. 8d. (Q) ⁴⁵						
Sergeant-at-Arms	1			3	2			
Fool	1	£1. 4s. (Q) ⁴⁶						

APPENDIX 1B: OFFICES IN THE KING'S CHAMBER AND PRIVY CHAMBER, 1485-1547

	How many in the king's Chamber ⁴⁷	Minimum wage per annum (yearly)	Maximum wage per annum (yearly)	Horses ⁴⁸	Beds ⁴⁹	'Bouche of Court' ⁵⁰	Entitled to eat and drink in the king's Chamber ⁵¹
Lord Chamberlain	1	£100	—	18	7	Y	Y
Vice-chamberlain	1	£66. 13s. 4d.	—	8	3	Y	Y
Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber	6 – 18	£33. 6s. 8d. ⁵²	£50 ⁵³	6	2	Y	Y
Gentleman Usher of the Privy Chamber	2 – 3	£30 ⁵⁴	—	4	2	Y	Y
Grooms of the Privy Chamber	3 – 5	£20 ⁵⁵	—	2	2	Y	Y
Groom of the Stool	1		—			Y	Y
Squires for the Body	4	£33. 6s. 8d.	—			Y	Y
Gentlemen Ushers	4	£20 ⁵⁶	—	3	1	Y	Y
Yeomen Ushers	10 – 12	£12. 3s. 4d. ⁵⁷	£24 ⁵⁸			N	
Yeomen of the Chamber	40 – 100	£12. 3s. 4d. ⁵⁹	£24 ⁶⁰			N	
Grooms of the Chamber	12 – 18	£3. 8s. 4d.	£10 ⁶¹	2	1	N	
Groom Porters	1	£3. 8s. 4d.	—			Y	Y
Pages of the Chamber	4 – 7	£2. ⁶²	£2. 15s.	2	1	N	
Messengers ⁶³	4	£5	£5. 17s. 4d.	4	2	N	
Carvers	1 – 3	£33. 6s. 8d. ⁶⁴	—	4	2	Y	Y
Cupbearers	1 – 3	£33. 6s. 8d. ⁶⁵	—	4	2	Y	Y
Sewers	1 – 3	£33. 6s. 8d. ⁶⁶	—	4	2	Y	Y
Surveyors	2	£11. 8s. 1d. ob. ⁶⁷	—			Y	Y
Sewers of the Chamber	4 – 6	£11. 8s. 1d. ob. ⁶⁸	—	4	2	N	Y

Yeomen of the Robes	1	£5. 17s. 4d. ⁶⁹	£18. 5s. ⁷⁰			Y	Y
Grooms of the Robes	1	£3. 8s. 4d. ⁷¹	—			Y	Y
Pages of the Robes	1	£2. 15s. ⁷²	—			Y	Y
Yeomen of the Beds	1	£5. 17s. 4d. ⁷³	—			Y	Y
Grooms of the Beds	2	£3. 8s. 4d. ⁷⁴	—			Y	Y
Pages of the Beds	1 – 2	£2. 15s. ⁷⁵	—			Y	Y
Physicians	2 – 4	£40 ⁷⁶	£66. 13s. 4d. ⁷⁷	3 – 4	1 – 2	Y	
Apothecaries	1 – 2	£4. 11s. 4d. ⁷⁸	£11. 8s. ⁷⁹			Y	
Confessors		£24 ⁸⁰					
Almoners	1						
Chaplains				3	2		
Chancellor							
Secretary	1			8	3	Y	Y
Master of the Horse	1	£66. 13s. 4d.					
Receiver-General	1						
Sergeant-at-Arms				3	2		
Barber	2	£20				Y	Y
Fool	1						

¹ The number of each servant attending upon Henry's queens remained relatively stable from 1509 to 1547. See TNA LC 9/50, ff. 182v-216r (1509); BL Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV ff. 269-70 (1526); BL Add MS 71009, ff. 57v-59r (1533); BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 15v – 18r (1540); TNA SP 1/157, ff. 13-17 (1540); *HO*, pp. 162-170, TNA LC 5/178, ff. 23-26 (1544-45) and TNA LC 2/2 (1547).

² *HO*, p. 199.

³ *HO*, p. 199. The entitlement to stabling and beds for their own servants was, for women, calibrated according to rank, and whether or not their husbands resided at court. See BL Add MS 45716A, f. 15v-16r. *HO*, p. 199. A marquess was entitled to stabling for sixteen horses and five beds for her own servants; a countess to fourteen horses and four beds; a baroness to ten horses and three beds; a knight's wife to eight horses and three beds; gentlewomen whose husbands resided at court had five horses and one bed; gentlewomen who were widowed, six horses and two beds. Maids-of-honour shared between them stabling for six horses and three beds for their own servants. Such allowances may not have been observed strictly: in 1537, Mary Arundell, lady Sussex, serving Jane Seymour, had three of her own servants lodged at court, which was 'one more than she is allowed'. *Lisle*, IV, 868a, pp. 121-3.

⁴ BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 15v-18v; *HO*, pp. 167-173.

⁵ See BL Add Ms 45716A, f. 20v, where 'bouche of court' is calculated 'in gross' for most of the queen's Chamber servants.

⁶ BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 15v-18v; *HO*, pp. 167-173 indicates who was entitled to eat and drink in the queen's chambers.

⁷ Thomas Manners, earl of Rutland, Anne of Cleves' lord chamberlain, was paid £10 a quarter in 1540 (TNA E101/422/16).

⁸ Sir Edward Baynton, Anne of Cleves' vice-chamberlain, was paid £6. 13s. 4d. a quarter in 1540 (TNA E101/422/16), as was Anthony Cope, Catherine Parr's vice-chamberlain, in 1547 (TNA E101/426/2).

⁹ Andrew Wadham, Thomas Byston and Richard Dauncy, Anne of Cleves' gentlemen ushers, were paid at a fixed rate of £11. 8s. 1d. ob. per annum in 1540 (BL Add MS 45716A, f. 16v; *HO*, p. 167).

¹¹ Anthony Lowe, Catherine of Aragon's yeoman usher, was paid 22s. 10d. a quarter in 1525-6, or £4. 11s. 4d. a year (BL Egerton MS 2604).

¹² Henry Johns, John Powes, Edward Fox and John King, Anne of Cleves' yeomen ushers, were paid at a fixed rate of £15. 4s. 2d. in 1540 (BL Add MS 45716A, f. 17r).

¹³ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 167-168.

¹⁴ John Madison, Catherine of Aragon's yeoman of the Chamber, was paid 31s. monthly, or 1s. a day in 1525-6 (BL Egerton MS 2604), as were Elizabeth of York's yeomen of the Chamber (*PPE*, Eliz, pp. 35-36, 71-72) in 1502-3.

¹⁵ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 167-168.

¹⁶ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 167-168.

¹⁷ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 167-168.

¹⁸ Owen Whitstones, Elizabeth of York's Messenger, was paid 40s. by the queen in 1503.

¹⁹ 'Wages only' according to BL Add MS 45716A, f. 15v, suggesting that the queen's Messenger received his wages from the king. This amount is taken from the account book for Catherine Parr's dower household, John Grove was paid at 22s. 9d. ob a quarter (TNA E101/426/2).

²⁰ There are no records in the reign of Henry VIII of ladies serving in the Privy chamber of his queens receiving a wage. The absence of Anne of Cleves' ladies of the Privy chamber from her accounts indicates that they did not receive a wage (TNA E101/422/15; TNA E101/422/16).

- ²¹ Elizabeth of York appears to have paid her ladies a wage in 1503, but there was no standard or set amount. The highest amount was £33 6s. 8d., paid to Lady Elizabeth Stafford. This wage is comparable with Henry VIII's gentlemen of the Privy chamber, some of whom received the same amount, or 50 marks. In the list for Elizabeth of York's ladies in 1503, the amounts they received vary greatly: Eleanor, lady Verney, received £20, Jane, lady Guildford, received £13. 6s. 8d. and Elizabeth, lady Pêche, received 66s. 8d.
- ²² Anne of Cleves' and Catherine Parr's gentlewomen were paid at a rate of 50s. a quarter (TNA E101/422/15; TNA E101/426/2).
- ²³ When Anne Basset was appointed as a maid-of-honour to Jane Seymour, John Husee was informed in 1537 that 'the Queen will give her but x a year', or £10 per annum (*Lisle*, IV, 894). Anne of Cleves' maids-of-honour were paid 50s. a quarter (TNA E101/422/15) in 1540, at a sum of £10 per annum, the amount received by Catherine Parr's maids-of-honour in 1547 (TNA E179/69/47).
- ²⁵ Isabel Stoner, Mother of the Maids, was in the accounts for Anne of Cleves was paid 100s. a quarter (TNA E101/422/15) in 1540.
- ²⁶ This was the wage of Francis Baptiste, Elizabeth of York's chamberer, in 1503. Her chamberers were paid at different rates: Alice Skeling, 'chief chamberer', was paid £5, Elizabeth Baptiste, received £3. 6s. 8d. a year (*PPE*, Eliz, pp. 99-100).
- ²⁷ Anne of Cleves' chamberers were paid 33s. 4d. a quarter (TNA E101/422/15) in 1540, at a sum of £6. 13s. 4d. per annum, the amount received by Catherine Parr's chamberers in 1547 (TNA E179/69/47).
- ²⁸ Carvers, cupbearers, sewers and gentlemen waiters were all paid by the king at a fixed rate in 1540 (BL Add MS 45716A, f. 16v), and in 1544-5 (*HO*, p. 167).
- ²⁹ William Denton, Elizabeth of York's carver, was paid a years wages at £26. 13s. 4d. in 1503 (TNA E36/210, ff. 91-92, *PPE*, Elizabeth, pp.99-100). It appears that this was wage was paid by the queen herself.
- ³⁰ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 16v; *HO*, p. 167.
- ³¹ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 16v; *HO*, p. 167.
- ³² BL Add MS 45716A, f. 16v; *HO*, p. 167.
- ³³ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 17r; *HO*, p. 167.
- ³⁴ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 17r; *HO*, p. 167.
- ³⁵ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 17r; *HO*, p. 167.
- ³⁶ There is a slight wage discrepancy here between Robes and Beds. Perhaps this was an error made by the secretary keeping the account.
- ³⁷ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 17r, *HO*, p. 167.
- ³⁸ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 17r; *HO*, p. 167.
- ³⁹ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 17r; *HO*, p. 167.
- ⁴⁰ Dr. Ferdinand de Victoria, Catherine of Aragon's physician, was paid by the king for half-years wages at £33. 6s. 8d. in 1517 (BL Add MS 21481, f. 263r) and in 1520 (TNA E36/216, f. 97r). In her dower household in 1547, Catherine Parr paid Dr. Huicke his wages, at £17. 13s. 4d. a quarter. Both amounts total to the sum of £66. 13s. 4d. a year (TNA E101/426/2).
- ⁴¹ Catherine Parr's dower household accounts indicate that chaplains were not in receipt of a wage (TNA E101/426/2).
- ⁴² Thomas Dennys, Anne of Cleves' chancellor, was paid £12. 10s. a quarter in 1540 (TNA E101/422/16).

