

PRACTICES AND PERFORMANCES OF QUEENSHIP:
CATHERINE OF ARAGON AND MARGARET TUDOR, 1503-1533

BY

MICHELLE L. BEER

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2014

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Emerita Caroline Hibbard, Chair
Associate Professor Clare Crowston
Associate Professor Derek Neal, Nipissing University
Associate Professor Carol Symes

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the reigns of two early sixteenth-century queens consort of England and Scotland, Catherine of Aragon (r. 1509-1533) and Margaret Tudor (r. 1503-1513). It examines the responsibilities, rights, duties, and actions of Catherine and Margaret within their sixteenth-century dynastic context, without a teleological focus on the controversies of their later lives. As the first wife of Henry VIII, Catherine of Aragon has often been portrayed as a pious and ultimately tragic figure whose reign has been overshadowed by her inability to bear a male heir. Margaret Tudor, Henry VIII's sister and queen of James IV, has had her reign continually cast in the shadow of her husband's tragic early death and her later disastrous career as regent of Scotland. Despite being the common subjects of popular histories, Catherine and Margaret are in fact understudied queens, neither of whom has been the subject of scholarly monographs for over fifty years. This work is the first to consider Catherine and Margaret since the emergence of a robust field of queenship studies, which has combined women's and gender history with the study of international court culture and politics.

This study argues that the particular type of female authority available to queens in monarchical, dynastic regimes must be understood by considering the practices and performances of queenship that allowed queens to accumulate the moral, political, and social capital necessary to act as the public partners of their husbands. In juxtaposing Catherine and Margaret's reigns, I show that pre-modern queenship shared common challenges, themes, and traditions across borders, while also illuminating how native traditions and personal circumstances could create opportunities and problems for individual queens not encountered by their peers.

The first two chapters of this work focus on the financial resources and material culture that formed the basis for important practices of queenship by Catherine and Margaret, including the administration of lands, extension of their presence at court through livery, and participation in gift exchanges, which established them as queens consort and enabled them to extend their patronage at their husbands' courts. I argue that the resources available to each queen were heavily dependent upon both historical traditions of queenship in England and Scotland, and on the personal circumstances of each woman at her royal court. The final four chapters then show how Catherine and Margaret accumulated social and political capital by successfully performing expected queenly virtues including magnificence, hospitality, patronage, and piety. My dissertation argues that areas traditionally considered problematic for queens—their marital relationships, their foreignness, their dependence—were in fact assets that allowed them to succeed as the public partner of the king. My work expands our understanding of queenship and reassesses the definition of a successful queen consort.

for my father

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has been many years in the making, and I have acquired too many debts, both personal and professional, for me to adequately acknowledge them all here. Nevertheless, I shall endeavor to express my gratitude to some of the many people in my life who made this dissertation possible. This project could not have been completed without the support and guidance of my advisor Professor Caroline Hibbard, to whom I owe more than I can say. Her work on queenship inspired my own interest in the reigns of Catherine and Margaret, and her support and influences can be seen on every page of this dissertation. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the members of my committee, Professors Carol Symes, Clare Crowston, and Derek Neal, whose challenging comments and probing questions broadened the scope of my thinking and writing. The tireless members of the University of Illinois Pre-modern Reading Group read many drafts of these chapters, and I am grateful for their comments and suggestions. Lastly, I would like to thank all of the members of the Illinois history department, both professors and students, who over the years have shaped me into the scholar I am today.

The research for this dissertation was made possible through the generous help of the Mellon Dissertation Research Fellowship from the Institute of Historical Research, London. More specifically, I would like to thank the members of the IHR's Tudor and Stuart History Seminar, especially Pauline Croft and Simon Healy, for welcoming me to London and providing me with academic and moral support during my time there. The excellent staffs of the National Archives, UK, the British Library, the Scottish National Library, and the Scottish National Archives were exceptionally helpful and efficient. Malcolm Underwood, archivist for St. John's College, Cambridge, was very kind to me on my visits there and provided many welcome cups of tea and a great deal of help with the St. John's college archives. I would also like to express

my thanks to Clare Gaskin and Sam and Caroline Finlayson, who opened their homes to me during my research trip in the U.K. and made my time there engaging and enjoyable.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge that a project as large as this was only possible to complete through the personal support and love from my family. My husband Michael survived many hours of dinner conversation about British queenship, and he probably knows more about British history than any other computer programmer in the country. Without his encouragement and support this dissertation would never have been possible. My parents, Pamela and Colin, always gave me their love and confidence throughout my graduate school career. Daniel and Sarah, my brother and sister, were truly great cheerleaders, and I am in awe of their own accomplishments while I finished this work. My father passed away before I could complete this dissertation, but it is his shining example of stubborn perfectionism and determination that gave me the confidence both to start and finish my PhD. His faith that all of his children could succeed at whatever we strove for made all of us the people we are today, and I hope that this dissertation will stand as a lasting testament to his memory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1 The Financial Resources of Queenship	40
CHAPTER 2 The Queen's Wardrobe: Clothing Culture and Material Connections	88
CHAPTER 3 The Material Magnificence of Queenship	126
CHAPTER 4 The Queen at Court: Hospitality, Sociability and the Queen as Audience	167
CHAPTER 5 Patronage through Partnership: Service, Largesse, and Rewards in the Queen's Household and Beyond	204
CHAPTER 6 Queenship and the Performance of Piety	248
CONCLUSION	284
APPENDIX	292
GLOSSARY	293
BIBLIOGRAPHY	295

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following list indicates the abbreviations used for printed and manuscript sources and reference works.

BL	The British Library. London, UK.
CDS	Bain, Joseph, ed. <i>Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland</i> . 5 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1881-1888. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php
CSP Spanish	Bergenroth, G. A., ed., et al. <i>Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain Preserved in the Archives of Simancas and Elsewhere</i> . 28 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862-1954. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php
CSP Venetian	Brown, Rawdon, ed. <i>Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs: existing in the Archives and collections of Venice, and in other libraries of Northern Italy</i> . 38 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London: Longman, 1864. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php
Eltham Ordinances	“Ordinances for the Household Made at Eltham in the XVIIth Year of King Henry VIII A.D. 1526.” In <i>A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, Made in Divers Reigns...</i> Eighteenth Century Collections Online. London, 1790. Gale. 173-281. http://find.galegroup.com/ecco .
ERS	Stuart, John, George Burnett, and George Powell McNeill, eds. <i>The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland</i> . 23 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: General Register House, 1878. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php
Foedera	Rymer, Thomas. <i>Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, Et Cujuscunque Generis Acta Publica Inter Reges Angliae</i> . 20 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London, 1704. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php
JRL	John Rylands Library. University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.
LHTA	Dickson, Thomas, ed., et al. <i>Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland</i> . 13 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1877-1978. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php

<i>LP</i>	Brewer, J. S., J. Gairdner, and R. H. Brodie, eds. <i>Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547</i> . 21 vols. and addenda vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1862. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php .
NAS	National Archives of Scotland. Edinburgh, UK.
<i>ODNB</i>	Matthew, H. C. G., Brian Harrison, eds. <i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition. Lawrence Goldman, ed. www.oxforddnb.com .
<i>RMS</i>	Paul, John Balfour, ed. <i>The Register of the Great Seal of Scotland</i> . 11 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1882-1914. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php .
<i>RSS</i>	Livingstone, M., ed. <i>The Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland</i> . Vol. 1. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1908. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php .
SJCA	St. John's College Archive. Cambridge, UK.
<i>Statutes of the Realm</i>	<i>Statutes of the Realm</i> . Vol. 3 (1509–1545). Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London, 1817. http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php .
TNA	The National Archives. Kew, UK.

INTRODUCTION

One day in October 1516, Catherine of Aragon, queen of England, and her sister-in-law, Margaret Tudor, dowager queen of Scots, sat in Catherine's chamber at Westminster, surrounded by their waiting women. We do not know what these women spoke of, although we do know that they listened to music and watched their ladies dancing.¹ If the two queens conversed, it would have been in English, as Catherine had lived in England for fifteen years and had become fluent in English, although she still spoke with an accent. Margaret Tudor, who had spent thirteen years in Scotland, may have spoken with a slight Scottish accent. Both women had learned a great deal about their adopted countries, and they likely exchanged news and opinions about the state of affairs in Britain and on the Continent. They had both recently become mothers to baby girls, and so possibly they passed the time planning their daughters' futures, discussing the important marriage alliances the princesses of the Tudor dynasty could cement. They might also have discussed the problems and challenges faced by young women, such as they had experienced, when they left home to marry into a foreign dynasty in a strange land.

Catherine of Aragon and Margaret Tudor were contemporaneous queens in the early sixteenth century. Margaret Tudor was the eldest daughter of Henry VII of England, and in 1504 she became Queen of Scots by marrying James IV of Scotland. In 1516, Margaret Tudor returned to England and the court of her brother, Henry VIII, after the death of her husband and a failed attempt at regency for her young son, James V. Her hostess in 1516, Catherine of Aragon, had become queen of England in 1509 when she married Henry VIII. Catherine and Margaret faced many common challenges and were often linked together quite closely through queenly traditions, networks of servants and nobility, and above all, dynastic proximity. However,

¹Sebastiano Giustiniani, *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*, ed. Rawdon Brown (London: Smith, Elder, 1854), 1:301.

Catherine and Margaret were queens in kingdoms that had developed different traditions of queenship. In studying these two women together, it is my goal to produce a complementary study of related figures that illuminates both similarities and differences as a methodology for understanding each queen within her domestic and international historical context. My study of Catherine and Margaret shows that a study of closely related queens can both acknowledge the contingency of their queenships on an “individual” level while also speaking to broader ideas of the nature of queenship in early modern Europe more generally.

This complementary study of two queens thus fully embraces the international nature of queenship that developed across Europe from the early medieval period to the sixteenth century. The term “queen consort” referred specifically to the wife of the king, and her office, rights, and responsibilities developed alongside the growth of dynastic monarchies of the early middle ages.² The royal dynasties of Europe and the British Isles had long sought to use royal marriages to further their own diplomatic goals and to increase their own prestige. Marriage into a foreign royal house set the monarch apart from his nobility and bestowed exclusive lineages upon his offspring, which increased the chance of an heir inheriting the throne.³

Diplomatic marriages also signaled the position of European dynasties compared to each other, because the ability to marry into another royal house was a crucial indicator for the legitimacy and position of a king and his kingdom on the wider European stage. Both Catherine of Aragon and Margaret Tudor’s marriages were arranged to enhance the status of the Tudor

² Women called queens could also hold other positions of power in European monarchies. A queen regent is a queen ruling on behalf of the monarch, usually because the monarch was a minor heir. Queens regent were usually the widow of the previous king and mother of the current monarch. A queen regnant is a queen ruling in her own right, based on her inheritance of the throne through her own blood. Queens regnant were unusual in European monarchies, though they did have a history of success in medieval Spain and southern Italy, and more famously, sixteenth-century England and Scotland. Elizabeth II, current Queen of Great Britain, is a queen regnant. The term “king” had no such malleability, and the husband of a queen regnant often posed numerous political problems because it was inconceivable to have a king-consort who was subordinate to a queen.

³ Janet L. Nelson, “Medieval Queenship,” in *Women in Medieval Western European Culture*, ed. Linda Elizabeth Mitchell (New York: Garland, 1999), 182, 185.

dynasty. By marrying his daughter Margaret to a Scottish king and gaining a Spanish princess as a bride for his heir, Henry VII claimed a place for his new Tudor dynasty amongst the royal houses of Europe. In Scotland, royal dynastic marriages were an important way for the Stuarts to bolster their claims for Scottish sovereignty as well as enhancing royal authority against the fractious Scottish nobility from which their dynasty had only recently risen above.

Catherine's and Margaret's marriages in the first decade of the sixteenth century saw both women participating in a style of queenship that could be found across Europe, enhancing the power of early modern monarchies and ushering in an era of intense diplomatic and cultural exchange among England, Scotland, France, Spain, and the Holy Roman Empire. This period saw the emergence of a number of powerful and influential consorts in France and the Italian States, as well as female rulers in Spain and the Low Countries. Catherine's marriage was in fact the final alliance orchestrated by her parents, Isabel of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon, who used their children's marriages to cement alliances across Europe. Two of her sisters, Isabel and Maria, married into the royal house of Portugal, while her sister Juana, known to history as Juana the Mad, married Philip of Burgundy, heir to the Holy Roman Emperor. Juana's history in particular illustrates the potential for power and influence that consorts could wield, for a series of deaths made her the heir to the Spanish kingdoms. Juana's ultimate fate—neglected and abused by her husband, imprisoned by her father and son—is certainly not a positive example of the power of queens. However, Bethany Aram argues that Burgundian attempts to confine and isolate their new consort acknowledged her potential influence and power.⁴ As I shall show, Catherine's household and her connections at court were similar sources of strength and influence for the queen consort.

⁴For Juana's difficult career as consort of Philip of Burgundy and later "queen" of Spain, see Bethany Aram, *Juana the Mad: Sovereignty and Dynasty in Renaissance Europe* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005).

The potential for the exercise of power by consorts was not limited to the daughters of Isabel of Castile. In France, Anne of Brittany, heiress of the independent Duchy of Brittany and consort to two French kings, worked to establish the French queen's household in parity with the king's household. She strove to protect her own considerable inheritance and resources as part of her agenda for maintaining control over an independent Brittany.⁵ Redoubtable Italian consorts such as Isabella d'Este, wife of Francesco Gonzaga, were crucial participants in the administration of Italian city-states and acted as religious, literary and artistic patrons.⁶ Throughout Europe the concentration of power and patronage in princely courts and households made the influence of the consort, her court, and her household visible and important because she was at the cultural and political center of her state.

Throughout this work I will be using the interrelated terms court and household, so it would be helpful to provide my own definitions of these notoriously slippery terms. By the sixteenth century, household was significantly different from the royal court. The court was, first of all, immensely larger than the household, encompassing not only all members of the royal households, but also a number of others whose positions elsewhere in royal service entitled them to receipt of fees or bouge of court.⁷ The court further increased on festive occasions, when it swelled to include foreign ambassadors and dignitaries, the highest nobility and clerics, and skilled artisans and laborers. The court was also a physical space, located wherever the king resided, which included palaces and outbuildings, and often local area houses, manors, and inns,

⁵Caroline zum Kolk, "The Household of the Queen of France in the Sixteenth Century," *The Court Historian* 14, no. 1 (2009): 11–13; there has been a recent explosion of works on Anne of Brittany's political legacy and cultural patronage. Two works that consider her roles in the development French queenship are Nicole Hochner, "Revisiting Anne de Bretagne's Queenship: On Love and Bridles," in *The Cultural and Political Legacy of Anne de Bretagne: Negotiating Convention in Books and Documents*, ed. Cynthia J. Brown (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010), 147–162; Michel Nassiet, "Anne de Bretagne, a Woman of State," in *The Cultural and Political Legacy of Anne de Bretagne: Negotiating Convention in Books and Documents*, ed. Cynthia J. Brown (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010), 163–176.

⁶Sharon L. Jansen, *The Monstrous Regiment of Women: Female Rulers in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 155–162.

⁷D. M. Loades, *The Tudor Court* (London: Batsford, 1986), 40.

as some royal residences were too small to accommodate the entire court. The court also came to be associated with complex ideas, attitudes, social habits and institutional forms that were characteristically elite and privileged, and supposedly distinctly different from the world outside the court.⁸ Most significantly for my purposes, however, is that the court was a large, ill-defined group that could fluctuate in size and composition, and courtiers might be members of different households or even the heads of their own substantial households.

The household in the sixteenth century is also a difficult term, but it most often refers to a smaller group of servants and attendants who personally waited on the householder, and who received some sort of benefit from that person, including but not limited to fees, liveries, meals, living quarters, and gifts.⁹ It is important to remember that a person could be a member of the queen's household while also being the head of their own, smaller household establishment. In order to accurately describe the relationship between the queen, her household and the wider court, I have adopted a strict approach to defining members of Catherine's and Margaret's households throughout this work.¹⁰ Occasionally I also use the term household to include the material goods, such as clothing and furniture, of Catherine and Margaret and their servants, although in these instances, I have tried to make it clear I am including material goods as well.

⁸D. A. L. Morgan, "The House of Policy: The Political Role of the Late Plantagenet Household, 1422-1485," in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. David Starkey (London: Longman, 1987), 68; Susan Crane, *The Performance of Self: Ritual, Clothing, and Identity during the Hundred Years War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 2.

⁹Sixteenth-century sources, such as the accounts from Catherine's receiver-general Griffith Richards use the term household or *hospicii*, British Library, London, UK, Cott. App. LXV. Scottish sources also used *domicilii* (house) when accounting for the expenses of the household, J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R. H. Brodie, eds, *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547*, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1862) 2:243, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>. Usually members of the queen's household would refer to themselves as part of her Chamber or one of her other household departments, or simply as "the queen's footman," etc.

¹⁰However, there will be moments when I will note that sources indicate but do not explicitly state that certain individuals—Giles Duwes, called the queen's librarian for Catherine of Aragon, for example—were likely members of their households. For a more detailed discussion of the meaning of household in the sixteenth century, see Jeri L. McIntosh, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State: The Preaccession Households of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, 1516-1558* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 6–7.

Shortly after Catherine and Margaret became queens, the institution of queenship was affected by the Reformation, which fundamentally altered the way all early modern Europeans interacted with each other. The hierarchical basis for European society, which above all looked to the king and his queen as the guarantors of social order and Christian faith, was questioned and then redefined by the Reformation.¹¹ The Reformation destroyed the religious unity of Western Europe. It created fault lines that reverberated not only in the everyday lives of European Christians, but also in the diplomacy and foreign policy of their rulers.¹² Perhaps nowhere was this more obvious or more personal than in the case of royal marriages and foreign queens, because Catholics and Protestants began to scrutinize the religion of their monarch and his wife in ways never considered before the Reformation. After the Reformation, foreign policy, which of course included the selection of queens, held new religious dimensions. The religious divisions of the Reformation created wholly new questions about the religious beliefs and practices of a queen consort, who now had the potential to come from a different Christian sect. This later became an area of controversy for queens, even when they otherwise were following established ideals of queenship.

Catherine was the last queen of England whose religion and allegiance to the Catholic Church were not a source of controversy, but rather a source of pride and strength. The beginning of the English Reformation, however, is inextricably bound up with queenship. In his quest to exchange one queen for another, Henry VIII created his own church and made his choice of wife a major political issue. After his first divorce, Henry's queens were embroiled in domestic factional and confessional politics that was even more divisive and controversial than

¹¹Anne McLaren, "Queenship in Early Modern England and Scotland," *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006): 935–936, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4091589>.

¹²Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press, 2007), 3.

the political roles played by Queens Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth Woodville during the Wars of the Roses.¹³ Catherine of Aragon, the queen Henry replaced, was England's last pre-Reformation queen. Therefore, in order to understand the practice of early modern queenship without the bias of later confessional conflicts, we must consider the queens, like Margaret and Catherine, whose reigns preceded the Reformation and were (mostly) untouched by the religious controversies that would eventually change the nature of British queenship. Bearing the pre-Reformation religious context in mind, my thesis reclaims Catherine's reign from the controversies of Henry's divorce, which too often have caused historians to focus on the elements of Catherine's queenship—her miscarriages, her loyalties to Rome and to Spain—that would become issues during the divorce. Instead, this work presents Catherine's reign as queen within the context of the queenships of her near contemporary, Margaret Tudor, and her queenly predecessors.

Catherine and Margaret were also some of the last queen consorts in Scotland and England before a series of dynastic mishaps led to a queenly interregnum in both kingdoms in the late sixteenth century. After the deaths of Henry VIII (1547) and James V (1542), neither England nor Scotland would have an adult male monarch for several decades, and hence, no queen consort. The reign of Mary Queen of Scots (a queen regnant) meant that Scotland had no queen consort until James VI married Anne of Denmark in 1590 (a gap of forty-eight years). In England, an interregnum of fifty-six years separated Katherine Parr, Henry's last wife, from Anne of Denmark, who became queen consort of England when James VI succeeded Elizabeth I in 1603. This interregnum is more than a dynastic anomaly. Because queens consort also meant

¹³ From Henry's break with Rome in 1532 until the accession of James VI and I and his wife Anna of Denmark in 1603, England had no foreign-born queens barring the brief reign of Anne of Cleves, who was married to Henry for seven months. Scotland, whose royals remained Catholic until the deposition of Mary Queen of Scots in 1568, continued to welcome foreign queens, but they too were caught up in confessional fighting between Protestants and Catholics.

larger households and a growing royal family, the size, tone, and shape of the Scottish and English courts during this interregnum were profoundly different than their predecessors. When considering the development of queenship in the British Isles during the sixteenth century, it is important to consider the changes wrought to queenship by the absence of a queen consort, and the potential for significant shifts in expectations and attitudes that could occur in their absence. Negative views of queenly influence and extravagance, and the continual focus of early historians on issues of fertility and succession, likely stem from the decades-long paranoia experienced by both kingdoms who faced uncertain political futures and had little or no experience of queens consort.

Catherine of Aragon was a successful queen consort of England, fulfilling nearly all her duties and roles, with the exception, in the eyes of her contemporaries, being her failure to provide a viable male heir. My work shows that this failing, which of course became one of the primary reasons behind Henry's desire to divorce Catherine in the 1530s, did not overshadow Catherine's queenship up to that date. By considering Catherine's queenship alongside that of her sister-in-law, Margaret, this study shows that there was a great deal more to being a successful consort than the production of an heir. Margaret gave birth to four boys, one of whom became James V in 1513. As we will see, her royal motherhood did not confer upon her automatic success as a queen, and by examining these two women together we can gain different perspectives on the same questions and answers about the nature of queenship.

Eschewing a teleological focus on the issues of the 1530s, I argue by considering the broad picture of Catherine's queenship, including her patronage, piety, material resources, and her role at court, we can begin to understand how this foreign queen consort was able successfully to resist Henry's attempts to divorce her and to do so in a manner that retained her

popularity and good reputation. For, as scholars of the divorce have often overlooked, throughout the divorce controversy, Henry continued to treat Catherine with the respect her position commanded, and the queen was never slandered with any type of misogynistic or xenophobic rhetoric.¹⁴ Indeed, given what was at stake during the divorce crisis, Henry and his advisors were conspicuously reluctant to attack the queen directly. Moreover, there is much evidence that during the divorce, Catherine continued to be personally popular, and Henry was said to be concerned that she might be able to lead a rebellion against him.¹⁵ This dissertation shows that Catherine's resilience during the divorce was made possible through her practice and performance of queenship over many years.

My thesis conceptualizes queenship not as a static rank but as an office which was created and recreated by the continuous acquisition of social, political and cultural capital through performances of royal, queenly status, including magnificence, piety, patronage, lordship, and high estate.¹⁶ My analysis acknowledges the cultural and societal expectations—including gender, religious, and elite norms—which gave value to queenly performances, while maintaining that these performances were necessarily bound by the personal, contingent, practices of queenship by Catherine or Margaret. Practices and performances of queenship exist in this work along a continuum, in which different aspects of queenship contain layers of the practical and performative. Practice in this work refers to the material culture and resources, legal rights, personal actions, and household and administrative structures that supported and

¹⁴All of the king's efforts in divorcing Catherine concentrated around the validity of their marriage, and not the queen's personal reputation, Virginia Murphy, "The Literature and Propaganda of Henry VIII's First Divorce," in *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch (London: Macmillan, 1995), 135–58.

¹⁵G.A. Bergenroth, ed., et al, *Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain Preserved in the Archives of Simancas and Elsewhere*, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862-1954) 3.2:586, pg. 846, 4.2:1063, pg. 649, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>. Sharon L. Jansen, *Dangerous Talk and Strange Behavior: Women and Popular Resistance to the Reforms of Henry VIII* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 83–85.

¹⁶I am drawing upon the work of sociologist and anthropologist Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), chap. 3.

contributed to the recognition and functioning of Catherine and Margaret as queens. Practice could be rooted in tangible and concrete actions (such as the disciplining of a corrupt official) and the deployment of objects (such as a cloth of gold coronation gown) that made the performance of queenly power and authority. This work creates a picture of how Catherine and Margaret acquired the social, political, and cultural capital necessary to exercise their authority through the practices and performances of queenship in the early-sixteenth century British Isles.¹⁷

I will refer to two modes of performance throughout this work. Firstly, there are ceremonial and ritual performances in which queens participated as part of the royal court, from coronations to tournaments to welcome ceremonies. These “spectacular” types of performances have been studied in detail by historians of the Tudor court, although the queen’s role in some of these spectacles has been neglected. However, the “spectacular” performance of queenship should not be separated from a second, older understanding of performance: the carrying out or discharge of a duty, task, or role.¹⁸ The performance of queenship in this mode was just as vital, if not more so, as the spectacular types of performances for which English and Scottish courts were known for.

Performance of queenship as a duty is strongly rooted in late medieval and early modern elite traditions of reputation, honor, and status, all of which were crucially important to Catherine’s and Margaret’s queenship. Successful social performance of expected ideals, for example gender or social norms, resulted in establishing a “fund of good behavior” upon which queens could draw when they were required to defy social norms and act in an authoritative

¹⁷ In this combination of practice and performance I am following the work of many scholars who have used the ideas of Erving Goffman and Pierre Bourdieu to understand the way social and cultural expectations intertwined with individual agency to create opportunities for acquiring the social capital necessary to exercise power and authority in the pre-modern period. See also Crane, *Performance of Self*; Karin J. MacHardy, “Cultural Capital, Family Strategies and Noble Identity in Early Modern Habsburg Austria 1579-1620,” *Past & Present* no. 163 (May 1, 1999): 41–43, doi:10.2307/651169.

¹⁸ “performance, n,” OED Online (Oxford University Press, December 2011) <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/140783?redirectedFrom=performance>.

manner, as Catherine eventually had to do during the divorce.¹⁹ Felicity Heal has argued that “authority and power frequently rested on good social performance,” and I would argue that foreign-born queens were especially reliant on good social performance to establish and maintain their own status, power and authority in a foreign land where they had few independent allies.²⁰ Individual performances before the same audience created social relationships that also led to expectations of power, authority and obligation between the performer and her audience.²¹ Performance thus creates the queen before a variety of audiences, including her household, the royal court, foreign ambassadors and her common subjects. Steven Gunn and Timothy Elston have convincingly argued that a wide range of the Tudor populace were aware of royal events and had their own views on royal actions.²² For, as we shall see, queens such as Catherine and Margaret had to continually re-enact their performance of queenship before their households, courts, and kingdoms through a variety of ways, which then provided them with reputation, influence, and authority.

The fulfillment of the queen’s roles established her own status and the authority of monarchy at the royal court and throughout the kingdom. For pre-modern queens and their society generally, it was necessary to establish and maintain *fama*, the late medieval concept that, while possessing a “wide semantic range,” is useful in understanding the dynamic relationship

¹⁹Katherine Crawford discusses how sixteenth-century queens of France used this tactic, Katherine Crawford, *Perilous Performances: Gender and Regency in Early Modern France* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 9–10.

²⁰Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 22.

²¹Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959), 13–16.

²² Steven J. Gunn, “War, Dynasty and Public Opinion in Early Tudor England,” in *Authority and Consent in Tudor England: Essays Presented to C.S.L. Davies*, ed. G. W. Bernard and Steven J. Gunn (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2002), 131–149; Timothy G. Elston, “Widow Princess or Neglected Queen? Catherine of Aragon, Henry VIII and English Public Opinion 1533-1536,” in *Queens & Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. Carole Levin and Robert O. Bucholz (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 16–30.

between a pre-modern performance and its audience.²³ Historians of *fama* have shown that the word signified a type of honor “that could be bestowed only by other people, one that had to be plainly visible. It could be made so through material signs (clothing and other possessions) and through the performance of acts agreed on as honorable. This honor therefore required witnesses, who carried reports of *fama* to others.”²⁴ Thus *fama* had to be reiterated with public acts and appearances, all of which emphasized the importance of display and correct presentation in order to be effective.²⁵

Conduct books show that elite women were well aware of the importance of *fama* and the role the public played in producing it. Anne de France (1461-1522), daughter of Louis XI and sometime Regent of France, advised her daughter to “acknowledge the people of towns and the lesser folk graciously, inclining your head toward them so that they have no reason to think badly of you, because if you wish to have a good reputation everywhere, you must please the small as well as the great, because from such people come both renown and slander.”²⁶ It is exactly this type of honor and reputation that queens gained through their successful repeated performance of their duties before a wide variety of audiences.

Although proper performance of royal authority in general and queenship in particular was an ongoing process, certain moments of political crisis can illuminate what was at stake in these performances. For instance, the dismal failure of Henry VI and his supporters to rally the

²³Thelma Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail, eds., *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

²⁵ Public interaction and engagement of royal actions and issues could occur across a wide spectrum of society; however, evidence for public opinion in the Tudor era exists in isolated and haphazard sources which do not allow for a comprehensive definition of “publicness” in the sixteenth century. Instead, historians have found isolated incidents of engagement in political and social issues by a broad range of social groups, from alderman and churchwardens to apprentices and travelling friars. Our understanding of the Tudor public, therefore, must be somewhat nebulous, but this perhaps best reflects how Catherine and Margaret understood their public audiences, as their indistinct subjects who occasionally appeared to them in sharp relief at specific moments, but who nevertheless were always part of the potential audience of their public performances.

²⁶Sharon L. Jansen, ed., *Anne of France: Lessons for My Daughter* (Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 2004), 51.

London crowds during Edward of York's 1471 invasion was due in large part because the king and his household put on such a poor performance processing through London that few would acknowledge his authority.²⁷ In contrast, Jeri McIntosh has convincingly argued that Mary Tudor's expert use of the material and symbolic trappings of majesty during her 1553 bid for the throne was "determinative" in her success in defeating her opponents and becoming England's first queen regnant.²⁸ The proper performance of queenly (or kingly) roles and the maintenance of the capital needed to exert royal authority could have life or death consequences.

Fama, honor, reputation, and status were all closely bound to the embodied nature of the performance of queenship. Catherine's and Margaret's queenship cannot be separated from the bodily nature of their primary duty as queens, the continuation of the dynasty through the successful birth of an heir to the throne, preferably male. Becoming the queen invested their bodies with enormous political potential from their physical sexuality, which led to intimacy and influence with the king, and their potential for maternity, which could change the dynastic succession. This led to all their actions, including their physical health, attractiveness, and behavior, being scrutinized by courtiers, ambassadors, and members of their household, eager to see signs of a hoped-for-heir, but also watchful for signs of ill health or other, more sinister, problems. For, just as the queen's body held the potential for increasing her status through the production of heirs, it also held the potential for her downfall, as the queen's honor was above all embodied in her chastity. Sexual exclusivity was the most important bodily virtue for a queen to possess, and it was an important component of the queen's honor. Catherine's and Margaret's embodiment of queenship went beyond sexuality and maternity, however. Their bodies were the originating sites for many of their performances of queenship. For example, the clothing of their

²⁷ David Starkey, "Henry VI's Old Blue Gown: The English Court under the Lancastrians and Yorkists," *Court Historian* 4, no. 1 (1999): 2–3.

²⁸ McIntosh, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State*, 164–169.

bodies was one of the most visual indicators of their queenship, because as I will show in chapter 3 the material magnificence of the queen's body gave her authority, status, and dignity at court and abroad. Like the queen's chastity, the queen's clothing formed a component of her honor, for her royal wardrobe both proclaimed and protected her honor. A queen without her magnificent clothes had lost her honor.²⁹

Discussion of performance, honor, and reputation inevitably leads one to the question of audience. There is no question that Catherine and Margaret understood that they were nearly continually before an audience of some sort. They were constantly attended by their ladies, even in their most private chambers. The arrangement of their chambers at court, which strictly limited and defined who could gain access to the queen, provided a natural transition from the semi-private space of the queen's inner chambers to the outer chambers and the wider court, thus defining, for both historians and the queen, who their audience would be at any given moment. For example, we know that dancing in the queen's outer chamber would have been limited to a select group of courtiers.³⁰ Conversely, the different spaces of other performances—tournaments, for example—again presuppose a wider audience for the performance. Most importantly, because Catherine and Margaret were well aware of the protocols governing their chambers, they too would understand who would be the audience for their different performances.

²⁹For scholarship on pre-modern understanding of female honor beyond sexual chastity, see Linda A. Pollock, "Honor, Gender, and Reconciliation in Elite Culture, 1570–1700," *The Journal of British Studies* 46, no. 1 (January 1, 2007): 3–29, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/508396>; Garthine Walker, "Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour in Early Modern England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (January 1, 1996): 235–245, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3679239>; Laura Gowing, "Women, Status and the Popular Culture of Dishonour," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (January 1, 1996): 225–234, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3679238>; Susan Broomhall, "Gendering the Culture of Honour at the Fifteenth-Century Burgundian Court," in *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Susan Broomhall and Stephanie Tarbin (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008), 181–193.

³⁰ I am using the terms "outer" and "inner" chambers because the English and Scottish courts did not use the same terminology when discussing the royal apartments, and thus "Privy" chamber, which in England denoted the most private and highly selective area of the queen's chambers, has no equivalent in Scottish usage, see chapter 5 for more details on the organizational differences in English and Scottish households.

Furthermore, the behavior of the queen was meant to set a moral example for others. The queen was expected to perform her duties in a public manner that would then lead others to emulate her good works and modest behavior. Christine de Pizan urged elite women to give their alms openly so that their charity would be an example to others.³¹ Pizan also wrote that “[t]he ladies of the court ought to be models of all good things and all honour to other women,” thus connecting the behavior of the women at court with the honor and behavior of the women of the kingdom.³²

While it is clear that queens such as Catherine and Margaret understood that most of their actions were observed and commented upon by a variety of audiences, it is more difficult to get to the reactions of the audiences themselves. We know that some queenly performances attracted large crowds, such as royal entries into cities, pilgrimages across the countryside, or coronations and weddings. Margaret was greeted by large crowds during her journey to Scotland, for example, and Catherine drew a large audience of supporters during the 1529 Blackfriars trial of her divorce.³³ Recent work on late-medieval civic plays suggests that pre-modern audiences who witnessed spectacles saw themselves as participants in the performance of various types of power, potentially including queenly power.³⁴ This “spectatorial sensibility” suggests the possibility that queenly practices, such as the distribution of alms at the queen’s gates, were witnessed by pre-modern individuals who understood these acts to be a performance of an

³¹Christine de Pizan, *The Treasure of the City of Ladies*, trans. Sarah Lawson, rev. ed. (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), 47; Pizan’s works were well-known in England, and her most famous work, *The City of Ladies*, was translated into English in 1521 by a member of Catherine’s household specifically as part of a campaign on behalf of Catherine’s daughter Mary’s right to rule, see Hope Johnston, “How the *Livre de La Cité Des Dames* First Came to Be Printed in England,” in *Desireuse de plus Avant Enquerre*, ed. Liliane Dulac et al. (Paris: Champion, 2008), 385–396.

³²Pizan, *Treasure*, 51–52.

³³*Fyancells*, 282; *CSP Spanish* 3.2:845.

³⁴Seth Lerer, “‘Representyd Now in Yower Syght’: The Culture of Spectatorship in Late-Fifteenth Century England,” in *Bodies and Disciplines: Intersections of Literature and History in Fifteenth-Century England*, ed. Barbara A. Hanawalt and Gail McMurray Gibson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 31–32.

expected duty that then conferred social and moral capital on queens that affirmed and supported their power and authority.³⁵ Most of the eyewitness accounts of royal performances come from foreign ambassadors, whose political and personal motivations were not shared by the audience at large, but these accounts certainly indicate that a variety of audiences witnessed and responded to the performance of queenship.

Foreign ambassadors spent a great deal of time and ink describing the festivities they witnessed at court, including descriptions of clothing, pageants, tournaments, and snatches of conversations with important figures in their dispatches home. Courtiers too kept those outside the court updated on the queen's movements, her reception of gifts, or her intervention in various patronage matters. For example, Anne Boleyn's gift of a gold chain to Lord Leonard Grey before he left for Ireland in 1535 was reported back to Lord Lisle, deputy of Calais, by John Grenville.³⁶ There is no collection of letters for this period in England or Scotland that even comes close to the depth and range of the Lisle or Paston letters, which do not cover the early sixteenth century. However, it is reasonable to assume that, given the continuing importance of the court as a center of influence, patronage and fashion, courtiers and their servants continued to send news about the court to their families and employers who were away from court. In all likelihood, Catherine or Margaret would have been subjects of such reports.