⁴³ Sir Robert Dymmoke, chancellor to Catherine of Aragon, previously received £54 for his fee. *LP* VII 352.

⁴⁴ William Paget, Anne of Cleves' secretary, was paid 50s. a quarter in 1540 (TNA E101/422/16), as was Hugo Eglionby, Catherine Parr's secretary, in 1547 (TNA E101/426/2).

⁴⁵ John Dudley, Anne of Cleves' master of the horse, was paid £10 a quarter in 1540 (TNA E101/422/16).

⁴⁶ Sir Thomas Tyrrell, Catherine of Aragon's Master of the Horse, was paid at 3s. 4d. a day in 1514. By warrant, Tyrrell had two years wages 'avaunced to him', to a sum of £121. 13s. 4d., or £60. 16s. 8d. per annum (TNA E36/215, f. 304).

⁴⁷ Wymond Carew, Anne of Cleves' receiver-general, was paid £15. 11s. 8d. a quarter in 1540 (TNA E101/422/15).

⁴⁸ Elizabeth of York laid out 2s. a month, or 24s. a year, for her fool, William, but this was for his 'board' and may have covered more expenses than merely his wages. TNA E36/210, f. 64.

⁴⁹ The number of each servant attending upon the king fluctuated significantly from 1509 to 1547. See LC 9/50 ff. 182v-216r (1509); *LP* IV 1939 [8] (1519); BL Royal MS 7 F XIV, f. 100 (1536); BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 4v – 15r (1540); TNA E101/423/11 (1543); *HO*, pp. 165-166 (1544-45); TNA LC 2/2 (1547). The number of Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber grew from 6 in 1526 (*HO*, p. 152) to 18 by 1547 (TNA LC 2/2), at the end of Henry's reign. See also Starkey, 'Privy Chamber', p. 182. The number of Yeomen Ushers in 1509 was 10 (TNA E101/417/3 f. 33), and twenty years later, 12, in a similar warrant to the wardrobe for watching livery. The number of Yeomen of the Chamber varies greatly between documents, and often it is unclear if those listed are of the 'Chamber' or 'of the Guard'. In 1529-30, there were some 40 yeomen of the chamber (TNA E101/418/1) another warrant for the same period records 55 yeomen (TNA E101/420/1), and the numbers vary in documents for 1509 (82 yeomen, TNA E101/417/3, f. 33); 1540 (70 yeomen, BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 4v – 15r); 1543 (109 yeomen, TNA E101/423/11). The number of Grooms of the Chamber fell from 18 in 1509 (TNA LC 9/50 ff. 182v-216r), to 12 by 1540 (BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 4v – 15r), probably as the staff of the Privy chamber increased. The number of Pages of the Chamber fell from 7 in 1509 (TNA LC 9/50 ff. 182v-216r), to 4 from 1540 (BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 4v – 15r).

⁵⁰ *HO*, p. 199.

⁵¹ *HO*, p. 199. In *HO*, p. 198, the king's physicians, Mr. Chamber and Dr. Bently, are given different allowances for horses and beds. (Chamber was entitled to stabling for 4 horses and 1 bed for his servants; Bently was entitled to stabling for 3 horses and 2 beds for his servants).

⁵² BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 13r-15r.

⁵³ BL Add MS 45716A, ff. 13r-15r.

⁵⁴ In 1544-45 (*HO*, p. 169), Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber were paid £50, with the exception of two of them, who were paid 50 marks (£33. 6s. 8d.), (three of them in BL Add MS 45716A, f. 13v).

⁵⁵ *Ibid*.

⁵⁶ Phillip Hobbey and Morice Barkley, the king's gentlemen ushers of the Privy chamber, were paid at a fixed rate of £30 a year in 1540 (BL Add MS 45716A, f. 13v).

⁵⁷ John Jennings, Robert Boucher and Thomas Carden, grooms of the king's Privy chamber, were paid at a fixed rate of £20 a year in 1540 (BL Add MS 45716A, f. 14r).

- ⁵⁸ Roger Ratclif, and Thomas Palmer, the king's gentleman ushers, were paid 100s. a quarter (or £20 a year) in 1525-6 (BL Egerton MS 2604).
- ⁵⁹ In *HO*, p. 213, BL Add MS 45716A, f. 15r, at least four yeomen ushers were apparently being paid at 3*d.* a day., but these must have been quarterly attendants as the records indicate that virtually all yeomen of the chamber were either paid at 12*d.* a day (£18. 5*s.* a year) or 8*d.* a day (£12. 3*s.* 4*d.* a year).
- ⁶⁰ A fixed wage of £24 a year for the king's yeomen ushers was introduced later in the reign, in around 1544-5 (TNA LC 5/178, p.90).
- ⁶¹ In 1525-26, (BL Egerton MS 2604), there was 123 'yomen of the kings chambr' in wages. They were paid 12*d.* a day, or 1*s.* at £18, 5*s.* a year. This source does distinguish later between the yeomen of the chamber and 'yomen of the gard' who were given 4*d.* a day.
- ⁶² A fixed wage of £24 a year for the king's yeomen of the Chamber was introduced later in the reign, in around 1544-5 (TNA LC 5/178, p.90).
- ⁶³ Six grooms of the chamber were paid 50*s.* a quarter, or £10 a year, in 1525-6 (BL Egerton MS 2604). Were they perhaps grooms of the Privy chamber?
- ⁶⁴ John Ridley, William Reskymer, Henry Parker and John Marsh were paid at a fixed rate of 40*s.* a year in 1540 (BL Add MS 45716A, f. 14r).
- ⁶⁵ John Johnson was paid 25*s.* a quarter, or £5 a year, in 1525-6 (BL Egerton MS 2604). This rate must have been increased by 1545.
- ⁶⁶ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 13r.
- ⁶⁷ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 13r.
- ⁶⁸ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 13r.
- ⁶⁹ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 13r.
- ⁷⁰ BL Add MS 45716A, f. 13r.
- ⁷¹ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp.165-166. BL Add MS 45716A, f. 14v.
- ⁷² An anomaly in James Worsley (BL Egerton MS 2604), who was paid 31*s.* for a month in wages in 1525-26, making £18. 12*s.* a year, or more likely, matching yeomen of the chamber, 12*d.* or 1*s.* a day, at £18. 5*s.* a year.
- ⁷³ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 165-166. BL Add MS 45716A, f. 14v.
- ⁷⁴ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 165-166. BL Add MS 45716A, f. 14v.
- ⁷⁵ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 165-166. BL Add MS 45716A, f. 14v.
- ⁷⁶ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 165-166. BL Add MS 45716A, f. 14v.
- ⁷⁷ BL Lansdowne 2, ff. 33-38, in *HO*, pp. 165-166. BL Add MS 45716A, f. 14v.
- ⁷⁸ Bentley, the king's physician, was paid £10. a quarter, or £40 a year.
- ⁷⁹ A Dr. 'Farnandon' (Dr. Ferdinand de Victoria?) was paid £16. 13*s.* 4*d.* a quarter, or £66. 13*s.* 4*d.* An entry for a 'Lunaker', a physician, paid £12. 10*s.* a quarter, or £50 a year, in 1516 (BL Add MS 21481, f. 218r.)
- ⁸⁰ Cuthbert Blackden, the king's apothecary, received 22*s.* 10*d.* a quarter, or £4. 11*s.* 4*d.* a year, at Christmas in 1515. BL Add MS 21481, f. 209r.
- ⁸¹ Thomas Pereson, apothecary, received 57*s.* a quarter, or £11. 8*s.* a year, through Henry VII's reign and in 1510. BL Add MS 21481, f. 41r.
- ⁸² Entries for Henry VII's reign indicate the confessor was paid 40*s.* monthly, or £24 a year. TNA E101/414/6 f. 10v.

Bibliography

Manuscript sources

The National Archives, London

State Papers, Foreign (SP)
State Papers, Domestic (SP)
Lord Chamberlain (LC)
Exchequer (E)
Wills and probates (PROB)
Chancery (C)

British Library, London

Additional Manuscripts (Add)
Cottonian Manuscripts (Cotton)
Harleian Manuscripts (Harleian)
Stowe Manuscripts (Stowe)
Royal Manuscripts (Royal)
Arundel Manuscripts (Arundel)
Lansdowne Manuscripts (Lansdowne)

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Ashmole MS 1116

Lambeth Palace Library, London

MS 285

Printed primary sources

A collection of ordinances and regulations for the government of the royal household, made in divers reigns : from King Edward III to King William and Queen Mary, also receipts in ancient cookery (London, 1790)

Amyot, T, 'Transcript of an original Manuscript, containing a Memorial from George Constantyne to Thomas Lord Cromwell.' in *Archaeologia*, 23 (1831), pp. 50-78.