Despite their importance politically and diplomatically, queens consort have not received a great deal of attention from historians until recently. As Eric W. Ives first observed in 2004, "[i]t is a reflection on the essential maleness of history, of those who made most of it and those who have written most of it, that we still do not know enough about the position of the queen

³⁵Ibid., 31.

³⁶Muriel St. Clare Byrne, ed., *The Lisle Letters* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 2:468.

consort in England.”³⁷ Catherine and Margaret were heads of their own households, estate governors, creators of international exchanges, and patrons of scholars and priests, and all of these activities were necessary for the successful performance of pre-Reformation, pre-modern monarchy in the British Isles. Few kings during this period went for very long without a consort. After the king, the queen had the largest courtly household in the kingdom and controlled lands similar in value to those of magnates or princes.³⁸ The queen’s court reflected her status as the daughter of a foreign king and the potential mother of the heir to the throne. And yet, Catherine and Margaret, although well-known as characters in the dramatic histories of the Tudor dynasty that continue to fascinate both historians and popular audiences alike, are in fact understudied queens whose reigns have yet to be considered within the newly developing historiography of queenship.

I am indebted to earlier scholars for producing the narratives of Catherine’s and Margaret’s lives, narratives which have been continually reassessed as new concerns and methods have been brought to bear on the same historical sources. My work does not re-create these narratives, but rather looks beyond the biographical details of their lives to create an understanding of the practice and performance of Catherine’s and Margaret’s queenship in England and Scotland. As I demonstrate below, queens consort had specific roles at the royal court that were different from the roles played by dowager queens (as Margaret was after 1513, for example). My thesis focuses specifically on the years when Catherine and Margaret were the wives of reigning kings, and my arguments are deliberately centered on the practice of queens

³⁷E. W. Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 205; this work is essentially a substantially revised second edition of Ives’ masterful 1986 biography of Anne.

³⁸The traditional income for English queens was around £4,000 in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, Joanna L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 234–35; wealthy magnates’ incomes, like Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, ranged around £2,000 annually, Hazel Pierce, *Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, 1473-1541: Loyalty, Lineage and Leadership* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003), 37.

consort. I will only allude to events outside those periods in order to further illuminate a specific point about their reigns as queens consort.

Historical Background and Historiography

Catherine was born in 1485, the youngest daughter of Isabel of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon, the famous Catholic kings whose marriage united most of what we call modern Spain under their rule. Her future sister-in-law, Margaret Tudor, was four years younger than Catherine, born in 1489. The eldest daughter of Henry Tudor and Elizabeth of York, Margaret's dynasty was less illustrious than Catherine's, but as the eldest daughter, her marriage was an important component of her father's diplomacy. Margaret and Catherine, like the rest of their siblings, married into foreign royal dynasties as part of their parents' concerted efforts to further their dynastic goals. The Spanish monarchs sought to combat French expansion in Italy and the Pyrenees through the marriage of their offspring to nearby kingdoms.³⁹ Henry VII needed to legitimize his conquest of England in 1485 through foreign alliances and high-status marriages for his children.

Isabel carefully educated Catherine, in addition to her three elder sisters, Isabel, Juana, and Maria, at a very young age to prepare them to become queens consort and further Spanish ambitions. Isabel insured that her daughters had excellent tutors, and Catherine and her sisters were known throughout Europe for their humanistic education, especially their knowledge of Latin.⁴⁰ This education included lessons in music, dance, weaving, and sewing as well as

³⁹Catherine's dynastic connections were significant assets to her as queen and therefore it is important to bear in mind the multiple alliances her marriage could cement. The most important of these connections was formed when Catherine's elder sister Juana married Philip of Burgundy, the Hapsburg heir to the Holy Roman Emperor, in 1496. After the deaths of Catherine's older siblings Juan and Isabel, by 1498 Juana and her children became Ferdinand and Isabel's heirs. Eventually, Juana's son Charles would become Holy Roman Emperor, King of Spain, and Duke of Burgundy, in addition to numerous other lands and titles. Since he was her nephew and king of Spain, Catherine would regard Charles as England's natural ally in the later years of her queenship. Catherine's other sisters, Isabel and Maria, married into the royal house of Portugal, and Maria's son became John III of Portugal.

⁴⁰ See chapter 5 for discussion of Catherine's education.

religious instruction. Their learning insured that Catherine and her sisters had the skills to navigate the glittering and treacherous world of sixteenth-century European court politics and diplomacy. Margaret's childhood and education is sparsely documented, although we do know her brothers, Arthur and Henry, received fine humanist training, and it is possible she shared some of their tutors. Her dancing and musical abilities were often praised in accounts of court festivities, so it is likely that she was taught important courtly skills.

Both Catherine and Margaret's marriages were decided upon at a very early age. Margaret was six when Henry began negotiating with the Scots for an alliance, and in all likelihood, Catherine would never have known a period in her life when she was not destined to become queen of England. This possibly sheds some light on her subsequent determination, in the early 1500s and later in the 1530s, to fight for her place in England. In 1487, when Catherine was two years old, Isabel and Ferdinand began to negotiate with Henry VII, the newly minted Tudor king of England, for a dynastic union between Catherine and Henry's eldest son, Arthur, Prince of Wales.⁴¹ England had recently emerged from decades of the civil unrest known today as the Wars of the Roses. Henry VII claimed to have ended the conflict with his victory at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485, but his rule and dynasty were still new and potentially unstable.⁴² Thus the treaty with Spain was a significant confirmation of Henry's success and legitimacy as a monarch. The 1489 Treaty of Medina del Campo officially sealed the match, and Catherine, at the age of three, became the Princess of Wales. After this diplomatic success, Henry VII began negotiating for Margaret's marriage to James IV, King of Scotland. It took years of careful

⁴¹For a more detailed discussion of the negotiations and the European context of Catherine's first marriage, see Ian Arthurson, "'The King of Spain's Daughter Came to Visit Me': Marriage, Princes and Politics," in *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death and Commemoration*, ed. Linda Monckton and Steven J. Gunn (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2009), 20–30.

⁴² Henry's claim to the throne was weak, as he inherited through his mother's descent from a bastard line of the royal family, and he faced several challenges to his throne by pretenders claiming to be princes of the rival dynasty of York.

diplomacy to bring England and Scotland, “auld enemies,” together in a marriage alliance, but in 1502 a formal peace treaty between in England and Scotland was signed, optimistically entitled the Treaty of Perpetual Peace. Margaret’s marriage contract was signed at the same time. The English court then went through an elaborate betrothal ceremony that solemnly married Margaret to James by his proxy, the Earl of Bothwell.

After much negotiation and some delays, Catherine arrived in England to marry Arthur in 1501 accompanied by a splendid Spanish escort and a Spanish household carefully chosen by her mother. Arthur and Catherine’s wedding was possibly the greatest celebration of Henry VII’s reign, and historians have used a number of contemporary sources to reconstruct the magnificent pageantry.⁴³ The marriage of an heir to the throne during his father’s lifetime had not occurred in England since Edward III’s son the Black Prince married Joan of Kent in 1361.⁴⁴ Given the years of strife and dynastic uncertainty that had proceeded Henry VII’s reign, Catherine and Arthur’s marriage was a major accomplishment at its inception, regardless of the events to follow. The marriage of an adolescent heir to the throne to a foreign princess was an extraordinary statement of the stability and prosperity that the Tudor dynasty brought to the throne of England. It indicated the health and vigor of the heir, Arthur, his ability to pass into adulthood, and the power of Henry VII, who, unlike his recent predecessors, did not need to marry into noble English families in order to secure their support.

Tragically, young Arthur died a few months after the wedding, and Catherine was left a young widow in a strange land. Her parents immediately began negotiations for a second

⁴³Gordon Kipling, ed., *The Recept of the Ladie Kateryne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990); Sydney Anglo, “The London Pageants for the Reception of Katharine of Aragon: November 1501,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 26 (1963): 53–89.

⁴⁴ Henry VI’s heir Edward was technically married during his father’s lifetime, in 1470, to Anne Neville, the daughter of the Earl of Warwick; however, this was during the Yorkist period of ascendancy and shortly before the final Lancastrian defeat and Edward’s murder.

marriage, to Arthur's younger brother Henry, Duke of York. These negotiations appeared to be finalized in 1503, and they included a dispensation from the pope for Catherine to marry her deceased husband's brother. Catherine's household, led by her duenna Elvira Manuel, swore that the princess was a virgin; and, although this point would become a crucial issue in Catherine's life in the 1530s, in 1502-1503 it was dealt with by a papal bull that dispensed with the problem of affinity.⁴⁵ Shifting European politics and English alliances, however, meant repeated delays to Catherine's second marriage. Catherine remained in England in royal limbo, neither widow nor wife, for six years.⁴⁶

Meanwhile, in 1503, Margaret left the English court and began her journey to Scotland with a full train of supporters, including some of the highest nobility of the land and a lavish amount of wedding goods. Margaret's journey to the northern borders of England was more than a wedding procession. In the waning years of Henry VII's reign, it was one of the last great court progresses, and the first significant royal celebration since Catherine's marriage to Arthur in 1501. It was also the first major court event following the death of Margaret's mother, Queen Elizabeth of York. The queen had died in February 1503, after childbirth, at the age of thirty-seven. Her death weighed heavily on the Tudor court and must have greatly affected the young Margaret as she prepared to leave her home at the age of thirteen.

Margaret's reception by James IV and the city of Edinburgh is one of the most studied parts of Margaret's life, and I will discuss it further below. After the final round of festivities in Edinburgh, most of Margaret's retinue returned to England, leaving her in Scotland with a

⁴⁵Garrett Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon* (New York: Vintage Books, 1941), 51–54, 59; for a detailed discussion of the canon law of Catherine's divorce, including a consideration of the dispensation obtained in 1503, see J. J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 164–195; David Starkey, *Six Wives: The Queens of Henry VIII* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2003), 84–87.

⁴⁶see also Michelle L. Beer, "Royal Limbo: The Spanish Household of Catherine of Aragon as Princess of Wales, 1501-1509" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America, Washington, DC, March 2011).

handful of English attendants to make up her household. Margaret then began to assume fully her role as queen consort to James IV, traveling with the court, which led a peripatetic existence typical of the sixteenth century. As a very young queen, Margaret and her household were closely joined to the king's court. Although relations between England and Scotland were never completely cordial, from the time of Margaret's marriage until the death of her father in 1509, Scotland and England were at peace. Scottish and English leaders began to attempt to administer justice in the borderlands between the two kingdoms, and James sent a steady stream of messengers south with news of Margaret and orders to buy goods from London.⁴⁷

Henry VII's death in 1509 brought his son Henry VIII to the throne. The new king, who appears to have been of a romantic disposition, immediately married Catherine in a private ceremony, and she was crowned alongside Henry VIII in Westminster Abbey. Some historians have hinted that the quietness of Catherine's second wedding suggests some "lingering doubts about the propriety of the marriage, which, despite the Papal dispensation, never disappeared."⁴⁸ But this is to apply too much hindsight to a ceremony that was vastly eclipsed by a greater event, Catherine and Henry's joint coronation. It is far more likely that Henry's youth, and the somewhat precarious nature of the Tudor succession, given that he had no surviving brothers, necessitated a quick wedding that could then be publicly celebrated with his coronation. Henry was, at eighteen, a youthful king, and the presence of a queen consort would provide further support to the new reign through her own magnificence and comparative maturity (Catherine was seven years older than Henry). It would also further legitimize the Tudor dynasty, as Catherine was a member of one of the most celebrated royal houses in Europe. Henry VIII was the first English king to inherit the throne by a regular act of succession since Henry VI (r. 1422-

⁴⁷ *LHTA* 3:55, 351, 369.

⁴⁸ Starkey, *Six Wives*, 109.

1471), and now he had as his allies his wife's illustrious family, renowned throughout Europe as the 'Most Catholic Kings' of Spain.⁴⁹

Accounts of Catherine's life and career as queen have focused primarily on two themes, the English alliance with Spain and the need for an heir. These themes are prominent in a large part because they reflect the controversies over Henry VIII's later attempts to divorce Catherine, but it is certainly important to note that from the early years of her marriage, Catherine played a large part in the diplomacy between her father Ferdinand and her husband. She acted as her father's ambassador in England, a post she was granted in 1507. After her father's death in 1515, Catherine's connections to Spain became more irregular but still remained an important part of her queenship. However, as I argue in the following chapters, Catherine's queenship consisted of a great deal more than diplomacy and childbirth. Over the course of her lengthy marriage, Catherine's connections within the court, her ability to administer her estates and provide patronage, steadily grew and consolidated into a powerful definition of good reputation and queenship.

Catherine and Margaret both experienced the stillbirth or infant death of many of their children (at least five that we know of in the case of both women). In 1506 Margaret became pregnant for the first time, probably an indication that James had waited to consummate their marriage.⁵⁰ Only one of Margaret's children with James IV, born in 1512, survived to adulthood and eventually became James V. Catherine's only surviving offspring was a daughter, who became Mary I of England. During their childbearing years, Catherine and Margaret's full participation in court life may have been curtailed by their frequent pregnancies. A few years

⁴⁹ Henry VIII was the first adult monarch to succeed his father since Henry V succeeded Henry IV in 1413.

⁵⁰ John Carmi Parsons's study of aristocratic and royal women shows that, even when married at a very young age, most of these women did not have their first child until they were fifteen or older, "Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power: Some Plantagenet Evidence, 1150-1500," in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. John Carmi Parsons, Pbk. ed. (Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1998), 65-66.

after her first pregnancy, however, Margaret began to assume a more independent role from her husband. Her household was briefly administered separately from the king's, and in 1511 she made a formal entry into the city of Aberdeen without the king. After 1509, relations became strained between Scotland and England as Henry VIII became more belligerent towards France, Scotland's "auld ally." Margaret attempted to keep the peace between her husband and her brother, but in 1513, James invaded the north of England. He was killed by English troops at the battle of Flodden Field, paradoxically by an army under Catherine's command. At twenty-three Margaret became queen regent for her infant son, James V.

Aside from her much-discussed fertility problems, Catherine was a successful queen. In the early years of her marriage Henry looked to her for advice and council, to the extent that he named her regent and governess of England while on campaign in France in 1513. This moment was perhaps the apogee of Catherine's public power and under her command England won its greatest military victory of Henry's reign against the Scots at the Battle of Flodden Field. After 1520, Catherine seems to have withdrawn somewhat from the political and courtly stage, in part because of the ascendancy of Cardinal Thomas Wolsey as Henry VIII's chief minister. She devoted more of her energies as queen to the education of her surviving daughter Mary, but she continued to perform her public duties as queen in patronizing scholars, corresponding with foreign monarchs, administering her lands, and running her household.

Henry's marriage to Catherine was his first and longest-lasting. She was twenty-four years old when she married the eighteen-year old Henry, and her eight years already spent in England meant that she was certainly more familiar with her new husband and kingdom than most foreign brides would have been in the sixteenth century. Although Henry VIII is known today for his marital adventures, which resulted in marriages with six different women, in fact he

was married to Catherine for twenty-four years. Catherine and Henry's marriage lasted longer than all of his other marriages put together, and she was queen of England for longer than any consort since Margaret of Anjou in the mid-fifteenth century. None of her immediate successors, or those in the seventeenth century, reigned as long as she did, and her tenure as queen, until the divorce crisis of the 1530s, was uncontroversial.

Histories of Catherine of Aragon vary widely in scope and audience, attitude and verdict. Early histories of the queen, which began appearing soon after her death in 1536, were heavily influenced by the author's opinion of the Henrician Reformation. However, by the late seventeenth-century, Catherine's reputation had begun to solidify around the themes of dutiful wife, pious Catholic, and wronged woman.⁵¹ The definitive modern account of Catherine's life is the masterful biography written by Garrett Mattingly in 1941.⁵² Mattingly, who was familiar with foreign archives and had a keen understanding of the web of sixteenth-century European diplomacy, presents Catherine's life in the context of the domestic and foreign politics that shaped her world. It is still the best study of Catherine's life to date.

In the past four decades, many full-length biographies of the queen have appeared, although these tend to be written for a popular audience, including the recent *Catherine of Aragon: The Spanish Queen of Henry VIII* (2010).⁵³ Many biographies of Catherine form a part of the "six wives" story, a narrative history of Henry VIII's reign written through the lens of his six wives. Antonia Fraser, David Loades, Alison Weir and most recently David Starkey have

⁵¹Judith M. Richards, "Public Identity and Public Memory: Case Studies of Two Tudor Women," in *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Susan Broomhall and Stephanie Tarbin (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008), 208; Richards makes an interesting point that Catherine's reputation perhaps reveals the survival of oral traditions, which favored the queen, in opposition to the print propaganda put forth by Henry VIII and his son.

⁵²Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon*.

⁵³Giles Tremlett, *Catherine of Aragon: The Spanish Queen of Henry VIII* (New York: Walker & Company, 2010).

written Catherine's life story within this context.⁵⁴ These narratives ensure that many features of Catherine's life—her marriages, diplomatic activities, physical decline, and the fight over her divorce—are well-known to the public. In these works, Catherine is most often cast as the “Virtuous Queen” or wronged women in opposition to Anne Boleyn. While this type of history presents a good narrative, it does not and cannot tell us much about the practice of queenship by Catherine, or present Catherine within her proper context, as a queen consort with international standing and connections, whose duties and activities were far more varied and complex than pageantry, diplomacy, pregnancy and tragedy.

Such detailed scholarship as has appeared, in a range of contexts and fields, is in the form of articles as opposed to full-length monographs. Catherine's patronage and relationship with Juan Luis Vives, as well as her influence on the education of her daughter Mary, for example, have become a rich source of study for historians.⁵⁵ Catherine's history has also been revived by literary scholars focusing on the depictions and allusions to Catherine's history and reputation in later ballads, plays, contemporary histories and allegories.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, these works provide

⁵⁴ Antonia Fraser, *The Six Wives of Henry VIII* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1993), *Six Wives*; D. M. Loades, *Henry VIII and His Queens*, Pbk. ed. (Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1996); Alison Weir, *The Six Wives of Henry VIII* (London: Pimlico, 1997); Starkey, *Six Wives*.

⁵⁵ Timothy G. Elston, “Transformation or Continuity? Sixteenth-Century Education and the Legacy of Catherine of Aragon, Mary I, and Juan Luis Vives,” in *“High and Mighty Queens” of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 11–26; Richards, “Public Identity and Public Memory”; Judith M. Richards, “Mary Tudor: Renaissance Queen of England,” in *“High and Mighty Queens” of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 27–44.

⁵⁶ Johnston, “How the *Livre*”; Carolyn P. Collette, *Performing Polity: Women and Agency in the Anglo-French Tradition, 1385-1620* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), chap. 6; Matthew C. Hansen, “‘And a Queen of England, Too’: The ‘Englishing’ of Catherine of Aragon in Sixteenth-Century English Literary and Chronicle History,” in *“High and Mighty Queens” of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 79–100; Victor I. Scherb, “‘I de Have a Shooting’: Catherine of Aragon's Receptions of Robin Hood,” *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 42 (2003): 124–46; Carole Levin, “The Taming of the Queen: Foxe's Catherine and Shakespeare's Kate,” in *“High and Mighty Queens” of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 171–86.

interesting insights into the cultural and literary influence of Catherine's queenship and reputation, which clearly had many historical and literary "afterlives."

It is the later period of Margaret's life, from 1513 until her death in 1542, which has attracted the disapproving attention of historians since the sixteenth century. As Louise O. Fradenburg has pointed out, this history has been dominated by a type of modern nationalist historiography that vilifies the foreign "interference" that Margaret represented.⁵⁷ Scholars of Margaret have yet to place her within the wider context of queenship in pre-Reformation Scotland and Europe, much to the detriment of her historical reputation and our understanding of queenship. Additionally, many of the biographies of Margaret, even those which seek to redeem her reputation, such as Patricia Buchanan's *Margaret Tudor* (1985), are works of popular history, lack footnotes, and occasionally even feature fictional dialogue.

Still, Buchanan's biography is the only modern work to discuss Margaret's life in full without comparing her to her younger sister, Mary Tudor, who became queen of France. The lack of source material for both women and the basic parallels in their lives certainly make it logical for historians to pair them together: both were married at a young age to a foreign king, both were widowed early in their lives, and both hastily remarried noblemen without the consent of their brother, Henry VIII. Although superficially similar, Margaret and Mary had two very different careers and areas of influence in early modern Britain. While Margaret's marriage to James IV lasted a decade and produced at least five children (only one of whom survived infancy), Mary's marriage in 1514 to Louis XII lasted only a few months. Margaret Tudor was queen of Scotland for a decade, and queen regent and queen mother for several more decades. On the other hand, Mary returned to England as the wife of the Duke of Suffolk, and although

⁵⁷Louise Olga Fradenburg, "Troubled Times: Margaret Tudor and the Historians" in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, eds. Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (Phantassie: Tuckwell Press, 1998), 41.

she was referred to as the “French Queen” at court, it is nearly impossible to argue that she had been a queen in anything but name.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, aside from one work, almost all of the historical biographies of Margaret pair her with Mary. Maria Perry’s *Sisters to the King* (1999) is the most recent entry into this category of writing, which also includes Nancy Lenz Harvey’s *The Rose and the Thorn* (1975), and Hester Chapman’s *The Sisters of Henry VIII* (1969).⁵⁹ These works exhibit similar problems to the collective biographies of Henry VIII’s wives discussed above.

By far the most sophisticated analyses of Margaret Tudor’s career in Scotland focus on her wedding ceremonies and early days as queen consort to James IV. Although these are important studies, they are not concerned with Margaret’s career as a queen of Scots. Their interest in her is solely focused on her role as a symbol of peace and the alliance her marriage represented. In a variety of articles written by historians and literary scholars, the negotiations, ceremonies and meaning of Margaret’s marriage have been subjected to academic scrutiny.⁶⁰ In particular Douglas Gray’s article “The Royal Entry in Sixteenth-Century Scotland,” argues that Scotland developed a vibrant tradition of royal entries in the sixteenth century, beginning with

⁵⁸My point here is that Mary Tudor was not a queen, although she was an important figure at the court of her brother Henry VIII and a close friend of Queen Catherine; for a recent, nuanced approach to Mary’s life and career, see Erin A. Sadlack, *The French Queen’s Letters: Mary Tudor Brandon and the Politics of Marriage in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), www.palgraveconnect.com.

⁵⁹Maria Perry, *Sisters to the King: The Tumultuous Lives of Henry VIII’s Sisters, Margaret of Scotland and Mary of France* (London: André Deutsch, 1998); Nancy Lenz Harvey, *The Rose and the Thorn: The Lives of Mary and Margaret Tudor* (New York: Macmillan, 1975); Hester W. Chapman, *The Sisters of Henry VIII* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1969).

⁶⁰Louise Olga Fradenburg, “Sovereign Love: The Wedding of Margaret Tudor and James IV of Scotland,” in *Women and Sovereignty*, ed. Louise Olga Fradenburg (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), 78–100; Lorna G. Barrow, “the Kynge Sent to the Qwene, by a Gentyelman, a Grett Tame Hart’ Marriage, Gift Exchange, and Politics: Margaret Tudor and James IV 1502-13,” *Parergon: Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 21 (2004): 65–84; David Dunlop, “The Politics of Peace-Keeping: Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1503-1511,” *Renaissance Studies* 8, no. 2 (1994): 138–161, doi:10.1111/j.1477-4658.1994.tb00289.x.

Margaret's wedding celebrations.⁶¹ Sarah Carpenter has used the English account of Margaret's wedding to analyze the meaning of display and performance in early modern court culture.⁶² Margaret's ceremonial entry into Edinburgh was one of the first recorded Scottish royal entries, and its position as a pioneer for Scottish entries contributes to its importance in Scottish historiography.

Since the early 1980s historians have begun to investigate the roles, duties, and authority of medieval queens.⁶³ In general, medieval consorts have received greater attention from scholars in comparison to their early modern counterparts. Queens of England in particular, such as Matilda of Scotland (1080-1118), Eleanor of Castile (1241-1290), Eleanor of Provence (c. 1223-1291), and Margaret of Anjou (1430-1482), have garnered a great deal of attention from scholars because of their lengthy reigns and politically influential relationships with their husbands.⁶⁴ These works have shown that queens in England were important public figures in their own right, who sought to advance the interests of their countrymen and household, while also administering large estates and overseeing the care and education of their children. Some scholars have sought to discuss queenship more broadly by focusing not on a single individual, but on a collection of queens from specific periods. Anne Crawford analyzed a number of English queens in a series of articles, culminating in her edited collection *Letters of the Queens*

⁶¹Douglas Gray, "The Royal Entry in Sixteenth-Century Scotland," in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (East Linton, UK: Tuckwell, 1998), 10.

⁶²Sarah Carpenter, "'To Thexaltacyon of Noblesse': A Herald's Account of the Marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV," *Medieval English Theatre* 29 (2007): 104–20.

⁶³For an excellent overview of medieval queenship historiography, see Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 4–9.

⁶⁴E.g. Pauline Stafford, *Queens, Concubines, and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1983); John Carmi Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England*, 1st ed (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995); Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998); Helen E. Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2003); Lois L. Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2003).

of England, 1100-1547 (1994).⁶⁵ In this volume Crawford emphasizes that the queen could influence and affect a whole range of issues during her husbands' reign.⁶⁶ Medieval queenship studies have focused on the coronation ritual as defining the ideals and aspirations of queenship, and the diplomatic and ceremonial roles queens could use to influence their husbands or claim authority and respect for themselves.⁶⁷

The most comprehensive overview of English medieval queenship comes from Joanna L. Laynesmith's recent study, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503* (2002). In this work, Laynesmith discusses the queenships of four medieval queens during the last half of the fifteenth century: Margaret of Anjou, Elizabeth Woodville, Anne Neville, and Elizabeth of York. Laynesmith deliberately eschews a biographical format and instead considers her subjects thematically, thus producing an overall picture of the ideals, expectations, and realities of queenship during one of the most turbulent periods of English history. The Wars of the Roses, Laynesmith argues, created a crisis of legitimate kingship, which in turn created "aberrations in queenly practice," such as the marriage of a king to a knight's widow, Elizabeth Woodville, for example.⁶⁸

Studies of Scottish queenship have rightly considered the important and lasting influence of St. Margaret of Scotland (c.1045-1093), queen of Malcolm III, whose influence in bringing

⁶⁵ Anne Crawford, ed., *Letters of the Queens of England, 1100-1547* (Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1994); Anne Crawford, "The King's Burden?: The Consequences of Royal Marriage in Fifteenth-Century England," in *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England*, ed. Ralph A. Griffiths (Gloucester: A. Sutton, 1981), 33-56; Anne Crawford, "The Piety of Late Medieval English Queens," in *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society: Essays in Honour of F.R.H. Du Boulay*, ed. Caroline M. Barron and Christopher Harper-Bill (Dover, N.H.: Boydell Press, 1985), 48-57; Anne Crawford, "The Queen's Council in the Middle Ages," *The English Historical Review* 116, no. 469 (2001): 1193-1211, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1562291>.

⁶⁶ Crawford, *Letters of the Queens of England, 1100-1547*, 3.

⁶⁷ John Carmi Parsons, "Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500," in *Women and Sovereignty*, ed. Louise Olga Fradenburg (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), 60-77; Nelson, "Medieval Queenship"; John Carmi Parsons, ed., *Medieval Queenship*, Pbk. ed. (Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1998).

⁶⁸ Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 262-263; a recently published monograph has taken a similar approach to thirteenth-century queens consort, Lisa Benz St. John, *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

the Scottish church closer in line with Roman practice and her close links with Anglo-Saxon and Norman England made her a role-model for her successors.⁶⁹ Jessica Nelson argues that Scottish queenship developed rapidly as a result of St. Margaret's royal status before her marriage (she was the grand-niece of Edward the Confessor) and her influence over her husband and later her children, three of whom became kings of Scotland.⁷⁰ After Margaret's death, the absence of an active Scottish queen consort in the twelfth century, and the problem of finding brides of appropriate status for the emerging Scottish kingdom, retarded the growth of queenly traditions and authority, such as the queen's coronation.⁷¹ Later Scottish queens were politically significant figures whose husbands, such as James I or James II, trusted them to rule for their underage sons.⁷² However, these same studies have shown that Scottish queens were generally more reliant on their husband's power and authority than their English contemporaries, as exemplified by Scottish queen's coronation ceremony, which was a late development designed to enhance the power of the king by emphasizing the derivative nature of the queen's power.⁷³

It has taken longer for studies of early modern queens consort to develop the breadth and depth that those of their medieval counterparts enjoy. Beginning with Eric Ives's biography of Anne Boleyn (1986) and Caroline Hibbard's article "The Role of a Queen Consort: the Household and Court of Henrietta Maria, 1625-1642" in 1991, studies of early modern queens consort have gradually multiplied. One of the most important themes of history of early modern

⁶⁹St. Margaret was also considered a role model for English queenship through the influence of her daughter Matilda, queen of Henry I, who commissioned a life of her mother, see Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*, 10–16.

⁷⁰Jessica Nelson, "Scottish Queenship in the Thirteenth Century," in *Thirteenth Century England XI: Proceedings of the Gregynog Conference, 2005*, ed. Bjorn Weiler, Janet Burton, and Phillipp Scholfield (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), 63.

⁷¹*Ibid.*, 65.

⁷²Fiona Downie, *She Is but a Woman: Queenship in Scotland, 1424-1463* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2006), 88–89.

⁷³Fiona Downie, "Queenship in Late Medieval Scotland," in *Scottish Kingship, 1306-1542: Essays in Honour of Norman Macdougall*, ed. Michael Brown, Roland Tanner, and Norman Macdougall (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2008), 234–235. The first recorded Scottish queen's coronation was that of Joan Plantagenet, crowned alongside her husband David II in 1331 as part of the Scottish monarchy's reassertion of its sovereignty after the Wars of Independence against the English.

queens has been the importance of the court networks that connected queenly households to the wider court and to their homeland. Hibbard's article argues that Henrietta Maria's "dysfunctional" household, which failed to create effective connections between the court and the larger political kingdom, reflected similar problems encountered by the king's household, ultimately leading to political crisis.⁷⁴ Malcolm Smuts and Melinda J. Gough argue in their Introduction to *The Court Historian* volume entitled "Queens and the Transmission of Political Culture: the Case of Early Modern France" that studies of elite women and queens can provide a more subtle understanding of how national and international social and dynastic networks influenced early modern politics. This understanding can be provided by focusing on royal and elite women in particular because while studies of men at court reinforce national history, elite women, including noblewomen such as Joan Beaufort, who married James I of Scotland, or Constanza of Castile, who married John of Gaunt, were part of international marriage alliances that brought foreign influences and dynastic politics into their marital households. Studying elite women naturally points to a more international understanding of court studies because they were far more likely to be international figures themselves.⁷⁵ My work builds upon the concept of international connections formed by foreign queens consort by studying Catherine and Margaret together as queens who not only formed connections between their homelands and their native countries, but also with each other as queens in the British Isles.⁷⁶

⁷⁴Caroline Hibbard, "The Role of a Queen Consort: The Household and Court of Henrietta Maria, 1625-1642," in *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c.1450-1650*, ed. Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 393-414.

⁷⁵Malcolm R. Smuts and Melissa Gough, "Queens and the International Transmission of Political Culture," *The Court Historian* 10, no. 1 (2005): 1-2; for more on elite women's international connections see Sarah Bercusson, "The Duchess' Court in Sixteenth-Century Italy: A Comparison of Female Experience," in *Moving Elites: Women and Cultural Transfers in the European Court System*, ed. Giulia Calvi and Isabelle Chabot, Proceedings of an International Workshop (Florence, 12-13 December 2008) (San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy: European University Institute, 2010), 127-140, <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/14234>.

⁷⁶Other works that build upon the theme of international connections and queens consort include Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Queenship in Europe, 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004);

Studies of early modern queens consort have been slow to develop in part because of the scholarly attention devoted to the understandably more alluring careers of queens regnant and queens regent such as Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, or Catherine de Medici. Volumes of articles on queens in the British Isles or Europe tend to be heavily weighted in favor of those queens such as Isabel of Castile or her granddaughter Mary I of England whose access to power, patronage, and prestige was based not on their marriages to kings, but their own position as monarchs.⁷⁷ “Queenship” in the case of early modern Britain more often refers to the anomalous reigns of Mary I, Elizabeth I, or Mary Queen of Scots, and not to the queens consort who occupied the traditional role of queens. Queens regnant, who held power in their own right, faced a number of political and cultural challenges to their rule. This forced British political propagandists and theorists working for and against the government to discuss and define the relationship between power, gender, and queenship.⁷⁸ These reigns have thus attracted a great deal of attention from feminist scholars eager to discuss early modern ideas of gender and power. Works on queens regnant that implicitly place them alongside other queens prevent scholars in the field from developing a clear and nuanced understanding of the very different roles, rights, and duties, of queens consort, queens regnant and queens regent. The interchangeability of terms has thus produced a muddled field of “queenship” studies that attempts to embrace all types of queens without truly investigating the differences or connections between them.⁷⁹

Jansen, *Female Rulers in Early Modern Europe*; Magdalena S. Sánchez, *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun: Women and Power at the Court of Philip III of Spain* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).

⁷⁷Theresa Earenfight, ed., *Queenship and Political Power in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005).

⁷⁸See Constance Jordan, “Woman’s Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (1987): 421–451, doi:10.2307/2862518; Judith M. Richards, “Mary Tudor as ‘Sole Quene’?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy,” *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 4 (1997): 895–924, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640128>; Cynthia Herrup, “The King’s Two Genders,” *The Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006): 493–510, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/503588>.

⁷⁹Caroline Hibbard, “Early Modern Queens Revived and Revised,” *Journal of Women’s History* 22, no. 2 (2010): 181–190; for examples of works that mix studies of queens regnant and queens consort, see Carole Levin, Jo

Although queens regnant are often grouped with studies of queens consort, scholars have also been slow to recognize the precedents set by queens consort that were used in the reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth I. In early articles discussing the courts of Elizabeth and Mary, their courts and households are consistently compared to those of their male predecessors, with little acknowledgement of the models queens consort might have provided for female monarchs.⁸⁰ But in recent years scholars of the Tudor queens regnant have begun to recognize that queens regnant relied on the precedents and traditions associated with queens consort. Mary I, England's first queen regnant, drew upon imagery and ritual associated with both kings and queens consort for her coronation, for example.⁸¹

Sources and Methodology

Queens are often difficult to trace within the royal archives because their records are subsumed within the records of the king and his court. Because of the scarcity of manuscript sources directly related to Catherine and Margaret, I have exploited a variety of sources that touch upon a wide range of subjects, from equity proceedings about land ownership disputes in Buckinghamshire to inventories of Margaret's goods after she left Scotland in 1516.⁸² Manuscripts pertinent to this study include documents that have also been published in calendars and other formats—wherever possible I have given the published reference and only noted the manuscript reference if it differs from the published version. As queens consort, references to

Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves, eds., *"High and Mighty Queens" of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Regina Schulte, ed., *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500-2000* (New York: Berghahn, 2006); Liz Oakley-Brown and Louise J. Wilkinson, *The Rituals and Rhetoric of Queenship: Medieval to Early Modern* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2009).

⁸⁰Pam Wright, "A Change in Direction: The Ramifications of a Female Household," in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. David Starkey (London: Longman, 1987), 147–172; John Murphy, "The Illusion of Decline: The Privy Chamber, 1547-1558," in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. David Starkey (London: Longman, 1987), 119–146.

⁸¹Alice Hunt, "The Reformation of Tradition: The Coronations of Mary and Elizabeth," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, ed. Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 68, www.palgraveconnect.com.

⁸²The National Archives MS E111/49, Kew, UK; National Archives of Scotland MS SP 13/23, Edinburgh, UK.

Catherine and Margaret are often subsumed in the archives by the records of the royal household and government as a whole. Eric Ives noted this problem in his biography of Anne Boleyn: “much of the necessary record material no longer exists or is almost inextricably mixed up with the king's archive. This partial submerging of a queen in the overall royal entourage is one explanation for there being less notice of Anne Boleyn's active participation in public affairs after 1533 [precisely when she became queen consort].”⁸³ This is a common challenge facing historians of queens, as even figures as seemingly dominant as Anne Boleyn fade into the background of the archival record. Margaret especially suffers from this type of obfuscation because, as we shall see, her household was not administered independently from the king's household and thus only partially appears in the records.