Axon, W. E. A. (ed.), *The Game and Play of Chess* (London, 1969)

Baker, John Hamilton (ed.), *The reports of Sir John Spelman*, vol. 1, (London, 1977)

Banks, Sir Joseph (ed.), 'A Breviate touching the Order and Governmente of a Nobleman's House', *Archaeologia*, XIII (1800), pp. 315-89.

Bayle, Pierre (ed.), *A General Dictionary, Historical and Critical*, 10 vols.

- Bentley, Samuel (ed.), *Excerpta Historica, or, Illustrations of English History* (London, 1831)
- Black J. G., and Brodie, Robert Henry (eds), *Calendar of the Patent rolls preserved in the Public record office: Henry VII, 1485-1509*, 2 vols. (London, 1914)
- Blackley, F. D., and Hermansen, G. (eds), *The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England* (Edmonton, 1971)
- Brewer, J. S., et al. (eds), *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-47*, 21 vols. and addenda (1920)
- Brown, Rawdon, et al. (eds), *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, 38 vols. (1867-1947)
- Bruce, John, and Perowne, Thomas (eds.), *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, Parker Society (1853)
- Burnet, Gilbert, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 3 vols. (1679)
- Byrne, Muriel St. Clare (ed.), *The Lisle Letters*, 6 vols. (London, 1981)
- Caley, John (ed.), 'Two papers relating to the interview between Henry the Eighth of England and Francis the First of France', *Archaeologia*, 21 (1827), pp. 176-91.
- Campbell, William (ed.), *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry the Seventh*, 2 vols. (London, 1873-77)
- Castiglione, Baldassare, *The Book of the Courtier*, ed. and trans. by Opdycke, Leonard Eckstein (New York, 1903)
- Cavendish, George, *The Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, ed. by Singer, Samuel Weller (London 1827)
- Cognatus, Gilbertus, *Of the office of servavntes a boke made in Latine by one Gilbertus Cognatus and newly Englyshed*, ed. Chaloner, Sir Thomas (1543)
- Crawford, Anne (ed.), *Letters of the Queens of England* (Gloucestershire, 2004)
- Dasent, John Roche (ed.), *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, vol. 1, 1542-1547 (London, 1890)
- Douglas, David Charles and Rothwell, Harry (eds), *English Historical Documents*, 3 vols. (London, 1975)
- Ellis, Henry (ed.), *Original Letters illustrative of English History*, 2 vols. (London, 1825)
- Forrest, William, *The history of Grisild the Second: a narrative, in verse, of the divorce of Queen Katharine of Arragon*, ed. by Macray, W. D. (London, 1875)

- Foxe, John, 'Actes and Monuments', in Cattley, Stephen Reed (ed.), *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: A New and Complete Edition*, 8 vols. (London, 1837-41)
- Furnivall, Frederick J (ed.), *Early English Meals and Manners: John Russell's Boke of Nurture* (London, 1868).
- Gayangos, Pascual de, et al. (eds), *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*, 13 vols. (1888-1954)
- Giustinian, Sebastian, *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*, ed. and trans. by Rawdon Lubbock Brown (London, 1854), 2 vols.
- Gouge, William, *Of Domestical Duties*, 2nd ed. (London, 1626).
- Grose, Francis, Astle, Thomas, Jefferey, Edward (eds), 'The Booke of Henrie Erle of Arundell, Lord Chamberleyn to King Henrie Theighte', in *The Antiquarian repertory*, vol. 2, (London, 1808)
- Hall, Edward, *Hall's Chronicle: containing the history of England, during the reign of Henry the Fourth, and the succeeding monarchs, to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth*, 2 vols. (1809)
- Harpsfield, Nicholas, *A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce Between Henry VIII. and Catharine of Aragon*, ed. by Pocock, Nicholas (London, 1878)
- Hatt, Cecilia A. (ed.), *English Works of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester: Sermons and Other Writings, 1520-1535* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 212-254.
- Hay, Denys (ed.) *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil, A. D. 1485-1537*, *Royal Historical Society*, Camden Series, vol. 74 (London, 1950)
- Hayward, Maria, ed., *The Great Wardrobe Accounts of Henry VII and Henry VIII* (Suffolk, 2012)
- Heale, Elizabeth (ed.), *The Devonshire Manuscript: A Women's Book of Courtly Poetry* (Toronto, 2012)
- Hearne, T. (ed.), *Sylloge Epistolarum* (London, 1716)
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire*, 5 vols. (Dublin, 1907)
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of His Grace, The Duke of Rutland, Preserved at Belvoir Castle*, 4 vols. (London, 1888-1905)
- Holinshed, Raphael, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, 6 vols. (1807)
- Hume, Martin A. Sharp (ed.) *Chronicle of King Henry VIII: Being a Contemporary Record of some of the Principal Events of the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. Written in Spanish By An Unknown Hand* (London, 1889)

Jerdan, William (ed.), *Rutland papers: Original documents illustrative of the courts and times of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Selected from the private archives of His Grace the Duke of Rutland* (London, 1842)

Johnson, Charles (ed.), *Constitutio Domus Regis, The Establishment of the Royal Household*, with corrections by F. E. L. Carter and D. E. Greenway (Oxford, 1983), pp. 128-35.

Jones, Michael K., and Underwood, Malcolm G., 'Officers, servants and scholars in Lady Margaret's household, c. 1499-1509', in *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 268-287.

Kipling, G. (ed.), *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne* (Oxford, 1990)

Latymer, William, 'A briefe treatise or cronickille of the moste vertuous ladye Anne Bulleyne late quene of England', in Bodleian MS Don., C, 42, ff. 21r-33v transcribed in Dowling, Maria, 'William Latymer's Chronickille of Anne Bulleyne', *Camden Fourth Series*, 39 (1990), pp. 23-65.

Luders, A., et al. (eds), *The Statutes of the Realm: Printed by command of his Majesty King George the Third in pursuance of an address of The House of Commons of Great Britain, from Original Records and Authentic Manuscripts*, 10 vols. (1831)

Lyte, H. C. Maxwell (ed.), *A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds*, 6 vols. (London, 1906)

Merriman, Roger Bigelow (ed.), *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*, 2 vols. (1902)

Mueller, Janel (ed.), *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence* (London, 2011)

Murray, A. G. W, and Bosanquet, Eustace F. (eds) 'Excerpts from the Manuscript of William Dunche', *The Genealogist*, New Series, XXIX (1913) and XXX (1914)

Myers, A. R., (ed.), *The household of Edward IV, the Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478* (Manchester, 1959)

Nichols, J. G. (ed.) *The Chronicle of Calais in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII to the year 1540* (1838).

Nichols, J. G. (ed.), *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation* (London, 1859)

Nicolas, Sir Nicholas Harris (ed.), *Privy Council of England, Proceedings and Ordinances (1386-1542)*, 7 vols. (1834-1837)

Nicolas, Sir Nicholas Harris (ed.), *The Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York and Wardrobe Accounts of Edward the Fourth. With a Memoir of Elizabeth of York, and Notes* (London, 1830)

Nicolas, Sir Nicholas Harris (ed.), *The Privy Purse Expenses of King Henry VIII from Nov. 1529 to Dec. 1532* (London, 1827)

Parsons, Robert, *A treatise of three conversions of paganisme to Christian religion*, 3 vols., ed. by N. D. (1603-1604)

Pizan, Christine de, *The Boke of the Cyte of Ladyes*, ed. by Hope Johnston, trans. by Brian Anslay, *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 457 (New York, 2014)

Pizan, Christine de, *The treasure of the city of ladies; or, The book of the three virtues*, edited and translated with an introduction by Sarah Lawson (London, 1985)

Russell, Thomas (ed.), *The Works of the English Reformers: William Tyndale and John Frith*, 3 vols (1831)

Sander, Nicholas, *The Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, ed. by David Lewis (London, 1877)

Schmid, Susan Walters (ed.), *Anne Boleyn, Lancelot de Carle, and the uses of documentary evidence* (Arizona State University, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2009)

Stephenson, Joseph (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth I*, 28 vols. (1863)

Stevenson, Joseph (ed.) *The Life of Jane Dormer, Duchess of Feria by Henry Clifford, Transcribed from the Ancient Manuscript in the possession of Lord Dormer* (London 1887)

Strype, John, *Ecclesiastical Memorials relating chiefly to religion, and the reformation of it, and the emergences of the Church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary I*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1822)

Tyndale, William, 'Practice of Prelates', in Walter, Henry (ed.), *Expositions and Notes on Sundry Portions of the Holy Scriptures: Together with The Practice of Prelates*, vol. 43, (1849), pp. 308-309.

Wood, Mary Anne Everett (ed.), *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, from the commencement of the twelfth century to the close of the reign of Queen Mary*, 3 vols. (London, 1846).

Wriothesley, Charles, *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors, From A.D 1485 to 1559*, ed. William Douglas Hamilton, 2 vols. (1838)

Wyatt, George, 'Life of The Virtuous Christian and Renowned Queen Anne Boleigne' in 'Appendix' Samuel Weller Singer (ed.), *The Life of Cardinal Wolsey* (London, 1827)

Wyatt, Sir Thomas, *Collected Poems*, ed. by Daalder, J. (Oxford, 1975)

Secondary Sources

Adams, Simon, 'The patronage of the crown in Elizabethan politics: the 1590s in perspective', in Guy, John (ed.), *The reign of Elizabeth I: Court and culture in the last decade* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 20-45.

Adams, Simon, 'Eliza Enthroned? The Court and its Politics', in Haigh, Christopher (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I* (Hampshire, 1984)

Adams, Tracy, 'Court culture', in Susan Broomhall (ed.) *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* (Abingdon, 2017), pp. 225-227.