Despite the remarkable survival of state papers in England, records relating to queens have an uneven survival rate until the seventeenth century. Because Catherine, like several of Henry's wives, ended her reign in disgrace, there seems to have been little institutional or personal motivation for preserving documents relating to her reign, especially any which might have called into question the legitimacy of her successors' reigns. Alternatively, some documents (for instance, some of the land indentures concerning the leases for Catherine's properties) may have survived because of the unusual transition in ownership, which resulted in Catherine's tenants being required to renew their grants with Queen Anne.⁸⁴ Moreover, although some of Catherine's and Margaret's expenses appear in the Exchequer rolls of their kingdoms, there does not appear to have been a systematic accounting to the English or Scottish Exchequers of the queen's own officials in the sixteenth century.⁸⁵

⁸³Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, 205.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, 215.

⁸⁵ This process was considerably more systematic in the Middle Ages, where the dominance of the Exchequer over royal finances insured that the revenue and finances of Queen Isabella of France (1295-1358) as well as her some of

There are an even smaller number of surviving sources for Margaret's time as queen consort of Scotland, possibly in part due to Margaret's chaotic later career as Queen Regent and Queen Mother. Her active political life after 1513 included numerous attempted coups and a temporary exile, any of which may have resulted in her official and personal papers being confiscated at some point. For instance, in September 1516, just before she fled to England, an indenture was made of the goods taken into custody by the new regent, John, Duke of Albany. Listed amongst the valuable jewels and costly fabrics were a packet of letters regarding the surety of Margaret's lands in Kilmarnock, four books, and an obligation for a debt of 2000 marks, none of which have survived.⁸⁶ Alternatively, Margaret's papers may have been kept by her second and third husbands, and thus were never deposited into the royal archives.⁸⁷

In addition to the uneven survival of the queen's records, Scottish royal records in general suffered from losses as a result of the unsettled nature of Scottish affairs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Unlike England, Scotland suffered numerous invasions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. After Cromwell's 1650 invasion and occupation of Scotland, he had the records taken to England, and although they were returned in 1660, one of the ships carrying the records sank on the voyage home.⁸⁸ The principal surviving sources concerning Margaret are accounts of expenditure of the royal household, kept by the Treasurer, and include entries for Margaret's household amongst those of the king.

I have sought to craft a juxtaposition of Catherine's and Margaret's reigns in a way that illuminates not merely their commonalities and differences, but also their shared connections and

her predecessors, are in fact more fully documented than Catherine of Aragon, see Hilda Johnstone, "The Queen's Exchequer under the Three Edwards," in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, ed. John Goronwy Edwards, V. H. Galbraith, and E. F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), 143–53.

⁸⁶ NAS MS SP 13/23.

⁸⁷ I have as yet had no success in tracing the current whereabouts, if they still exist, of any archives of Margaret's second or third husbands relevant to the early sixteenth century.

⁸⁸ Scottish Record Office, *Guide to the National Archives of Scotland* (Edinburgh: The Stationery Office, 1996), x–xi. Incomplete inventories makes it difficult to know what was lost.

experiences that when seen together present a clearer understanding of both of their reigns. The manuscript sources on Catherine's queenship not only reveal details about Catherine, but also point to missing sources relevant to Margaret's queenship. Noting the absence or lack of sources for Margaret potentially reveals unconsidered problems or limitations of her queenship. For instance, in chapter 1, I argue that Margaret's dependence upon her husband for administering her dower estates significantly affected her ability to become a patron and assert her own control over her estates once she was a widow. This argument is supported through understanding not only how Margaret's estates were handled, but also how Catherine's control over her own estates enhanced her queenship. As is probably evident from their histories outlined above, the personal details of their queenships, including their age upon accession (Catherine was twenty-three and Margaret was thirteen) and duration of their reigns (Catherine reigned for over twenty years, Margaret only ten), would make a strict comparison unfair and unhelpful to the study of queenship.

This methodology deliberately seeks to pick up on one of the major developments in queenship studies of the past fifteen years, the emphasis on the international connections and influence of European queens consort of the early modern period. In eschewing a biographical or single-figure approach, my work shines light on the common themes, challenges, and strategies that queens confronted in pre-modern Europe on a broader and more wide-ranging scale. This approach also illuminates not merely connections between queens and their homelands, but also the connections between queens and their marital and natal families, including sisters and in-laws, connections that could occur across Europe.⁸⁹ The dense web of interconnectivity amongst

⁸⁹For instance, three daughters of Habsburg Emperor Ferdinand I married into the ducal courts of Gonzaga, Este, and Medici of sixteenth-century Italy. One sister, Eleanora, was mentored by her mother-in-law Margherita Paleologa, and in turn Eleanora mentored her daughter-in-law, Eleanora de Medici. Eleanora continued to visit her

the royal houses of Europe was not limited to immediate natal or blood kin, and in fact spanned multiple dynasties and generations. Additionally, the close personal connections between Catherine and Margaret that have emerged from this study show that foreign queens consort continued to maintain and even to extend the relationships between their natal and marital dynasties well beyond their immediate, initial connection with their husbands.

The organization and structure of this work naturally follows from the goals and strategies contained in its methodology. The following chapters are arranged thematically, each addressing aspects of Catherine's and Margaret's queenships together. The first chapter discusses Catherine's and Margaret's financial resources, including their dowries and dower lands. By examining their dowers, this chapter explores the potent administrative and legal factors that helped to finance pre-modern queenship. This chapter also shows that Catherine's dower lands, which her husband granted to her upon becoming queen, were administered much like any other large landed patrimony. These lands gave Catherine widespread resources and authority as a lord and the head of a council that exercised legal jurisdiction over her lands as a court of equity.

Chapters two and three consider the department of the Wardrobe and the material culture of queenship. Chapter two argues that the Wardrobe was an important department used by Catherine and Margaret to create ties of loyalty and household identity through the use of liveries and New Year's gifts. It also explores the close connections between the Wardrobe staff of the two queens. In their households there were groups of servants who successively served queens and royal women, effectively acting as "queenly specialists" and holders of institutional memory. Chapter three turns to the clothing and material goods of the queens themselves through three case studies: Margaret's wedding trousseau, royal childbirth, and Catherine's material diplomacy

Habsburg relatives in Innsbruck and her sister in Ferrara, further continuing the connections formed by her marriage, Bercusson, "Duchess' Court," 131–132, 137.

at the 1520 meeting of the French and English courts known as the Field of Cloth of Gold. In each case study, I show how Catherine and Margaret used material culture in fulfilling their roles as magnificent queens and thus displayed their own status, honor, and authority.

Chapter four reassesses Catherine's and Margaret's participation in the wider world of the royal court by concentrating on their duties as audience to royal spectacle and provider of royal hospitality. In the spectacular tournaments and amusements of the royal courts, Catherine and Margaret were audiences whose close connection to the king and place of honor established and then displayed their all-important relationships with their husbands. In more intimate settings, Catherine's and Margaret's responsibilities as hostess placed them and their households at the center of the socialization of court and in turn provided them with access and influence with the king and his courtiers. Chapter five returns to the relationship between the king and queen, and I argue that the close connections between their two households allowed them to work together to distribute patronage. Patronage gave Catherine and Margaret the opportunity not only to reward their followers but also to display to those at court their own influence and success as queen by demonstrating their access to rewards and largesse.

Chapter six turns to a discussion of Catherine's and Margaret's piety through their almsgivings and pilgrimages. These two pious activities were both morally important aspects of their religious practice and closely tied to their sacred and moral status as queens. Almsgiving, especially the rite of the Royal Maundy, connected Catherine and Margaret with the life of Christ and divinely-sanctioned monarchy. Pilgrimage for both queens was deeply linked to their trials and triumphs in childbirth, and thus to their primary duties as queen. Their journeys brought their faith out to the wider world and echoed the journeys made by many of their subjects, thus connecting their faith with that of the people.

CHAPTER 1

The Financial Resources of Queenship

It well please your moost noble gr[a]ce of your charyty a[nd] goodness to be g[ra]cious meane for your sayd pore bedewoman unto the king[es] good g[ra]ce that it may please his highness of his charyte... That your said pore bedwoman may be recompensed for the deth of her sayd husband butt also to see the sayd officer[es] dewly ponysshed for the wilfull escape of the sayd John Barnysby in example of all other officers accordingly.¹

During the reign of Henry VIII, one of his queens received the request quoted above as part of a petition from Alice Warner, a widow of Bury St. Edmunds.² Alice petitioned the queen for help in obtaining justice for her late husband, Thomas Warner, who had been murdered by John Barnysby, sacristan of the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds. Her petition calls upon the queen if “it well please your most noble gr[ace] of your charity a[nd] goodness to be gr[a]cious.” Alice asked for help in obtaining a warrant for the arrest of Barnysby, who had taken sanctuary in St. John’s Colchester, and to punish those officials of the town of Bury who allowed Barnysby to escape. She hoped the queen would intervene with the king for her, so that “it may please his highness of his charity” to see justice done.³

Alice’s petition has much in common with the numerous other petitions that English queens received from their subjects in the medieval and early modern period. It stresses the justice of the petitioner’s cause, and it emphasizes Alice’s inferior status and need for protection. Alice hopes that the queen’s relationship with the king will benefit her petition, and she positions the queen in the role as intercessor between Alice and an unresponsive justice system. The role of queens as intercessors for the poor has been noted by historians in the past, and it was an

¹ TNA MS E135/22/15; brackets indicate my expansions of in-text abbreviations.

² The National Archives dates the petition to “temp Hen VIII,” and it does not address the queen by name. The petition is undated, although it must have been written before 1539, when the abbey was dissolved.

³ TNA MS E135/22/15.

expected role for queens to fulfill.⁴ However, Alice's petition does not rely on those common queenly attributes alone. Instead, she appeals to the queen of England on several different levels, only one of which was the queen's traditional role as intercessor for the people. On another, more personal level, Alice appeals to the queen as her "pore bedewoman," an almswoman who prays for the queen, thus calling upon a special relationship with the queen, who is her patron. Alice emphasizes her status as a bedewoman to the queen multiple times in the petition, situating her status not as a petitioner but as a client and worthy recipient of charity. In addition to claiming a relationship with the queen based on charity, Alice has a final claim upon the queen's patronage. She asks the queen to intervene in this matter because the residents of Bury are tenants of the queen, which Alice argues gives the tenants the right to call upon the queen to act as a good lord. Although we do not know exactly to which of Henry's queens the petition was addressed to, rent from the town of Bury, Suffolk, was part of the dower assignment of Catherine of Aragon. Its inhabitants had called upon her to intervene on their behalf in other cases as well, so it is likely, given the length of Catherine's reign as queen and her other interactions with Bury, that this petition was addressed to her.⁵

Alice Warner's petition to the queen of England reveals the many ways in which queens interacted with their subjects in early modern England. At first glance, Alice's petition appears to call upon the queen as intercessor for the people of England. However, upon closer reading, it is

⁴John Carmi Parsons, "The Pregnant Queen as Councilor and the Medieval Construction of Motherhood," in *Medieval Mothering*, ed. John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (New York: Garland, 1996); Collette, *Performing Polity*, chap. 5; Paul Strohm, *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), chap. 5; Lois L. Huneycutt, "Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos," in *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth Maclean (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 126–146; John Carmi Parsons, "The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England," in *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth Maclean (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 147–177; for a discussion of the decline of intercession in queenly ritual, see Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 95, 106, 139.

⁵For Catherine's dower assignment, see *LP* 1.1:94; for Catherine's other dealings with Bury, see TNA MS E163/11/47/2.

clear that the queen's relationship with Alice is based on more specific ties, the ties of lordship, patronage, and clientage that made up the service relationships of the early sixteenth century. Narrative accounts of queenly petitions and intercessions tend to focus on rare, publicly staged events of queenly intercession. Documents from Catherine's council reveal that far more people petitioned the queen with more mundane requests, which were handled by the queen and her officials in the daily administration of her estates.

The business of lordship that the queen and her officials participated in was not only based on her status as the wife of the king, but also on the queen's rights and responsibilities as the holder of vast estates and properties in England. Recently, historians have discussed the "business of queenship" for medieval queens such as Isabella of France or Margaret of Anjou, but very little work has been done on how the sixteenth-century queens of England administered their estates and interacted with their subjects as lords in their own right.⁶ For behind the ritual, pageantry, and pomp of queenship, there was a series of complex and crucial financial, administrative, and juridical relationships that supported the queen's household and provided her with opportunities of patronage and reward that were not dependent on the king's oversight.

The most significant difference in Catherine's and Margaret's queenships was their control of financial resources and the authority they could claim based on those resources. As we will see in this chapter and subsequent chapters, access to financial resources—in terms of income and patronage—determined how they governed their households and established their own legal and administrative offices. While neither queen was completely independent of her husband for financial support and patronage opportunities, English traditions of queenship and Catherine's legal status provided her with opportunities for creating networks of obligation and

⁶ See Anthony J. Musson, "Queenship, Lordship and Petitioning in Late Medieval England," in *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance*, ed. W. Mark Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd, and Anthony Musson (York: York Medieval Press, 2009), 156–172; Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*; Johnstone, "The Queen's Exchequer under the Three Edwards."

influence in her household, the royal court, and across her kingdom.⁷ The business side of queenship is both the least visible and yet the most important basis for creating a foundation upon which Catherine could establish her authority independently as landlord and queen. Because of different traditions in Scotland, Margaret had no such opportunity during her time as queen consort of James IV, despite the fact that she was legally entitled to lands and income after the death of her husband. Understanding the foundation upon which Catherine built her queenship in England can illuminate the limitations Margaret faced in Scotland.

Catherine understood the importance of her dower properties to her practice of queenship and her ability to reward her trusted servants and officials. During the divorce crisis, one of the most distressing episodes Catherine faced came when Parliament began to strip her of her dower properties. In 1533 the Spanish ambassador to England wrote to Catherine's nephew Emperor Charles V that "[t]his is the thing which the Queen dreads most, and which causes her most pain and sorrow, more than any other personal annoyance she has hitherto gone through, imagining that as long as she retains the allowance and estate which queens generally enjoy she may consider herself as a queen, and not be dispossessed of her rank and dignity." Here, we see that Catherine believed her "rank and dignity" of queen to be intimately connected to her dower estates. Despite the fact that she had been queen of England for over two decades, Catherine knew that her authority as queen was closely connected to her ability to continue her traditional queenly roles, including the privilege of managing her estates. The ambassador went on to describe that Catherine was even more worried that her servants and officials "will henceforward be deprived of their pensions and salaries should her marriage portion [dower lands] be taken

⁷ The nature of the queen's relationship with her husband is discussed in more detail in chapter 5.

from her.”⁸ Catherine was well-aware of the rights and responsibilities her position as queen consort had granted her.

It is worth commenting here that the financial position of the pre-modern queens of England appears to be highly anomalous when compared to their Scottish or European contemporaries. While very little work has been done on the finances of consorts in other realms, the few studies that do exist suggest that Margaret’s financial situation was much more indicative of European norms than Catherine’s. Medieval French queens, for example, received funds that were assigned to them out of the king’s revenues. They possessed the bureaucracy necessary to collect and account for their funds from the king’s officials, but they did not administer their dower estates as landlords until they were widowed.⁹ Italian ducal consorts in the sixteenth century faced similar situations.¹⁰ It is therefore unsurprising that Margaret did not administer her own lands, and all the more significant that Catherine did.

When Catherine of Aragon became Queen of England in 1509, she immediately began to encounter the immense expense of queenship. Her husband, Henry VIII, specifically granted her an income that was “in consideracion of the greate costes, expenses and charges whiche his seid moste dere and welbeloved Wife Katherine Quene of Englund muste of necessite have and bere in her Chambre and other wises.”¹¹ English queens consort were landholders in their own right during the medieval and early modern period. In England, the queen’s dower was the “annual sum settled on her by the English Crown which would support her household during her husband’s lifetime and provide her entire income in her widowhood.”¹² The queen was then

⁸ *CSP Spanish* 4.2:1123, pg. 786.

⁹ Colleen Lily Mooney, “Queenship in Fifteenth-Century France” (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 1977), 75–76, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/302849950?accountid=14553>.

¹⁰ Bercusson, “Duchess’ Court,” 133–135.

¹¹ *Statutes of the Realm*, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (London, 1817) 3: I Henry VIII c.18, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>.

¹² Crawford, *Letters of the Queens of England, 1100-1547*, 8.

expected to administer her properties much as a great nobleman would, in order to receive the income from her properties and pay her expenses. The queen's lands were extensive and widespread in the sixteenth century, making her one of the largest landowners in the kingdom, well above almost all of the great noble magnates.¹³ As such, the dower was the queen's chief source of relatively independent patronage, and it could be used to reward her followers with offices, lands, and income beyond their fees. Kings also dowered their queens with the expectation that some of the income would be used to support the royal children, especially when they were young.¹⁴

Scottish queens consort did not control their dowers the way their English counterparts did. In general, English queens expected to administer their dowers by their own officials who took orders from her, consulted with her, and acted in her name without a great deal of involvement from the king. It is unlikely that Margaret independently held her dower lands until after her husband's death. Because Margaret did not control her own income from her lands, her

¹³The traditional income for English queens was around £4,500 in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 234–236; wealthy magnates' incomes, like Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, ranged around £2,000 annually, Pierce, *Margaret Pole*, 37. Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, had an income of £2,100 when he died in 1545, and Edward Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, had an estimated income of around £5,000 before he died in 1521, see "Brandon, Charles, first duke of Suffolk (c.1484–1545)" and "Stafford, Edward, third duke of Buckingham (1478–1521)" in H. C. G. Matthew, Brian Harrison, eds, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) Online edition, Lawrence Goldman, ed., www.oxforddnb.com.

¹⁴Dower and jointure are terms that were easily confused during this period, and occasionally they were used interchangeably. Neither term correctly corresponds to the unusual situation of queens consort in England and Scotland. When Catherine's lands were confirmed by Parliament in 1509, they were called her dower, *Statutes of the Realm*, 3: I Henry VIII c.18. The Scottish Parliament's confirmation of Margaret's dower lands used the Latin term "dot" which can be translated as dowry or dower, Thomas Rymer, *Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, Et Cujuscunque Generis Acta Publica Inter Reges Angliae*, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (London, 1704)12:92, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>. I will follow the standard practice of most historians of the early sixteenth century by using "dower," although both Catherine and Margaret's financial situations were distinct from what most contemporaries would have understood the common law term "dower" to mean. The money brought by women into their marriage, usually provided by their fathers, was called their dowry or marriage portion. For an excellent discussion of this complex legal issue, see Barbara J. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 22–23. Although I will generally refer to the queen's dower as her "lands," in truth her income came from several different sources tied to properties and rights of the crown, including manorial rents and privileges, fee farms, lordships, and a host of miscellaneous rights acquired over the centuries.

position in Scotland, including her household, patronage, and political influence, was highly dependent on the king. It was not until after her husband's death that Margaret began to personally administer her dower properties in Scotland.

The dowers belonging to English queens gave them opportunities to assert their authority over these estates in a similar manner to great noblemen. In England, queens consort took possession of their dower lands during the lifetime of their husbands in order to finance their households. Because she needed to administer these properties in order to receive revenues, the English queen had a council that managed her estates and dealt with legal matters. Scottish queens, however, only inherited their dower properties when they became widows.¹⁵ During the lifetime of her husband, Margaret's dower lands were controlled by her husband. There is no surviving evidence of a queen's council operating in Scotland during the lifetime of the king, but members of Margaret's household did act as her representatives and procurators in matters relating to her dower lands at the beginning of her marriage.¹⁶

In this chapter I will discuss three factors that determined the financial and administrative relationships that Catherine or Margaret engaged in as queens. First, I will discuss the nature of their dowers in England and Scotland, and what their legal status in each realm was. Then, I will consider the manor of Havering-atte-Bower, one of the traditional manors assigned to English queens and the only known stately home that belonged exclusively to the queen, as a case study for understanding the queen's relationship with her lands. Finally, I will show how Catherine's council operated in England. In studying the financial relationships that began their queenships, together with the day-to-day administration of Catherine's estates, I will show that the business

¹⁵ These properties were legally recognized as part of her dower as part of her marriage negotiations, and Margaret's dower was ratified by the Scottish parliament in 1504, Joseph Bain, ed, *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1881-1888) 4:1736, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>.

¹⁶ See discussion below.

of queenship, while difficult to assess, was one of the most important ways in which English queens extended their patronage and public authority. Margaret will take a secondary role in this chapter because she had fewer opportunities to administer her estates, but I believe that by understanding the rights and responsibilities accorded to Catherine in England, we can better understand Margaret's very different position in Scotland.

Dowers and the Queen's Income

Catherine's marriage to Henry VIII in 1509 was concluded to fulfill the treaty of marriage that was drawn up between Henry VII and her parents in 1503, after the death of Catherine's first husband, Arthur Prince of Wales.¹⁷ Both of Catherine's marriage contracts, in 1489 for her marriage to Arthur and in 1503, stipulate that if she became queen, she would receive the same lands and revenues that other queens of England had before her.¹⁸ In 1509, this is exactly what happened. In June, Henry issued letters patent giving Catherine the traditional lands, fee farms, and revenues of the queen of England, which Elizabeth of York had held before her.¹⁹ Henry's grant was then confirmed by Parliament, which also confirmed Catherine's right to the goods and chattels of any fugitives, felons and outlaws of her estates and tenants, another right that was commonly granted to English queens. In addition to the lands and revenues, Catherine was granted "Habilitie Capacite Avauntage and Libertie and in as large and ample fourme as though she had orygyinally ben borne within this Realme of Englund," which essentially was an act of naturalization for the Spanish queen, allowing her to own and administer lands as if she were a native-born Englishwoman.²⁰ Finally, Catherine was also given

¹⁷ *CSP Spanish* 2:17.

¹⁸ *CSP Spanish* 1:34, pg. 23; 1:364, pg. 307; this was a common practice, dating back to at least the fourteenth century, of dowering queens with their predecessor's lands, in some ways making them heirs to their predecessors, St. John, *Three Medieval Queens*, 83.

¹⁹ *LP* 1.1:94.

²⁰ *Statutes of the Realm* 3:I Henry VIII c.18.

the right to sue in her own name for her rents and debts, a status known as *femme sole*, a legal right that greatly increased Catherine's independence.²¹

Catherine's double boon of being granted, in essence, English naturalization and legal independence from her husband, allowed her to establish her authority separate from her husband through her independent administration of her dower lands, which as we will see, consistently involved invoking the queen's name as a source of authority. In theory, Catherine could be sued in her own name or pursue legal actions without the consent of her husband, the king. She would be represented in any legal matters as if she were a single woman or a widow. She could buy and sell property as if she were not married, and most importantly, enter into contracts or indentures regarding her lands. In England, queens had been given the authority to oversee their lands as if they were *femme sole* since at least the late thirteenth century.²² Additionally, the combination of *femme sole* status with the granting of dower properties to queens while the king was still alive gave English queens an advantage in managing their lands through a council and officials who could legally defend her rights and act in her name without being required to involve the king.

In declaring Catherine *femme sole*, Henry followed the established practice of other medieval kings, whose primary purpose had been to relieve themselves of responsibilities for their wives' debts.²³ Other than the peculiar case of English queens consort, designating a married woman *femme sole* had been used largely as an economic device by pre-modern urban married women that enabled them to manage their own trades independently from their

²¹ All of Henry's wives received this status, and it was confirmed by statute in 1540, Dakota L. Hamilton, "The Learned Councils of the Tudor Queens Consort," in *State, Sovereigns & Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of A.J. Slavin*, ed. Charles Carlton (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 89.

²² Crawford, "Queen's Council," 1194; St. John, *Three Medieval Queens*, 83–84; Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 237–238.

²³ Sir Edward Coke, *The First Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England, Or, A Commentary upon Littleton: Not the Name of the Author Only, but of the Law Itself*, ed. Charles Butler, vol. 1, 19th ed., *The Making of Modern Law* (London, 1832), 133a, <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/MOML?af=RN&ae=F100288223&srchtp=a&ste=14>.

husbands.²⁴ However, in 1509 Henry and Catherine probably had in mind the recent example of Henry's grandmother, Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond. Upon the accession of her son Henry VII, Margaret Beaufort was declared *femme sole*, despite the fact that her husband, Thomas, Lord Stanley, was very much alive and in good standing with the king. Margaret would go on to administer far-flung estates and act as an arbiter in local disputes as an independent noblewoman, much as if she were a widow.²⁵

When Henry gave Catherine her dower in 1509, he drew from the same royal estates that his mother, Elizabeth of York, had held as her dower until her death in 1503.²⁶ Some of these estates, such as the manor of Havering-atte-Bower in Essex, had been held by queens dating back centuries, while others were relatively recent additions to the queen's lands made by Edward IV and Henry VII.²⁷ Catherine also received lands that were not in Elizabeth's original parcel, including lands from Margaret Beaufort, who died in 1509, and from attainted nobles, such as the de la Poles.²⁸ Since the reign of Edward I and his queen, Eleanor of Castile, English queens had been traditionally given lands worth around £4,500 in rental income. This sum was rarely enough to meet all of their expenses, and English queens were often in debt or forced to receive cash infusions from their husbands. Additionally, while £4,500 was traditional, Elizabeth

²⁴ Marjorie K. McIntosh, "The Benefits and Drawbacks of Femme Sole Status in England, 1300–1630," *The Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 3 (July 1, 2005): 410–438, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/429708>.

²⁵ Michael K. Jones and Malcolm G. Underwood, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge University Press, 1992), 98–99.

²⁶ Queens' dower lands could be drawn from different royal estates, but Henry seems to have followed the practice of assigning nearly the same lands to all of his wives, and these lands were nearly the same parcel of estates assigned to his mother. This continuity did not survive the over fifty-year gap between Katherine Parr and Anne of Denmark's queenships, Richard W. Hoyle, "Introduction: Aspects of the Crown's Estate, c.1558-1640," in *The Estates of the English Crown, 1558-1640*, ed. Richard W. Hoyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 8.

²⁷ Crawford, "Queen's Council," 1208.

²⁸ This strategy could be risky, as occasionally these lands were returned to their original holders; for instance, when Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, was given lands her brother had lost when he was attainted and executed in 1500, some of them had been previously granted to Catherine, in which case, Henry had to grant Catherine property equal in value to the manors she had lost, *LP* 3.1:429.

of York's dower never reached that amount, and neither did Catherine's.²⁹ Henry VIII's grants to Catherine, despite going beyond what his mother had received, provided less than £4,500, and he appears to have consistently given his wives slightly less than the traditional amount.³⁰ In 1515, the crown assessed the rental value of Catherine's lands at £4,129 2s 4d per year, though this number only reflects the value of the lands in theory, which in the sixteenth century could be considerably higher than the actual rent that could be collected.³¹

Medieval English queens also received revenues to support their households from a variety of other sources beyond the lands, fee-farms, and privileges specifically granted to them as part of their dower. Catherine's fifteenth-century predecessors received income from wardships granted to them by their husbands, which gave the queen temporary interest in the lands of the minor ward.³² Queens in the fifteenth century had maintained their rights to "queen's gold," the queenly prerogative of a ten percent additional fine levied on top of voluntary fines paid to the king for charters, pardons, and other privileges.³³ This right was continued by queens into the seventeenth century. While I have found no record of Catherine augmenting her income through wardships, there is some slight evidence that Catherine collected queen's gold. In his 1668 treatise on queen's gold, William Prynne claimed that he found a patent from Catherine of Aragon naming Richard Decons as her receiver-general of all of her rents and revenues, specifically including queen's gold.³⁴ There are also a few extant documents that show Catherine did receive queen's gold. In October 1528, for example, Catherine received 14s 8d as queen-gold

²⁹Crawford, "King's Burden?," 40; for a detailed discussion of Elizabeth of York's dower, see Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 236, fn. 83.

³⁰Hamilton, "Learned Councils," 89; Anne Boleyn was the exception, as she hit a high income of just over £5,000.

³¹*LP* 2.1:1363.

³²In the statute granting Catherine her dower, she was also granted the right to wardships of tenants on her own lands but I have not found a source that shows if Catherine ever exercised this right or how much it contributed to her income; *Statutes of the Realm*, 3:I Henry VIII c.18.

³³Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 239.

³⁴William Prynne, *Aurum Reginae: Or, a Compendious Tractate, and Chronological Collection of Records in the Tower and Court of Exchequer Concerning Queen-Gold* (London: T. Ratcliffe, 1668), 120–122.

levied upon a fine of £7 10s paid by John Hasilwood.³⁵ In Griffith Richards's accounts as receiver-general to the queen in the late 1520s, he records a few instances of the queen receiving queen-gold over the course of several years in amounts of £2 and £6 per year.³⁶ Richards's account is badly damaged and only covers the years 1525 to 1530, so it is impossible to know if these accounts are consistent across Catherine's reign. The amounts listed, moreover, are very small in comparison to the queen's overall income. It is likely, though by no means certain, that queen's gold for Catherine, as for her predecessors Elizabeth Woodville and Elizabeth of York, was a fairly minor source of income.

Catherine of Aragon thus had an income that probably covered most of her expenses, but she was not able to cover them all. Especially at the beginning of the reign, when she was beginning to form her queenly household and had not yet received income from her estates, Henry VIII gave her several lump sums of cash, some of which went towards paying the debts Catherine had incurred when she was dowager Princess of Wales.³⁷ Even as late as 1516, the king was paying the wages of some of Catherine's household servants, though certainly not all of them.³⁸ Catherine's household was also subsidized by the king when they were together because the queen's household dined at the king's expense.³⁹

Margaret's resources, on paper, appear to be very similar to Catherine's dower properties, but in practice the two queens had very different relationships with their dower lands and the funding of their households. According to the Spanish envoy, Don Pedro de Ayala, who visited

³⁵ BL MS Add Ch. 22308.

³⁶ BL MS Cott. App. LXV, 45r, 76v; a summary of this document can be found in *LP* 4.3:6121, which does not include the entries for queen's gold.

³⁷ BL MS Add 21481; *LP* 2.2:pg. 1442;

³⁸ *LP* 2.2:pg. 1464, pg. 1470.

³⁹ *LP* 3.1:491, 528, 577; previous queens, such as Margaret of Anjou, had paid a daily rate of around £6 or £7 for the provisioning of their households when their households were at court, but there are no records of Elizabeth Woodville, Elizabeth of York or Catherine of Aragon ever making such payments, see Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 235.

Scotland in 1498, Scottish queens were comfortably dowered, possessing “four country seats, situated in the best portions of the kingdom, each of which is worth about fifteen thousand ducats” in addition to their own baronies.⁴⁰ His description was probably an exaggeration, although Margaret’s dower properties did include three major castles or palaces in addition to other smaller baronial houses. The marriage agreement between Henry VII and James IV stipulated that Margaret was to receive dower lands worth £2,000 sterling per annum in rental income, which amounted to £6,000 Scots, roughly a quarter of the Scottish Crown’s income.⁴¹ Additionally, the queen was to receive a pension of £1,000 Scots, which was to be paid in semi-annual installments at Easter and Michaelmas. The lands set aside for Margaret by James IV, and confirmed by Parliament, included two of the principal royal residences, Stirling and Linlithgow, as well as baronies and castles.⁴² A damaged account drawn up in May 1503 gives a partially itemized list of the dower lands granted to Margaret, and states their worth at £6,140 15s 7d. Scots.⁴³

The revenues Margaret received for her dower were a combination of lordships, rentals and property scattered across lowland Scotland. Her revenues came from three geographic areas. Her principal palaces, Linlithgow and Stirling, were close to Edinburgh, as was the barony of Dunbar. A second group of properties was in the Scottish Borders with England and included the

⁴⁰ Ayala was writing to the Spanish monarchs Ferdinand and Isabel after a lengthy visit to Scotland where he was entertained by James IV. As there was no queen at the time of his writing, he is not describing an actual queen’s dower. In his letter, Ayala mentions Catherine’s sister Maria as a prospective bride for James IV if the English marriage did not take place, so he may have been given an overly generous description by the Scots, *CSP Spanish* 1:210, pg. 174, 175.

⁴¹ *CDS* 4:1680.

⁴² *CDS* 4:1736; *Foedera* 12:855.

⁴³ *CDS* 5, Addenda to Part 2:5053; the rental is damaged, and it is unclear as to whether this is in English sterling or Scots. It is most likely Scots, which means that the lands listed fulfilled James’s obligations for Margaret’s dower. While very little data exists for the incomes of contemporary Scottish magnates, Margaret’s income of £6,000 Scots, when adjusted for the sixteenth-century exchange rate, would have been £2,000 Sterling, or around half of Catherine’s income. For some discussion of the income of Scottish magnates from the early fifteenth century, see Jenny Wormald, *Lords and Men in Scotland: Bonds of Manrent, 1442-1603* (Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1985), 100; Alexander Grant, *Independence and Nationhood: Scotland 1306-1469* (London: Edward Arnold, 1984), 132–133.

royal Forest of Ettrick, as well as lands in the Border earldom of March. Finally, Margaret was given lands north of Edinburgh, in and around Perth, including the royal earldom of Menteith, between Stirling and Perth, and the lordship and palace of Methven, to the east of Perth.⁴⁴ As a morning gift after her marriage, James IV also gave Margaret the lordship and castle of Kilmarnock, Ayrshire, in the south-east.⁴⁵ Margaret's dower properties were thus spread out across the southern and western portions of Scotland, traditional areas of strength for Scottish royal authority, and the location of the older portions of the royal demesne in Scotland.⁴⁶ Some of Margaret's properties were located in the troublesome and often lawless Border areas of Scotland, which meant that Margaret would have yet another reason for desiring peace between England and Scotland during her marriage and subsequent widowhood.

Like Catherine's lands, many of Margaret's lands were traditional queenly lands for Scottish consorts, and her dower closely resembles the one granted to Margaret of Denmark wife of James III and Margaret Tudor's immediate predecessor.⁴⁷ The castle and lordship of Methven, for instance, had been held by James IV's grandmother, Mary of Guelders, as well as by Margaret of Denmark, and would become one of the few dower properties Margaret Tudor actually lived in after her widowhood.⁴⁸ Consorts in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries were usually awarded customs from royal burghs such as Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Linlithgow, and Dundee, in addition to their lands, although there is no record of Margaret Tudor

⁴⁴ Seisins for her lands were taken by Margaret's representatives in Scotland throughout May and June 1503, see *CDS* 4:1709-1714.

⁴⁵ *CDS* 4:1737.

⁴⁶ Peter McNeill and Ranald Nicholson, eds., *An Historical Atlas of Scotland, c 400 - c.1600* (St Andrews: Atlas Committee of the Conference of Scottish Medievalists, 1975), 185.

⁴⁷ Margaret Tudor and Margaret of Denmark both held the lordship of Ettrick Forest, the castles of Stirling, Doune, Methven and Linlithgow Palace; *ODNB*, "Margaret (1456/7?-1486)."

⁴⁸ Downie, *She Is but a Woman*, 105, 107; Andrea Thomas, *Princelie Majestie: The Court of James V of Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2005), 49.

enjoying these revenues.⁴⁹ Unlike in England, the size of Scottish queen's dowers was not fixed by tradition. They could range from the relatively modest dower of £1,666 Scots of Annabella Drummond, queen of Robert III in the late fourteenth century, to the much larger one of Mary of Guelders, who was allotted a 10,000 crown dower as the wife of James II in 1451.⁵⁰

Despite assigning lands to Margaret as her dower in 1503, James continued to collect revenues and to administer Margaret's dower lands as if they were his own, in accordance with how previous Scottish queen's dowers had been managed. For instance, beginning in 1507, James IV set about to re-let the Forest of Ettrick as feefarms (essentially converting it from rental properties to perpetual tenancy), "nochtwithstanding the annexatioun and the conjuncteftment gevin to the qwenis grace of the saide forest."⁵¹ While the king was alive, decisions about Margaret's dower properties were clearly made by him. Margaret's palaces, including Linlithgow and Stirling, were in regular use by the entire Scottish court, and Margaret does not seem to have any rights or administration of them during the lifetime of her husband.

James's administration of his wife's lands meant that Margaret did not have the occasion to develop a formal council or legal body to manage her affairs. Margaret's relationship to her dower lands was thus very similar to what any noble wife might expect. Her lands were set aside for her widowhood, but she appears to have had little say in their administration while her husband was alive. Unlike her sister-in-law, Margaret was not declared *femme sole* by her husband, nor did she have independent control over her dower. Instead, her income was controlled by James until his death, whereupon Margaret inherited them as a widow. Margaret's

⁴⁹ Downie, *She Is but a Woman*, 103.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 103, 72.

⁵¹ *ER* 12:659; Craig Madden notes that the Forest does not appear in royal accounts after 1513, when it passed into Margaret's hands as part of her dower, further supporting the idea that before 1513, James administered Margaret's lands for her. He also notes that rents for the properties went down during Margaret's widowhood, suggesting that Margaret's administration was "lax," or at the very least, quite troubled, Craig Madden, "The Feuing of Ettrick Forest," *Innes Review* 27 (1976): fn. 12, pg. 75.

household, therefore, was funded in a very different manner from Catherine of Aragon's household, as Margaret was almost completely dependent on her husband financially.

There are very few sources that detail how Margaret paid her household or her expenses. From the beginning of her marriage, James IV seems to have paid for most of the large expenses of Margaret's household, including fees for her English servants, liveries for her Scottish servants, stable expenses, and most of her wardrobe.⁵² Margaret also received a pension of £1,000 Scots, which was usually paid to her treasurer or almoner in semi-annual installments at Easter and Michaelmas.⁵³ This pension, the equivalent to about £300 Sterling, likely went toward the queen's private incidental expenses, such as alms, rewards for servants, and wardrobe items that do not appear in the king's accounts but would have been necessary for the queen, such as linens, hose, or pins. Unfortunately, there is no surviving account book or record of how Margaret spent this money.

Margaret's financial administration went through a few changes beginning in 1508, which gave her much more financial independence and responsibility, although these changes were short-lived. For about eight months in 1508, the queen's household accounts were kept separately from the king's household accounts by her comptroller, Sir Duncan Forester. Forester was issued £2,500 Scots for Margaret's household by the king's Treasurer and Comptroller; however, by the end of the account he had exceeded this amount in expenditure and had to be given an extra £700.⁵⁴ After this period, Forester became the king's comptroller, and the two accounts merged. Margaret's servants' fees and their traveling expenses were paid by Forester,

⁵² These expenses are scattered throughout the Exchequer Rolls and Lord Treasurer's accounts; see chapter 2 for discussion of Margaret's servants and Wardrobe department.

⁵³ *LHTA* 2:243; 3:37, 46, 268, 271, 416; 4:28, 29, 32, 217.

⁵⁴ Athol L. Murray, "The Exchequer and Crown Revenue of Scotland, 1437-1542" (PhD diss., Edinburgh, 1961), 219.

as the King's Comptroller, although they were listed separately in the Exchequer Rolls.⁵⁵

Although Margaret did not have a separate income or control over her finances, her household was still considered distinct from the king's and was so noted in the accounts.

The experiment with Sir Duncan Forester's brief tenure as Margaret's comptroller may have come to an end for several reasons. He was clearly not able to keep the queen's expenses within his initial budget of £2,500. However, it seems that his performance as comptroller to the queen must have been at least somewhat successful, since he was promoted to the office of comptroller for the king after only a few months. Forester was a steadily rising courtier who had served James IV since the beginning of his reign, becoming comptroller to the king first in 1492 before moving to Margaret's service. Forester was not unknown to Margaret in 1508. He had first served the queen in 1503 in his capacity as Keeper of Stirling when he prepared hunting for her in the royal forest of Torwood.⁵⁶ Forester was clearly a favorite of the king, receiving grants of lands in Menteith in 1492. In 1489 the king became a godfather to one of Forester's grandsons, named James after his royal patron.⁵⁷

Given Forester's lengthy service to the Crown and his previous experience as comptroller to the king, it is more likely that the merging of the king and queen's finances occurred because the king decided that he wanted Forester as comptroller for his own household, and not because of any specific problems or successes in Margaret's financial administration. Finally, at the end of 1508 James had completely spent the dowry money he had received from his marriage to Margaret, causing a significant drop in royal revenues thereafter and creating potential financial

⁵⁵ *ER* 13:259.

⁵⁶ *LHTA* 2:444.

⁵⁷ Colin D. I. G. Forrester, *The Forresters: A Lowland Clan and Its Lands* (London: Gronow Press, 1989), 77–78.

difficulties for the Crown. It is possible that James decided it was too expensive to maintain separate royal households at this time.⁵⁸

Like her sister-in-law's dower properties, Catherine's lands were scattered across her new country. Catherine's lordships and manors stretched across twenty counties in the south and east of England.⁵⁹ Her properties were generally concentrated in the Home Counties, especially Essex, but she held a range of properties that stretched from Devon in the southwest, Herefordshire along the Welsh borders, and Lincolnshire in the north. She held manors in nearly all the counties surrounding London, and her official London residence was Baynard's Castle, on the Thames close to St. Paul's Cathedral. The breadth of Catherine's lands meant that her public presence stretched far beyond the small area in which she and Henry regularly traveled in the Thames valley. Whenever Catherine's tenants were called to her manor courts or dealt with her officials, they were called under her name and authority, as we shall see. The scope of her lands, therefore, meant that her authority touched a wide swath of the kingdom who knew her not only as the wife of the king, but also as their lord.

The queen's lands were more than a means of supporting her household. They also served to extend her influence, public profile, and patronage throughout the court in both the king's household and her own. Because Catherine and her council administered her lands, the indentures, or landholding agreements, were drawn up between the queen and her tenants just as would have been done for any sixteenth-century landowner and tenant. Around ninety indentures between Catherine and her tenants have survived from 1510 to 1531. Most indentures specify the yearly rent for the property, as well as obligations of the tenants towards the queen, which often included providing goods or services to the queen out of the resources of the manor in question.

⁵⁸Murray, "Crown Revenue of Scotland," 321.

⁵⁹*LP* 1.1:94.

For example, an early indenture between the queen and John Guidon specifies that he is to maintain the water mill at the farm of Langton. Guidon will provide the queen with 200 faggots of lumber from Dedham wood, along with a yearly rent of £4 13s 4d.⁶⁰ In 1516, Edward Morris, clothmaker, was required to maintain the houses of the manor of Langham that he rented from the queen for nine pounds annually, including repairing the thatch and daube.⁶¹ The indentures usually reserved rights of use of the manor or its accommodations when the queen was visiting; for example, Humphrey Jennets and William Grey leased Feckenham Pool with the floodgate and watermill from the queen in 1522. The indenture specifies that if the queen is at the manor she is “to take her pleasure in the said water this Indenture notwithstanding.”⁶²

Catherine’s tenants came from a wide variety of backgrounds and had different relationships with the queen. Many were yeomen and husbandmen, leasing lands, meadows or mills for a few shillings or a couple of pounds. Others were clearly more connected with the court generally or the queen in particular. High-ranking courtiers, such as Sir Henry Wyatt and Sir William Kingston, leased lands from the queen.⁶³ Members of Catherine’s household and council were also her tenants. Catherine’s Lord Chamberlain, Sir William Blount, leased her manor of Standen, in Hertfordshire. Other servants of the queen’s household, such as Anthony Carleton and John Glynn, leased lands together in the manor of the Havering-atte-Bower.⁶⁴

The career of John Poyntz best illustrates of how members of Catherine’s household also benefited from the patronage she could offer through her dower lands. John Poyntz was the second son of Sir Robert Poyntz, Catherine’s vice-chamberlain and later chancellor from 1501 to

⁶⁰ TNA MS E315/176, no. 8.

⁶¹ TNA MS E315/176, no. 50.

⁶² TNA MS E315/176, no. 73; though it sounds as if Catherine might be going swimming at the Feckenham Pool, it is likely this clause meant that the queen’s household could make use of the mill and the pool for supplies if in residence.

⁶³ TNA MS E315/176, nos. 1, 47.

⁶⁴ TNA MS E315/176, no. 9

1521. At least two of Robert's sons, including his second son John, served Catherine as members of her household, beginning with her first household as Princess of Wales in 1501.⁶⁵ Almost certainly due to his father's position as queen's chancellor and thus head of the queen's council, John Poyntz was became one of Catherine's receivers, responsible for overseeing some of her properties. He rendered accounts for the queen's lands to Griffith Richards, Catherine's receiver-general. As part of his duties, he distributed £3 6s 8d in alms to the dean and college of Stoke, near Clare, Suffolk.⁶⁶

John Poyntz also became a tenant of the queen. In March 1521, John entered into a seven-year lease for the park of Hunden, Suffolk. The following July, he also signed an indenture, jointly with Humphrey Wingfield, for the property of Veyfeys within the queen's manor of Stratford, Suffolk.⁶⁷ Both his leases and his almsgiving centered on the queen's estates in Suffolk, associated with or near the town of Clare, which Catherine held as part of her dower. Poyntz was likely the receiver for this general area of the queen's estates. Poyntz was then elected as Devizes's Member of Parliament in 1529. Devizes, Wiltshire was one of Catherine's boroughs, and his election was almost certainly due to her patronage.⁶⁸

Poyntz's career, which spanned Catherine's household, her lands, and her administration, is illustrative of the connections of family and patronage that crossed her household, council, and lands, creating a complex picture of how her lands and household were interdependent. By examining in detail the location of Catherine's properties and the connections formed by her household with those properties, we can see the significant patronage prospects that the queen's

⁶⁵ At the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520, John Poyntz was named Catherine's sewer of the chamber, one of those gentlemen responsible for overseeing the queen's table at meals. He paid the lay subsidy tax as part of the queen's household in the 1520s, *ODNB* "Poyntz, Sir Robert"; TNA MS E179/69/15; *LP* 3.2:491.

⁶⁶ BL MS Cott.App. LXV, 44r and 65r.

⁶⁷ TNA MS E315/176, nos. 60 and 72.

⁶⁸ "Poyntz, John (c1485-1522), of Alderley, Glos," in Edward Miller, ed., *The History of Parliament*, CD-ROM (Cambridge University Press and The History of Parliament Trust, 1998), vol. 2.

dower provided to her and her household. The management of these properties, moreover, created legal relationships between Catherine and her tenants that affirmed her authority as landlord. This gave her legitimate authority in her own right, without reference to her husband, because of her status as *femme sole*. Of course, Henry could interfere with Catherine's dower if he wanted to, but it is important to realize that consistently, across many years and properties, it was Catherine's authority that was invoked in her indentures, and as we will see, by her council.⁶⁹ Catherine's dower also illuminates the limitations Margaret faced in Scotland by not controlling her dower properties. A closer examination of one of Catherine's best-documented dower properties, Havering-atte-Bower, will provide further insight into Catherine's relationship with her dower.

Case Study: Havering-atte-Bower

Catherine's dower lands included a property that had belonged to the queens consort of England since the thirteenth century, the manor and, from 1460, the liberty of Havering-atte-Bower in Essex. Havering is one of the most intensively-studied properties belonging to the queens of England, in part because its local records have been well-preserved. Catherine's interactions with her manor of Havering-atte-Bower illustrate the multiple intersections and interventions that queens might have with their dower properties, even if the property in question was actually largely self-governed, as Havering was in the sixteenth century. Havering-atte-Bower experienced a relationship with the queen on many levels, through personal use of the country house by the queen, king, and princess Mary, and through household connections between Havering landholders and the queen's household.

⁶⁹The medieval queen's council's relative independence has been discussed by Anne Crawford, "Queen's Council," 1195.

Havering was an ancient royal demesne, which meant that in the sixteenth century, the tenants were free and rents and fees had been frozen at their 1251 level. The manorial court at Havering had been on the decline in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and during the sixteenth century, the Crown's rights were rarely defended. The income from the manorial court of Havering was negligible, usually between eight and twelve pounds a year.⁷⁰ The income from the property itself was also small, around £100 year.⁷¹ The queen's officials in Havering, the steward, deputy steward and clerk, were usually outsiders and their positions were valuable for the fees they collected. The steward of Havering at the beginning of Catherine's reign was Sir Thomas Lovell, former treasurer to Elizabeth of York as well as an influential royal councilor and courtier. From 1527 to 1534, William Blount Lord Mountjoy, Catherine's Lord Chamberlain, was steward, suggesting that this position was an important, or at least lucrative, one.⁷² While Havering and its courts may not have produced a great deal of income for the queen, the patronage opportunities it presented, which mirrored other positions throughout her lands, allowed Catherine to reward her servants and extend her influence.

There had been a royal residence at Havering since the eleventh century, and in the sixteenth century it consisted of a country house with a park for hunting. The house had been built in the thirteenth century and it was probably quite large, with apartments for the king and queen, a great chamber, and two chapels. Havering was especially associated with queens, having first been assigned to Eleanor of Provence in the thirteenth century, and it remained part of the queen's dower from then on. The suffix "atte-Bower" supposedly refers to this

⁷⁰Marjorie K. McIntosh, *A Community Transformed: The Manor and Liberty of Havering, 1500-1620* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 4, 297–300.

⁷¹Marjorie K. McIntosh, *Autonomy and Community: The Royal Manor of Havering, 1200-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 55.

⁷²McIntosh, *A Community Transformed*, 421; for Sir Thomas Lovell, see Derek Neal, "The Queen's Grace: English Queenship, 1464-1503" (master's thesis, McMaster University, 1996), 130.

association.⁷³ It was the only residence, according to historian Simon Thurley, that was reserved for the queen's exclusive use during Henry VIII's reign. It was essentially her "country seat."⁷⁴

Although the evidence is fragmentary, Catherine did visit Havering as a country seat during her reign as queen. Located just outside of London, it was close enough to the larger royal residences such as Richmond or Greenwich for convenience, but far enough from the growing city to provide over 1,000 acres of parkland for hunting.⁷⁵ Unsurprisingly, the house itself needed repairs from time to time. In 1525, Griffith Richards recorded that £166 13s 4d were spent on repairs for Havering, and this was not the first time Catherine had to pay for repairs to the nearly 300 year-old-house.⁷⁶

In 1519, the queen hosted the king and his court at Havering during Henry's summer progress, at the end of August. Her duties on this occasion reveal the significance of her position not as the king's wife, but as lord of the manor.⁷⁷ The summer of 1519 progress was an especially grand affair as Henry traveled beyond London with French noble hostages. The king was entertained Catherine on this trip just as he was by other local, male, lords, including Lord Bergavenny, the duke of Norfolk, and the duke of Buckingham.⁷⁸ Catherine invited Henry and the French hostages to Havering, and according to Edward Hall, the queen entertained them there in high style: "[a]nd for their welcomyng she purveyed all thynges in the moste liberallest maner: and especially she made to the kyng suche a sumptuous banket that the kyng thanked her hartely,

⁷³W. R. Powell, "Parishes: Havering-Atte-Bower," in *A History of the County of Essex: Volume 7*, British History Online, n.d., <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=42806>.

⁷⁴Simon Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), 78.

⁷⁵Havering is about twenty miles from the center of London, Powell, "Parishes: Havering-Atte-Bower."

⁷⁶*LP* 4.3:6121; Catherine's receivers recorded minor repairs on the house, H. M. Colvin, *The History of the King's Works* (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1963), 4.2:151.

⁷⁷*LP* 3.2: pg. 1537.

⁷⁸Neil Samman, "The Progresses of Henry VIII, 1509-1529," in *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch (London: Macmillan, 1995), 61.

and the straungers [the French hostages] gaue it greate prayse.”⁷⁹ As I discuss in chapter 4, hosting visitors was an important role for queens to perform at court, but Hall’s description of the Havering visit places Catherine’s hospitality in the context of her duties as a seigniorial lord. Because Havering was her property, Catherine received praise for hosting the king not only as his consort but as the local lord of the manor.⁸⁰

Catherine also used Havering as a residence for her beloved daughter, Princess Mary. In the summer of 1518, during a threat of sickness, an itinerary was drawn up for the princess’s removal from Bisham Abbey to Wolsey’s palace of the More, where the king and queen were staying. Along the proposed route, the princess would have stopped at Havering before going to the More.⁸¹ Mary also stayed at Havering for the Christmas season in 1523. She offered 20d at the chapel of Havering on Christmas Day, and Catherine’s Master of the Horse, Sir Thomas Tyrell, sent a servant with twelve does from Essex to the princess at Havering for Christmas. On the 30th of December, the princess’s aunt, Mary Tudor, sent three fifiers to Havering, and they were paid 3s 4d for entertaining the princess.⁸² As a country house, then, Catherine used Havering as most noblewomen would have, as a venue for hosting summer hunting trips and as a suitable location for housing her daughter and her daughter’s household from time to time.

In addition to the personal visits by the queen (which were probably more numerous than we have evidence for), some of Catherine’s household became tenants or residents of the village, thus forming another set of connections between the queen and her property. As discussed above, members of the queen’s household could also be her tenants on her dower properties, leasing

⁷⁹Janette Dillon, *Performance and Spectacle in Hall’s Chronicle* (London: Society for Theatre Research, 2002), 68; one of the attractions of Havering was its hunting, and while visiting the king and his hostages engaged in shooting and hunting “dailye” according to Hall.

⁸⁰ See chapter 4 for Catherine’s role as royal hostess.

⁸¹ *LP* 2.2:4326.

⁸² *LP* 3.2:3375.

lands from the queen. Many members of the queen's household held lands from the queen that were merely part of the numerous properties that made up their holdings. However, some household members settled in the communities where they held these lands. They therefore had the potential to acquire influence in the local community and act as liaisons between the queen's administration and local leaders.

John Glynn was a member of Catherine's household who had strong ties to Havering, possibly because of his connection to the queen. Glynn was a yeoman in Catherine's chamber from 1509 until at least 1524, a position that granted him access to the queen and required his attendance at court for at least a portion of the year. In addition to the fees and liveries Glynn received from the queen, he was also able to secure several positions administering crown lands. In October 1511, for example, he was granted a bailiffship in the Marches of Wales by the king.⁸³ In May of that same year, Glynn and another servant of the queen's, Anthony Carleton, signed an indenture to lease fields within the manor of Havering-atte-Bower.⁸⁴ In a 1534 list of the fees and annuities granted to the new queen, Anne Boleyn, John Glynn is listed as the keeper of the south gate and the pale of Havering Park.⁸⁵

Glynn's association with Havering, possibly begun through his connections to the queen, would continue for the rest of his life. In his will, dated February 1534, Glynn made several bequests that indicate a lasting relationship with the manor. Glynn requested to be buried in the chapel of Romford, which was the market town within the manor of Havering. Glynn left bequests to the chapel at Havering-atte-Bower, and one of his executors was the curate of Romford. Glynn had substantial interests in land surrounding Havering, holding leases on the chantry lands of Havering that he left to his wife Jane and her brother Gilbert, in addition to a

⁸³ *LP* 1.1:1898.

⁸⁴ TNA MS E315/176, no.9.

⁸⁵ *LP* 7:352.

tenement in Havering that he left to his wife for life. From Glynn's will, we can see that he was deeply involved in the life of Havering, and he had personal connections to the local chapels in addition to owning and leasing lands in the manor.⁸⁶

Some of the local gentry of Havering formed connections to the queen's household through marriage, providing both the queen and the local residents with further channels of communication and influence. Margaret Pennington served Catherine from at least 1512, receiving liveries from the king in October 1511 and May 1512.⁸⁷ Sometime shortly after the 1512 livery, she married John Cook, a widower and one of the chief landowners within the manor of Havering whose younger brother, Richard Cook, was active in the households of both Catherine and her sister-in-law Mary Tudor.⁸⁸ John Cook died in 1516, and left his wife Margaret two manors for life, as well as entrusting her with the raising of his heir, Anthony Cook, his son by his first wife.⁸⁹ After her widowhood (and possibly during her marriage) Margaret continued to serve Catherine as a gentlewoman in her household, participating in New Year's gift exchanges, receiving clothing from the king's wardrobe, and attending the Field of Cloth of Gold as part of the queen's household.⁹⁰ After Catherine's death, Cook became part of Princess

⁸⁶TNA MS PROB/11/25; Glynn left bequests to a few other properties located in Kent, but most of his activities and wealth were focused on Havering. Although he refers to "my house" the will does not specify if Glynn was living in Havering, though it seems likely based on references to local landmarks such as "Chase Cross," that he did.

⁸⁷TNA MS E101/417/6; *LP* 1.1:1218.

⁸⁸Richard Cook became a trusted messenger between Catherine and Charles V in 1520s and 1530s, which may have been facilitated through his brother's match to the queen's gentlewoman; Marjorie K. McIntosh, "The Cooke Family of Gidea Hall, Essex 1460-1661" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1967), 132, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/302225832?accountid=14553>.

⁸⁹Marjorie K. McIntosh, "Some New Gentry in Early Tudor Essex: The Cookes of Gidea Hall, 1480-1550," *Essex Archaeology and History* 9 (1977): 131, 133.

⁹⁰*LP* 5:1711; BL MS Harley 2284, 3r; *LP* 3.1:704. In 1527, Mistress Cook, as she was commonly called, paid taxes as part of the queen's household, *LP* 4.2:2972. Margaret Cook was a frequent and close companion to the queen, receiving, sometime after 1528, a printed Book of Hours from the queen, Eamon Duffy, *Marking the Hours: English People and Their Prayers, 1240-1570* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006), 24.

Mary's household, and in her will left bequests to ladies in Princess Mary's household who were her "fellows in service," including one of her step-granddaughters, Anne Cook.⁹¹

Throughout her career at court Cook also maintained close links to Havering and the community there. She had a good working relationship with her brother-in-law, Richard Cook, who oversaw her step-son's education. Margaret Cook also had a close, warm relationship with her step-son Anthony and was godmother to two of his children, Margaret and Edward.⁹² She sought Anthony's help, while he was still a minor, when she went to court to recover documents relating to one of her properties. Margaret Cook was an active and competent landowner, successfully retaining her life interest in the manors granted to her by her late husband, which were within the liberty of Havering. She continued to expand her holdings, renting a manor in Havering from New College, Oxford in 1527.⁹³

A few years later, during the upheavals of the English Reformation, the church goods of Romford, Havering's market town, including a bell weighing forty pounds and rich altar cloths, would be kept safe by Cook, who had remained a staunch Catholic throughout her life. Like John Glynn, she requested that she be buried in Romford, in the community where she had forged a life for herself.⁹⁴ Margaret Cook's career at court and her involvement in the community of Havering are informal connections between the queen's household and the lands which made up her dower. Without further evidence, it is impossible to tell how Cook's connections might have

⁹¹ Anne Cook later married Sir Nicholas Bacon, but remained in Mary's privy chamber when Mary became queen in 1553, despite Anne's reforming sympathies. Anne was one of the few reformers who maintained their standing at Mary's court after the Catholic queen's accession. It is likely that the long relationship between Margaret Cook and Catherine played a part in protecting Lady Anne Bacon in Mary's reign. Although Lady Bacon's survival at court is well-documented, the role Margaret Cook played in continuing the connection between the younger generation of Cook women and Mary I have not been noted by historians; for a discussion of Mary's household including Lady Anne Bacon, see Charlotte Merton, "Women, Friendship, and Memory," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, ed. Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 246, www.palgraveconnect.com.

⁹² Sheridan Harvey, "The Cooke Sisters: A Study of Tudor Gentlewomen" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 1981), 30, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/303018817?accountid=14553>.

⁹³ McIntosh, "The Cooke Family," 134.

⁹⁴ McIntosh, "The Cookes of Gidea Hall," 134, 135.

influenced the queen's relationship with her manors. For instance, Margaret Cook may have played a special role in helping to organize the king and queen's visit to Havering in 1519; she may have even hosted members of the queen's household at one of her properties. She may have kept her brother-in-law or her step-son apprised of developments in the queen's household that affected Havering. In the later years of the reign of Henry VIII, Margaret's step-son Anthony Cook would use his position as both a Justice of the Peace for the liberty of Havering and a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber to protest actions taken by the steward of Havering, Sir John Gates. Margaret, who like her step-son held a place at court as well as status within the local community, could have performed similar interventions.⁹⁵ Margaret Cook's close proximity to the queen over the course of several years would have made her a valuable person to cultivate for the local community at Havering. It is not evident in the surviving sources whether or not they did so.⁹⁶

This case study of Havering has shown that Catherine's status as lord of the manor was not an abstract concept for Havering, but a practical reality that involved prominent members of the community with close connections to the queen. Other significant properties of the queen, such her properties in Walsingham Magna in Norfolk, potentially had similar experiences. Catherine's lordship was not compromised by her gender, and in some instances, she may have been able to draw upon a specifically female connection to Havering. Although she owed her lordship rights to her position as queen consort, in practice she expected to hold and administer her lands in a similar manner to a nobleman or a widowed noblewoman. Margaret Cook's

⁹⁵As a woman at court, any potential interventions by Margaret would have been on a personal, private level with the queen and members of the council; Marjorie K. McIntosh, "Sir Anthony Cooke: Tudor Humanist, Educator, and Religious Reformer," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 119, no. 3 (1975): 242, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/986673>.

⁹⁶For more on how Catherine's ladies could benefit or exert influence at court, see chapter 4 and 5 and Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 227.

prominent local position in Havering suggests Catherine could draw upon connections that may not have been available to male landlords. There were potential benefits Catherine gained from being a female landlord who could both administer her estates and draw upon the women of her household to create connections between the queen and her estates.

Catherine's relationships with her dower properties were as varied as the properties themselves. Havering-atte-Bower, one of the traditional estates of the queens of England, had in many respects an unusually close and frequent connection to the queen through her personal visits, as well as through the connections formed by members of her household with the local community. Catherine's other properties would have had very different experiences from Havering in many ways. However, the connection between the queen's lands and her household, exemplified through the activities of John Glynn and Margaret Pennington Cook, would potentially have repeated across her estates, wherever a tenant, official, or administrator of the queen's lands was also part of her household.

The Queen's Council in England

Catherine's other, smaller, properties may never have seen the queen herself, but they did experience her authority through the council that managed her estates in her name and exercised legal authority over her estates. The queen's council in England had existed at least since Eleanor of Provence held and administered lands her own right in the thirteenth century.⁹⁷ By the sixteenth century, the queen's council in England was an established body, and Catherine's council, like those of her predecessors, was responsible for collecting her revenues, managing her estates, and representing and advising the queen on legal, fiscal, and political matters. The "real practice of queenship" was often done through the queen's council, though fragmentary evidence has made it difficult for scholars to create a complete picture of the council's

⁹⁷Crawford, "Queen's Council," 1194–1196.

activities.⁹⁸ Catherine's council was the primary way she maintained her interests and authority on her dower properties. While the council's activities were carried out by male councilors, her name was consistently invoked as their source of royal and legal authority regarding her estates. As we have seen, these estates were important not only for their revenues, but also as a source of patronage that Catherine could exploit to reward her servants. Both the administration of her estates and the distribution of patronage from those estates established the queen's authority as a patron and landlord, making her an attractive object of petitions and clients.

Catherine's council served her in three different capacities: advisory, administrative, and judicial. As a judicial and administrative body, its activities are illuminated through fragments of accounts, petitions, witness statements, and legal decisions. Administratively, the council was responsible for collecting the queen's revenues from her dower properties and thus providing her household with its income. Judicially, it represented her in legal proceedings through her attorneys, and it constituted a court of its own that had jurisdiction over suits involving the queen's lands, officials, or her tenants.

Tudor councilors were expected to offer advice to their superiors on a range of matters relating to foreign and domestic policy.⁹⁹ As an advisory body, the queen's council has left very few records, and no memoranda or minutes of their meetings survive, but Catherine likely made

⁹⁸No council minutes or proceedings exist for Catherine of Aragon or any of the late medieval or sixteenth-century queens; for the most detailed analyses of the English queens' councils in general see Crawford, "Queen's Council"; Hamilton, "Learned Councils"; N. R. R. Fisher, "'The Queenes Courte in Her Councell Chamber at Westminster,'" *The English Historical Review* 108, no. 427 (1993): 314–337, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/573709>.

⁹⁹Councilors could also become targets of criticism for policies of the regime as a whole. The most famous example of 'bad councilors' in the early sixteenth century was undoubtedly the fates of Sir Edmund Dudley and Richard Empson, councilors of Henry VII who were singled out by the new regime of Henry VIII as scapegoats for popular discontent with the previous regime. Henry had Dudley and Empson executed on trumped up charges of treason in 1510, an object lesson in both the importance and potential danger of providing counsel to the monarch. For the execution of Dudley and Empson, see S. B. Chrimes, *Henry VII* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1972), 315–317; For Empson's career, see Mark R. Horowitz, "Richard Empson, Minister of Henry VII," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 55 (1982): 35–49, doi:10.1111/j.1468-2281.1982.tb01143.x; On Dudley's career, see D. M. Brodie, "Edmund Dudley: Minister of Henry VII," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 15 (1932): 133–161, doi:10.2307/3678645.

decisions about her lands and patronage with advice from her council. There some indications that Catherine consulted with, or was perceived to be consulting with, her council for guidance on domestic politics and foreign diplomacy. Catherine's councilors may have taken an especially prominent role during her time as Queen Regent of England in 1513. When Henry VIII left to campaign in France in the summer of 1513, he left Catherine as Regent of his kingdom. In anticipation of the responsibilities his wife was about to shoulder, Henry also specifically granted her "councilors, officers and servants" an exemption from accompanying Henry on his military expedition.¹⁰⁰ Henry clearly felt that the queen's councilors would be necessary to attend on Catherine during his absence.

One of the few recorded instances of Catherine conferring with her council about political matters occurred in April 1520 during the preparations for the meeting between the English and French royal courts known as the Field of Cloth of Gold. Catherine was not pleased with the Anglo-French alliance, which threatened England's relations with Spain, and the French ambassador nervously kept an eye on her activities in England before the meeting. He wrote to France that Catherine "assembled her council to confer about this interview," during which conference Catherine had strongly argued against the meeting and voiced her concerns to her council. When Henry arrived during the meeting, the ambassador reported that:

[o]n his asking what was going on, the Queen told him why she had called them [the councilors], and finally they said that she had made such representations, and shown such reasons against the voyage, as one would not have supposed she would have dared to do, or even to imagine. On this account she is held in greater esteem by the King and his council than ever she was. Has not been able to find out, however, what answer the King made to her. There is no doubt that the voyage is against the will of the Queen and all the nobles[.]¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ *LP* 1.2:1985.

¹⁰¹ *LP* 3.1:728; the French ambassador was understandably concerned about Catherine's opposition to the alliance, so he may have exaggerated the incident.

This incident indicates that Catherine's councilors were expected to act as political advisors to the queen, and probably did so.¹⁰²

The duties and actions of Catherine's council were very similar to the councils of other great magnates in England who had numerous and far-flung estates to manage, with a few crucial differences, the most obvious being that the queen's council served a woman. Hilda Johnstone, in her discussion of the queen's councils of the fourteenth century, notes that the queen's council was positioned between the kingdom-wide sweep of the king's council and the more local councils of magnates or bishops.¹⁰³ The Duchy of Lancaster, the enormous landed patrimony of John of Gaunt that stretched across many counties in England, may be regarded as the forerunner of the late medieval and early modern queen's council.¹⁰⁴ Its procedures and even some of its estates would come to provide basis for Lancastrian and Yorkist queen's councils and some of their dower lands.¹⁰⁵ In administering the queen's revenues and adjudicating disputes, Catherine's council was following the precedents not only of medieval queens, but of great landowners as well. The right to hold courts and to administer justice was a legal duty long associated with seigniorial landownership in medieval England, and in that sense the queen administered her lands in a similar manner to other landed magnates, such as Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond; Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury; Edward Stafford, Duke of Buckingham; or Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk.¹⁰⁶ Indeed, Catherine's council dealt with at

¹⁰²Crawford, "Queen's Council," 1204.

¹⁰³Hilda Johnstone, "The Queen's Household," in *Chapters in Medieval Administrative History*, by T.F. Tout, vol. 5 (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1930), 291–292.

¹⁰⁴For a discussion of the Duchy's development of its council procedures, see Robert Somerville, "The Duchy of Lancaster Council and Court of Duchy Chamber," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 23 (1941): 159–77; for the Yorkist expansion of Duchy management, see B. P. Wolffe, "The Management of English Royal Estates under the Yorkist Kings," *The English Historical Review* 71, no. 278 (1956): 4–7, doi:10.2307/558623.

¹⁰⁵Crawford, "Queen's Council," 1204–1205.

¹⁰⁶For the duke of Suffolk's role in local governance of his estates see Steven J. Gunn, *Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, C.1484-1545* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), 158–159; Lisa Benz St. John argues that fourteenth-century queens behaved in similar ways to great landed magnates, *Three Medieval Queens*, 73–76.

least one petitioner who sought to appeal a verdict from Charles Brandon's own court to the queen's council.¹⁰⁷

Only two other women in Tudor England would have headed councils with a similar scope to Catherine's: Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond, and Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury. Both of these women were magnates in their own right, and they held their lands and titles by virtue of inheritance, not marriage. Margaret Pole was the widowed daughter of George, Duke of Clarence, and she had inherited the earldom of Salisbury through her mother. Margaret Beaufort, as discussed above, was declared *femme sole* when her son became Henry VII, and she held extensive estates inherited from her mother and father and granted to her by her son. Margaret Beaufort's council, at the height of its power from 1502-1509, was essentially a regional council of the Midlands, and it followed the same legal procedure for pleadings that Catherine's did. Its structure may have been influenced by medieval queens' councils.¹⁰⁸ Margaret Pole administered her estates with the help many male officials and likely had a council of her own as well.¹⁰⁹ Thus, Catherine's council was unusual in that it was headed by a woman, but it was not completely unique in early sixteenth-century England. The successful careers of Margaret Beaufort and Margaret Pole suggest that Catherine's position as a *femme sole* magnate was not merely theoretical.¹¹⁰ Rather, it was part of a longer tradition of queen's administering their lands with their councils that had built upon traditional noble rights and responsibilities.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ TNA MS E111/25; the account is fragmented and damaged, and it is unknown whether Catherine's council decided to overrule Brandon.

¹⁰⁸ Jones and Underwood, *King's Mother*, 86–90.

¹⁰⁹ Pierce, *Margaret Pole*, 82.

¹¹⁰ Margaret Pole's fall from grace and execution in 1538 has cast a shadow over her career as a remarkably successful female magnate who understood how operate as a "good lord" and work with men to run her estates, see *ibid.*, chap. 3.

¹¹¹ The other unique aspect of Catherine's council was its close association with royal authority. Although Catherine's council did not have any claims to state governance, its use of her royal authority as queen, and its close

Queens' councils were traditionally made up of the officials who administered her properties and oversaw her finances, including her chancellor, receiver-general, auditor, and surveyor. The council could include or rely on attorneys to represent the queen in legal business, as well as a clerk of the council. Catherine's council may have also included important members of her household establishment, such as her lord chamberlain, her knight carver, almoner, and clerk of the signet.¹¹² The queen's chancellor was the head of her council, and as the chief financial officer of her household, his position was the official link between the queen's household and her council and the administration of her estates.¹¹³

Catherine of Aragon's council was closely tied to her household. In her article on the Tudor queens' councils, Dakota Hamilton argues that during the sixteenth century, queen's councils became more bureaucratic and distinct from the household. The queen's councilors, according to Hamilton, were officials whose only link to the queen's household was through the chancellor, the only official to be considered both a member of the queen's household and the queen's council. However, Catherine's council and household actually overlapped in many ways. There was not a clear distinction between the queen's council and her household for either Elizabeth Woodville or Elizabeth of York, and Catherine's council echoed her predecessors', including some of the same staff.¹¹⁴ Although members of the queen's council were not automatically members of her household, in fact many of her councilors either held or had held positions in the queen's household, or had close ties to the household through family members. For instance, Catherine's receiver-general from at least 1525, Griffith Richards, was originally

proximity to other governing Tudor councils in the palace of Westminster, in all likelihood made it a higher-profile body than its legal powers and jurisdiction would have warranted.

¹¹²Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 233; Hamilton, "Learned Councils," 87.

¹¹³Hamilton, "Learned Councils," 87–88; Neal, "The Queen's Grace," 127–128; Catherine's council appears to be similar in composition to the council of the queen of France. The queen's council in France, like that in England, included important royal officials, members from other royal councils, lawyers, and judges. It also served as a link between the queen and the provincial officers and agents who managed her revenues, Kolk, "Household," 19.

¹¹⁴Neal, "The Queen's Grace," 127–128.

her clerk of the signet.¹¹⁵ Some of the queen's councilors accompanied Catherine to the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520 as members of the queen's chamber, including Richard Decons, her secretary, Griffith Richards, her clerk of the signet, and her chancellor Sir Robert Poyntz, listed as one of the queen's knights.¹¹⁶

Additionally there may have been "extraordinary" members of the queen's council who did not hold an office normally associated with her council; for instance, Catherine's almoner is referred to as a member of her council in one lawsuit.¹¹⁷ It is likely that Catherine's lord chamberlain, Sir William Blount, who was both a member of her household and an officer on her estates, was involved in council business.¹¹⁸ Catherine's vice-chamberlain from 1517-1527 was Sir Edward Darrell, whose lands in Wiltshire were near several of Catherine's dower properties. In addition to his responsibilities overseeing the running of the queen's Chambers as a deputy for her Lord Chamberlain, Darrell was extensively involved in overseeing part of the queen's parliamentary patronage. Like Sir Robert Poyntz, Darrell used his access to the queen to obtain lands for his second son, Edmund, as well as election to Parliament for Edmund as MP for Marlborough, which was part of the queen's gift and close to Darrell's own estates in Wiltshire.¹¹⁹ Though his position as vice-chamberlain was not necessarily included on the queen's council, Darrell's influence in areas where Catherine held lands, in addition to his success in obtaining parliamentary patronage from the queen, suggests that he may have served on her council as well. Catherine's council clearly had members who moved between the

¹¹⁵ *LP* 1.1:82.