Akkerman, Nadine and Houben, Birgit (eds), *The Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting across Early Modern Europe* (Boston, 2013)

Alford, Stephen, 'Politics and Political History in the Tudor Century', *The Historical Journal*, 42:2 (1999), pp. 535-548.

Amussen, Susan Dwyer, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York, 1988)

Anhert, Ruth, Anhert, Sebastian E., Coleman, Catherine Nicole and Weingart, Scott B. (eds), *The Network Turn: Changing Perspectives in the Humanities* (Cambridge, 2020)

Anhert, Ruth and Anhert, Sebastian E., *Tudor Networks of Power* (Oxford, forthcoming)

Archer, John Michael, *Sovereignty and Surveillance: Spying and Court Culture in the English Renaissance* (Stanford, 1993)

Asch, Ronald G. and Birke, Adophe M. (eds), *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c.1450-1650* (Oxford, 1991)

Ashbee, Andrew, 'Groomed for Service: Musicians in the Privy Chamber at the English Court, c.1495-1558', *Early Music*, 25:2 (1997), pp. 185-197.

Aylmer, G. E., 'Office-holding as a Factor in English History, 1625-42,' *History*, XLIV (1959), pp. 228-240.

Aylmer, G. E., *The King's Servants: The Civil Service of Charles I, 1625-1642* (London, 1974)

Bailey, Amanda, 'Livery and Its Discontents: "Braving It" in "The Taming of the Shrew"', *Renaissance Drama*, 33 (2004), pp. 87-135.

Baldwin, David, *Henry VIII's Last Love: The Extraordinary Life of Katherine Willoughby, Lady-in-Waiting to the Tudors* (Gloucestershire, 2015)

Barclay, Katie, 'Family and household', in Broomhall, Susan (ed.) *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* (Abingdon, 2017), pp. 244-247.

Barclay, Katie, 'State of the Field: The History of Emotions', *History*, 106, 371 (2021), pp. 456-466.

Baron, Helen, 'Mary (Howard) Fitzroy's Hand in the Devonshire Manuscript', *The Review of English Studies*, 45:179 (1994), pp. 318-335.

- Bean, J. M. W., *From Lord to Patron: Lordship in late medieval England* (Manchester, 1989)
- Beem, Charles, *Queenship in Early Modern Europe* (New York, 2019).
- Beer, Barrett L., 'A Note on Catherine Parr's Almoner', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 25, 4 (1962), pp. 347-348.
- Beer, Michelle, 'A queenly affinity? Catherine of Aragon's estates and Henry VIII's Great Matter', *Historical Research*, 91:253 (2018), pp. 426-445.
- Beer, Michelle, *Queenship at the Renaissance Courts of Britain: Catherine of Aragon and Margaret Tudor, 1503-1533* (Suffolk, 2018)
- Behrens, Betty, 'The Office of the English Resident Ambassador: Its Evolution as Illustrated by the Career of Sir Thomas Spinelly, 1509-22', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 16, 1933 (2009), pp. 161-195.
- Bellamy, John, *The Tudor Law of Treason: An Introduction* (London, 1979)
- Bernard, G. W., 'Anne Boleyn's religion', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), pp. 1-20.
- Bernard, G. W., *Anne Boleyn: Fatal Attractions* (London, 2010)
- Bernard, G. W., 'Politics and Government in Tudor England', *The Historical Journal*, 31:1 (1988), pp. 159-182.
- Bernard, G. W., *Power and Politics in Tudor England* (Aldershot, 2000)
- Bernard, G. W., 'The rise of Sir William Compton, early Tudor courtier', *English Historical Review*, 96, 381 (1981), pp. 754-777.
- Bernard, G. W., 'The Tudor nobility in perspective', in Bernard (ed.), *The Tudor nobility* (Manchester, 1992), pp. 1-48.
- Betteridge, Thomas, and Lipscomb, Suzannah (eds), *Henry VIII and his Court: Art, Politics and Performance* (London, 2013)
- Betteridge, Thomas, and Riehl, Anna (eds), *Tudor Court Culture* (Selinsgrove, 2010)
- Block, Joseph S., *Factional Politics and the English Reformation, 1520-1540* (Suffolk, 1993)
- Bordo, Susan, *The Creation of Anne Boleyn: A New Look at England's Most Notorious Queen* (Boston, 2013)
- Borman, Tracy, *The Private Lives of the Tudors: Uncovering the Secrets of Britain's Greatest Dynasty* (New York, 2016)
- Braddick, Michael J., and Walter, John, 'Grids of Power: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Early Modern Society', in Braddick and Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern*

Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 1-42.

Braddock, Robert C., 'The Rewards of Office-holding in Tudor England', *The Journal of British Studies* (1975), pp. 29-47.

Braddock, Robert C., 'To Serve the Queen', in Hunt, Alice, and Whitelock, Anna (eds), *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010), pp. 225-238.

Brears, Peter, *All The King's Cooks: The Tudor Kitchens of King Henry VIII at Hampton Court Palace* (London, 2011)

Brooks, Christopher, *Law, Politics and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2009)

Broomhall, Susan (ed.), *Authority, Gender, and Emotions in Late Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2015)

Broomhall, Susan (ed.), *Emotions in the Household, 1200-1900* (New York, 2008)

Broomhall, Susan (ed.), *Women and Power at the French Court, 1483-1563* (Amsterdam, 2018).

Bucholz, Robert and Sainty, John, *Officials of the Royal Household 1660-1837: Department of the Lord Chamberlain and Associated Offices, Office Holders in Modern Britain*, 11 (London, 1997)

Bucholz, Robert, 'The Database of Court Officers', *Court Historian*, 3, 2 (1998), pp. 22-28.

Burnett, Mark Thornton, *Masters and Servants in English Renaissance Drama and Culture: Authority and Obedience* (New York, 1997)

Capp, Bernard, *When Gossips Meet: Women, Family and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2003)

Carlton, Charles (ed.), *State, Sovereigns & Society in Early Modern England* (Gloucestershire, 1998)

Cavill, Paul, 'Perjury in Early Tudor England', *Studies in Church History*, 56 (2020), pp. 182-209.

Cervone, Thea, *Sworn Bond in Tudor England: Oaths, Vows and Covenants in Civil Life and Literature* (London, 2011)

Childe-Pemberton, William S., *Elizabeth Blount and Henry the Eighth, with some account of her surroundings* (London, 1913)

Chrimes, S. B., *An Introduction to the Administrative History of Mediaeval England* (Oxford, 1952)

Clark, Nicola, *Gender, Family and Politics: The Howard Women, 1485-1558* (Oxford, 2018)

Cooper, J. P. D., *Propaganda and the Tudor State: Political Culture in the Westcountry* (Oxford, 2003)

Coss, Peter, 'An age of deference', in Rosemary Horrox and W. Mark Ormrod (eds), *A Social History of England, 1200-1500* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 31-72.

Crawford, A., 'The King's Burden? The Consequences of Royal Marriage in Fifteenth-Century England', in Griffiths, R. A. (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 33-56.

Crawford, A., 'The Piety of Late Medieval English Queens', in Barron, C., and Harper-Bill, C. (eds), *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society* (Woodbridge, 1985), pp. 48-57.

Crawford, Anne, 'The Queen's Council in the Middle Ages', *The English Historical Review*, 116, 469 (2001), pp. 1193-1211.

Cressy, David, 'Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England', *Past & Present*, 113, 1 (1986), pp. 38-69.

Cuddy, Neil, 'The Revival of the Entourage: The Bedchamber of James I, 1603-1625', in Starkey, David (ed.), *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Essex, 2002), pp. 173-225.

Darsie, Heather, *Anna, Duchess of Cleves: The King's 'Beloved Sister'* (Gloucester, 2019)

Daybell, James (ed.), *Early Modern Women's Letter Writing, 1450-1700* (Hampshire, 2001)

Daybell, James, 'Gender, Obedience, and Authority in Sixteenth-Century Women's Letters', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Spring 2010), pp. 49-67)

Daybell, James, "'I wold wyshe my doings myght be...secret": Privacy and the Social Practices of Reading Women's Letters in Sixteenth-Century England', in *Women's Letters Across Europe, 1400-1700: Form and Persuasion*, ed. by Jane Couchman and Ann Crabb (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 143-6.

Daybell, James (ed.) *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700* (Gloucestershire, 2004)

Daybell, James, *Women Letter-Writers in Tudor England* (Oxford, 2006)

Denny, Joanna, *Anne Boleyn* (London, 2008)

Denny, Joanna, *Katherine Howard: A Tudor Conspiracy* (London, 2005)

Dewhurst, Sir John, 'The Alleged Miscarriages of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn', *Medical History*, 28 (1984), pp. 49-56.

Dowling, Maria, 'A Woman's Place: Learning and the Wives of Henry VIII', *History Today*, 41, 6 (1991), pp. 38-42.

Dowling, Maria, 'Anne Boleyn and Reform', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35, 1 (1984), pp. 30-46.

Duindam, Jeroen, 'The Court as a Meeting Point: Cohesion, Competition, Control', in Berkel, Maaïke Van, and Duindam, Jeroen (eds), *Prince, Pen, and Sword: Eurasian Perspectives* (Boston, 2018), pp. 32-128.

Duindam, Jeroen, *Myths of Power: Norbert Alias and the Early Modern European Court* (Amsterdam, 1994)

Dutton, Ralph, *English Court Life: From Henry VII to George II* (London, 1963)

Dunn, Caroline, 'All the Queen's Ladies? Philippa of Hainault's Female Attendants', *Medieval Prosopography*, 31 (2016), pp. 173-208.