¹¹⁶ *LP* 3.1:704.

¹¹⁷ Catherine's almoner was the Dean of Stoke, who could have been either Dr. Robert Bekinsall or Dr. Robert Shorton, depending on the year in question. The petition is undated, although the National Archives catalog dates it during Catherine's reign. Her almoner was referred to in a suit as "one of your most discrete counsaill." There is a possibility that the petitioners were referring to the almoner as an advice-giver to the queen, and not a literal member of her council; TNA MS E298/6.

¹¹⁸ For discussion of "extraordinary" members of noble councils, see Somerville, "The Duchy of Lancaster Council," 163; Mountjoy was steward of Havering-atte-Bower, McIntosh, *A Community Transformed*, 421.

¹¹⁹ TNA E315/176 no. 87; "Darrell, Sir Edward" and "Darrell, Edmund" in Miller, *The History of Parliament*.

household and council chamber, while also including many other officials whose primary connection to the queen was through their offices on her estates.

Since at least 1404, the queen's council had met in its own chamber in Westminster palace, near the chambers of the rest of government, a sign of its importance and close relationship with other centers of royal power and administration.¹²⁰ Catherine's council met frequently, and its members likely kept in touch through correspondence when it was not meeting. The queen's council chamber at Westminster was kept by her clerks, usually two designated as a keeper and under-keeper.¹²¹ In addition to providing a meeting space for the council, Catherine's council chamber also housed deeds and documents relating to her dower and properties, which followed the king's practice of storing financial documents at Westminster.¹²² Catherine's council worked closely with the king's officials, and seems to have relied on them for legal advice. In addition to the queen's own attorney, solicitor, sergent-at-law and five apprentices-at-law, Catherine also retained John Ernelye and Richard Lytstere, king's attorneys, to aid her council in the 1520s.¹²³ Catherine's councilors would have regularly done business with the king's clerks as they administered her lands; for instance, in 1520, Poyntz and Richard Decons ordered the queen's wardrobe to deliver 22s worth of black satin to "Master Thomas More," then clerk of the privy seal to the king. The satin was likely a reward for his help on council business.¹²⁴

Catherine's councilors were paid fees for their duties, which could be £30 or £60 per annum for her highest officials such as her chancellor and receiver-general.¹²⁵ Attorneys retained

¹²⁰Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 233.

¹²¹Hamilton, "Learned Councils," 87.

¹²²*LP* 6:1445; during the divorce, Cromwell specifically required the queen's clerks to give up the keys to the chamber, so that he could access the financial records of her estates.

¹²³*LP* 4.3:6121.

¹²⁴John Rylands Library Latin MS 239, 9r, University of Manchester, UK

¹²⁵Hamilton, "Learned Councils," 95–96.

by the queen's council were given fees between 40s and 53s; John Grigby, clerk of the queen's council and registrar of her Chancery, was given £5 per annum.¹²⁶ In April and May of 1520 Catherine's councilors paid 6d a day for the "here [hire] and board of a clerke."¹²⁷ Councilors were also entitled to livery clothes, as when Master Rudhale, Catherine's sergeant-at-law, was given a gown of velvet worth 40s in 1520.¹²⁸ Some members of Catherine's council, such as her secretary and chancellor, could receive meals at court alongside members of her household at court; the 1526 Eltham Ordinances stated that members of the queen's council would receive messes (meals) at her lord chamberlain's table.¹²⁹ Catherine also rewarded members of her council as she would members of her household, with gifts of clothing and plate from her wardrobe. For example, Sir Edward Neville, gentleman of the king's privy chamber, worked with Catherine's council, and was given a doublet of cloth of gold from the queen's wardrobe worth £7 and a New Year's gift by the queen in the 1520s.¹³⁰

The administration of Catherine's dower properties probably consumed the largest bulk of the council's time and energy. In order to oversee such vast and sprawling estates, Catherine's council was supported by a large number of officials at the local level. Her receiver-general was responsible for collecting and accounting for the revenues she received from her estates, which in turn came from her receivers, men who were responsible for collecting revenues from groups of her estates. Unfortunately, documents relating to the other officials of Catherine's council—her surveyor, auditor, or legal advisors—have not survived, making their specific activities

¹²⁶ *LP* 4.3:6121

¹²⁷ JRL Latin MS 239, 4r.

¹²⁸ JRL Latin MS 239, 2v.

¹²⁹ "Ordinances for the Household Made at Eltham in the XVIIth Year of King Henry VIII A.D. 1526," in *A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, Made in Divers Reigns...* Eighteenth Century Collections Online, (London, 1790) 173, <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/>.

¹³⁰ For Neville's associations with the queen's council, see *LP* Addenda 1.1:165; for his reward of a doublet, see TNA MS E101/418/6, 26v; for New Year's gifts see *LP* 5:1711 and Addenda 1.1:367; For an overview of his career, see *ODNB* "Neville, Sir Edward."

difficult to trace. In general, however, the queen's council functioned like any other noble council, with each official traveling around her estates to perform their duties. They collected accounts and reports from the queen's local officials, including her bailiffs, stewards, and surveyors. Given the extensive manors and properties held by Catherine, the number of officials who reported to her through the council would have been considerable. The machinery necessary to organize and run her scattered estates, although mostly lost from the historical record, would have been large and complex.¹³¹

The receiver-general was Catherine's principal official in charge of her revenues, and for most of her reign this post was held by Richard Decons, who was succeeded by Griffith Richards. Catherine's lands had remained under the watchful eye of Decons for many years before 1509. Decons had been receiver-general to Elizabeth of York, and after she died, Decons continued to account to Henry VII for her lands as a distinct group. He was thus very familiar with the majority of Catherine's lands and was able to continue in his office for many years.¹³² In 1509 Henry VIII could assign lands to Catherine within a few weeks of their marriage in part because those lands had remained Decons's responsibility and had not been broken up.

Catherine's council was also a judicial body that dealt with disputes concerning the queen's lands and her tenants, and it could summon individuals connected with these disputes to appear before it as a court of equity. The queen's council as a court of law could not establish legal precedents, but suits before it conformed to early sixteenth-century legal practice as a court of equity, which were established by older noble councils, particularly the Duchy of Lancaster Council.¹³³ Legal business before the council was conducted in English, and a suit usually began

¹³¹Crawford, "Queen's Council," 1194, 1209.

¹³²B. P. Wolffe, *The Crown Lands, 1461-1536* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970), 45-46.

¹³³For details about the procedure used by the Duchy of Lancaster council and its development see Somerville, "The Duchy of Lancaster Council"; other equity courts included the court of the Star Chamber, the court of Chancery, and

with a petition or bill stating the problem and requesting a specific remedy from the council. Defendants in council suits used answers and rejoinders to state their case before the council, though evidence from Elizabeth of York's council shows that personal attendance could be required by the council or that oral petitions were probably accepted by the council as well.¹³⁴ Catherine's council also took depositions to determine the facts of the case.¹³⁵

Warrants and orders issued by the council were sealed under the authority of Catherine's privy seal, as when her council summoned Thomas Metyng and Richard Ivony before them "by vertue of a privey seale to theym."¹³⁶ When a matter required further investigation, the chancellor Sir Robert Poyntz could delegate a local official to handle matters. For instance, he sent documents to Sir Edward Neville relating to the ongoing dispute before the queen's council regarding the title to lands in Kent. Poyntz requested that Neville "handle it politiquely according to the articles enclosed, or otherwise as you think best, and certify the Queen's Council next term."¹³⁷ Members of the queen's council might also travel to gather information regarding a suit, as when John Lovelace, regarding his answer to a complaint, stated that "where the quenys grace lakkyd a certen sum of the rentes...for the reformcion of the same, ther wer certein of her grace's counsellers came in to kent to survey the foreseid manors to adresse the lak."¹³⁸

From this overview of the queen's council and its duties, we can clearly see that Catherine's council was actively involved in the administration and governance of her dower lands and properties throughout her reign as queen. What is more difficult to determine is the extent to which Catherine herself was involved in the transactions. Her name was invoked in

the court of Requests, see R. Somerville, "Henry VII's 'Council Learned in the Law,'" *The English Historical Review* 54, no. 215 (1939): 430, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/554405>.

¹³⁴ See TNA MS E298/5-31 for examples of the proceedings before Catherine's council; for Elizabeth of York, see Crawford, "Queen's Council," 1209.

¹³⁵ TNA MS E111/7 or E111/63, for example.

¹³⁶ TNA MS E163/26/6.

¹³⁷ *LP Add* 1.1:165.

¹³⁸ TNA MS E298/9.

documents and requests submitted to her council, and the indentures which leased her lands all followed the standard form of an agreement between the tenant and the queen. All of these practices would have served to establish the idea of her authority in the minds of her tenants. However, with no official records of council meetings, we can have very little idea of how much participation Catherine had in the daily affairs surrounding her estates. Given the court's frequent movements and her numerous other activities, it is unlikely that she attended every council session. However, there is evidence that Catherine involved herself in council matters concerning her estates, and it is likely that she would have attended some council sessions personally.¹³⁹ Catherine was certainly as aware and protective of her rights as were her councilors.

The degree of a queen's involvement in her council's affairs could vary from queen to queen and could also vary over the course of their queenship. Certainly, frequent confinement for pregnancies as well as a host of other duties could prevent a queen from attending her council sessions, but this was not always the case. Moreover, because members of Catherine's council, such as her chancellor Sir Robert Poyntz or her receivers-general, were also members of her household and had access to her in her chambers, Catherine did not have to be at council sessions to be aware of their actions and voice her own wishes and opinions. Just as the king relied on his ministers and council to oversee the governance of the kingdom, so the queen used her officials to administer her estates and act in her name.¹⁴⁰ If we dismiss Catherine's authority in managing her dower, we risk adopting even more patronizing assumptions towards her queenship than those held by her sixteenth-century contemporaries. Ambassadors, tenants, and officials did not discount the queen's interest in her own affairs, nor should we.

¹³⁹Garrett Mattingly, Catherine's greatest biographer, claims that she "regularly presided in person" over her council sessions, though I have not found a source that specifically corroborates this claim; Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon*, 168.

¹⁴⁰J.L. Laynesmith argues that "there is no particular foundation for assuming that queens did not behave like lords or kings in taking active involvement with their councils," *Last Medieval Queens*, 232–233.

Catherine had a significant advantage when dealing with her business affairs relating to her dower: her excellent command of Latin. Catherine's knowledge of Latin, part of her wide-ranging education in Spain, was well-documented by her contemporaries, and she earned praise from humanists Juan Luis Vives and Desiderus Erasmus for her learning.¹⁴¹ This learning had a practical aspect as well, as many of the documents concerning her lands, including a large portion of the indentures and petitions to her council, were in Latin. Although we have no direct evidence of Catherine reading any of these legal documents, her ability to read Latin undoubtedly would have given her an advantage.¹⁴²

One area that sheds some light on Catherine's involvement in the administration of her dower properties is her ability to choose her officials who administered her lands. Queens could not replace the local officers of their lands—such as their stewards, bailiffs or receivers—when they became queen.¹⁴³ However, Catherine could choose who would hold an office when the position became vacant. A letter from Sir Thomas Henneage to Cardinal Wolsey in July 1528 reveals the freedom with which Catherine could act concerning these vacancies. Sir William Compton, groom of the stool and close friend of the king, had died in June 1528. In July, Henneage wrote to Wolsey concerning, among other business, the offices Compton had held from the queen. Henneage wrote that “the King will not speak to the Queen for such offices as Compton had of her, but leave her to bestow them at her pleasure, except the keepership of Odyam park,” which was to go to the sergeant of the king's cellar.¹⁴⁴ Although it is difficult to tell from one incident whether this degree of freedom for her own patronage was normal, in this

¹⁴¹ See chapter 5 for more on Catherine's education.

¹⁴²For Catherine's Latin education, see Maria Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), 16–17; on the advantage of Latin in administering lands, see McIntosh, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State*, 121.

¹⁴³Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 234.

¹⁴⁴LP 4.2:4449.

instance, Catherine was clearly the person making decisions about the administration of her lands, and crucially, the distribution of patronage.¹⁴⁵ While it is impossible to compile a complete list of the men who worked for the queen on her lands, the partial list of receivers in Griffith Richards's accounts includes men who had close connections to the queen's household and thus probably owed their position to her specific patronage.¹⁴⁶

In addition to exercising patronage over the choice of her officers, Catherine issued orders through her council in her own name. In the warrants and letters that survive from Catherine which concern her estates, the queen oversaw suits and cases which were routine council business, suggesting that she may have been actively involved in council business on a detailed level.¹⁴⁷ For instance, in a warrant signed by the queen and issued under her signet, Catherine sent an order to the mayor and burgesses of Bridgewater.¹⁴⁸ According to the warrant, officials in Bridgewater had been unlawfully taking tolls from the tenants of the queen's castle of Bridgewater, "which have been toll free time out of mind." Furthermore, the mayor and burgesses of Bridgewater had chosen officers "among yourself" within the liberty of the castle, though the castle was not part of their jurisdiction. In defending her rights to the castle of Bridgewater, Catherine ordered the officials to cease their activities, or else give legal proof before her council that they have the authority to do so. The warrant itself is strongly worded, ending with a firm commitment to see the matter through if the mayor and burgesses do not comply: "[j]ustify your doinges which if ye do not we intend to attempt the law against you for

¹⁴⁵ This is perhaps all the more remarkable given that in 1528 tensions between the king and queen were mounting over his infatuation with Anne Boleyn.

¹⁴⁶ BL MS Cott.App. LXV.

¹⁴⁷ Like any important personage, it is difficult to tell how closely Catherine inquired about the letters that she signed, but given her education and reputation for intelligence, it is difficult to discount her close involvement in at least some council business.

¹⁴⁸ TNA MS E298/19; there is no indication of the date on the warrant.

your misdemeanors.”¹⁴⁹ This warrant, dealing with an important but not unusual matter of legal business concerning the queen’s rights, shows that Catherine was actively involved in council business concerning her estates.

The queen was also clearly interested in protecting and preserving the patronage rights that were attached to her lands, which were an important source of reward that she could oversee without direct reference to the king. Her dower lands included rights of presentation to religious houses as well as rental payments from church institutions. Catherine has a reputation as a loyal daughter of the church, but she did not hesitate to defend her rights against encroachment by other religious figures or the tenants themselves. For instance, in early 1526, a contest occurred between Catherine of Aragon and Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, Henry VIII’s chief minister and papal legate, over the chantry college of Stoke-by-Clare, Suffolk. Catherine’s successful defense of her rights to the college used the resources of her council and a healthy dose of legal trickery to prevent the cardinal from closing the college and thus depriving the queen of an important source of reward and patronage for her own chaplains and priests.

Stoke was a small but wealthy religious institution, traditionally under the patronage, and therefore control, of the queens of England. It was the richest of the Suffolk colleges, and it had become a “country retreat for Cambridge dons” with close connections to the king and queen’s households.¹⁵⁰ Since 1497, the deanery of Stoke had been held by a royal almoner from either the king’s or queen’s households. Dr. John Ednam had been almoner to Henry VII, and upon his death in 1517, Robert Bekinsall, Catherine’s almoner and president of Queens’ College Cambridge, was made Dean of Stoke. From 1525 to 1529 the position was held by Dr. William

¹⁴⁹ TNA MS E298/19; this wording could be simple a legal formula used in most disputes, but without similar letters or warrants it is impossible to say how formulaic this letter is.

¹⁵⁰ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 138.

Greene, who appears to have been a client of Wolsey, but his successor, Dean Robert Shorton, had links to both Catherine and Wolsey's patronage.¹⁵¹

In the late 1520s, Cardinal Thomas Wolsey had begun a series of "Little Dissolutions" of religious houses that were deemed too small or too poor to sustain themselves adequately. Wolsey's goal was to confiscate their income and use it to endow his two new educational projects, the new Cardinal College, Oxford, and an Ipswich feeder school, also called Cardinal College.¹⁵² Many of these dissolutions took place in East Anglia and Essex, and thus in areas of the kingdom where Catherine, as a substantial landowner and patron in her own right, had an interest.¹⁵³ Catherine was probably well aware of Wolsey's efforts to endow his new colleges, as her interest in his educational program at Oxford was well known.¹⁵⁴ And, because Wolsey's fundraising activities were occurring in areas where she held lands, Catherine's receivers and bailiffs could have kept her council informed of what Wolsey was doing. Stoke-by-Clare, for instance, was one of many properties which were under the administration of John Poyntz as one of Catherine's receivers.¹⁵⁵ As Poyntz was not only the queen's receiver but also sewer of her chamber he could have served as a direct conduit of local news and information to Catherine and her council.

In 1526, the queen appears to have gotten wind of Wolsey's interest in her college, and she sent one of her most trusted servants, Griffith Richards, to Stoke. Richards's mission was to ensure that the college remained under Catherine's control. He removed for safekeeping all the most important college statutes and muniments, including the founding bull from Pope John

¹⁵¹"Colleges: Stoke by Clare," in *A History of the County of Suffolk: Volume 2*, British History Online, n.d., <http://british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=37945>.

¹⁵²Deirdre O'Sullivan, "The 'Little Dissolution' of the 1520s," *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 40, no. 2 (2006): 227, doi:10.1179/174581306X143043.

¹⁵³For a list of the houses that were dissolved, see *ibid.*, 233, 237.

¹⁵⁴*LP* 4.1:995.

¹⁵⁵*LP* 4.3:6121.

XXII (r.1316-1334) and charters from King Henry V.¹⁵⁶ We know about Richards's activities because the canons informed their bishop, Bishop Richard Nix of Norwich, about the removal during his visitation in 1526. Because Catherine held the college muniments, Wolsey would have had to obtain consent for the surrender of Stoke from the queen herself, an unlikely proposition. As Deirdre O'Sullivan points out in her analysis of the Little Dissolutions, "[t]he consent of patrons was a clear precondition of closure in the 1520s," and Catherine meant to hold on to her claim to Stoke.¹⁵⁷ The college remained open until the final dissolution of church property in Henry VIII's Reformation, and it would continue to be a source of patronage for Henry's other wives, including Catherine's immediate successor, Anne Boleyn.¹⁵⁸

Catherine's motivations for protecting the college of Stoke are fairly clear; over the years, at least two if not more of the positions of the college were held by officials who actually served the queen, and thus constituted a form of reward that she could distribute. Additionally, the college was specifically associated with academics from Cambridge institutions such as Queens' College and St. John's College, and it housed an impressive library bequeathed by Dean Ednam in 1517. It thus had links to foundations and causes already within Catherine's interests as a patron of learning.¹⁵⁹ Finally, it is possible that Catherine's actions in 1526 were influenced by her tense relationship with Cardinal Wolsey, who had taken to monitoring the queen's conversations in the 1520s with ambassadors from her Habsburg relations.¹⁶⁰ Her successful defense of Stoke from Wolsey's predations indicates that her patronage power, as well as her political skills, allowed Catherine to pursue her own clerical patronage agendas in ways that both

¹⁵⁶A. Jessopp, ed., *Visitations of the Diocese of Norwich*, vol. 43, The Camden Society New Series (Westminster: Nichols and Sons, 1888), 227.

¹⁵⁷O'Sullivan, "The 'Little Dissolution' of the 1520s," 247.

¹⁵⁸"Colleges: Stoke by Clare."

¹⁵⁹MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, 146.

¹⁶⁰*CSP Spanish Further Supplement* (1513-1542), pg. 411.

benefited members of her household and preserved her links to other institutions of faith and learning, such as Cambridge.

Catherine also asserted her legal rights over the administration of churches within her dower properties. In 1515 the queen wrote to the Anglesey Priory in Cambridgeshire, which was part of the lordship of Clare that also included the college at Stoke. The Prior of Anglesey, John Barton, had resigned in early 1515, and the queen wrote to ensure that they would not elect another prior until she had given them leave to do so. In writing to the prior, she reminds the brethren at Anglesey of their dependence on her, threatening that “not failing thus do, as you intend to have us your good and gracious lady hereafter.”¹⁶¹ As with her attention to the Stoke affair, the queen was clearly aware of her own rights and responsibilities regarding her dower. These incidents are also examples of two very different types of interactions between the queen and her tenants. In the Stoke incident, Catherine is practicing good lordship in protecting her college from dissolution. In the Anglesey letter, Catherine has a more adversarial relationship with her clients, illustrating the tensions and disputes that were part of the administration of lands in early modern England.

Catherine’s defense of her rights to Anglesey was an attempt to protect her patronage rights to the priory, and her dower properties in general were significant sources of patronage for Catherine. Catherine’s dower provided several different avenues for patronage, including leasing lands to members of court or her household, appointing officers and councils for her lands, all of which came with different responsibilities and perquisites, as we have seen above. Additionally, Catherine used the rights and products of her lands to distribute smaller, singular instances of patronage, such as the gift of a buck from her park at Okehampton to her servant John Creusse in

¹⁶¹Henry Ellis, ed., *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, vol. 1, Facsimile edition, First Series (London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1969), 207.

1526.¹⁶² Catherine's efforts to ensure that she oversaw the election of the new prior at Anglesey were part of a pattern of using churches within her dower lands as avenues of patronage.

Catherine of Aragon's relationship with her dower, manifested through her own involvement as well as the actions of her officials, is crucial to understanding how her queenship functioned in England. The queen's lands in England did more than provide her with an income. They were a source of patronage for the queen to reward her servants, and the administration of her lands was possibly the single broadest way the English people interacted with their queen. Her dower was also part of a heritage of English queens consort, who had held lands independently since the thirteenth century, giving them a powerful basis for patronage and influence beyond their husbands' courts. The actions of her council further established her authority as queen through the use of her name in legal documents and land indentures.

The importance of Catherine's lands to her queenship is also evident when we consider the very different position of her sister-in-law, Margaret Tudor, and Scottish queens in general. Margaret Tudor, although granted a sizeable income as her dower in 1504, did not manage her lands until after the death of James IV in 1513. Scottish queens consort had an uneven record of holding their dower properties while their husbands were still alive, which meant that no tradition of queens' councils or other types of administrative bodies developed in Scotland for queens. Margaret's youth may have also been a factor in determining how James IV decided to administer her lands. At thirteen, Margaret would have been heavily dependent on her legal council to oversee her lands, and James may not have wished to devolve such control.

The dower lands of the queen consort provided more than a simple income for the queen. In England, dower lands were a significant basis for the queen's patronage and creation of relationships of obligation and service. In Scotland, this potential was curtailed by the king's

¹⁶² *LP* 4.2:2475.

control over the queen's dower properties until his death. As we shall see in subsequent chapters, Margaret's reliance on her husband for income and largesse did not prevent her from successfully obtaining patronage for her household or creating connections at court. Both Catherine and Margaret capitalized on their access to their husbands, but they also understood how to use other ways to achieve authority at court, including the use of material culture to reward their households and amplify their presence at court through their Wardrobe departments.

CHAPTER 2

The Queen's Wardrobe: Clothing Culture and Material Connections

Mr. Wilkynson in Canwyke St., 3 1/2 yds. green cloth at 4s. the yard, for the half of 2 coats made for the Queen's guard, which she did not like, and so gave one to Ric[hard] Justice, and the other remains.¹

Elis Hilton made this note in an account book he kept as part of his duties as yeoman of the Robes to Catherine of Aragon. This particular entry, from April or May of 1520, is a rare glimpse into the informal economy of the queen's Wardrobe and her involvement in providing clothes for her household. The coats mentioned above were intended for Catherine's entourage at the meeting between the English and French courts called the Field of Cloth of Gold. Catherine's rejection of the cloth is a unique record of the queen's involvement in outfitting her household. Because liveries and servants' clothing were ordered and distributed by her Wardrobe officers, usually in large-scale issuances of cloth, it is often difficult to see how involved the queen might have been in selecting and overseeing the "magnificence" of her household.² This incident suggests that Catherine was more personally invested in the appearance of her household than records suggest. Of course, this may have been an isolated occurrence; the preparations for the Field of Cloth of Gold were unlike anything the royal court had experienced in scale and complexity, and Catherine may have taken a particular interest in her household's appearance because of this.³

Because Catherine did not approve of the cloth, Hilton gave one of the coats to Richard Justice, her groom of the Robes. Alongside his superior Wardrobe officer, Richard Justice was extensively involved in procuring and distributing clothing for not only the queen, but members of her household as well. Justice had many opportunities to capitalize on his position as part of

¹ *LP* 3.1:852.

² Princely magnificence was an important royal virtue and way of displaying power and authority, for more on this see chapter 3.

³ For more discussion of the Field of Cloth of Gold, see chapter 3.

one of the most costly departments in the queen's household. Aside from the occasional gifts of clothing, such as the rejected coat, Justice's position enabled him to profit from the court economy. He bought and sold clothing to courtiers, using his knowledge and access to London cloth suppliers to act as a broker between merchants and courtier-customers.⁴

Of the range of activities and staff that served the queen, no department left such an impression, visually and monetarily, as the culture of clothing produced by the queen's Wardrobe. As one of the few departments of the queen's household to leave behind substantial written records that clearly delineate the queen's household from the king's (especially in the case of Catherine of Aragon), the queen's Wardrobe provides excellent evidence of how the queen's household was created as a distinctive group in the service of the queen. Wardrobe accounts are a unique source because they are often the only indication we have of some individuals who served the queen. Moreover, access to the perquisites of the queen's Wardrobe was a significant privilege accorded to members of the queen's household. The distribution of clothing to household members usually surpassed the value of income they could receive in fees, and thus the Wardrobe was a very important source of reward for members of the queen's household.⁵ Not only do Wardrobe documents reveal who served the queen, but they also reveal part of the system of rewards and benefits that supported her household.

The success of Catherine's and Margaret's Wardrobes in contributing to both the magnificence of their households and their connections to the royal court was in part due to the experience of their Wardrobe staff. Both queens relied on a Wardrobe staff that had a long history of service with other royal women, providing continuity from one generation of royal women to the next. The skills and relationships these men (and some women) relied upon to

⁴ See below for a discussion of Justice's business activities.

⁵ Maria Hayward, *Rich Apparel: Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII's England* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 139.

furnish the Wardrobe with supplies and artisanal labor had been developed in the households of Catherine and Margaret's predecessors, Elizabeth of York and Margaret Beaufort. By relying on this staff, Catherine and Margaret profited from institutional knowledge of the gender-specific needs of their own wardrobes and the organizational-specific needs of providing for their households.⁶

The queen's Wardrobe was, furthermore, an important mechanism through which Catherine and Margaret created affinities at the courts of their husbands and used their households to extend their presence at court. Foreign queens relied on their households to successfully maintain the dignity of their office, and their power and influence was facilitated by their households. The queen's household in both England and Scotland was both distinct from, and yet intimately connected to, the king's household and his court. Her proximity to the king was one of her greatest assets, but in order to act in the service of the queen her household must also be capable of acting as a separate body. I argue that Catherine's and Margaret's Wardrobes uniquely functioned to support their queenships by maintaining their households as distinct entities whose members amplified the queen's presence at court while also facilitating connections between the queen's household and the royal court as a whole. The queen's Wardrobe, through liveries and gifts of clothing, marked her household as a cohesive group whose loyalty and service to the queen extended her presence at court and was well-rewarded. The Wardrobe also provided opportunities for both the queen and her household to extend their relationships with courtiers and the elite of the new kingdoms, creating connections and potential bonds of obligation through gift exchanges.

The Development and Administration of the Queen's Wardrobe

⁶ Throughout this chapter I will use Wardrobe to denote the household department in charge of the queen's clothing and other goods, while wardrobe will indicate I am discussing the collection of the queen's clothing.

Although Catherine of Aragon's and Margaret Tudor's Wardrobes exhibited many similarities in function and magnificence, there were important differences in the administration and funding of their wardrobes. Margaret established her Wardrobe as queen consort to James IV after her marriage in 1503, and it changed dramatically in 1513 by the death of her husband at Flodden, at which time Margaret became Regent and Queen Mother to James V. Catherine's queenly Wardrobe existed for a much longer period, throughout her marriage to Henry VIII from 1509 to 1533. Both Catherine and Margaret had separate Wardrobes from their husbands, each of which was cared for by its own staff, whose responsibilities and access to material goods helped to create bonds of a common identity within the queen's household. Catherine and Margaret both relied on a combination of household servants and officials who cared for and oversaw the Wardrobe, and local artisans who supplied materials and skilled labor to the Wardrobe.

No independent queen's Wardrobe accounts exist for Margaret, which may be another indication that her household was dependent on her husband's Wardrobe. Instead, we have the account books of the king's expenses, kept by the Lord Treasurer of Scotland, which exist for 1503-1508 and 1511-1513. These accounts show only the portion of the queen's Wardrobe that was paid for by the king. This is still a substantial amount of material, however, for both Margaret and her household, and it indicates that the bulk of Margaret's Wardrobe was probably paid for through the Lord Treasurer's accounts. These accounts include consistent, yearly entries for items of clothing for Margaret, liveries distributed by the king to her servants, and small items of clothing for her gentlewomen and other household officials. There are specific categories of items missing from these accounts that suggest Margaret's Wardrobe must have been able to acquire items independently. For instance, in 1511-1512, Margaret received thirteen

gowns, three kirtles,⁷ seven stomachers, and numerous pairs of sleeves, slippers, hats, hoods, and headdresses, but there are no entries for smaller items such as lace, ribbons, or pins, which were also necessary components of a sixteenth-century lady's apparel.⁸ In contrast, one account book for Catherine of Aragon records numerous purchases of ribbons, lace, and pins.⁹ It is therefore likely that Margaret's Wardrobe obtained and supplied items to the queen independently from the king's expenditures on her behalf.

In England, the Wardrobe was the first department of the queen's household which was administered separately from the king's household. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the queen's Wardrobe evolved along similar lines to the king's Wardrobe, and it included the Great Wardrobe, which purchased, stored, and distributed non-perishable goods to the household, such as cloth, wax, furs, and spices. The Wardrobes of the Robes and of the Beds oversaw the queen's clothing, bedding, and other material furnishings for the household.¹⁰ Medieval queens' Wardrobes included a staff of about ten people, including a Keeper of the Wardrobe who handled nearly all the queen's outgoing expenditure.¹¹ By the early sixteenth century, the English queen's Wardrobe appears to have lost some of its organizational structure. While the Wardrobes for Catherine of Aragon and her successors continued to purchase some supplies for the queen as well as caring for and supplying clothing, bedding, and furnishings, there was no separate Great Wardrobe for the queen, and there was no one in Catherine's reign who held the office of master

This symbol will indicate terms that are defined in the glossary.

⁸Fiona Downie observes a similar situation with the accounts and recording-keeping of two early fifteenth-century Scottish queens consort, Joan Beaufort and Mary of Guelders; Downie, *She Is but a Woman*, 112.

⁹TNA MS E101/418/6.

¹⁰Johnstone, "The Queen's Household," 239, 243; English queens' Wardrobes are somewhat precocious in comparison to those of other medieval queens, such as the queens of France, who did not develop a separate Wardrobe department, called an *argenterie*, until the early fifteenth century, Mooney, "Queenship in Fifteenth-Century France," 93–110; Rachel C. Gibbons, "The Queen as 'Social Mannequin'. Consumerism and Expenditure at the Court of Isabeau of Bavaria, 1393-1422," *Journal of Medieval History* 26, no. 4 (2000): 379–380, doi:10.1016/S0304-4181(00)00010-5, Gibbons points out that the French king's *argenterie* did not develop as a separate department from the household until the fourteenth century.

¹¹Johnstone, "The Queen's Household," 248.

or mistress of the queen's Wardrobe. Instead, Catherine's Wardrobe staff comprised three men of the Wardrobe of the Robes and three for the Wardrobe of the Beds. Her expenditure was channeled through her receiver-general Richard Decons and her clerk of the signet Griffith Richards.¹² In comparison to her medieval predecessors and to the king's Great Wardrobe, Catherine's Wardrobe was less structured; however, it continued to have its own storehouse at Baynard's Castle, which had been built by Henry VII as a central repository for the queen's goods in 1500-1501.¹³

Though staffed by men who were relatively low in rank at court, Catherine's Wardrobe handled some of the most expensive goods that the queen owned, and accounted for expenditures of over £800 out of her annual expenditure of around £4,400. Catherine's Wardrobe expenses were the largest portion of her expenditure, although the fees for her household and her Stables expenses, each of which usually ran about £800 annually, were close behind.¹⁴ The queen's Wardrobe provided for most (but not all) of her clothing and furnishings, and it gave out some clothing for her daughter Princess Mary, her household, and her particular friends at court. From day-to-day expenditures, like the purchase of velvet to cover two pairs of night slippers for Catherine, to the most sumptuous robes of cloth of gold and purple velvet, the yeomen, grooms, and pages of the Wardrobe oversaw some of the most precious goods in the queen's household.¹⁵

Catherine's Wardrobe staff kept their own accounts. Four accounts for Catherine's Wardrobe survive, all from roughly 1515 to 1520. The four manuscripts were kept by Richard Justice, Catherine's groom of the Robes, and Elis Hilton, Catherine's yeoman of the Robes.¹⁶

¹² TNA MS E315/242/3, 31r; JRL Latin MS 239, 7v.

¹³ Maria Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII: The Wardrobe Book of the Wardrobe of the Robes Prepared by James Worsley in December 1516; Edited from MS Harley 2284, and His Inventory Prepared on 17 January 1521, Edited from Harley MS 4217, Both in the British Library* (Leeds, UK: Maney Publishing, 2007), 28.

¹⁴ see Appendix; LP 4.3:6121.

¹⁵ TNA MS E101/418/6, 33v.

¹⁶ TNA MS E101/418/6, TNA MS E315/242/3, JRL Latin MS 239.

Justice's accounts record expenses for purchasing and making clothing and other small items for the queen, the princess Mary, and members of her household and the court. Hilton's accounts specifically relate to the Field of Cloth of Gold and deal with providing liveries for the Queen's attendants there, from footmen to guardsmen, as well as the expenses of transporting these clothes to Calais.¹⁷

The account books of Henry VIII's Great Wardrobe suggest that the queen's Wardrobe was not initially independent from the king's Wardrobe in England. At the beginning of the reign, when Catherine's Wardrobe was beginning to constitute itself on a queenly scale, the king's Great Wardrobe and his lord chamberlain, Lord Charles Somerset, helped to provision the queen's household. The lord chamberlain bought material not only to outfit the queen's new household for the coronation itself, but also to provision Catherine's Wardrobe and Stables. Throughout July 1509, the Lord Chamberlain provided Catherine with a range of items necessary to furnish her household; sheets and blankets for her beds; saddles, sacks, and bridles for her horses, and of course, gowns and kirtles for her wardrobe.¹⁸ From June to August in 1509, the Lord Chamberlain spent over £300 on outfitting Catherine's household. This reflects the fact that Catherine, after years of living at the edges of Henry VII's court as the Princess Dowager of Wales, underwent a rapid change in status with the quick decision by the new king to marry his brother's widow and have a joint coronation.¹⁹

After the first few months of Henry's reign, Catherine's Wardrobe began to fulfill its role in her household, although it continued to be supplemented by the Great Wardrobe. For example, in one account book from 1516 Catherine received twenty-seven items from the king, including

¹⁷ However, these accounts are not as clearly delineated as it would first appear; Justice's accounts include many entries for servants' liveries, and Hilton's accounts have expenses for the queen herself mixed with those of the liveries.

¹⁸ TNA MS LC9/50, 156r-161v.

¹⁹ Unlike, for instance, the more measured transition of Margaret Tudor from princess to queen, see chapter 3.

over twelve stomachers ranging from crimson satin to white cloth of silver.²⁰ The same account book also included gifts of clothing for members of Catherine's household and deliveries of cloth to Richard Justice and John Wheeler of Catherine's Wardrobe and John Scutt the queen's tailor to make clothes for the princess Mary.²¹ In the accounts from both Catherine and Henry's Wardrobe, there is a clear distinction between the queen's household and the rest of the royal court, but at the same time the queen's household is closely connected to the king and his patronage.