Eales, J., *Women in Early Modern England 1500-1700* (London, 1998)

Earenfight, Theresa, 'A Lifetime of Power: Beyond Binaries of Gender', in Heather J. Tanner (ed.), *Medieval Elite Women and the Exercise of Power, 1100-1400: Moving beyond the Exceptionalist Debate* (Cham, 2019), pp. 271-294.

Earenfight, Theresa, *Queenship in Medieval Europe* (New York, 2013)

Earenfight, Theresa (ed.), *Royal and Elite Households in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: More than Just a Castle* (Leiden, 2018)

Earenfight, Theresa, 'Without the Persona of the Prince: Kings, Queens and the Idea of Monarchy in Late Medieval Europe', *Gender & History*, 19, 1 (2007), pp. 1-21.

Einstein, Lewis, *Tudor Ideals* (New York, 1921)

Elias, Norbert, *The Court Society*, ed. and trans. by Jephcott, Edmund (Oxford, 1983)

Emerson, Kathy Lynn, *Wives and Daughters: Women in Sixteenth Century England* (New York, 1984)

Elston, Timothy G., 'Widow Princess or Neglected Queen? Catherine of Aragon, Henry VIII and English Public Opinion 1533-1536', in *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. by Carole Levin and Robert O. Bucholz (Lincoln, 2009), pp. 16-30.

Elton, G. R., *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 1953)

Elton, G. R., 'Tudor Government: The Points of Contact. I. Parliament', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 24 (1974), pp. 188-200.

Elton, G. R., 'Tudor Government: The Points of Contact. II. The Council', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 25 (1975), pp. 195-211.

Elton, G. R., 'Tudor Government: The Points of Contact. III. The Court', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976), pp. 211-228.

Evans, Mel, 'The vsuall speach of the Court'? Investigating language change in the Tudor family network (1544–1556)', *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 1, 2 (2015), pp. 153-188 (pp. 177-180).

Evans, Victoria Sylvia, *Ladies-in-Waiting: Women who served at the Tudor Court* (London, 2014)

Everett, Michael, *The Rise of Thomas Cromwell: Power and Politics in the Reign of Henry VIII, 1485-1534* (London, 2015)

Facinger, Marion, 'A Study of Medieval Queenship: Capetian France, 987–1237', *Nebraska Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 5 (1968), pp. 1-48.

Flather, A.J., *Gender and Space in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 2006)

Flather, A. J., 'Space, place and gender: the sexual and spatial division of labour in the early modern household', *History and Theory*, 52, 3 (2013), pp. 344-60.

Fletcher, Anthony, *Gender, Sex & Subordination in England 1500–1800* (New Haven, 1995)

Fox, Julia, *Jane Boleyn: The Infamous Lady Rochford* (London, 2009)

Fraser, Antonia, *The Six Wives of Henry VIII* (London, 2002)

Freeman, Thomas S., 'One Survived: The Account of Katherine Parr in Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'', in Betteridge, Thomas and Lipscomb, Suzannah (eds), *Henry VIII and his Court: Art, Politics and Performance* (London, 2013), pp. 235-252.

Freeman, Thomas S., 'Research, rumour and propaganda: Anne Boleyn in Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'', *The Historical Journal*, 38, 4 (1995), pp. 797-819.

Gaude-Ferragu, Murielle, *Queenship in Medieval France, 1300-1500*, trans. by Angela Krieger (New York, 2016)

Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973)

Given-Wilson, Christopher, 'The Merger of Edward III's and Queen Philippa's Households, 1360-9', *Historical Research*, 51, 124 (1978), pp. 183-187.

Given-Wilson, Christopher, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England, 1360-1413* (New Haven, 1986)

Goodman, Anthony, *The New Monarchy: England, 1471-1534* (Oxford, 1989)

Gowing, Laura, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford, 1996)

Gowing, Laura, 'The Politics of Women's Friendship in Early Modern England', in Gowing, Laura, Hunter, Michael, and Rubin, Miri (eds), *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe, 1300-1800* (Basingstoke, 2005), pp. 131-149.

Graves, Michael A. R., *Henry VIII: A Study in Kingship* (Harlow, 2003)

Gray, Jonathan Michael, *Oaths and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2012)

Griffiths, R. A. (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981)

Grummitt, David, 'Henry VII, Chamber Finance and the 'New Monarchy': some new Evidence, *Historical Research*, LXXII, 179 (1999), pp. 229-243.

Grummitt, David, 'Household, politics and political morality in the reign of Henry VII', *Historical Research*, 82, 217 (2009), pp. 393-411.

Gunn, S. J., 'Chivalry and the politics of the early Tudor court', in Anglo, Sydney (ed.), *Chivalry in the Renaissance* (Woodbridge, 1990), pp.107-28.

Gunn, S. J., *Early Tudor Government, 1485-1558* (Hampshire, 1995)

Gunn, Steven, *Henry VII's New Men and the Making of Tudor England* (Oxford, 2016)

Gunn, Steven, and Janse, Antheun (eds), *The Court as a Stage: England and the Low Countries in the Late Middle Ages* (Suffolk, 2006)

Gunn, Steven, 'The Courtiers of Henry VII', *English Historical Review*, 108 (1993), pp. 23-49.

Gunn, Steven, 'The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5 (1995), pp. 59-90.

Guth, D. J., and McKenna, J. W. (eds), *Tudor Rule and Revolution* (Cambridge, 1982)

Guy, John (ed.), *The Tudor Monarchy* (London, 1997)

Gwyn, Peter, *The King's Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey* (1990)

Haigh, Christopher, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, 1993)

Hamilton, Dakota, 'The Learned Councils of the Tudor Queens Consort', in Carlton, Charles (ed.), *State, Sovereigns & Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of A. J. Slavin* (Gloucestershire, 1998), pp. 87-102.

Hanawalt, Barbara A., 'Lady Honor Lisle's Networks of Influence', in Erler, Mary C., and Kowaleski, Maryanne (eds), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens, 1988), pp. 188-212.

Harkrider, Melissa Franklin, *Women, Reform and Community in Early Modern England: Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk, and Lincolnshire's Godly Aristocracy, 1519–1580* (Rochester, 2008)

Harris, Barbara J., *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers* (Oxford, 2002)

Harris, Barbara J., 'Property, Power and Personal Relations: Elite Mothers and Sons in Yorkist and Early Tudor England', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 15, 3 (1990), pp. 606-632.

Harris, Barbara J., 'The View from My Lady's Chamber: New Perspectives on the Early Tudor Monarchy', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 60, 3 (1997), pp. 215-247.

Harris, Barbara J., 'Women and Politics in Early Tudor England', *The Historical Journal*, 33:2 (1990), pp.259-281.

Harris, William O., 'Wolsey and Skelton's "Magnyfycence": A Re-Evaluation', *Studies in Philology*, 57:2 (1960), pp. 99-122.

Haugaard, William P., 'Katherine Parr: The Religious Convictions of a Renaissance Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 22:4 (1969), pp. 346-359.

Hayward, Maria, *Dress at the Court of Henry VIII* (Abington, 2007)

Hayward, Maria, 'Gift-Giving at the Court of Henry VIII: The 1539 New Year's Gift Roll in Context', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 85 (2005), pp.125-75.

Hayward, Maria, *Rich Apparel: Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII's England* (Aldershot, 2009)

Head, David, "'Beyng Ledde and Seduced by the Devyll" The Attainder of Lord Thomas Howard and the Tudor Law of Treason', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 13:4 (1982), pp. 3-16.

Heal, Felicity, 'Food Gifts, the Household and the Politics of Exchange in Early Modern England', *Past & Present*, 199 (2008), pp.41-70

Heal, Felicity, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990)

Heal, Felicity, *The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2014)

Heale, Elizabeth, 'Women and the Courtly Love Lyric: The Devonshire MS (BL Additional 17492)', *The Modern Language Review*, 90:2 (1995), pp. 296-313.

Hefferan, Matthew 'Family, Loyalty and the Royal Household in Fourteenth-Century England', in Green, D., and Given-Wilson, C. (eds), *Fourteenth Century England*, XI, pp. 129-154.

Hefferan, Matthew, and Ward, Matthew (eds), *Loyalty to the Monarchy in Late Medieval and Early Modern Britain, c.1400-1688* (London, 2020)

Hibbard, Caroline, 'The role of a Queen Consort: the Household and Court of Henrietta Maria 1625-1642' in Asch, Ronald G. and Birke, Adophe M. (eds), *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c.1450-1650* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 393-414.

Hicks, Michael, *Bastard Feudalism* (London, 1995)

Hill, Mary C., *The King's Messengers, 1199-1377: A Contribution to the History of the Royal Household* (London, 1961)

Hilton, Lisa, *Queens Consort: England's Medieval Queens* (London, 2008)

Hoak, Dale, 'The Secret History of the Tudor Court: The King's Coffers and the King's Purse, 1542-1553', *Journal of British Studies*, 26, 2 (1987), pp. 208-231.

Hogrefe, Pearl, *Tudor Women: Commoners and Queens* (Iowa, 1975)

Horrox, Rosemary, and Ormrod, W. Mark (eds), *A Social History of England, 1200-1500* (Cambridge, 2006)

Horrox, Rosemary, *Richard III: A Study of Service* (Cambridge, 1989)

Howell, Margaret, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1998)

Howell, Margaret, 'The Resources of Eleanor of Provence as Queen Consort', *The English Historical Review*, 103:403 (1987), pp. 372-393.

Hufton, Olwen, 'Reflections on the Role of Women in the Early Modern Court', *The Court Historian*, 5:1 (2000), pp.1-13.