Although no manuscripts survive from Margaret's Wardrobe or her Wardrobe officials, Margaret did have a separate Wardrobe from her husband. In the early years of her queenship, Margaret's Wardrobe was staffed nearly entirely by Englishmen, headed by her master of the Wardrobe, Piers Manwaring.²² Manwaring oversaw two English Wardrobe specialists, Henry Roper and Richard Justice, who later served Catherine in England, and an English furrier, Patrick Hill.²³ The four Englishmen left the Scottish court by 1508, and by 1511 Scottish livery lists show that James Dog, a long-time Scottish servant of James IV, was heading Margaret's Wardrobe.²⁴ Interestingly, in 1511 Margaret's Scottish tailor, Robert Spittel, and her furrier, Lancelot Ferry, received liveries, and so it is likely that they became *defacto* Wardrobe staff after Roper and Justice had left.²⁵

We can infer that Margaret's Wardrobe had its own accounts. Since there is evidence that the Scottish king's yeoman of the Wardrobe in later reigns kept their own accounts for small expenditures,²⁶ it is probable that Margaret's servants did the same during this period. One entry

²⁰ BL Harley MS 2284

²¹ BL Harley MS 2284, 3r, 17r, 18v.

²² *LHTA* 2:336.

²³ *LHTA* 2:337; for more on Roper and Justice, see below.

²⁴ *LHTA* 2:208.

²⁵ *LHTA* 4:265.

²⁶ Murray, "Crown Revenue of Scotland," 300.

in the Treasurer's accounts, from March 30, 1512, indicates that Margaret could order the purchase of cloth herself: "to Stevin Law burges of Edinburgh be the Quenis writingis... for certane yellow dammes [damask] deliverit to hyre befor this day."²⁷ William Dunbar, James IV's court poet, wrote a poem criticizing James Dog, Margaret's keeper of the Wardrobe after her English staff had left. He refers to "marks" or "writins" from the queen which supposedly had authorized the gift of a new doublet.²⁸ Distributing clothing rewards to courtiers was understood to be an important function of the queen's Wardrobe, and Dunbar's poem shows that Margaret was believed to exert control over her own, separate, Wardrobe. The poem criticizes James Dog for not honoring Margaret's warrant, but it is actually addressed as a complaint to Margaret, with the refrain "madame you have a dangerous dog," a play on the keeper's name.²⁹ Dunbar faults the Wardrobe keeper for not fulfilling his duties: "[t]he wardraipper of Venus boure,/To giff a doublette he is als doure," but it is to Margaret that he turns for redress.³⁰

In Dunbar's poem, we can see that Margaret may have exercised more control over her Wardrobe than surviving records indicate. In addition, Margaret received a yearly allowance of £1000 Scots and probably used this sum to purchase items for her own use or that of her household without immediate recourse to her husband's material or funds. Thus, while the surviving records give the appearance that Margaret had little or no separate Wardrobe establishment from her husband, a close examination of what the records contain and what they are missing show that Margaret's Wardrobe functioned separately from her husband's. This is crucial in establishing both how the queen's household functioned and also in considering Margaret's sources of rewards and patronage.

²⁷ *LHTA* 4:212

²⁸ William Dunbar, *The Poems of William Dunbar*, ed. James Kinsley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), K29, line 5, line 9.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, K29.

³⁰ "The wardraper of Venus's bower/To give a doublet he is all dour," *ibid.*, K29, lines 1-2.

Most of the entries for Margaret mentioned in the Lord Treasurer's accounts record two different types of monetary outlay, the cost of buying the materials and the cost of making the garment in question. Throughout the accounts, there are some deliveries to the queen's Wardrobe of cloth that has no specified purpose—a few ells of velvet or Holland cloth, coils of gold thread, or some silk.³¹ However, the vast majority of entries indicate the specific item that the material is for; for instance, 12 ells fine black satin became a night gown, and 6 ells of white and yellow taffeta became sleeves.³² Often these entries do not indicate who is actually making the garments, although they do include a fee for “the making of it [the gown].” When tailors or furriers are mentioned as creating or mending garments for the queen, the accounts generally try to identify where the materials for the work come from. When Robert Spittel, Margaret's tailor, received a delivery of damask to line a cloak for the queen the damask was paid for by the Treasurer's accounts.³³

It is these entries, the ones that identify not only who was making the garments, but also where the material for them was obtained, that can reveal some of the workings of Margaret's Wardrobe. In 1513, Lancelot Ferry, the queen's furrier, presented the Lord Treasurer with a bill for numerous items which he had made for the queen over the course of several months. These entries, probably copies of Ferry's own accounts, show that although Ferry did a great deal of work for the queen, it was often using materials provided for by the queen's Wardrobe, in short, “of her own stuff.” This was a common phrase, used to describe materials coming from the queen's Wardrobe of both England and Scotland. It is evidence of the routine practice of artisans working with materials that were already bought and paid for by the Wardrobe in its capacity as

³¹A Scottish ell was 37 1/5 inches, and an English ell was approximately 45 inches, Elizabeth Coatsworth, “Ell,” in *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles in the British Isles C. 450-1450*, ed. Gale R. Owen-Crocker, Elizabeth Coatsworth, and Maria Hayward (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 189.

³²*LHTA* 4:210-211.

³³*LHTA* 4:425.

a storehouse for the queen's goods. All of the eight gowns listed by Ferry were lined or trimmed with fur that was "of the queen's own stuff." Ferry provided skins and fur for cuffs and collars, but he did not supply the ermine, watermellis, or pampilion that lined the gowns themselves.³⁴ Since Margaret did not receive any of these furs from the Lord Treasurer's accounts in the previous years, it is possible that Margaret's own master of the Wardrobe was buying them for Margaret, using her own funds.

Like Margaret, Catherine received clothing from her husband as gifts for herself and her household. Although Margaret certainly relied on the king's Wardrobe to a greater degree than did Catherine, both queens drew on similar resources in order to furnish their Wardrobes and maintain members of their households. The queens' Wardrobes served their households and were a source of reward in the form of gifts and livery. At the same time, both Catherine and Margaret were supported by the king's Wardrobe in various ways, such that their households have the appearance of being heavily dependent on the king.

In addition to the uneven pattern of record survival and differences in administration, studying the queen's Wardrobe and household poses other problems for historians. Because there could often be long gaps between the reigns of queens consort, a queen's household appears to "lack the permanency of the main royal household."³⁵ As a result of the uncharacteristically acrimonious transition between Henry's first and second wives, there was less reason or incentive for Wardrobe officials to save the records of the queen's Wardrobe. This does not reflect a lack of professionalism, independence, or importance in the queen's Wardrobe. Instead, the appearance of a lack of records and continuity in staff reflects the particular and peculiar reality under which Henry divorced Catherine of Aragon to marry Anne Boleyn, as well as the

³⁴ *LHTA* 4:425-426.

³⁵ Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 177.

vagaries and happenstance that dictate how any early sixteenth century source survives. Yet, the earlier transition from Elizabeth of York's Wardrobe to her daughter-in-law's nearly six years later is a testament to how, even after a lapse of some six years, the queen's Wardrobe was able to reconstitute itself quickly and efficiently with the same staff, who specialized in providing for royal women.

Shared Staff

In studying the royal women who preceded Margaret and Catherine, we can see that in both their households in general, and Wardrobe staff in particular, there was a great deal of overlap in personnel. While the gaps between the reigns of queens in the early sixteenth century certainly contributed to the loss of documents and sources on the queen's Wardrobe, there remained a degree of continuity in the Wardrobe staff of the royal women of England: Margaret Beaufort, Elizabeth of York, Margaret Tudor, Catherine of Aragon. This continuity meant that Catherine and Margaret were able to call upon a Wardrobe staff that was practiced in the workings of the queen's Wardrobe and the creation of magnificence for the queen.

There were several men and at least one woman associated with Catherine's and Margaret's Wardrobes who had experiences in the households of other royal women, thus providing a considerable amount of familiarity and expertise in providing clothing, bedding, furnishings, and other necessities for royal women. Richard Justice and Harry Roper served Elizabeth of York, Margaret Tudor, and Catherine of Aragon nearly consecutively in the early sixteenth century. Elis Hilton served Elizabeth of York as groom of the Wardrobe and resumed his position when Catherine became queen. Mistress Elizabeth Collins, a chamberer who was involved in the care of clothing in the Wardrobe, served Margaret Beaufort and then Catherine of Aragon. By moving from one royal woman's household to another during times of transition

these servants remained in royal service, and thus were still available to be called upon when a new queen was crowned. This practice of sharing staff amongst different royal female households also helped mitigate the expense of pensioning off officers of Elizabeth of York's Wardrobe when she died in 1503.

When Margaret left for Scotland in July 1503, she brought with her men who were not only experienced servants of the queen's Wardrobe, but also familiar with Margaret's own tastes and preferences. Richard Justice and Harry Roper had both served in the household of Elizabeth of York from at least 1501 until her death in February of 1503. They then journeyed to Scotland with Elizabeth's daughter Margaret in July of 1503. Justice had been Elizabeth's page of the Robes in 1502, and Henry Roper page of the Beds; thus each would have had experience outfitting a royal woman. In Elizabeth's household, Justice frequently fetched the queen's robes from one royal palace to another, and oversaw mending gowns and kirtles for the queen.³⁶ Harry Roper also fetched items for the queen and delivered messages for her as well.³⁷ Both Justice and Roper performed Wardrobe-related tasks for Margaret from 1502 to 1503. In June of 1502 Roper bought a number of items for Margaret, now referred to as the Queen of Scots, including a chafer of brass, two washing bowls, and three basins of pewter. He also carried these same items from London to Westminster for the young Queen of Scots.³⁸ Richard Justice also brought Margaret clothing while he was Elizabeth's page of the Robes. In July 1502 he fetched a pair of orange sarsenet sleeves from Westminster to London for her.³⁹

Justice and Roper served Margaret in Scotland for several years as her two English yeoman of the Wardrobe. In Scotland, Justice and Roper continued to care for two different areas

³⁶Sir Nicholas Harris Nicholas, ed., *Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York: Wardrobe Accounts of Edward the Fourth*, Facsimile edition (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1972), 7, 15–16.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 10–11.

³⁸*Ibid.*, 19.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 33.

of Margaret's Wardrobe, and perform many of the same types of tasks. Justice and Roper were paid along with Margaret's other English attendants on a semiannual basis, each receiving £5 16s 8d Scots in February 1504, August 1504, February 1505, August 1505, August 1506, and February 1507.⁴⁰ Harry Roper, whose name occurs in the accounts more frequently than Richard Justice, appears to have stayed in Scotland longer, receiving fees in August 1507 and February 1508.⁴¹ Richard Justice left Scotland some time in 1507. Both had returned to England in time for Catherine of Aragon's coronation in June 1509.

Richard Justice's duties in Margaret's Wardrobe primarily involved receiving deliveries of clothes into her Wardrobe from the king's Wardrobe and ordering smaller items for the queen. In May 1504, Justice received a delivery of Danzig skins to be used for summer hose for the queen. He was also paid for purchases of fabric, for instance for a quarter ell of purple velvet in 1507.⁴² Justice also made some items for James IV; in November 1505 he was paid 56s for making hawk hoods at the king's command.⁴³

Harry Roper took care of a different category of items in Margaret's Wardrobe, items that generally would fit with his experience as page of the Beds to Elizabeth of York. He bought less sumptuous fabrics like canvas for pillowcases and say for curtains. After 1506, Roper's appearance in the accounts and his duties increased dramatically, no doubt as a result of the departure of Piers Manwaring, Margaret's English Master of the Wardrobe. Throughout 1507 and the first half of 1508, Roper was responsible for the washing of the queen's wardrobe (previously Manwaring had overseen this), including buying eight sacks of violet powder. Roper was the Wardrobe's handyman, mending an assortment of objects necessary to the queen's

⁴⁰ *LHTA* 2:336; 3:118-120; NAS MS E21/7, 89r; *LHTA* 3:324-325; NAS MS E21/8, 68v.

⁴¹ *LHTA* 3:67.

⁴² *LHTA* 2:435; 3:268.

⁴³ *LHTA* 2:413; 3:154, 169.

household. He fixed one of the feet of the queen's chair of state, the queen's liar (a screen used for privacy), and another chair, and had the queen's hanging of Arras mended.⁴⁴ Roper also continued to purchase items for the queen's bed, like striped sheets and pillowcases, 'bearing sheets' to carry Wardrobe items, and thread, hooks, and cords. He probably began to keep accounts and issue bills for his many activities, for one entry in the Treasurer's accounts shows that curtains for the queen's chamber window were paid by "writin with Hary Roperis bill."⁴⁵

Both Justice and Roper traveled with the queen and her Wardrobe as the court moved around, although not all the time. In November 1503, one of the two was paid when he "remanit in Edinburgh, kepand the said wardrob viii owkes [weeks] the king being in Strivelin and at Saint Duthois iiii French crounis [56s Scots]."⁴⁶ In Aug 1506 Harry Roper was paid 7s for his expenses because he was three days behind the queen's household, presumably because he was having the queen's Arras hanging mended.⁴⁷

The departure of most of Margaret's English household and staff, including Justice and Roper, occurred during a period that makes it difficult determine when and why they left. Although the death of her father Henry VII and the accession of a new king and queen in England may have been the primary motivation for their departure, the Treasurer's accounts, which record the activities of Margaret's Wardrobe, are missing from 1509 to 1511—thus the difficulty in drawing any definite conclusions. Whatever the exact timing, both Harry Roper and Richard Justice were in London for Catherine's coronation, and served Catherine in her Wardrobe for many years afterwards.⁴⁸ Reflecting his years of experience and service under two queens, Harry Roper was promoted to the title of yeoman under Catherine. Richard Justice

⁴⁴ *LHTA* 3:338; 4:29, 32.

⁴⁵ *LHTA* 3:268.

⁴⁶ *LHTA* 2:405.

⁴⁷ *LHTA* 3:338.

⁴⁸ TNA MS LC9/50, 209v.

remained groom of the Robes, working under another former member of Elizabeth of York's household, Elis Hilton.

In Catherine's accounts, Roper becomes slightly less visible than Richard Justice. None of the account books reflect his department of the Wardrobe, the Beds, and thus we do not have a clear picture of his activities. We know that Catherine's Wardrobe of the Beds in later years spent between £14 and £56 annually for the queen's beds; although this was probably after Roper's tenure, it is safe to assume that he handled comparable sums, if not more, considering that in the early years Catherine may have been accumulating bedding to furnish her new household.⁴⁹ Roper received bedclothes from the Great Wardrobe for the queen's use in February 1510 and again in October 1514.⁵⁰ He also received in February 1510 a delivery of a "chair covered with crimson tissue cloth of gold," as part of a delivery for goods for the royal nursery, "God willing."⁵¹ Roper was not listed as one of the members of Catherine's household who attended her at the Field of Cloth of Gold, nor can I find any other trace of him after 1516, so he had probably left Catherine's service around then.

Richard Justice, Harry Roper's fellow expatriate in Scotland, became an important member of Catherine's household staff and the keeper of two of the surviving manuscripts relating to Catherine's Wardrobe, an account book from 1515 to 1517, which is badly damaged and in fragments, and another account book, from March 1520.⁵² From these books we can see that Justice oversaw numerous transactions relating to clothing for the queen, Princess Mary, members of Catherine's household, and the nobility. Justice also oversaw and paid for the care

⁴⁹ *LP* 4.3:6121; the wardrobe of the Beds was quite small compared to the queen's wardrobe of the Robes, which during the same period usually cost between £600 and £800 per year. See Appendix.

⁵⁰ *LP* 1.1:364; 1.2:3332.

⁵¹ *LP* 1.1:381; this was probably in preparation for Catherine's first pregnancy, which ended in a miscarriage at the end of January 1510, but her physician believed she was still pregnant with a second child for some months after, see *CSP Spanish* Supplement to Vols. 1 and 2:7, pg. 34; Sir John Dewhurst, "The Alleged Miscarriages of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn," *Medical History* 28, no. 1 (1984): 50–51.

⁵² TNA MS E101/418/6; JRL Latin MS 239.

and maintenance of the queen's clothing. When Henry VIII paid for clothing for his wife, the cloth itself was often sent to Richard Justice to be made into gowns, kirtles, or stomachers.⁵³ Justice also made, or had clothes made, for other women at the royal court, a sign of his skills and experience as a groom of the Robes. For instance he received from the king 3 quarters of a yard of crimson velvet to border and cuff a gown for Princess Mary in August 1519.⁵⁴

Justice's position of groom of the Robes gave him access to the significant resources of the queen's Wardrobe and involved close interaction with elite members of her household, if not the queen herself. The king's own yeomen and grooms of the Robes would have had close daily contact with him as they got out the clothes and brought them to the king every day. In the reign of Henry VIII, his yeoman of the Robes received the same livery as yeomen of the privy chamber, a clear sign of his closeness to the king.⁵⁵ Justice's activities, discussed above, indicate that the queen's Robes staff performed similar duties of collecting and delivering the queen's clothing. As I discuss in chapter 5, however, it is unlikely that the male members of the queen's household, including her yeoman of the Robes, enjoyed the same kind of personal access to the queen that their counterparts in the king's household did. Reasons of modesty and privacy would have kept the yeoman of the Robes at a somewhat greater distance from the queen.

Both Roper and Justice appear to have possessed necessary artisanal and mercantile skills to fix or mend Wardrobe items and to evaluate and purchase goods for the Wardrobe. Unsurprisingly, Richard Justice came from a mercantile background in the town of Reading. His successful career at court was accompanied by a steady rise in the town government of his native Reading. His father, Henry Justice, had been a minor government official in Reading and

⁵³ BL Harley MS 2284.

⁵⁴ BL Harley MS 2284, 33v.

⁵⁵ Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 143.

Richard continued to move up the local hierarchy.⁵⁶ Richard Justice was a member of the guild in Reading in 1509, and after holding a series of offices in Berkshire, Hampshire, and Buckinghamshire, he became mayor of Reading in 1539 and later served as an alderman. He was elected to Parliament by the Reading burgesses in 1542.⁵⁷ His business activities at court, which I discuss below, were likely enhanced by his merchant contacts and experience.

As outlined above, Justice and Roper possessed significant Wardrobe skills and experience that contributed to the creation of magnificence for their mistresses, which I will discuss in detail in chapter 3. It is important to note that their skills were developed through service in multiple royal female households, which meant that their careers specifically focused on the service to royal women. Moreover, Justice's experience in creating and commissioning royal clothing for women was clearly acknowledged by Henry's Wardrobe, when its staff sent fabric and money to Justice to make gowns for Princess Mary as well as the queen. Although Catherine and Margaret's Wardrobes lacked the permanency of their husband's Wardrobe, their shared staff gave both queens the advantage of significant collective experience in the creation of their Wardrobes.

Richard Justice used his position in Catherine's Wardrobe department to participate in the informal court economy as a lender. Richard Justice's account book from *circa* 1516 shows that he used his position to make small loans of cash or goods to servants and household members of the queen. Justice's activities appear to be personal business transactions, but his expertise and reputation for creating elite clothing and access to fine fabrics (either from the queen's own store or from merchants he dealt with in London) came from his service in the queen's Wardrobe. While the account book is unclear where the money Justice lent came from, he was probably

⁵⁶ Richard Justice owed his place at court to his stepfather, Richard Smith, who had been a yeoman of the Robes to Elizabeth of York.

⁵⁷ "JUSTICE, Richard(by 1488-1548/49), of Reading, Berks," Miller, *The History of Parliament*, vol. 2.

able to make many of these transactions either because he had access to lines of credit with cloth merchants or because he used Wardrobe funds to finance his loans. Justice's loans, moreover, covered numerous areas of expenditures for courtiers. He financed purchases of not only clothes, but also horses, and he loaned out "ready money," or cash.⁵⁸ These transactions, while relatively minor, show how Justice was connected not only to the queen's household, but also to other courtiers, thus providing another connection between the queen's household and the rest of the royal court.

Most of the loans Justice recorded were for members of the queen's household. He lent Alexander Frognall, Catherine's carver, 33s 4d for an "H of gold set with stones," possibly an object meant for someone at court or even as a gift for the king from queen.⁵⁹ Other members of Catherine's household borrowed money from Justice at different times, creating a network of debt and obligation within the household, echoing the larger role the Wardrobe played in connecting members of the household through liveries and clothing culture. Matthew Jones, page of the queen's Beds, Benat Montgomery, the queen's footman, Hugh Carr, page of the chamber, and even Griffith Richards, Catherine's clerk of the signet, all borrowed money from Justice.⁶⁰

Prominent courtiers, men and women, came to Justice to purchase clothing and often paid him in installments. Giles Duwes, the king's lutenist and Princess Mary's French tutor, paid off the 11s he owed Justice "for the rest of a doublet of tawny tinsel."⁶¹ Lady Compton, wife of Sir William Compton, who was a close friend of the king and groom of the stool, borrowed black

⁵⁸ TNA MS E101/418/6, fol. 13.

⁵⁹ TNA MS E101/418/6, 13r; giving recipients their initial set with jewels was a common high-status Tudor gift, see below. In this case, the H could have been meant as a gift for Henry VIII or for Catherine as a symbol of her love for Henry.

⁶⁰ TNA MS E101/418/6, 18v, 19v.

⁶¹ TNA MS E101/418/6, 13r.

velvet worth 11s the yard. “My Lady of Suffolk,” Mary Tudor, the king’s sister and wife of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, borrowed a “frontlet of crimson velvet” worth 20s.⁶²

Even more interestingly, Justice appears to have had contact with one of the members of Margaret Tudor’s household, possibly while she was visiting her brother in 1516, after the death of her husband. Although the entry is undated, Justice loaned one Edmund Levisay 10s for a horse.⁶³ This may have been the Edmund Levisay who was an English gentleman usher and favorite courtier in Margaret’s household. He had been in Scotland until at least 1512, which makes him one of the longest-serving members of Margaret’s English retinue.⁶⁴ Many of the entries with dates from Justice’s account book are from the period when Margaret was staying at the English court. It is possible that Levisay journeyed south with Margaret in 1516, and he might have used his former contacts from Margaret’s household when he arrived at the Tudor court.

Justice’s activities as recorded in his account book reflect both the queen’s Robes expenses and his own commercial activities (which also included the buying and selling of horses and cloth). The debts owed to Justice are small, but they do show that Catherine’s groom of the Robes facilitated a series of debts and obligations amongst various members of the royal court, from the sister of the king to the queen’s footman. As the account book only covers a few years, it is reasonable to assume that Justice made many more loans over the course of his decades-long career in Catherine’s household. Justice’s loans are one of the ways that the queen’s Wardrobe built affinities and patronage around the queen’s household that extended into

⁶² TNA MS E101/418/6, 18v, 19v; Mary Tudor’s entry is crossed out, indicating she paid her debt or returned the frontlet; Lady Compton’s is not.

⁶³ TNA MS E101/418/6, 13v.

⁶⁴ *LHTA* 3:249.

the rest of the royal court.⁶⁵ Justice was deeply involved in the non-monetary economy of the court as well, in which clothing, both old and new, was used as a form of reward.

One of the few women of Catherine's household who was definitely involved in the care of the queen's wardrobe was Mistress Elizabeth Collins, a chamberer to the queen and former chamberer to Margaret Beaufort.⁶⁶ Mistress Collins had joined Catherine's household by 1511, when she received a gown of damask furred with miniver from the Great Wardrobe along with three other chamberers to Queen Catherine. Around six years later Elizabeth Collins was still an active member of Catherine's household, receiving items from the queen's Wardrobe, including gifts of black cloth and velvet.⁶⁷ Although she is only ever referred to as a "chamberer," Mistress Collins was involved in caring for the queen's clothes. Richard Justice provided her with starch for the queen's clothes and she was paid for drying items for the queen.⁶⁸ Her duties never rose to the level of "Mistress of the Robes," a much later title used for the lady in charge of the queen's Wardrobe, but the brief notices of her involvement provide glimpses of behind-the-scenes maintenance of the queen's wardrobe.

Elis Hilton is the final member of Catherine's Wardrobe staff who can be linked to the households of other royal women, and he is perhaps the most intriguing. A groom of the Robes under Elizabeth of York, he was promoted to yeoman of the Robes for Catherine in 1509. In the Wardrobe of Elizabeth of York, Hilton had been paid for buying Holland cloth for shirts and fox fur for a gown for Lord William Courtney, the queen's nephew. He had also bought cloth for

⁶⁵ Justice also noted money he provided to his family, sending 10s "to Asheley for my wife" or 12s to John Spander, his mother's servant, TNA MS E101/418/6, 15v.

⁶⁶ Mistress Elizabeth Collins received 26s 8d as a reward from the estate of Margaret Beaufort in 1509 as part of Margaret Beaufort's former household, St. John's College Archive MS D56.131, St. John's College, Cambridge, UK.

⁶⁷ TNA MS E101/418/6, 32r.

⁶⁸ TNA MS E101/418/6, 4r; JRL Latin MS 239 13v; she also received wedding clothes from the queen: cloth for a russet satin gown and a black satin kirtle, TNA MS E101/418/6, 38r.

Elizabeth, such as two yards of black lining for the queen's cloak in November 1502.⁶⁹ Like Justice and Roper, Hilton also fetched gowns to and from royal residences for the queen.⁷⁰ When Hilton became part of Catherine's Wardrobe, he was made yeoman of the Robes. Two of the existing accounts from Catherine's Wardrobe were kept by him, and each concerned providing liveries to Catherine's male servants in 1520, in preparation for the Field of Cloth of Gold. This was a large, expensive task and one that Hilton oversaw with the help of many other members of Catherine's Wardrobe and household. The only surviving accounts of Hilton's thus show his role in overseeing a massive project for the queen's Wardrobe. As yeoman of the Robes, Hilton held a higher rank than Richard Justice and possibly delegated the keeping of everyday records and account books to him. While Justice appears to have had the technical expertise in making and mending items for the Wardrobe, as he did in Scotland for Margaret, there is no evidence that Hilton actually made clothing for the queen's Wardrobe.

Despite his importance to the queen's Wardrobe, very little has been written about Elis Hilton, although a closer look at his activities outside the Wardrobe reveals that he and his family benefited in many ways from his service to Catherine. Like Justice, Hilton was a businessman whose family connections and economic transactions demonstrate the economic opportunities available to members of the queen's household. He leased the farm of Highham at a rate of £25 a year from St. John's College, Cambridge, the foundation Margaret Beaufort had created in her will. He also received occasional alms from St. John's College to distribute to the poor at Highham.⁷¹ Hilton received a yearly fee of £8 10d as keeper of Baynard's Castle, the traditional London repository for the queen's goods and the formal location for the queen's

⁶⁹Nicholas, *Privy Purse Expenses*, 54.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, 17.

⁷¹ SJCA MS D106.11, 2v, 16r, 49r, 93r, 106r, 111v.

Wardrobe.⁷² Hilton's duties as keeper of Baynard's Castle, and thus the queen's goods stored within, complemented his position as yeoman of the Robes. He was also granted a tenement in Gravesend in 1528, which was probably only shortly before his death.⁷³ In his will Hilton bequeathed the lease of Highmore (probably Highham) to his nephew Richard Raynshaw, and also bequeathed his "ownage of the sealing of the cloths in the county of Lancaster" to his brother-in-law Giles Raynshaw.⁷⁴ Hilton thus appears to be connected by marriage to one of the suppliers of Catherine's Wardrobe, William Raynshaw, from whom Hilton bought 52 yards of black lining in 1520.⁷⁵ One of Hilton's executors, William Ebgrave, was an embroiderer to Henry VIII, to Catherine of Aragon, and to later Anne Boleyn.⁷⁶

The careers and activities of Henry Roper, Richard Justice and Elis Hilton show that the Wardrobe and its staff had multiple roles to play in the queens' households and in the English and Scottish court at large. While fulfilling their duties as handymen, providing clothing for the queen, or provisioning the household, these men also forged connections with the royal court and gained rewards and recognition from their queen. Additionally, the careers of Roper and Justice, men who served Elizabeth of York, Catherine and Margaret in approximately the same capacity, show that there was continuity between the English and Scottish courts through the households of Elizabeth, Catherine, and Margaret. Elis Hilton's career, which spanned the reigns of Elizabeth of York and Catherine of Aragon, eventually brought him responsibilities outside of the Wardrobe that further served Queen Catherine and brought Hilton additional rewards.

⁷² LP 4.3:6121; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 28; Hilton's keepership should not be confused with the keeper (or master) of the Great Wardrobe. The Great Wardrobe was also located in the same area of London, Baynard's Castle Ward, but in a different complex of building from the castle and the queen's Wardrobe, see Maria Hayward, ed., *The Great Wardrobe Accounts of Henry VII and Henry VIII*, London Record Society 47 (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2012), xiv–xv.

⁷³ LP 4.3:4313.

⁷⁴ TNA MS PROB/11/22

⁷⁵ TNA MS E315/242/3.

⁷⁶ Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 327; TNA MS E315/242/3, 22v.

Clothing and the Creation of Connections at Court

Catherine's and Margaret's Wardrobes provided clothing to people other than their mistresses. Both queens used their Wardrobes to issue clothing to members of the queen's household and the nobility. The exchange of material goods, from the Wardrobe and elsewhere, on behalf of the queen and her household, became one of the most useful mechanisms for queens to create networks of obligation and support at the courts of their husbands. Livery clothing was by far the largest and most noticeable way the queen used her Wardrobe to reward and bring together her household as a group. This clothing could also promote the queen's household as a distinct group through the use of livery. Livery contributed to the creation of the queen's household as a cohesive whole by visually linking the queen's servants with each other and her own personal and dynastic symbols. As we will see in chapter 3, livery served to extend the queen's presence at court by creating material markers of the queen whenever her servants went about their tasks while wearing their livery. The queen's Wardrobe was an important center of material culture beyond the queen's household itself, further strengthening the connections between the queen, her servants, and the wider world of the court.

Livery clothing was distributed by the queen's Wardrobe either as part of a large allotment of clothing, or as individual pieces given to members of the household, and it served symbolic and communal purposes. Livery was usually clothing marked with sewn or embroidered badges, either the royal Tudor emblems of the rose and portcullis that Margaret used in Scotland or Catherine of Aragon's own Spanish emblems of pomegranates and sheaves of arrows. Livery was a way of creating or affirming the identity of the queen's household, both defining the members of the household (those who received livery) and also ranking them within

the household itself, based on the amount, quality, and cut of the clothing they received.⁷⁷ The emblems in turn perpetuated the queen's image as a member of an illustrious royal house, equal in dignity to the king. Servants dressed in livery amplified the queen's presence at court, serving as visual proxies for the queen wherever they went and enhancing her own dignity and status when they attended upon her in person. Liveried servants were also evidence of the queen's power to command the service and loyalty her household; liveries were physical manifestations of the service the queen's household owed to her.

For Margaret Tudor, livery lists accurately distinguished members of her household from those of the king's household in the Lord Treasurer's accounts.⁷⁸ James IV provided livery for the queen's servants every December, beginning in 1505. Twelve men of the queen's chamber and six men from the stables were given French tawny, chamlet, and kersey for their liveries.⁷⁹ Other members of Margaret's household, especially those who accompanied the queen outdoors such as her littermen and footmen, received liveries from the king. The women of Margaret's household also received livery gowns from the king, and the quality reflected the relative rank of these ladies and gentlewomen. In December 1511, James provided livery gowns to 15 ladies of the court, the only large-scale issue of livery to women during Margaret's reign. In anticipation of the Yule season in 1511, high-ranking noblewoman Lady Gordon was given a livery gown of tawny velvet, furred by the queen's furrier, with tawny satin kirtle and velvet hood and three pairs of sleeves. Lady Callendar's livery gown was of black velvet, with sleeves of crimson satin.

⁷⁷ Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 17; Catherine L. Howey, "Fashioning Monarchy: Women, Dress and Power at the Court of Elizabeth I: 1553-1603," in *The Rule of Women in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Anne J. Cruz and Mihoko Suzuki (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 143.

⁷⁸ From the account entries, it appears that Margaret and James's households received roughly the same liveries, of tawny and black, but the accounts do not state if emblems or badges were sewn into the liveries.

⁷⁹ *LHTA* 3:108-109.

Waiting women like Mistress Musgrave received the slightly less expensive livery gowns of black satin with sleeves lined with black velvet.⁸⁰

Catherine's and Margaret's Wardrobes created connections among their households and between their households and the rest of the court through the distribution of clothing and the exchange of cash and material goods. Livery enhanced the queen's presence at court and was one of the principal ways her household was distinguished from the rest of the royal court. The queen also gave clothing as a sign of special favor, and Catherine used her clothing to both reward her servants and maintain her friendships amongst the female elite of England. The use of material culture as part of courtly gift-exchange, not only with clothing, but as we will see, with gold, silver, and gilt plate as well, was an expected practice of good queenship. It was also a significant way for Catherine and Margaret to maintain connections between themselves, their household servants, and important elite supporters and friends, thus forming new relationships between the foreign queen and the elite of her new land.

Clothing could be issued as part of annual livery distributions, but it could also take on more personal meaning as a reward or a gift. Clothing was often part of the gift-giving at court and it had symbolic meaning as a sign of particular favor, intimacy, or esteem towards the recipient. Maria Hayward has argued that gifts of clothes by Henry VIII were a sign of favor, similar to the annual New Year's gifts of silver and plate.⁸¹ Gift-giving was a common way for all levels of society to engage in exchange and create relationships based on gratitude. Because queens were at the very highest levels of society, their gift-giving could fulfill expectations of liberality towards their social inferiors or soften social divides by fostering friendships between

⁸⁰ *LHTA* 4:219, 220, 230.

⁸¹ Maria Hayward, "Fashion, Finance, Foreign Politics and the Wardrobe of Henry VIII," in *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, ed. Catherine Richardson (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004), 174.

the queen and the nobility of England and Scotland.⁸² Catherine and Margaret used their Wardrobes to create connections and affinities based on gift exchange among the queen, her household, and her courtiers.

Both Catherine and Margaret provided clothing to members of their households beyond the yearly provision of livery, which continued their duties to care for their household through the virtue of liberality. It is occasionally difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between an “ordinary” provision of clothing and a gift. As Natalie Zemon Davis and others have theorized, gift-giving existed on a wide spectrum of obligation and reciprocity. The inherently unequal relationship between queens and their households, in addition to the ideals of queenly liberality and practices of non-monetary rewards, meant that some clothing might be received as a form of payment, while others would be seen as a more particular mark of favor, or indeed, as a gift.⁸³

Richard Justice often issued complete sets of clothes for particular members of Catherine’s household, such as Ochoa de Sauzedo, her Spanish yeoman of chamber, who received dark tawny broadcloth, black chamlet, black satin, and black cotton for a gown, doublet, jacket and hose.⁸⁴ Catherine’s ladies received numerous items of clothing, usually several times in the course of the year. Mistress Anne Knyvett, one of Catherine’s maids of honor in 1520, was given multiple sets of clothing by Richard Justice, including a gown of tawny chamlet with tawny velvet-lined sleeves, as well as slippers, kirtles, girdles, and hose.⁸⁵ Margaret’s ladies frequently received clothing that was not part of the annual livery distribution. For instance,

⁸² For more on the social meanings of gifts and the social importance of gift-giving, see Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000), 8–10, 37–40.

⁸³ Davis, *Gift*, especially 1–10.

⁸⁴ TNA MS E101/418/6, 39v.

⁸⁵ JRL Latin MS 239 8v, 9v.

Mistress Barlow, one of Margaret's English gentlewomen, received tawny satin and velvet for a gown in July 1506, and she received velvet and worsted cloth for a kirtle in March 1507.⁸⁶

Catherine also gave away items of her own clothing to members of her household and the others at court. She had grown up in a court where the distribution of clothing was an important sign of favor. Her mother Isabel had admonished her eldest son and heir, Juan, to give away his clothing when he was as young as eight.⁸⁷ Justice's account book records several gifts that the queen made to members of her household and nobility from 1515 to 1517, though most of the entries regarding gifts are specifically from 1516. Catherine gave the Duchess of Norfolk a gown of crimson velvet with Spanish sleeves lined with green cloth of gold damask in May. The queen gave Lady Maltravers gown of white satin in August. Lady Darrell, the queen's chamberers, and Mistress Victoria, the wife of Henry's Spanish physician, all received gifts of gowns from Catherine in 1516 and 1517. In January 1516, Mistress Phillips was given a gown of black satin with wide sleeves, from which the ermine fur had been removed. John Glynn, one of Catherine's trusted yeomen of the chamber, was given a gown of green velvet "of the Spanish fashion" with sleeves lined with cloth of gold.⁸⁸

Weddings were an important opportunity for Catherine to show her support and extend her largesse to members of her household. Sometimes this meant fostering alliances and providing dowries for the young gentlewomen of the queen's household.⁸⁹ But the queen also supported lower-ranking members of her household at their marriages, through gifts of clothing.

⁸⁶ *LHTA* 3:116, 321.

⁸⁷ Ruth Matilda Anderson, *Hispanic Costume, 1480-1530* (New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1979), 12–13; on the other hand, Catherine's sister Juana hoarded or destroyed clothing rather than present it to servants she found unworthy, see Aram, *Juana the Mad*, 28–29.

⁸⁸ TNA MS E101/418/6, 11r, 9v; the recipients of the gowns probably would not have worn the gowns themselves, often the gowns would be pulled apart for the material to make other items of clothing, or would be sold. Occasionally, gowns might be kept as mementos of the giver, see Hayward, "Fashion, Finance, Foreign Politics," 177; Howey, "Fashioning Monarchy," 146.

⁸⁹ See chapter 5.

Catherine of Aragon provided a range of cloth to members of her household when they got married. Robert Hilton, one of her yeomen ushers, received 7 yards of velvet cloth for his marriage at a cost of 56s.⁹⁰ When Elizabeth Collins was married in 1516, the queen gave her 11 yards of russet satin for a gown, a kirtle of black satin hemmed with crimson velvet, and calaber and mink fur to line the gown.⁹¹ Catherine's tailor, John Scutt, was given seven yards of violet cloth worth 70s on his marriage.⁹²

Members of Margaret's household also received clothing upon their marriage from the king's Wardrobe. Isabel Stewart, daughter of John Stewart, Earl of Atholl, was one of Margaret's gentlewomen, and she was given clothing for her wedding.⁹³ As part of the queen's household, she received a livery gown of tawny velvet and a kirtle of crimson velvet, amongst other gowns. In preparation for her marriage in January 1512 she was given several items of clothing, including two new gowns. One gown was made of 14 ells of tawny stain with sleeves lined of crimson satin, while another was of gray satin with sleeves lined and edged in black velvet. Isabel was also given a second pair of sleeves and a gray damask kirtle for her marriage, which along with the gowns, cost over £84 Scots.⁹⁴ Edmund Levisay, Margaret's long-serving English usher who was also a favorite of James IV, received a wedding gown of gray and crimson satin in 1512.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ Robert Hilton may have been a relative of Elis Hilton, although there is no indication of such a relationship in Elis Hilton's accounts nor is he included in Hilton's will, TNA PROB/11/22.

⁹¹ TNA MS E101/418/6, 47r, 38r

⁹² TNA MS E101/418/6, 39r; in view of Scutt's profession, it is likely that the cloth would be sold on or used for a paying client, rather than worn by Scutt himself.

⁹³ Isabel Stewart (also called Elizabeth) married John Stewart, heir of the Earl of Lennox, in January 1512. The Stewart Earls of Atholl were descended from Joan Beaufort, mother of James II, and her second husband, Sir John Stewart. They were thus related to both the Scottish royal family and Margaret Tudor, through her grandmother Margaret Beaufort, which may explain why the king was so lavish with her wedding clothes, James Balfour, *The Scots Peerage: Founded on Wood's Edition of Sir Robert Douglas's Peerage of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1904), 1:442, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015046819846>; William Fraser, *The Lennox*, vol. 2, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (Edinburgh, 1874), 192–200, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com>.

⁹⁴ *LHTA* 4:227, 228.

⁹⁵ *LHTA* 4:249.

Catherine and Margaret and their households participated in the most important gift exchange of the early pre-modern court at New Year. Both Henry VIII and James IV gave New Year's gifts to their wives and members of the queen's household, as well as elite members of the court, personal attendants, and merchants and artisans. Usually these gifts were items of gold and silver plate, but they could also be rewards of cash and clothing. Catherine of Aragon distributed gifts to members of her own household, as well as prominent courtiers and others who were in some way connected with her. New Year's gift exchanges also show how connections could form and be maintained between the queen's household, the king's household, and members of the court and nobility. Although we have no records for Margaret's New Year's Gifts, the pattern of giving at the Scottish court by James IV indicates that this was an established tradition that Margaret most likely would have participated in. Accounts of Catherine's gifts, which are partially preserved for *circa* 1520, 1522, and 1528, show the queen engaging in similar gift-giving activity to her husband, though on a smaller scale.⁹⁶

When James IV distributed New Year's gifts in 1504, he included Margaret's household in his generosity. In doing so, he used gift-giving to incorporate these new, English members into the Scottish court, and rewarded the queen's English attendants, who were starting a new life away from home and family. Margaret's gentlewomen received jewelry from the king; for example, a Mistress Margaret was given a chain of gold with an image of St. Andrew, worth £20 Scots and Mistress Eleanor Jones was also given a chain of gold decorated four gold coins on it,

⁹⁶ *LP* 5:1711, Add. 1.1:367; TNA MS E101/420/4.

worth £6 9s 10d.⁹⁷ The king would continue to give chains and coins to Margaret's gentlewomen over the years.⁹⁸

James also distributed coins to other English members of Margaret's household; yeomen and ushers of her chamber, including Englishman Hamnet Clegg, were given gifts of cash worth £21 Scots total in 1504, and would continue to receive New Year's money from the king until 1508.⁹⁹ Margaret's English household left Scotland sometime around 1509, and when the accounts resume in 1512, James no longer gave money to the yeomen and ushers of her chamber. In 1512, James was still giving to ladies of the court, only now the queen's retinue had changed, and it included many more Scottish gentlewomen and noblewomen.¹⁰⁰

Just as James IV sought to honor Margaret's household and to create connections through New Year's gifts, Catherine of Aragon used New Year's gifts to maintain alliances with particular friends within the English nobility and to reward her English and Spanish servants. Two types of documents show evidence of Catherine's gift-giving. First, there are the incomplete accounts kept by her receiver-general, Griffith Richards, which survive from 1524 to 1530. His accounts show that the queen spent between £350 and £424 a year on gifts, although the account is not itemized, and it does not indicate if these gifts are specifically for New Year's.¹⁰¹ There are also three manuscripts that can be associated with Catherine that list the distribution of plate at the court. These contain different types of details from the Scottish accounts, which give us a different perspective on how gift-giving functioned at the English court. They are not formal gift rolls, like those surviving from the later years of Henry VIII, nor are they identified as the

⁹⁷ *LHTA* 2:413.

⁹⁸ In 1505 five of Margaret's ladies received gifts; in 1506 eight ladies were given coins attached to string. Also in 1506, the king gave velvet, satin, and damask to two English ladies worth a total of £81 12s Scots, *LHTA* 2:472; 3:177-178, 111; in 1507 Margaret's ladies received chains and saint's images, *LHTA* 3:359-360.

⁹⁹ *LHTA* 2:413.

¹⁰⁰ *LHTA* 4:324, 401.

¹⁰¹ *LP* 4.3:6121; see the Appendix.

queen's gift lists either in the title or by the editors of the *Letters and Papers* of Henry VIII.¹⁰² However, there is strong internal evidence within the documents themselves that indicates they were produced for the queen's gift-giving.

The first account, from *circa* 1520, appears to be a list of the queen's gifts ordered from the goldsmiths, and it lists the item, its weight, who it was delivered to and who delivered the gift.¹⁰³ Not all the plate mentioned in this delivery is assigned a recipient, so some must have gone into the queen's store for future use. Of the seventy-three different recipients of plate on the 1520 list, only thirteen involve people, either as recipients or bearers, whom I have not definitively connected with the queen.¹⁰⁴ Other entries are courtiers or royal household officials with whom Catherine would have associated frequently. Another list from 1522 is similar in format to the goldsmith's list, but is actually a list of the gifts delivered and includes items given away from the queen's own store of plate.¹⁰⁵ Finally, there is an incomplete list of gifts given for New Year's in 1528 which is most likely a list of the queen's gifts.¹⁰⁶ The 1528 list is in a different format from the previous two, being a list of gifts distributed, and not a list of items delivered from the goldsmiths.

The exchange of New Year's gifts at the court of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon was in most cases carried out by servants or attendants, who actually delivered the gift to the intended recipient and received a reward for their trouble, which could be quite lucrative.

William Cholmeley, cofferer for the Duke of Buckingham, gave 100s to "a servant of the Queen,

¹⁰²Maria Hayward, "Gift Giving at the Court of Henry VIII: The 1539 New Year's Gift Roll in Context," *Antiquaries Journal* 85 (2005): 124–175.

¹⁰³*LP* 5:1711 is dated by the editors to 1531, however, one of the gift recipients is the Duke of Buckingham, who was executed in 1521, so I believe this list actually dates from between 1515 and 1521, between when Thomas Wolsey became a cardinal (1515) and when the duke was executed.

¹⁰⁴ Of these thirteen courtiers, six of them are women who were either wives of prominent courtiers, or potential gentlewomen or servants of the queen I have yet to identify.

¹⁰⁵*LP Add.* 1.1:367.

¹⁰⁶TNA MS E101/420/4; Hayward, "Gift Giving at the Court of Henry VIII," 129.

bringing a New Year's gift" in 1521.¹⁰⁷ Lady Katherine Courteney, dowager Countess of Devon and aunt of Henry VIII, gave the queen's servant 53s for her New Year's gift in 1524.¹⁰⁸ The entries in the goldsmith accounts for Catherine of Aragon frequently indicate both the recipient of the gift and the bearer of the object in question. The most elite bearers were gentlewomen to the queen, such as Mistress Cook or Lady Darrell, wife of the queen's vice-chancellor.¹⁰⁹ Maria de Salinas, Catherine's Spanish lady-in-waiting who married Lord William Willoughby, delivered two gifts in 1520, one to the queen's chancellor, Sir Robert Dymoke, and the other to the King's nurse.¹¹⁰ The bearers of gifts in 1522 were also members of Catherine's household or courtiers closely connected to her.¹¹¹

The delivery of plate by Catherine's household on her behalf presents a rare documented set of interactions between Catherine's household servants, acting as representatives of the queen, and members of the English nobility. The practice of gift-giving allowed the queen to maintain connections to the rest of the queen's affinity through the distribution of material goods that were valuable monetarily and symbolically. In 1522, when George Talbot, the 4th Earl of Shrewsbury and leading nobleman at the court of Henry VIII, was given a 28oz gilt cup with a cover delivered by Richard Justice, Catherine would have reinforced her relationship with the earl and also insured that members of her household knew and were known to the prominent

¹⁰⁷ *LP* 3.3:1285.

¹⁰⁸ *LP* 4.1:771.

¹⁰⁹ *LP* Add. 1.1:367; of the 73 entries in the 1520 account, 65 of them indicate who or how the plate was delivered, see *LP* 5:1711.

¹¹⁰ *LP* 5:1711; for Lady Willoughby's marriage, see Melissa Franklin-Harkrider, *Women, Reform and Community in Early Modern England: Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk, and Lincolnshire's Godly Aristocracy, 1519-1580* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2008), 30.

¹¹¹ The 1522 list, which has 87 entries of recipients, with no repeats, also indicates who delivered the gift for 65 of those entries.

courtier.¹¹² These relationships may have developed over many years, as some of the bearers delivered gifts to the same person each year. Although there are only two years' worth of lists to compare, we can see some consistent links forming between the queen's household and gift recipients. When comparing the two lists, there are 19 recipients whose plate was delivered to them by the same person in both 1520 and 1522. Some of these relationships hint at potential connections between the recipient and the bearer. John Glynn, one of Catherine's yeomen ushers, delivered a New Year's gift to Thomas Howard, the Duke of Norfolk, in 1520 and 1522. Glynn may have been well-known to Norfolk because of his involvement with the Scottish campaign in 1513; Glynn was the messenger Catherine sent to deliver the bloody coat of James IV to Henry VIII after Norfolk's (then Earl of Surrey) great victory at Flodden.¹¹³

On the whole, however, most of the repeat-bearers were simple yeomen and gentlemen ushers of Catherine's household without any clear relationship with the recipient they visited. The practice of using multiple contacts between relatively humble household servants bearing gifts and noble members of court or the queen's affinity allowed Catherine to use the exchanges to reinforce bonds between her household and the wider Tudor court. Some of the gift exchanges, of course, occurred between members of the queen's household who were already well-acquainted with each other and connected to Catherine through multiple ties of obligation and affinity, and their role as gift-bearers possibly reflects more personal and status-related elements to the gift exchange. For instance, when the queen's gentlewoman Mistress Cook delivered a gilt pot with a cover to Lady Anne Grey, she would have known Lady Anne from their previous service together in the queen's household at the Field of Cloth of Gold. Other

¹¹² *LP* Add. 1.1:367; the Earl of Shrewsbury proved to be sympathetic to Catherine, and told the Spanish ambassador that he would refuse to crown Anne Boleyn, *ODNB* "Talbot, George, fourth earl of Shrewsbury and fourth earl of Waterford (1468–1538)".

¹¹³ *LP* 1.2:2268.

pairings denote an element of deference based on years of service rather than social rank, as when Lady Willoughby delivered a gift to the king's nurse in 1520.¹¹⁴ Lady Willoughby also delivered plate to the queen's chancellor Sir Robert Dymoke, and her secretary Richard Decons, both of whom had acted as guarantors of Lady Willoughby's jointure for her marriage.¹¹⁵

One of the crucial differences between the 1520 and 1522 lists is the distribution of gifts "from the queen's own store" in 1522. These would have been plate that Catherine already held in her coffers. The plate could have originally been part of her Spanish dowry, which had been partially paid for in plate. The plate could have also come from gifts Catherine received, or it could have been bought at a different time. Five women in 1522 were given gifts from the queen's own store, including Gertrude Blount Courtenay, Countess of Devon and daughter of the Queen's Chamberlain Lord Mountjoy.¹¹⁶ Five other women received gifts that were originally given to the queen from someone else.¹¹⁷ These ladies were also some of the queen's friends and closely-connected noblewomen such as Lady Alice Darrell, wife of Catherine's vice-chamberlain Sir Edward Darrell, and Mary Tudor, Duchess of Suffolk and Catherine's sister-in-law.¹¹⁸

These gifts tended to be more varied and personal than the gilt cups, salts and spoons bought from the goldsmiths for other recipients. For instance, Agnes Tilney Howard, Duchess of Norfolk, was given a pendant-like object shaped like an "A," made of pearls and set with

¹¹⁴ *LP* Add. 1.1:367; *LP* 3.1:704.

¹¹⁵ *LP* 5:1711; the recipient is only named as "the queen's chancellor" and depending on the exact date of the document it could be referring to Sir Richard Poyntz, who was Catherine's chancellor until 1520; Add. 1.1:367.

¹¹⁶ The other recipients were Lady Margaret Grey, the Marchioness of Dorset; Anne Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon and daughter of the second Duke of Buckingham; Agnes Howard, the Duchess of Norfolk, and Mistress Victoria.

¹¹⁷ Of these ten gifts, four were delivered by "Mistress Phillips", the wife of Francisco Felipez and a servant of Catherine's as well. Four others were delivered by different yeomen of the queen's, and in two cases it was not noted who delivered the gift.

¹¹⁸ The other three recipients were Lady Elizabeth Boleyn, Lady Mabel Fitzwilliam, and Margaret Pole Countess of Salisbury, all of whom served in Catherine's household or the household of Princess Mary.

diamonds; the Marchioness of Dorset and the Countess of Devon were both given similar crucifixes with five diamonds and a pearl. Mary Tudor was given a gold ring with a heart-shaped diamond and nine granades (garnets). Lady Fitzwilliam received a gold pomander enameled with the passion of Christ, which had originally been given to Catherine by the Earl of Devon. Giving gifts that were originally given to the queen by someone else was not an uncommon phenomenon in the sixteenth century. There was no insult or stigma attached to repurposing these items, and it could be seen as a sign of personal favor.¹¹⁹ The 1522 list indicates that the turnaround for gifts could often be quite quick. Lady Darrell was given “a pomander given by the Earl of Shrewsbury that same year,” and the Countess of Salisbury received “a pax that the elder countess of Devon gave to the queen in the same year.”¹²⁰ The sources do not reveal if there was a particular reason why gifts were “recycled.” Certainly connections can be found between the previous giver and new recipient; for instance, the Countess of Salisbury and the dowager Countess of Devon were cousins, so Catherine may have felt that the pax she had been given would have had particular meaning for its new owner.¹²¹ But it is difficult to be certain without additional evidence. Family and regional connections were so common amongst the English elite that it is possible to find some sort of tenuous relationship between any two people.

As the gifts above indicate, Catherine also received New Year’s gifts from members of court, although we have no systematic accounting of gifts for any year.¹²² Gifts to the queen from her social inferiors were a sign of honor and respect from the giver and could act as a reminder of obligations or an affirmation of friendship. In the accounts of Catherine’s receiver, Griffith

¹¹⁹Hayward, “Gift Giving at the Court of Henry VIII,” 137.

¹²⁰*LP Add.* 1.1:367.

¹²¹ Katherine, dowager Countess of Devon, was the daughter of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville. Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury was the daughter of Edward’s brother George, Duke of Clarence, so the two women were first cousins and shared royal blood with Henry VIII, grandson of Edward IV.

¹²² Systematic accounts of gifts to the king were kept in the latter half of Henry’s reign, see Hayward, “Gift Giving at the Court of Henry VIII,” 127–129.

Richards, we can see that in the late 1520s, the queen regularly paid out around £100 a year in “rewards to persons bringing presents,” although we have no itemized list of how the rewards were distributed.¹²³ There are scattered references in other accounts to gifts the queen received. The Duke of Buckingham in 1520 gave the queen a pomander and a chain of gold. That same year he gave the king a goblet of gold and Cardinal Wolsey a cup of gold with a cover.¹²⁴ Gertrude Blount Courtenay, Countess of Devon, gave Catherine 18 ells of fine Holland cloth, at 3s 10d an ell, worth £63 total.¹²⁵ Lady Courtenay’s gift reflects her close relationship with the queen; instead of giving the more customary gold plate, Lady Courtenay chose to give the queen fine Holland cloth, an equally valuable gift which may have reflected her own knowledge of the queen’s tastes and preferences.¹²⁶ Catherine’s gift in 1522 to Lady Courtenay, of a crucifix with diamonds, mentioned above, reflected a similar intimacy.

The queen’s Wardrobe was one of the most useful and important departments of her household for creating connections between the queen, members of her household, and the courtiers of England and Scotland. As a department, it distributed liveries and gifts of clothing to the queen’s gentlewomen, household servants, and particular friends. Its personnel acted as facilitators in the informal economy of the court, lending money and cloth to a variety of courtiers and servants. Catherine and Margaret relied on a group of men and women who staffed their Wardrobe and formed part of a group of household servants who specialized in serving royal women. This staff, like their households at large, benefited from royal generosity while also helping Catherine and Margaret create affinities within their marital courts, all as part of the clothing culture that was crucial to court life.

¹²³ *LP* 4.3:6121.

¹²⁴ *LP* 3.1:1070.

¹²⁵ *LP* 4.1:1792.

¹²⁶ For examples of this type of gift-giving at the court of Elizabeth I, see Howey, “Fashioning Monarchy,” 149–150.

The material wealth of the Scottish and English courts was deployed to create and reinforce relationships of obligation and affinity between the queen, the king, her household, and the nobility. Gifts were a signifier of favor and largesse that was particularly important during ritual occasions, such as New Year, when Catherine's and Margaret's households participated in the exchange of gifts, as recipients and as couriers, which created connections between the queen's household and the royal court and aristocracy. Distributing clothing, gifts, and plate to members of the household was a crucial part of good queenship that both enriched her household and added to the magnificence and splendor of the court as a whole. Magnificence was, more than anything else, the primary business of the queen's Wardrobe, and in the next chapter I will explore how the material culture of the court was used by Catherine and Margaret to establish and maintain their status as consorts, and the way in which material culture could be used to pursue political goals.

CHAPTER 3

The Material Magnificence of Queenship

Nevertheless she has a wonderful love for apparel. She has caused the gown of cloth of gold, and the gown of cloth of tynsen [tinsel] sent by Henry, to be made against this time, and likes the fashion so well, that she will send for them, and have them held before her once or twice a day to look at.¹

This was a description of Margaret written by Christopher Garneys to Henry VIII on December 28, 1515. Garneys was a gentleman usher of the king's chamber and in late 1515 he was sent to the north of England to meet with disaffected Scottish lords and present Margaret with gifts of clothing.² Margaret was recuperating at Morpeth, where she continued to suffer illness after the birth of her daughter, Margaret Douglas. Margaret's reign as queen consort of Scotland had ended with the death of her husband James IV in the Battle of Flodden, where a Scottish invading army was devastated by a smaller English force led by Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey. The heir to the Scottish throne was Margaret's only surviving son, James V, who was barely a year old. James IV had appointed Margaret guardian and regent for her son, but her relations with the Scottish nobility quickly soured. After a disastrous second marriage to Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus, Margaret lost her guardianship and eventually had to flee Scotland for her English homeland. Heavily pregnant with her child by Angus, she arrived at Harbottle Castle in the north of England in September 1515. There she gave birth and remained in the north for several months before journeying south to London.

Upon first reading, Garneys's letter appears to confirm the negative assessment of Margaret's character as vain and frivolous, an assertion commonly made by Scottish and English

¹ *LP* 2.1:1350.

² For more on Garneys, see *ODNB* "Garneys, Sir Christopher (d. 1534)." See also my discussion of Margaret's 1515 visit to England in chapter 4.

historians since at least the nineteenth century.³ The letter goes on relate how Margaret “is going to have in all haste a gown of purple velvet lined with cloth of gold, a gown of right crimson velvet furred with ermine... These five or six days she has had no other mind than to look at her apparel.”⁴ The implication one could draw from this description is that Margaret placed more value on her wardrobe than on the serious business of politics.

However, I would argue that Margaret’s preoccupation with clothing was a deliberate effort by the queen to regain her dignity and authority after the series of political failures that forced her to leave her two young sons in Scotland and escape to England while heavily pregnant. Margaret seems to have fled for England with little or no baggage, and it was only after her slow recovery from a difficult childbirth and her removal from Harbottle Castle to Morpeth that she was able to reassert her dignity as Queen Dowager and meet with Scottish lords to discuss her political future.⁵ Margaret’s desire to have her new gowns brought before her may have been a way to reassert her dignity as queen, even as she was unable to leave her bed. Undoubtedly, she took pleasure in the beautiful fabrics and colors of her new gowns. But her display of these gowns would have served to remind her servants, attendants, and the men around her that she was a queen and sister of the king of England. When Garneys first presented Margaret with the gifts from Henry, she called the visiting Scottish lords to see her gifts, reportedly saying “[s]o, my Lord, here ye may see that the King my brother hath not forgotten

³For a critical overview of Margaret’s historical reputation, see Louise Olga Fradenburg, “Troubled Times: Margaret Tudor and the Historians,” in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (East Linton, UK: Tuckwell, 1998), 38–58.

⁴*LP* 2.1:1350.

⁵ An indenture for her personal goods left behind in Edinburgh (and later delivered to Margaret in England) suggests that Margaret left a significant portion of her wardrobe in Scotland behind, including clothing, jewels, four books, and silver plate, NAS MS SP 13/23; also published in Thomas Thomson, ed., *A Collection of Inventories and Other Records of the Royal Wardrobe and Jewelhouse; and of the Artillery and Munitioun in Some of the Royal Castles* (Edinburgh, 1815), 24–28.

me, and he would not I should die for lack of clothes.”⁶ Gifts of clothing, as discussed in chapter 2, were a significant marker of esteem and status, and Margaret’s delight in her new clothing was in part because they were a manifestation of her status and her connections to those in power.⁷

Moreover, Garneys’s letter itself does not sound condemnatory. His account focuses on assuring the king that his sister is being treated well and in accordance with her royal dignity. He discussed the preparations of Margaret’s host, Lord Dacre, for the Christmas season, stating that he “never saw a baron’s house better trimmed in all his life.”⁸ Garneys described the hangings, plate, and rich food that Dacre provided in glowing terms, and Garneys made a point of noting the Scottish and English nobles who came to pay their respects to Margaret. Garneys’s keen eye as an experienced courtier knew how to read the material culture of hospitality. He interpreted the preparations at Harbottle as the appropriate response to the visit of the king’s sister and dowager queen of Scots

Margaret’s urgent efforts to reassemble her queenly wardrobe after she fled Scotland illustrate the close connection between material magnificence of the queen’s wardrobe and her honor and authority as queen. The queen’s clothing was an outward sign of her dignity and status, which both covered and yet accentuated the source of her dynastic power, her body. Clothing and the body had greater political significance for queens than for other women in the kingdom. Like the king, the queen’s body was part of political discourse, that of dynastic alliances, royal dignity, and the succession. John Carmi Parsons has argued that medieval queens had two bodies, an “official” body that had been sanctified through her coronation, and a

⁶ *LP* 2.1:1350.

⁷ For a reconsideration of accusations of vanity and wardrobe extravagance against one of Margaret’s successors, Anne of Denmark, wife of James VI, see Maureen M. Meikle, “‘Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule of the House’: Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Finances, 1589-1603,” in *Women in Scotland, c.1100-c.1750*, ed. Maureen M. Meikle and Elizabeth Ewan (East Linton, UK: Tuckwell, 1999), 105–11; Jane Stevenson, “Texts and Textiles: Self-Presentation among the Elite in Renaissance England,” *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 3, no. 1 (Autumn 2011): 39–57, <http://northernrenaissance.org/>.

⁸ *LP* 2.1:1350.

physical body that held the potential for carnal sin and pollution.⁹ The outward sign of the queen's sanctity was her magnificent clothing, which honored and exalted her body even as it obscured it. Like a holy relic encased in gold and jewels, the queen's physical body was glorified and protected by her clothing.

The importance of clothing to Margaret in regaining her queenly dignity in 1515 reflected the pre-modern understanding of the relationship between clothes and the wearer, in which clothing created and signified honor and status. In the pre-modern period, clothing in particular is crucial in the creation of identity and subjectivity because of its interaction with the body. By both covering and articulating the human body, clothing can "make 'body' into 'person.'" ¹⁰ For elite women, and especially queens, clothing also had the potential to emphasize their superior authority and social status compared to the men around them, thus "destabilizing gender hierarchies" in order to maintain royal dignity and social structure.¹¹ Just as Catherine's lordship, discussed in chapter 1, in many ways superseded the limits of her gender, clothing and material culture could emphasize Catherine and Margaret's authority through magnificence by proclaiming their access to rare goods, wealth, and their social and political eliteness.

It was not only Margaret's dignity that was implicated in her clothing. As Dyan Elliot has shown, medieval women were expected to uphold male honor through their dress.¹² Rachel

⁹John Carmi Parsons, "'Never Was a Body Buried in England with Such Solemnity and Honour': The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500," in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London, April 1995*, ed. Anne Duggan (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1997), 333; Kantorowicz barely mentions the role of queen consort, see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957); other authors have considered the queen's two bodies, Rachel Judith Weil, "Royal Flesh, Gender and the Construction of Monarchy," in *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500-2000*, ed. Regina Schulte (New York: Berghahn, 2006), 89.

¹⁰Catherine Richardson, "Introduction," in *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, ed. Catherine Richardson (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004), 8-9.

¹¹ Edith Snook, *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England: A Feminist Literary History* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 68-70.

¹²Dyan Elliott, "Dress as Mediator between Inner and Outer Self: The Pious Matron of the High and Later Middle Ages," *Mediaeval Studies* 53 (1991): 289.

Gibbons has expanded upon this idea by arguing that Isabeau of Bavaria, queen of France from 1385 to 1422, used luxurious clothing to maintain the dignity of the French monarchy when her husband Charles VI suffered from bouts of insanity.¹³ Margaret's clothing reflected not only her own status, but also the status of her brother, her son, and her bloodline as a whole. It is little wonder that the Scottish council was willing to send Margaret's wardrobe south to her in 1515; she was, after all, the mother of their infant king, and any disgrace for her would have reflected badly on the honor and dignity of the Scottish kingdom.¹⁴

Pre-modern women deployed clothing to uphold their honor and status, and the queen's clothing in particular made political claims for her. Clothing was a self-performance that could carry multiple types of meaning—fashion, honor, loyalty—that had the potential to make personal or political assertions about the wearer.¹⁵ Catherine's and Margaret's coronation robes, for example, emphasized their virginity and purity through the use of expensive white fabrics like white cloth of gold and white damask.¹⁶ When Catherine's position as the legal wife of Henry VIII was under attack in 1527, she responded by increasing her Wardrobe expenditure and maintaining the dignity of her estate.¹⁷ In order to understand how their authority and status at court were assessed and understood by their contemporaries, we must look to the material culture of their surroundings, including their clothing, linens, and furniture, to see how clothes could literally make a queen.

¹³Gibbons, "The Queen as 'Social Mannequin'. Consumerism and Expenditure at the Court of Isabeau of Bavaria, 1393-1422."

¹⁴ The indenture for her personal goods left behind in Edinburgh indicate that they were later delivered to Margaret in England, NAS MS SP 13/23; also published in Thomson, *A Collection of Inventories*, 24–28.

¹⁵Crane, *Performance of Self*, 6–7, 15.

¹⁶ *LHTA* 2:209; John Young, "The Fyancells of Margaret, Eldest Daughter of King Henry VIIth to James King of Scotland," in *Joannis Lelandi Antiquarii de Rebus Britannicis Collectanea...*, ed. John Leland, vol. 4, Eighteenth Century Collections Online (London: William and John Richardson, 1770), 291, <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/start.do?prodId=ECCO>; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 44.

¹⁷Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 179; see also Appendix.

This chapter focuses specifically on how the queen's clothing and material goods created the necessary magnificence for the exercise of her queenship. The material culture surrounding the queen, in her rooms and on her body, was one of the most visible ways for Margaret and Catherine to assert vital aspects of their queenship, including their transition from princess to queen, their roles as mothers, and their political agendas. In this chapter I will present a close analysis of three of the most important and materially splendid events in their lives: Margaret Tudor's wedding journey to Scotland in 1503, the materiality of royal childbirth, and the 1520 meeting between the courts of England and France known as the Field of Cloth of Gold. The importance of clothing to the creation of early modern social and political status meant that dressing as the queen made Catherine or Margaret the queen, not only for themselves but also for their households, courtiers, and kingdoms.

“Translating” a Queen: Material Culture and the Creation of Margaret Tudor as Queen of Scots¹⁸

In October 1504, the tailor of Margaret Tudor was paid 20s Scots to “translate” a gown of cloth of gold of tissue for the queen. Translating a gown, in this case, meant altering the outside cut of the gown and giving it a new lining of taffeta.¹⁹ The translated cloth of gold gown was likely one of a handful of rich gowns that her father Henry VII had given her before she left England in 1503 to marry James IV, king of Scots. Cloth of gold of tissue was the most expensive form of cloth of gold, incorporating gold and silver thread woven on a ground of fine fabrics such as velvet or silk.²⁰ The cloth itself was imported—probably from Italy—at great expense and was thus well worth saving and “translating” into a new gown for the queen. By

¹⁸ Parts of this section have been published as an article in *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 10 (2014).

¹⁹ *LHTA* 2:461.

²⁰ Lisa Monnas, “Cloth of Gold,” in *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles in the British Isles C. 450-1450*, ed. Gale R. Owen-Crocker, Elizabeth Coatsworth, and Maria Hayward (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 132.

law, this type of cloth of gold was reserved only for royalty and the highest aristocracy in England, and its extravagance meant that it was used in major royal ceremonies such as coronations and weddings.²¹ The gown was thus a symbol of Margaret's royal dignity, and it conveyed political and cultural meanings about the queen and her status, including her dual identities as an English princess and Queen of Scots. Margaret's gown and the rest of her wardrobe imported the English court to Scotland, creating a space in the queen's household and chambers that proclaimed her status as a member of the Tudor dynasty while also establishing and maintaining her dignity as Queen of Scots.

At transitional stages in Margaret's life, clothing visibly and physically marked her translation from princess to queen or from wife to mother. Although Margaret was never forced to perform the ritual undressing at the border that many European brides did, material culture was deployed as a marker of status and translation for the young girl from princess to queen.²² In pre-modern Europe, the bridal voyage held symbolic significance; the movement of people and goods across great distances demonstrated the power and security of European royal dynasties and was thus an expression of political rivalries and competition.²³ Margaret's wedding trousseau was not unique for royal brides. For example, Catherine of Aragon had arrived in England in

²¹ Henry VIII's 1510 sumptuary law forbade anyone below the rank of duke from wearing cloth of gold of tissue, Hayward, *Rich Apparel*, 89.

²² Although Marie Antoinette's ritual undressing in 1770 is the most well-known example, many royal brides were required to change their clothes at the culmination of their bridal voyage. See Abby Zanger, "Fashioning the Body Politic: Imagining the Queen in the Marriage of Louis XIV," in *Women and Sovereignty*, ed. Louise Olga Fradenburg (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), 101–120; Christine Coester, "Crossing Boundaries and Traversing Space. The Voyage of the Bride in Early Modern Europe," in *Moving Elites: Women and Cultural Transfers in the European Court System*, ed. Giulia Calvi and Isabelle Chabot, Proceedings of an International Workshop (Florence, 12–13 December 2008) (San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy: European University Institute, 2010), 16–17, <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/14234>. Neither Catherine nor Margaret was required to change their clothes upon their arrival, although Catherine was forced by Henry VII to remove her veil so he could see her. It seems that this European tradition did not take hold in the British Isles.

²³ See Coester, "Crossing Boundaries," 9–11.

1501 with a bridal wardrobe reputedly worth ten percent of her dowry.²⁴ Margaret's wedding and coronation in 1503 in particular allow us to see how the queen's wardrobe was used to proclaim her new status as Queen of Scots. Her magnificent wedding trousseau was assembled by her father in London and then displayed to the people of England and Scotland throughout her wedding journey.

Magnificence and generosity were royal virtues that pre-modern monarchs were expected to exhibit, and Margaret's wedding trousseau was an opportunity for her father to display his wealth and power.²⁵ Henry VII, Margaret's father, understood the value of material magnificence and its role in furthering his political goals. He used his court and household as centers for the display of Tudor power and authority, projecting images of strength, wealth, and security.²⁶ The first Tudor king had won his throne by force of arms, and the marriage between his daughter and James IV was a triumph in establishing the legitimacy of his rule and dynasty by distancing his bloodline from the rest of the English nobility through an exogamous marriage. Moreover, Margaret's marriage was an indication of the return to stability and prestige of England as a kingdom; England had not seen a royal princess marry into the dynasty of another realm since the marriages of Henry IV's daughters in 1401 and 1406.²⁷ Margaret's wedding journey was an

²⁴ There was some disagreement, in the original treaty of marriage in 1489, as to whether Catherine's trousseau would be included in the total amount of her dowry, *CSP Spanish* 1: pg. 22-23. The treaty for her 1501 marriage states that 20,000 *scudos* of her 200,000 *scudos* dowry is in the "jewels, pearls, ornaments etc. of the Princess of Wales," *CSP Spanish* 1:307.

²⁵ Christian and Classical ideals of good government and princely virtue encouraged princes to be liberal in their generosity and display their status through material goods, including clothing, see Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Vol. 1 Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 127; Stephen Rigby, "Political Thought," in *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles in the British Isles C. 450-1450*, ed. Gale R. Owen-Crocker, Elizabeth Coatsworth, and Maria Hayward (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 422-26.

²⁶ Sean Cunningham, *Henry VII* (London: Routledge, 2007), 201-208; Chrimes, *Henry VII*, 305-307.

²⁷ Princess Blanche married Ludwig, son of Rupert, the count palatine of the Rhine, and Princess Philippa married Erik VII, king of Norway, Sweden and Denmark, *ODNB* "Henry IV (1367-1413)"; Edward IV's sister, Margaret of York, technically not a princess, married the duke of Burgundy in 1468, with much pomp and fanfare, *ODNB* "Edward IV (1442-1483)."

opportunity for the king to display the resources of his household, wardrobe, and patronage not only to equip his daughter for marriage but also to reaffirm his own dignity and power.

The young Queen of Scots, accompanied by her retinue of household servants and noble attendants, traveled from London to Edinburgh in July 1503, stopping in major towns along the way. Her journey culminated in a lavish ceremonial entry into Edinburgh, which has been one of the most studied aspects of her life.²⁸ While historians have discussed the political and artistic significance of Margaret's wedding, little attention has been paid to the role that material culture played in Margaret's translation from princess to queen.²⁹ The changes to Margaret's status were first indicated by changes to her wardrobe in England, which was used to present Margaret as a queen, first to her father's northern subjects and then to her new Scottish people.