Hull, Suzanne W., *Women According to Men: The World of Tudor-Stuart Women* (London, 1996)

Hume, Martin, *The Wives of Henry the Eighth, and the Parts they Played in History* (London, 1905)

Hunt, Alice, and Whitelock, Anna (eds), *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (Hampshire, 2010)

Huneycutt, L. L., 'Medieval Queenship', *History Today*, 39 (1989)

Hutchinson, Robert, *House of Treason: The Rise and Fall of a Tudor Dynasty* (London, 2009)

Hutchinson Robert, *The Last Days of Henry VIII: Conspiracy, Treason and Heresy at the Court of a Dying Tyrant* (London, 2009)

Irish, Bradley J., *Emotion in the Tudor Court: Literature, History and Early Modern Feeling* (Evanston, 2018)

Irish, Bradley J., 'Gender and Politics in the Henrician Court: The Douglas-Howard Lyrics in the Devonshire Manuscript (BL Add 17492)', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 64:1 (2011), pp. 79-114.

Irish, Bradley J., "The Secret Chamber and Other Suspect Places": Materiality, Space, and the Fall of Catherine Howard, *Early Modern Women*, 4 (2009), pp.169-173.

Ives, E. W., 'Anne Boleyn and the Early Reformation in England: The Contemporary Evidence', *The Historical Journal*, 37:2 (1994), pp.389-400.

Ives, E. W., 'Court and County Palatine in the Reign of Henry VIII: The Career of William Brereton of Malpas', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 123 (1971), pp. 1-38.

Ives, E. W., *Lady Jane Grey: A Tudor Mystery* (Oxford, 2011)

Ives, E. W., 'Patronage at the Court of Henry VIII: The Case of Sir Ralph Egerton of Ridley', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 52 (1969-70), pp. 346-74.

Ives, E. W., 'The Fall of Anne Boleyn Reconsidered', *English Historical Review*, CVII (1992), pp. 651-664.

Ives, E. W., *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: 'The Most Happy'* (Oxford, 2004)

Ives, E. W., *Faction in Tudor England*, 2nd edition. (London, 1986)

James, Mervyn, 'English politics and the concept of honour, 1485-1642', *Past & Present Supplement*, 3 (1978), pp. 43-63.

James, Susan, *Catherine Parr: Henry VIII's Last Love* (Gloucestershire, 2008)

Jansen, Sharon L., *Dangerous Talk and Strange Behavior: Women and Popular Resistance to the Reforms of Henry VIII* (Basingstoke, 1996)

Johnston, Hope, 'How the Livre de la cité des dames first came to be printed in England', in Dulac, Liliane, Paupert, Anne, Reno, Christine and Ribémont, Bernard (eds), *Desireuse de plus avant enquerre* (Paris, 2008), pp. 385-96.

Johnstone, Hilda, 'The Queen's Household', in Tout, T. F., *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*, 6 vols. (Manchester, 1920-33), vol. 5, pp. 231-289.

Johnstone, Hilda, 'The Queen's Household', in Willard, J. F., and Morris, W. A. (eds.), *The English Government at Work 1327-1336*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1940), vol. 1, pp. 250-298.

Jones, Paul V. B., *The Household of a Tudor Nobleman* (London, 1970)

- Kelso, Ruth, *Doctrine for a Lady of the Renaissance* (Chicago, 1956)
- Kettering, Sharon, 'The Household Service of Early Modern French Noblewomen', *French Historical Studies*, 20:1 (1997), pp. 55-85.
- Kettering, Sharon, 'The Patronage Power of Early Modern French Noblewomen', *The Historical Journal*, 32:4 (1989), pp. 817-841.
- Kisby, Fiona, 'The Early Tudor Royal Household Chapel: Function, Organisation and Personnel', *The Court Historian*, 2:1 (1997), pp. 8-13.
- Kisby, Fiona, 'Officers and Office-Holding at the English Court: A Study of the Chapel Royal, 1485-1547', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 32 (1999), pp.1-61.
- Kisby, Fiona, 'Kingship and The Royal Itinerary', *The Court Historian*, 4:1 (1999), pp.29-39.
- Kisby, Fiona, "'When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547', *Journal of British Studies*, 40:1 (2001), pp.44-75.
- Kleinman, Ruth, 'Social Dynamics at the French Court: The Household of Anne of Austria', *French Historical Studies*, 16:3 (1990), pp. 517-535.
- Kolk, Caroline Zum. 'The Household of the Queen of France in the Sixteenth Century', *The Court Historian*, The Society for Court Studies, 2009, 14:1, pp. 3-22.
- Krieken, Robert Van, 'Norbert Elias and Emotions in History', in David Lemmings and Ann Brooks (eds), *Emotions and Social Change: Historical and Sociological Perspectives* (New York, 2014), pp. 19-42.
- Kujawa-Holbrook, Sheryl A., 'Katherine Parr and Reformed Religion', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 72:1 (2003), pp. 55-78.
- Kussmaul, Ann, *Servants in husbandry in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1981)
- Sharon Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers, and Clients in Seventeenth-Century France* (Oxford, 1986)
- Lambe, Simon, "'Towards God religious, towards us most faithful': The Paulet Family, the Somerset Gentry and the Early Tudor Monarchy, 1485– 1547' in *Loyalty to the Monarchy in Late Medieval and Early Modern Britain, C. 1400-1688*, ed. by Matthew Ward and Matthew Hefferan, pp. 85-106.
- Laurence, Anne, *Women in England, 1500-1760: A Social History* (London, 1996)
- Laynesmith, J. L., *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445–1503* (Oxford, 2004)
- Lehmberg, Stanford E., *The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)

Levine, Mortimer, 'The Place of Women in Tudor Government', in Guth, Delloyd J., and McKenna, John (eds), *Tudor Rule and Tudor Revolution, Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends* (Cambridge, 1982) pp. 109-123.

Levine, Mortimer, *Tudor Dynastic Problems: 1460-1571* (London, 1973)

License, Amy, *Elizabeth of York: Forgotten Tudor Queen* (Gloucestershire, 2014)

Loach, Jennifer, 'The Function of Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII', *Past & Present*, 142 (1994), pp. 43-68.

Loades, David, *Catherine Howard: The adulterous wife of Henry VIII* (Gloucestershire, 2012)

Loades, David, *Elizabeth I* (London, 2003)

Loades, David, *Intrigue and Treason: The Tudor Court 1547-1558* (Harlow, 2004)

Loades, David, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford, 1989)

Loades, David, *Power in Tudor England* (Hampshire, 1997)

Loades, David, *The Six Wives of Henry VIII* (Gloucestershire, 2010)

Loades, David, *The Tudor Court* (London, 1992)

Loades, David, *Tudor Queens of England* (London, 2009)

Longfellow, Erica, 'Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45, 2 (2006), pp. 313-334.

MacCaffrey, Wallace, 'Place and Patronage in Elizabethan Politics', in Bindoff, S. T. et al. (eds.), *Elizabethan Government and Society* (London, 1961), pp. 108-9.

Malcolmson, Cristina, 'Christine de Pizan's *City of Ladies* in Early Modern England', in Malcolmson, Cristina and Mihoko, Suzuki (eds), *Debating Gender in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (New York, 2002), pp. 15-36.

Mann, Catherine, '"Whether your Ladiship will or ne": Displeasure, Duty and Devotion in *The Lisle Letters*', in Broomhall, Susan (ed.) *Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction* (Abingdon, 2017), pp. 119-134.

Martienssen, Anthony, *Queen Katherine Parr* (London, 1975)

Mattingly, Garrett, *Catherine of Aragon* (London, 1961)

McFarlane, K. B., 'Bastard Feudalism', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 20, 61 (1945), pp. 161-80.

McFarlane, K. B., *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (Oxford, 1973)

McIntosh, J. L., *From Heads of Household to Heads of State: The Preaccession Households of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, 1516-1558* (New York, 2009)

McIntosh, Marjorie K., The Benefits and Drawbacks of Femme Sole Status in England, 1300–1630, *The Journal of British Studies*, 44:3 (2005), pp.410-438.

McKelvie, Gordon, *Bastard Feudalism, English Society and the Law: The Statutes of Livery, 1390-1520* (Suffolk, 2020)

Mears, Natalie, 'Courts, Courtiers, and Culture in Tudor England', *Historical Journal*, 46 (2003), pp. 703-722.

Mears, Natalie, 'Politics in the Elizabethan Privy Chamber: Lady Mary Sidney and Kat Ashley', in Daybell, James (ed.), *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700* (Hampshire, 2004), pp. 67-82.

Mears, Natalie, *Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms* (Cambridge, 2005)

Mendelson, Sara and Crawford, Patricia, *Women in Early Modern England, 1550-1720* (Oxford, 2003)

Mertes, Kate, *The English Noble Household, 1250-1600: Good Governance and Politic Rule* (Oxford, 1988)

Merton, Charlotte, 'Women, Friendship and Memory', in Hunt, Alice, and Whitelock, Anna (eds), *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010), pp. 239-250.

Miller, Helen, *Henry VIII and the English Nobility* (Oxford, 1986)

Miller, Helen, 'Subsidy Assessments of the Peerage in the Sixteenth Century', *Historical Research*, 28:77 (1955), pp.15-34.

Morgan, Hollie L. S., *Beds and Chambers in Late Medieval England: Readings, Representations and Realities* (York, 2017)

Murphy, John, 'The illusion of decline: the Privy Chamber, 1547-1558' in Starkey, David (ed.), *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Essex, 2002), pp.119-146.

Murray, Molly, 'The Prisoner, the Lover, and the Poet: The Devonshire Manuscript and Early Tudor Carcerality', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 35:1 (2012), pp. 17-41.

Myers, A. R., *Crown, Household and Parliament in Fifteenth-Century England* (London, 1985)

Norton, Elizabeth, *Anne Boleyn: Henry VIII's Obsession* (Gloucestershire, 2009)

Norton, Elizabeth, *Anne of Cleves: Henry VIII's Discarded Bride* (Gloucestershire, 2009)

- Norton, Elizabeth, *Bessie Blount: Mistress to Henry VIII* (Gloucestershire, 2011)
- Norton, Elizabeth, *Catherine Parr* (Gloucestershire, 2010)
- Norton, Elizabeth, *Jane Seymour: Henry VIII's True Love* (Gloucestershire, 2009)
- Olson, Rebecca, 'Margaret Beaufort, Royal Tapestries, and Confinement at the Tudor Court', *Textile History*, 48, 2, pp. 233-247.
- Parsons, J. C., *Medieval Queenship* (New York, 1998)
- Paul, John E., *Catherine of Aragon and Her Friends* (London, 1966)
- Perry, Curtis, 'The Politics of Access and Representations of the Sodomite King in Early Modern England', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53, 4 (2000), pp. 1054-1083.
- Plakans, Andrejs and Wetherell, Charles, 'Households and Kinship Networks: The Costs and Benefits of Contextualization', *Continuity and Change*, 18, 1 (2003), pp. 49-76.
- Plowden, Alison, *Tudor Women: Queens and Commoners* (New York, 2003)
- Pollock, Linda, '“Teach her to live under obedience”: the making of women in the upper ranks of early modern England', *Continuity and Change*, 4:2 (1989), pp.231-258.
- Porter, Linda, *Mary Tudor: The First Queen* (London, 2007)
- Reddy, William, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the history of emotions* (Cambridge, 2001)
- Richardson, Amanda, 'Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces c. 1160—c. 1547: A Study in Access Analysis and Imagery', *Medieval Archaeology*, 47, 1 (2003), pp. 131-165.
- Richardson, Glenn, 'Hunting at the Courts of Francis I and Henry VIII', *The Court Historian*, 18, 2 (2014), pp. 127-141.
- Richardson, Glenn, '“Most Highly To Be Regarded”: The Privy Chamber of Henry VIII and Anglo-French Relations, 1515–1520', *The Court Historian*, 4, 2, pp. 119-140.
- Richardson, Glenn, *The Field of Cloth of Gold* (New Haven, 2013).
- Richardson, Glenn, *Renaissance Monarchy: The Reigns of Henry VIII, Francis I and Charles V* (London 2002)
- Richardson, R. C., *Household Servants in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2010)
- Richardson, W. C., *Tudor Chamber Administration, 1485-1547* (Louisiana, 1952)
- Rivlin, Elizabeth, 'Service and Servants in Early Modern English Culture to 1660', *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, 4 (2015), pp. 17-41.

Rosenwein, Barbara H., 'Worrying about Emotions in History', *American Historical Review*, 107, 3 (2002) pp. 821-45.

Rosenwein, Barbara H., *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 2011)

Russell, Joycelyne G., *Field of Cloth of Gold: Men and Manners in 1520* (London, 1969)

Samson, Alexander, *Mary and Philip: The marriage of Tudor England and Habsburg Spain* (Manchester, 2020)

Samson, Alexander, 'Power Sharing: The Co-monarchy of Philip and Mary', in Hunt, Alice, and Whitelock, Anna (eds), *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010), pp. 159-172.

Saaler, Mary, *Anne of Cleves: Fourth Wife of Henry VIII* (London, 1995)

Sangha, Laura, and Willis, Jonathan (eds), *Understanding Early-Modern Primary Sources* (London, 2016)

Scarisbrick, J. J., *Henry VIII* (Middlesex, 1972)

Scott, Joan, 'Gender: a Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *Gender and History*, 91:5 (1986), pp. 1053-1105.

Scott, Joan W., *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1988)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven, 2009)

Shirley, Christopher, 'The Devonshire Manuscript: Reading Gender in the Henrician Court', *English Literary Renaissance*, 45:1 (2015), pp. 32-59.

Sil, Narasingha Prosad, 'Sir Anthony Denny: A Tudor Servant in Office', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 8, 3 (1984), pp. 190-201.

Sil, Narasingha Prosad, 'Sir William Herbert in Tudor Politics, 1547—53', *Biography*, 5, 4, (1982), pp. 297-318.

Sil, Narasingha Prosad, 'The Rise and Fall of Sir John Gates', *Historical Journal*, 24, 4 (1981), pp. 929-43.

Sil, Narasingha Prosad, *Tudor Placemen and Statesmen: Select Case Studies* (New Jersey, 2001)

Sim, Alison, *Masters and Servants in Tudor England* (Gloucestershire, 2006)

Skidmore, Chris, *Edward VI: The Lost King of England* (London, 2007)

- Slavin, Arthur Joseph, *Politics and Profit: A Study of Sir Ralph Sadler, 1507-1547* (Cambridge, 1966)
- Slavin, A. J., 'On Henrician Politics: Games and Daramas, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 60:3, The Remapping of English Political History, 1500-1640 (1997), pp.249-271.
- Smith, Hannah, 'Court Studies and the Courts of Early Modern Europe', *The Historical Journal*, 49, 4 (2006), pp. 1229-1238.
- Smith, Lacey Baldwin, *A Tudor Tragedy: The Life and Times of Catherine Howard* (London: 1962)
- Smith, Lacey Baldwin, 'English Treason Trials and Confessions in the Sixteenth Century', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 15:4 (1954), pp.471-498.
- Smith, Lacey Baldwin, *Henry VIII: The Mask of Royalty* (Chicago, 2005)
- St. John, Lisa Benz, *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England* (New York, 2012)
- Somerset, Anne, *Ladies-in-Waiting: From the Tudors to the Present Day* (London, 2005)
- Southall, Raymond, 'The Devonshire Manuscript Collection of Early Tudor Poetry, 1532-41', *The Review of English Studies*, 15:58 (1964), pp. 142-150.
- Spain, Daphne, 'Gendered Spaces and Women's Status', *Sociological Theory*, 11, 2 (1993), 137-51.
- Starkey, David, 'Court and government', in Guy, John (ed.), *The Tudor Monarchy* (London, 1997), pp. 189-212.
- Starkey, David, 'Court and Government', in Christopher Coleman and David Starkey (eds), *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 29-58.
- Starkey, David (ed.), *Henry VIII: A European Court in England* (London, 1991)
- Starkey, David, 'Representation through intimacy: A study in the symbolism of monarchy and Court office in early modern England', in Guy, John (ed.), *The Tudor Monarchy* (London, 1997), pp. 42-77.
- Starkey, David, 'The age of the household: politics, society and the arts c. 1350- c. 1550', in Medcalf, Stephen (ed.), *The Later Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 225-290.
- Starkey, David, 'The Court: Castiglione's Ideal and Tudor Reality; Being a Discussion of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Satire Addressed to Sir Francis Bryan', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 45 (1982), pp. 232-239.
- Starkey, David (ed.), *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Essex, 2002)

- Starkey, David, *Six Wives: The Queens of Henry VIII* (London, 2004)
- Starkey, David, *The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics* (London, 1986)
- Streitberger, W. R., *Court Revels, 1485-1559* (Toronto, 1994)
- Strickland, Agnes, *Lives of the Queens of England*, 12 vols. (Boston, 1894)
- Strunck, Christina, 'The 'two bodies' of the female sovereign: Awkward hierarchies in images of Empress Maria Theresia, Catherine the Great of Russia and their male consorts', in Watanbe-O'Kelly, Helen, and Morton, Adam (eds), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500-1800* (New York, 2017), pp. 64-83.
- Swensen, Patricia C., 'Patronage from the Privy Chamber: Sir Anthony Denny and Religious Reform', *Journal of British Studies*, 27, 1 (1988), pp. 25-44.
- Tarbin, Stephanie, 'Raising Girls and Boys: Fear, Awe, and Dread in the Early Modern Household' in Broomhall, Susan (ed.), *Authority, Gender, and Emotions in Late Medieval and Early Modern England* (New York, 2015), pp. 106-130.
- Thomson, A. T., *Memoirs of the Court of Henry the Eighth*, 2 vols. (London, 1826)
- Thorstad, Audrey M., *The Culture of Castles in Tudor England and Wales* (Suffolk, 2019)
- Thurley, Simon, 'Henry VIII and the Building of Hampton Court: A Reconstruction of the Tudor Palace', *Architectural History*, 31 (1988), pp. 1-57.
- Thurley, Simon, *Houses of Power: The Places That Shaped the Tudor World* (London, 2017)
- Thurley, Simon, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (London, 1993)
- Tout, T. F., *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*, 6 vols. (Manchester, 1920-33)
- Tree, Herbert Beerbohm, *Henry VIII and his Court* (London, 1910)
- Tremlett, Giles, *Catherine of Aragon: Henry's Spanish Queen* (London, 2010)
- Turner, J. H., and Stets, E., *The Sociology of Emotions* (Cambridge, 2005)
- Tytler, Sarah, *Tudor Queens and Princesses* (London, 1896)
- Vale, Malcolm, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe* (Oxford, 2001)
- Walker, Greg, *John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s* (Cambridge, 1988)

- Walker, Greg, *Persuasive Fictions: Faction, Faith and Political Culture in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot, 1996)
- Walker, Greg, 'Rethinking the Fall of Anne Boleyn', *The Historical Journal*, 45, 1 (2002), pp. 1-29.
- Walker, Greg, 'The 'Expulsion of the Minions' of 1519 Reconsidered', *The Historical Journal*, 32, 1 (1989), pp.1-16.
- Warnicke, Retha M., 'Anne Boleyn's Childhood and Adolescence', *The Historical Journal*, 28, 4 (1985), pp. 939-952.
- Warnicke, Retha M., *Elizabeth of York and Her Six Daughters-in-Law, Fashioning Tudor Queenship, 1485–1547* (London, 2017)
- Warnicke, Retha M., 'Queenship: Politics and Gender in Tudor England', *History Compass*, 4:2 (2006), pp. 203-227.
- Warnicke, Retha M., 'Sexual Heresy at the Court of Henry VIII', *The Historical Journal*, 30:2 (1987), pp.247-268.
- Warnicke, Retha M., 'The Eternal Triangle and Court Politics: Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, and Sir Thomas Wyatt', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 18, 4 (1986), pp. 565-579.
- Warnicke, Retha M., 'The Fall of Anne Boleyn Revisited', *English Historical Review*, CVIII (1993), pp.653-665.
- Warnicke, Retha M., *The Marrying of Anne of Cleves: Royal Protocol in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000)
- Warnicke, Retha M. *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn: Family politics at the court of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 2000)
- Watkins, Sarah-Beth, *Anne of Cleves: Henry VIII's Unwanted Wife* (Winchester, 2018)
- Weir, Alison, *Elizabeth of York: The First Tudor Queen* (London, 2014)
- Weir, Alison, *Henry VIII: King and Court* (London, 2008)
- Weir, Alison, *Mary Boleyn: 'The Great and Infamous Whore'* (London, 2011)
- Wellman, Barry and Wetherell, Charles, 'Social Network Analysis of Historical Communities: Some Questions from the Present for the Past', *History of the Family*, 1, 1 (1996), pp. 97-121.
- Wheeler, Elisabeth, *Men of Power: Court Intrigue in the Life of Catherine Howard* (Glastonbury, 2009)

- Whitelock, Anna, and MacCulloch, Diarmaid, 'Princess Mary's Household and the Succession Crisis, July 1553', *The Historical Journal*, 50, 2 (2007), pp. 265-287.
- Willard, J. F., and Morris, W. A. (eds.), *The English Government at Work 1327-1336*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1940)
- Williams, James, 'Hunting and the Royal Image of Henry VIII', *Sport in History*, 25, 1 (2005), pp. 41-59.
- Wilson, Derek, *In the Lion's Court: Power, Ambition and Sudden Death in the Reign of Henry VIII* (London, 2002)
- Wooding, Lucy, *Henry VIII*, 2nd edition (Oxford, 2015)
- Woolgar, C. M., 'Households of Late Medieval Queens of England', in Woolgar, C. M., *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, 2006), pp. 222-247.
- Woolgar, C. M., *The Great Household in Late Medieval England* (London, 1999)
- Woolgar, C. M., *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, 2006)
- Wright, Pam, 'A Change in Direction: the Ramifications of a Female Household, 1558-1603' in Starkey, David (ed.), *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Essex, 2002), pp. 147-72.
- Zagorin, Perez, 'Sir Thomas Wyatt and the court of Henry VIII: the courtier's ambivalence', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 23 (1993), pp. 113-141.

Unpublished theses

- Bacon, Cheryl B., 'Influence, Image and Intimacy: Gift-Giving in Tudor England', (College of William and Mary, Virginia, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1987)
- Beer, Michelle, 'Practices and Performances of Queenship: Catherine of Aragon and Margaret Tudor, 1503-1533 (University of Illinois, Unpublished Ph.D thesis, 2014)
- Bowles, Carol De Witte, *Women of the Tudor Court, 1501-1568* (Portland State University, Unpublished MA thesis, 1989)
- Braddock, Robert Cook, 'The Royal Household, 1540-1560: A Study of Officeholding in Tudor England' (Northwestern University, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1971)
- Brock, Richard Egbert, 'The Courtier in Early Tudor Society, Illustrated from Selected Examples' (University of London, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1963)
- Bryson, Alan, '"The Speciall Men In Every Shere', The Edwardian Regime, 1547-1553' (University of St. Andrews, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2001)

Bundesen, Kristin, “‘No other faction but my own’: Dynastic Politics and Elizabeth I’s Carey Cousins’ (University of Nottingham, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2008)

Carter, Heather Lindsay, ‘Power Strategies and Negotiations: English Queenship from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Centuries (California State University, Unpublished MA thesis, 2006)

Chamberlayne, Joanna L., ‘English Queenship, 1445-1503’ (University of York, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1999)

Clark, Nicola, ‘Dynastic Politics: Five Women of the Howard Family During the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547’ (Royal Holloway, University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 2013)

Clark, Nicola, ‘Richly Beseen: Women at the Court of Henry VII’ (Royal Holloway, University of London, Unpublished MA thesis, 2008)

Cole, Emily V., ‘The State Apartment in the Jacobean Country House, 1603-1625’, (University of Sussex, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2010)

Culling, Elizabeth Ann, ‘The Impact of the Reformation on the Tudor Royal Household to 1553’ (University of Durham, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1986)

Dowling, Maria, ‘Scholarship, Politics and the Court of Henry VIII’ (University of London, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1982)

Elston, Timothy G., ‘Almost the Perfect Woman: Public and Private Expectations of Catherine of Aragon, 1501-1536’ (University of Nebraska, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2004)

Given-Wilson, Chris, ‘The Court and Household of Edward III’ (University of St. Andrews, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1976)

Graham-Matheson, Helen Joanne, “‘All women in thar degree shuld to thar men subiectit be’: The controversial court career of Elisabeth Parr, marchioness of Northampton, c. 1547-1565’ (University College London, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2015)

Greig, Lorne Cameron George, ‘Court Politics and Government in England, 1509-1515’ (University of Glasgow, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1996)

Hamilton, Dakota Lee, ‘A Tudor Woman of Influence: A study of the relationship between Henry VIII’s chief minister Thomas Cromwell and Lady Lisle during the years 1533-1540’ (University of Louisville, Unpublished M.A. thesis, 1989)

Hamilton, Dakota L., ‘The Household of Queen Katherine Parr’ (University of Oxford, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1992)

Hayward, Maria, ‘The Possessions of Henry VIII: A Study of Inventories’ (London School of Economics and Political Science, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1998)

Herber, Courtney, ‘Towards Consortship: Performing Ritual, Intercession, and Networking in Tudor and Early Stuart England’ (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nebraska, 2020)

Hepburn, William Rendall, 'The household of James IV, 1488-1513' (University of Glasgow, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2013)

Hewerdine, Anita Rosamund, 'The Yeomen of the King's Guard, 1485-1547' (London School of Economics and Political Science, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1998)

Hocking, Joanne Lee, 'Aristocratic Women at the Late Elizabethan Court: Politics, Patronage and Power' (University of Adelaide, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2015)

Howey, Catherine Louise, 'Busy Bodies: Women, Power and Politics at the Court of Elizabeth I, 1558-1603' (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2007)

Irish, Bradley J., 'Powerful Feelings: Emotional Practices of the Tudor Court in Early Modern Literary Culture' (University of Texas at Austin, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2011)

Kesselring, Krista, 'To Pardon and To Punish: Mercy and Authority in Tudor England' (Queen's University, Kingston, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2000)

Kisby, Fiona, 'The Royal Household Chapel in Early-Tudor London, 1485-1547' (Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of London, 1996)

McIntosh, J. L., 'Sovereign Princesses: Mary and Elizabeth Tudor as Heads of Princely Households and the Accomplishment of the Female Succession in Tudor England, 1516-1558' (John Hopkins University, Unpublished Ph.D thesis, 2002)

Merton, Charlotte Isabelle, 'The Women Who Served Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth: Ladies, Gentlewomen and Maids of the Privy Chamber, 1553-1603' (University of Cambridge, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1990)

Mobley, Jill Perilli, 'Katharine of Aragon: Influence and Legacy of a Foreign Queen of England in the Early Sixteenth Century' (Texas A&M University-Commerce, Unpublished MSc thesis, 2015)

Mooney, Colleen Lily, 'Queenship in Fifteenth Century France' (The Ohio State University, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1977)

Mueller, Robert Joseph Jr., 'Service to the sovereign: A prosopographical study of the royal household, court and privy council of Elizabeth I of England through an examination of the careers of Sir Francis Knollys, Sir James Croft and Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford' (University of California, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1993)

Mullin, Janet Elizabeth, 'Words to Live By: Castiglione's *Il Libro Del Cortegiano* and Four Men of Henry VIII's Court' (University of New Brunswick, Unpublished MA thesis, 1984)

Neal, Derek, 'The Queen's Grace: English Queenship, 1464-1503' (McMaster University, Unpublished MA thesis, 1996)

Payne, Helen Margaret, 'Aristocratic Women and the Jacobean Court, 1603-1625' (University of London, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2001)

Robertson, Mary Louise, 'Thomas Cromwell's Servants: The Ministerial Household in Early Tudor Government and Society', (University of California, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1975)

Rowley-Williams, Jennifer Ann, 'Image and Reality: the Lives of Aristocratic Women in Early Tudor England' (University of Wales, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1998)

Russell, Gareth, 'Catherine Howard and the Queen's Household in England, 1540-1' (Queen's University, Belfast, Unpublished MA thesis, 2011).

Samman, Neil, 'The Henrician Court during Cardinal Wolsey's Ascendancy, c. 1514-1529' (University of Wales, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1988)

Schofield, Roger Snowden, 'Parliamentary lay taxation 1485-1547' (University of Cambridge, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1963)

Schultz, Earl W., 'The Lisle Letters Evaluated as a Source for Early Tudor Political and Social History' (University of Houston-Clear Lake, Unpublished MA thesis, 1991)

Sil, Narasingha Prosad, 'King's Men, Queen's Men, States men: A Study of the Careers of Sir Anthony Denny, Sir William Herbert and Sir John Gate, Gentlemen of the Tudor Privy Chamber' (University of Oregon, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1978)

Starkey, David, 'The King's Privy Chamber, 1485-1547' (University of Cambridge, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1973)

Trull, Mary, 'Public Privacies: Household Intimacy in Renaissance Genres' (University of Chicago, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2002)

Wolfson, Sara Joy, 'Aristocratic Women of the Household and Court of Queen Henrietta Maria, 1625-1659' (Duirham University, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 2010)

Zimmerman, Cassandra J., 'Elites and Patronage in Late Medieval and Early Modern England' (Western Illinois University, Unpublished MA thesis, 2013)