When Margaret left her grandmother Margaret Beaufort's residence of Collyweston to begin her journey in the summer of 1503, John Young, Somerset Herald and an eyewitness, described her thus in his narrative account of the journey and wedding ceremony: "[t]he qwe[n]e was richly drest, mounted upon a faire Palfrey."³⁰ At the tender age of thirteen, Margaret was dressed as befitted a queen because her father and the staff of his Wardrobe had spent the better part of a year outfitting her and her household for this occasion. John Young certainly understood the power of clothing to make an impression, and historian Sarah Carpenter has noted that "Young attempts to convey the sensory impression of performance by his marked emphasis on clothing. Sensitive to the crucial importance of costume in the performance of magnificence, he provides detailed assessments of fabrics, cut, jewels, and accoutrements."

²⁸ See Introduction for a discussion of this historiography.

²⁹ The exception being Carpenter, "To Thexaltacyon of Noblesse," 104–20; Sarah Carpenter, "'Gely Wyth Tharmys of Scotland England': Word, Image and Performance at the Marriage of James IV and Margaret Tudor," in *Fresche Fontanis: Studies in the Culture of Medieval and Early Modern Scotland*, ed. Janet Hadley Williams and J. Derrick McClure (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013), 165–178.

³⁰ Young, "Fyancells," 267.

Throughout his narrative, Carpenter argues, Young constructs costume and clothing as an outward sign of honor or noblesse.³¹ Young was reflecting the importance that the English and Scottish courts placed on costume in its own right, through the use of costly fabrics and colors, liveries and luxury goods by Henry VII and James IV to proclaim their status and power. Indeed, Margaret's arrival has been seen as the catalyst for an expansion of the material extravagance of the Scottish court that lasted for the rest of James's reign.³² The power of Margaret's physical appearance during this wedding journey, the resources and skill that went into it, and its intended effect on the people the young queen encountered in Scotland and England, are all crucial to understanding the importance and utility of royal wardrobes in the sixteenth century.

Before her official betrothal and the signing of the Treaty of Perpetual Peace between Scotland and England, Margaret was simply Lady Margaret, the king's eldest daughter. Usually alongside her younger sister Mary, she received clothing from the king in suitably rich materials, and the sisters were often dressed in a similar fashion. In February 1499, for example, a warrant from the king's Wardrobe in the National Archives shows a number of clothes were made for Henry VII's younger children, including clothes for Lady Margaret and Lady Mary. According to the warrant, which was a written order to the king's Wardrobe staff, both sisters were to be given gowns made of green velvet edged with purple, kirtles of tawny damask edged with black velvet, and kirtles of black satin.³³ At the time, Margaret would have been ten and her sister three.

Margaret's wardrobe began to change in November 1501, when Margaret and her sister Mary again received clothes from the king's Wardrobe. In contrast to previous orders, the clothing that Margaret received in 1501 was markedly different from that of her sister. Now,

³¹Carpenter, "To Thexaltacyon of Noblesse," 108.

³²Fradenburg, "Sovereign Love," 89–90.

³³TNA MS E101/412/15.

Margaret was given a gown of tawny cloth of gold tissue, furred with ermine, a gown of purple velvet, and two kirtles, one of tawny satin and one of russet satin. She was given “an ell of black velvet for a hood of the French fashion,” one of the first instances of the “French hood” to be known in England, and a garment that would have been the cutting edge of fashion and sophistication in the early sixteenth century. Indeed, she appears to have brought the fashion to Scotland, as several of her ladies in later years were given French hoods at the Scottish court.³⁴

In the same warrant, Margaret’s sister Mary received a gown of russet velvet furred with ermine and miniver and a gown of crimson velvet. These gowns indicate, very subtly, Margaret’s change in status. She received gowns of cloth of gold and purple velvet, while her sister received the slightly less regal russet and crimson velvet gowns. Margaret’s purple gown had associations with royalty and was a color usually worn on specific feast days and for coronations.³⁵ Mary’s gowns, still fashionable and regal in shades of red and costly fabrics and furs, befit a young princess but show the differences that were beginning to emerge in the two sisters’ positions.

Of course, these distinctions are by no means clear-cut, and certainly in the case of Margaret and Mary, the seven-year age difference could also be a factor, as the differences in clothing could also indicate Margaret’s approaching maturity and hence, marriageability. Significantly, in the same month that Margaret was given a gown of cloth of gold, Henry VII issued a commission to members of his council to treat with James IV regarding Margaret’s betrothal and her journey to Scotland and to obtain the necessary Papal bulls for the marriage.³⁶

This commission indicates that the king, whose negotiations with James IV over the treaty and

³⁴ TNA MS E101/415/7, no.51; Melanie Schuessler, “French Hoods: Development of a Sixteenth-Century Court Fashion,” ed. Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker, *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 5 (2005): 136; Margaret had numerous hoods made for her in Scotland that also fit the style of French hoods, although they are never called French hoods specifically; see *LHTA* 4:210.

³⁵ Ermine was also a fur associated with royalty, and it was used to line coronation robes, Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 121, 46.

³⁶ *CDS* 4:1678; James and Margaret were related within prohibited degrees and thus required a papal dispensation to marry; Patricia Hill Buchanan, *Margaret Tudor Queen of Scots* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985), 10.

the marriage had stretched on for years, felt that the marriage was certain to go forward and that Margaret's status would change accordingly, hence the new clothes.

Margaret's status changed officially with much pomp and fanfare in January 1502 in a lengthy series of betrothal ceremonies. For several days, the twelve-year-old princess was at the center of ceremonies at the English court that began with a proxy wedding ceremony, in which the young princess swore to take the King of Scots as her husband.³⁷ After the elaborate betrothal ceremony, which took place in the chamber of her mother Elizabeth of York, Margaret was officially the Queen of Scots and was treated as such by the English court. The earliest and most visible markers of her translation would have been the changes in her relationship with the material culture of the court. For instance, as Queen of Scots, Margaret dined with her mother under a rich cloth of estate. She also immediately began to fulfill queenly ideals of generosity, when she distributed prizes to winners of the jousts in her honor.³⁸

After the betrothal ceremony, throughout much of 1502 and 1503, the new queen's trousseau began being assembled in earnest. Both her father and her mother provided items of clothing and material goods for her wardrobe, which would accompany her to Scotland. Elizabeth of York paid for two pairs of costly sleeves for Margaret in June 1502, one pair in black velvet and another in white sarsenet.³⁹ Henry VII was also providing rich garments for his daughter, in accordance with her new status as Queen of Scots. In November 1502, Henry paid for a gown of black velvet furred with minks as well as a kirtle of black satin hemmed with crimson velvet.⁴⁰ After the death of her mother in February 1503, Margaret's clothing became a combination of wedding and mourning clothes, as Henry VII continued to pay for gowns and

³⁷Young, "Fyancells," 262; the age of consent for marriage was twelve for girls and fourteen for boys.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Nicholas, *Privy Purse Expenses*, 23.

⁴⁰CDS 4:1689.

kirtles for her in black, as well as sleeves in a variety of colors and fabrics for the young queen. Henry also provided numerous other types of gowns made of rich materials and lined with expensive furs, including gowns of black satin, cloth of gold, and crimson satin, and at least three of purple velvet.⁴¹ These clothes were paid for through royal warrants and are almost always for the young queen alone.⁴²

Margaret's clothes during this period were listed in "bulk" warrants which contain a host of items for the young queen, from gowns and kirtles to hats and pins. One warrant from June 1503 gives us a particularly detailed idea of the wardrobe required by Margaret shortly before she left for Scotland. In this warrant, she received three gowns made of black satin, black velvet, and crimson satin respectively. Each gown required around twelve ells of fabric, which for the black satin gown cost 100s.⁴³ In addition to the gowns, Margaret was given three kirtles, of black satin, tawny damask, and cloth of gold. Kirtles needed around seven ells of fabric, roughly half the cost of a gown.⁴⁴ The true variety of her clothing came from her sleeves, however. In this warrant alone, nine pairs of sleeves were ordered for the young queen, in colors of black, green, gold, tawny, and crimson, and in fabrics of satin and sarsenet.⁴⁵ Sleeves, of course, used significantly less fabric, usually less than an ell, and could cost as little as 4s 8d for a pair of green satin sleeves.⁴⁶

In addition to major items of clothing, this warrant also included smaller items that can give us a more detailed picture of the queen's wardrobe and the kinds of necessities and luxuries

⁴¹ Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 56.

⁴² The wardrobe accounts for Henry VII show that some of Margaret and Mary's linens and shoes continued to be ordered together after January 1502, although not, it appears, their clothing; *CDS* 4: Appendix 1, no. 36, pp. 422-24.

⁴³ *CDS*, 4: Appendix 1, no. 36, p. 430.

⁴⁴ *CDS*, 4: Appendix 1, no. 36, p. 431.

⁴⁵ TNA MS E101/412/15.

⁴⁶ *CDS* 4: Appendix 1, no. 36, p. 431; for Tudor fashions, sleeves could be made separately from a gown and then attached with lacing or pins, providing opportunities for variation. Often sleeves were exquisitely decorated and came in a variety of shapes (wide, pointed, fitted, etc), and could be the most magnificent part of the entire outfit, see Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 165.

she brought with her into Scotland. Margaret was given two hats, one of crimson and one of scarlet, as well as three yards of black velvet for hoods, “orlettes” and frontlets “of the French fashion.”⁴⁷ In an acknowledgement, perhaps, of the cold Scottish winters to come, the young queen was given a night gown of black velvet with wide sleeves and two night bonnets of ermine, one with a border of crimson velvet. To carry and care for all of these items, trussing coffers, cloth sacks, and brushes were ordered. Finally, pins, ribbon, and thread were provided, all necessary items for piecing together the Tudor fashions, in which sleeves, gowns, kirtles, and bodices could be combined in different ways. In total, this single warrant cost £60 19s 10d, with £59 6s 2d of that amount paid to sixteen different merchants, suppliers, or artisans.⁴⁸ These items and many others like them would form the basis for the new queen’s wardrobe, which would be used and displayed in Scotland during the wedding and for months, if not years, afterwards.

Beginning in May 1503, the king’s Wardrobe also began to outfit Margaret’s household attendants and make the beds, chairs, and carriages that the queen would take with her into Scotland. The new queen was accompanied into Scotland with a retinue of nobility, gentry, and household servants. Her household was given liveries that proclaimed their status and linked them intimately not only with the queen but with the Tudor dynasty as a whole. Among her many other attendants, at least two footmen and two littermen waited on Margaret. Her father ordered livery for the four men in May 1503. The footmen were given two sets of livery, one with doublets of black velvet with jackets of green cloth of gold and white, and another with black velvet jackets, embroidered with the Tudor portcullis badge and doublets of green

⁴⁷ “Orlettes” most likely refers to oreillettes, crescent-shaped front borders of French hoods, which were usually stiffened and covered the ears, Schuessler, “French Hoods,” 151–54.

⁴⁸ *CDS* 4: Appendix 1, no. 36, p. 435.

damask.⁴⁹ This would have been the livery that John Young was describing when he wrote that “[t]hre fotemen were always ny hyr [near her] varey honestly appointed, and had in their Jaketts browdered Portecolllys...Next after was convayed by two Foteman arayd as the others, one varey rich Lytere borne by two faire Coursers varey nobly drest.”⁵⁰

Margaret’s heralds and trumpeters were also outfitted with royal arms and badges on their tabards and banners, celebrating not only the magnificence of the English court but also the power and prestige of the Tudor dynasty associated with the display of wealth and pomp.⁵¹ Her ladies were issued livery gowns of designs relatively similar to each other, which included variations on a tawny-colored gown edged with black velvet. Often it is only through the issuance of livery gowns that we know which of the ladies who waited on Margaret in England were to accompany her to Scotland. Mistresses Frances Baptiste and Elizabeth Barlow each received the same type of livery gown of tawny chamlet edged with black velvet and a black worsted kirtle. Mistress Zouche, one of Margaret’s distant cousins on her paternal grandmother’s side, received a higher-status livery gown of tawny damask with a black chamlet kirtle, and a second gown of tawny medley.⁵²

The material furnishings intended for Margaret’s household and chambers in Scotland not only reflected her new status as Queen of Scots, but also proclaimed her royal heritage through the use of the Tudor arms, and by extension, the success and legitimacy of the Tudor dynasty as a whole. The most lavish items would grace her public spaces, including her presence chamber, bedchamber, and chapel. These furnishings would all play a part in the daily ritual and

⁴⁹ *CDS* 4:1705; her littermen were given similar black velvet jackets with the Tudor portcullis embroidered on the front and back.

⁵⁰ Young, “Fyancells,” 267. Young may have conflated the footmen and littermen, as both were given portcullis badges and would have attended on Margaret during her journey. Alternatively, Margaret could have acquired another footman between the time the warrant was issued and her departure.

⁵¹ *CDS* 4:1727.

⁵² *CDS* 4:1720, 1724.

ceremony at the Scottish court and thus would be visible to James IV and his courtiers on a regular basis. Henry provided Margaret with a bed of state, consisting of cloth of gold coverings, yellow damask valance, silk fringe, and crimson satin curtains.⁵³ The frame of her bed of state was set with the English arms, supported by two of the king's heraldic beasts. Margaret's cloth of state, which would hang over her chair of state in her presence chamber, had a similar device of the king's arms supported by the king's beasts, and it too was lined with yellow damask and fringed with gold. Margaret's priests were outfitted with vestments bearing a crucifix and the English arms crowned. Henry also provided two altar cloths for her private chapel embellished with a needlework crucifix, escutcheons of the royal arms, embroidered portcullises and roses, and a *Pietà*.⁵⁴ When Margaret reached her new home in Scotland, all of the principal rooms of her household—her presence chamber, bedchamber, and chapel—would proclaim her family loyalty and the generosity of her father through the English arms and the sumptuous fabrics used to decorate her suite. These goods would probably remain in use at the court for years to come. A 1505 Inventory of the Royal Chapel at Stirling lists three gilt candlesticks with the arms of England, brought by Margaret into Scotland, in addition to a number of newer vestments featuring the joined arms of England and Scotland.⁵⁵ Margaret continued to use magnificence to proclaim her royal status and her identity as a Tudor princess for years after her marriage.

As Margaret headed north to her new home, her elaborate retinue and progress served several purposes. Henry VII used Margaret's wedding journey as an opportunity for an intensive round of royal propaganda and magnificence, celebrating and emphasizing his dynasty's success in securing a royal marriage for his eldest daughter and his own wealth and magnificence. This

⁵³ TNA MS 101/415/7 no. 120; *CDS* 4:1725.

⁵⁴ *CDS* 4:Appendix 1, no. 36, p. 427.

⁵⁵ F. C. Eeles, "The Inventory of the Chapel Royal at Stirling, 1505," *Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society* 3 (1911): 315, 321, 322.

was an especially important and delicate task in the north of England, which had been a Yorkist stronghold against the Tudors.⁵⁶ When Margaret and her noble retinue left for Scotland in the summer of 1503, they took with them the material goods produced by Henry VII's Wardrobe, conveyed in carriages the coverings of which were a visual statement of the foreign marriage and alliance that the young queen represented. Margaret's carriages were encased with "with Covurynge whyt and grene, and the Armes of Scotlaund and of Inglaund half perted with red Roses and Porcollys cronned."⁵⁷ Roses and portcullises were specifically symbols of the Tudor dynasty that were taken from their Lancastrian and Beaufort ancestors and thus were a political statement in the former Yorkist territories of northern England. The arms of England and Scotland were half-parted to indicate Margaret's marriage and thus dual identity as English royal and Scottish queen. The train was certainly lengthy; in Scotland, it took twenty-two carts to bring the queen's gear from Dalkeith to Edinburgh before her wedding.⁵⁸ Making their way slowly north, accompanied by not only many richly dressed lords and ladies, but also carriages and wagons covered in the royal arms, it must have seemed to onlookers as if Margaret was taking half the wealth of England with her into Scotland.

Margaret's journey north gradually introduced the young queen to the arts of queenship through the medium of material culture. In England, she was both Queen of Scots and a representative of her dynasty. John Young recounts how, at every major town along her route, Margaret made an official entry richly dressed, often stopping to prepare herself and likely change clothes, before entering the town.⁵⁹ Margaret would then be greeted by the local officials of the town, usually the mayor, alderman, and local clergy. Her visit would be marked by the

⁵⁶Neil Murphy, "Receiving Royals in Later Medieval York: Civic Ceremony and the Municipal Elite, 1478-1503," *Northern History* 43, no. 2 (2006): 244, doi:10.1179/174587006X116167.

⁵⁷Young, "Fyancells," 268.

⁵⁸*LHTA* 2:386.

⁵⁹Young, "Fyancells," 276.

presentation of relics for her to kiss and a Mass. During these ceremonies, Margaret's wardrobe was on display for all to see. For example, when she attended Mass at York Minster, Margaret wore a gown of cloth of gold with a collar of precious stones and "a gyrdle wrought of fin Gold hauntyng don to the Yerth."⁶⁰ Young's account shows that Margaret's entrances into a town were witnessed by her own entourage and common folk, and thus were widely-seen performances of her queenship. Moreover, her veneration of relics and piety were part of her responsibility, as Queen of Scots and an English princess, to display her religious devotion as a moral leader of her people.

Before Margaret left a town, civic officials usually presented her with a gift. At the city of York, the Mayor and Aldermen gave her a gilt vessel filled with coins. Margaret received the gift standing under a cloth of state and responded to the civic officials by thanking them and claiming that the gift would "ever endeavor me to love you and this Citie all the days of my life."⁶¹ She also promised to "show to the king's grace my father the great kindness that you have done to me at this time."⁶² Margaret acknowledged that the gift was symbolic of the relationship between her and the city.⁶³ Queens often fulfilled dual roles as independent patrons and mediators, because they had access to both their own material resources and the favor of the king. Margaret's response suggests she saw herself as both a patron in her own right, who would "love" the city for the rest of her life, and also a mediator or broker of patronage, recommending

⁶⁰Ibid., 274; "a girdle wrought of fine gold hanging down to the Earth."

⁶¹York, York City Archives MS B9, 7r.

⁶²Ibid., 7r.

⁶³ Gifts served to act as material reminders or symbols of patron-client relationships and were part of a self-consciously constructed performance of patronage that established reciprocal bonds between monarchs and their subjects, see Linda Levy Peck, "'For a King Not to Be Bountiful Were a Fault': Perspectives on Court Patronage in Early Stuart England," *The Journal of British Studies* 25, no. 1 (1986): 34–36, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/175610>; Linda Levy Peck, "Benefits, Brokers and Beneficiaries: The Culture of Exchange in Seventeenth-Century England," in *Court, Country and Culture: Essays on Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin*, ed. B. Y. Kunze and D. D. Brautigam (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1992), 112–113.

the city to her father.⁶⁴ This instance was a transitional moment for Margaret as she looked towards her own queenship and her responsibilities as a patron and mediator, although at this point her primary patronage relationship was still with her father Henry VII.

Once Margaret crossed the border and was greeted by her future subjects in Scotland, her translation began to pick up speed, and material culture became the medium through which she established relationships with her subjects, courtiers, and of course, her husband. Certainly, the populace was eager to see the English procession, and Young described the press of people who turned out to see the Queen: “[a]nd thorough the Countre in sum Places war made by Force, Wayes for the Cariage and th grett Quantyte of People sembled for to se the said Qwene, bringing with them Plante of Drynke, for ychon that wold have of it, in paying therefore.”⁶⁵ In addition to the crowds, Margaret was now meeting Scottish ladies who would become her subjects and members of her court. Their welcome of the young queen was about impressing and pleasing a potential new patron. Scottish ladies greeted Margaret richly dressed in their own distinctly Scottish style. For instance, when Margaret attended chapel at the castle of Dalkeith, she was accompanied by her hostess the Countess of Morton wearing “letyces, ermynes, and hyr gentylwomen arayde after the Gyse of the Countrey,” and Scottish dress that earlier observers noted included elaborate headdresses.⁶⁶ Margaret left Dalkeith on a litter of cloth of gold, adorned with cloth of gold, pearls, and jewels, conveyed by a procession of noble supporters whose own magnificence magnified hers.⁶⁷

⁶⁴Murphy, “Receiving Royals in Later Medieval York,” 251.

⁶⁵Young, “Fyancells,” 282; “and through the Country in some Places were made by Force, Ways for the Carriage and the great Quantity of People assembled for to see the said Queen, bringing with them Plenty of Drink, for each one that would have of it, in paying therefore.”

⁶⁶Ibid., 285; “lettices, ermines, and her gentlewomen arrayed after the Guise of the Country,”; *CSP Spanish*, 1:174, Spanish envoy Don Pedro de Ayala noted that Scottish women “dress much better than here [England] and especially as regards the head-dress, which is, I think, the handsomest in the world.” Margaret Scott, “A Burgundian Visit to Scotland in 1449,” *Costume* 21 (1987): 21.

⁶⁷Young, “Fyancells,” 286.

Margaret's translation from princess to queen culminated in her wedding and coronation in Edinburgh. This spectacular event celebrated the marriage and proclaimed the importance and magnificence of the new queen through Margaret's wardrobe. James IV had ordered matching wedding clothes for himself and his queen, made of white damask woven with gold flowers, lined with taffeta.⁶⁸ Wearing matching clothing was a sign of love and respect, and would have emphasized the union of Margaret and James visually to anyone who saw them together on their wedding day.⁶⁹ The matching wedding gowns were not lost on the audience, as Young observed that Margaret wore a "rich Robbe, lyke Hymselfe [the king], borded of cramsyn velvet, and lyned of the self. Sche had a varey riche Coller of Gold, of Pyerrery and Perles, round her Neck, and the Cronne apon hyr Hed: Her Hayre Hangyng. Betwyx the said Cronne and the Hayres was a varey riche Coyfe hangyng down behynde the whole Length of the Body."⁷⁰ Margaret's robe was clearly designed to make an impression on its audience as well as signify to the court the unity of the king and queen, Margaret's own virginal purity, and the wealth and status of the marriage. White was symbolic of purity and virginity, and while it was somewhat unusual for grooms to wear white before the mid-sixteenth century in England, it was possibly more common in Scotland, as in 1495 James IV had provided the pretender Perkin Warbeck with a white damask "spousing" gown.⁷¹

⁶⁸ *LHTA* 2:209; the damask cloth alone cost £157 18s 9d Scots.

⁶⁹ Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 121.

⁷⁰ Young, "Fyancells," 293; "rich Robe, like Himself [the king], bordered of crimson velvet, and lined of the same. She had a very rich Collar of Gold, of Pyerrery and Pearls, around her Neck, and the Crown upon her Head: Her Hair Hanging. Betwix the said Crown and the Hairs was a very rich Coife hanging down behind the whole Length of the Body."

⁷¹ Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 52; Warbeck claimed to be Richard, Duke of York, second son of Edward IV and one of the lost princes in the tower. His claims were supported by James in the 1490s as a way to destabilize England. In 1495 James arranged Warbeck's marriage to his distant cousin Katherine Gordon, and their wedding was celebrated with a tournament. For more on Warbeck in English foreign policy see Arthurson, "Marriage, Princes and Politics," 21–22; *ODNB* "Warbeck, Perkin [Pierrehon de Werbecque; alias Richard Plantagenet, duke of York] (c.1474–1499)"; David Dunlop, "The 'Masked Comedian': Perkin Warbeck's Adventures in Scotland and England from 1495 to 1497," *The Scottish Historical Review* 70, no. 190 (October 1,

The queen's wedding dress became part of the festivities themselves when, a few days after the wedding, Margaret and James gave their wedding clothes to the Scottish and English officers of arms, respectively. While ordinarily these officers might have expected to sell the clothing on, in fact Margaret wanted to keep her wedding gown, and later she bought it back from the officers for 40 nobles (£20 Sterling).⁷² The exchange of clothing and later its return to the queen's wardrobe reveal not only the value of the clothes themselves, but also how the wardrobes of the king and queen were a mechanism through which courtiers and servants were rewarded for their service and loyalty.

It was not only Margaret's clothing that Young described in order to evoke the pageantry of the day. Margaret was accompanied by ladies "richly arrayd, som in Gownys of Cloth of Gold, and others of Cremsyn velvet and black. Others of satyn and of tynsell, of damask, and of chamlet of many colours, hoods, chaynnes and collers upon ther Neks, acompayned of ther Gentylwomen arrayd honestly after ther Gyse."⁷³ The women of the court, richly dressed, were as much a part of the ceremony as the officers of state or church officials. Their glittering presence, which indicated the power and wealth of both British courts, also enhanced Margaret's own status as the women of the court came, in the words of John Young, "for to hold Company with the Sayd Quene."⁷⁴

Margaret's wedding celebration continued for several more days before most of her English escort left to return home, their bags laden with gifts from the Scottish king, but this was only the beginning of Margaret's life as queen of Scotland. The preparations for her wedding, as

1991): 97–128, doi:10.2307/25530509; for Warbeck's wedding jousts, see Katie Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood in Scotland, 1424-1513* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2006), 83–84.

⁷²It was traditional in both England and Scotland to give away gowns after particular ceremonies, such as the Royal Maundy (see chapter 6), Young, "Fyancells," 292; Carpenter, "To Thexaltacyon of Noblesse," 109.

⁷³Young, "Fyancells," 291; "richly arrayed, some in Gowns of Cloth of Gold, and others of Crimson velvet and black. Others of satin and of tinsel, of damask, and of chamlet of many colors, hoods, chains and collars upon their Necks accompanied of their Gentlewomen arrayed honestly after their Guise."

⁷⁴Ibid.

seen through the material culture of the early sixteenth-century court, established the young girl in her new life as queen and wife. These material objects would remain with her at the Scottish court well into her queenship, acting as signifiers of her identity and status as queen. Margaret would continue to use and re-use items from her wedding trousseau, such as her altar cloth or bed of state, as part of the magnificence of her queenly household. She would also continue to have her gowns translated as part of her queenly wardrobe. From March 1504 to October 1506, Margaret had at least nine gowns altered by her tailors. These gowns ranged from a relatively inexpensive russet chamlet, which cost 20 shillings Scots for the “making of it new,” to a gown of crimson velvet, which was given a new edge of black velvet and a new bodice.⁷⁵ Gowns could be translated if parts of them wore out due to normal wear and tear. If the fabric was particularly fine some effort would be made to re-use it. For instance, in 1511 Robert Spittel, the queen’s tailor, was paid for translating a gown of white satin into a kirtle for the queen, which included lining the kirtle with Scots black at 14 shillings Scots per Scottish ell.⁷⁶

Married in 1503 at thirteen, Margaret was a young queen who was probably still a growing girl, and thus her gowns may have had to be altered to accommodate adolescent growth spurts in the early years of her marriage. There is also some evidence from 1506 onwards that Margaret’s gowns were translated during periods that the queen was pregnant. For instance, in October 1506, when Margaret was probably six or seven months pregnant with her first child (Prince James, who lived for only one year), William Welsch, tailor, was paid for translating several dresses for the queen including a gown of purple velvet and an embroidered gown.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ *LHTA* 3:40.

⁷⁶ *LHTAA* 4:208.

⁷⁷ *LHTAA*, 3:265; other entries of gowns that were translated which roughly correspond to Margaret’s known pregnancies include gowns translated in January and March 1512 by her tailor Robert Spittel, possibly because of her pregnancy which resulted in the birth of the future James V in April 1512, *Ibid.*, 4:211, 212.

The clothing and material goods that Margaret brought with her to Scotland, ordered by her father as part of a deliberate policy of promoting his dynasty through the display of his magnificence, physically manifested the change in status the thirteen-year-old princess experienced in the summer of 1503. Her journey from her grandmother's house of Collyweston to Edinburgh was a progress that allowed Margaret to assume her new role in public, accepting gifts from townspeople and displaying her person, richly dressed, to her father's subjects and her new Scottish people. Throughout this journey, Margaret's wardrobe was used to emphasize her status and to impress those she came in contact with. Additionally, the clothing and household goods she brought with her, including bedding, hangings, chairs, and chapel goods emblazoned with the English royal arms, would be put into daily use in her wardrobe and chambers. Margaret's translation from princess to queen, while celebrated for a few short weeks in pageant and song, would remain manifest through her wardrobe for years to come.

The Material Culture of Royal Childbirth

Both James IV and Henry VIII consistently furnished the queen's chambers for an event that they themselves would not witness, but one in which the queen's body and her relationship to the king were written in the materiality of her surroundings: childbirth. Catherine's and Margaret's birth chambers were sumptuously furnished shortly before their confinements. Their material surroundings reflected the status and importance of their bodies to their husbands.

After the queen's wedding and coronation, the next most significant queenly ritual was her churching, a ritual of purification and thanksgiving that celebrated a woman's return to public life after childbirth.⁷⁸ Churching was a uniquely female-centered public ritual that was

⁷⁸Like many ceremonies that blended the secular and sacred, churching was a ritual that had multiple meanings in the sixteenth century, and it was seen by both the church and women who participated in it as a ritual of purification and thanksgiving, and an opportunity for "hospitality, conviviality, and display," David Cressy, "Purification,

practiced by nearly all women in the pre-Reformation period, including queens. Gale McMurray Gibson has argued that churching was “woman’s theater” that celebrated women’s bodies, as the center of the ritual was the woman’s body, and men (even priests) were very much on the margins.⁷⁹ Laynesmith has also pointed to the potent female imagery involved in a queen’s churching, and she has shown that the queen’s churching nearly approached the pomp and ceremony of the Candlemas celebrations, which was the liturgical celebration of the Purification of the Virgin Mary.⁸⁰

Because royal childbrith churching was a ritual that centered on the queen’s body, the queen’s material surroundings and clothing were important signifiers of her status. Although courtiers did not witness the birth itself, the honor accorded to the queen’s body through the use of magnificent fabrics and furs drew attention to the queen’s body as a vessel of prestige and power. Throughout this process, for both the queen’s confinement and her churching, clothing and material goods were used to signify first the withdrawal and then the return of the queen to court life and thus the heightened significance of her body.

English and Scottish royal childbirth rituals were closely related to each other and to traditions in Burgundy and France. Queens usually retired to their chambers about a month to six weeks before the anticipated birth in a highly ritualized process dominated by the women of the court.⁸¹ Within their chambers, they would live in seclusion, waited on only by the women of their household, until their churching, usually one to two months after birth. During this period, then, the queen’s chambers became both the focus of the court and isolated from it at the same

Thanksgiving and the Churching of Women in Post-Reformation England,” *Past & Present* no. 141 (1993): 112, doi:10.2307/651031.

⁷⁹Gail McMurray Gibson, “Blessing from Sun and Moon: Churching as Women’s Theater,” in *Bodies and Disciplines: Intersections of Literature and History in Fifteenth-Century England*, ed. David Wallace and Barbara A. Hanawalt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 147–149.

⁸⁰Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 116.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 112.

time. The usually peripatetic courts of Henry VIII and James IV often remained at the palace where the queen was confined, usually for several months. In England, according to Hall, Catherine of Aragon “toke her chamber at Richemond, for the whiche cause the kynge kept hys Christmas there.”⁸²

The court knew how richly furnished the queen’s chambers were, and that they enclosed and reflected one of the most central aspects of queenship. Despite the fact that the queen’s chambers during this period were largely hidden from the view of most of the court, the ritual that began the queen’s confinement ensured that members of the court would see how richly adorned the queen’s Great Chamber was before she retired to the Privy Chamber. The queen was accompanied to Mass in the Royal Chapel by a pair of earls or dukes. She would then process to her Great Chamber, where she would take spices and wine under a cloth of estate, surrounded by lords and ladies of the court before officially entering her confinement.⁸³

While no extant descriptions of Catherine or Margaret’s confinements exist, we can create a picture of how their chambers were furnished for their confinements. Margaret’s bedchamber received several new additions in December 1506 in preparation for her first confinement. Her bed was covered with a “ruf” or canopy made out of crimson satin, at the cost of £44 3s 1d Scots. The canopy also had curtains, made of thirty-four ells of red and green taffeta banded with braided ribbons. Her bed was covered with several pairs of new sheets and pillowcases made out of Holland, a fine linen cloth, and lawn drapery around the bed. Four featherbeds were brought into Margaret’s chamber, as well as sheets and blankets for pallet beds

⁸²Dillon, *Hall’s Chronicle*, 36.

⁸³John Leland, *Joannis Lelandi Antiquarii de Rebus Britannicis Collectanea....*, Eighteenth Century Collections Online (London, 1770), 4:249, <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/start.do?prodId=ECCO>; Kay Staniland, “Royal Entry into the World,” in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Daniel Williams (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1987), 301; Fiona Kisby, “The Early-Tudor Royal Household Chapel, 1485-1547” (PhD diss., Royal Holloway, University of London, 1996), 176, <http://ethos.bl.uk/Home.do>.

for her attendants, and five new stools. During this same period, Margaret's Wardrobe also received a "great down bed of the king's which came hame at the king's marriage," presumably meant for the queen's use. Three great and two small down caddes, a type of pad probably used for sleeping, were also delivered to the queen for her chamber. Later in January, Margaret's yeoman of the beds was paid for making curtains to the queen's chamber out of forty-four ells of say. James also paid for a new couch for Margaret, covered with buckram and wool. Margaret also received thirty ells of Holland cloth at a total cost of £16 10s for "sarkis," probably a shift or chemise used for the final stages of her lying-in, and a chamlet nightgown furred with gray.⁸⁴ In January of 1512, Margaret again received new bedclothes in anticipation of her confinement. Although the future James V was not born until April 1512, in January Margaret's Wardrobe received foot sheets, head sheets, and pillowcases as well as bearing sheets "agane the birtht of the Prince." At the same time James provided sheets for the queen's gentlewomen, and blankets for the queen's bed made of Holmis fustian, a thick cloth probably from Norwich.⁸⁵

Like his brother-in-law James IV, Henry VIII also provided sumptuously for his wife's chambers during her many confinements. For Catherine's first pregnancy, in March 1510, the king's Great Wardrobe delivered blue sarsenet curtains to Oliver Holland, yeoman of the queen's chamber, which were to hang over the cradle of estate in the nursery.⁸⁶ In December 1510, for Catherine's second confinement, the Great Wardrobe recorded the items ordered for the queen's chamber. Catherine's bedchamber was to have a traverse (screen) made of 28 yards of blue

⁸⁴ *LHTA* 3:266-268; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 168.

⁸⁵ *LHTA* 4:210, 544.

⁸⁶ Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 198.

sarsenet at a cost of £6 3s 6d. Three large curtains of blue sarsenet were also ordered for Catherine. The curtains were decorated with seven ounces of blue silk ribbon and blue lace.⁸⁷

The orders for Catherine's chamber at this period closely correspond to those of other royal birthing chambers of the late fifteenth century, including those of Catherine's predecessor, Elizabeth of York, which in turn drew on Lancastrian precedent. Elizabeth's birthing chamber was carpeted and hung with blue cloth of Arras, decorated with gold fleur-de-lys.⁸⁸ Blue continued to be the color used for Catherine's confinements, as she received new blue say for covering the walls of her chamber and making a traverse for her confinement in October 1514, which were delivered to Henry Roper, her yeoman of the beds. Traverses were an important part of the ritual and ceremony of the queen's confinement. They were the focal point for several key moments during the queen's confinement and later her purification and re-emergence. A description of the confinement of Elizabeth of York orders that the traverse in the queen's chamber "shall be drawn unto the time she be purified." Once the traverse was drawn no male officer could enter the queen's great chamber, and the queen was then waited on by female servants until her churching.⁸⁹ Catherine probably followed the precedents set by fifteenth-century descriptions of the churching of queens.⁹⁰

The material furnishings of the queen's chamber were used as part of the queen's churching ritual when it was time for her to re-enter court life, about one to two months after her delivery. The queen's churching also displayed to members of the court, who participated in or viewed the ceremony, the sumptuous surroundings of the queen's chamber, which had been out

⁸⁷ TNA E101/417/4; from the inventory of Catherine's goods after her death, we know that during her lying-in she would have also been provided with smocks decorated with collars of gold and silk, similar to Margaret's Holland "sarkis." Other items associated with Catherine's confinement included two double petticoats of fine Holland cloth, two rollers (probably either a long bandage or swaddling clothes) three breast-cloths and a covering for a child fringed with gold, BL Royal MS 7.F.XIV, 136v.

⁸⁸ Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 112–113.

⁸⁹ BL MS Eg 985, 32r.

⁹⁰ Hall mentions that Catherine was churched in 1511, Dillon, *Hall's Chronicle*, 37.

of view for several weeks. The queen's churching would begin with the queen lying on her state bed behind the rich curtains that the king had furnished for her a few months before. Two high-ranking noblewomen would approach the bed and draw back the curtains, revealing the queen in her material splendor. The queen was then ceremonially raised from the bed by two dukes or earls. The court would then process to hear Mass in the Royal Chapel, followed by feasting in the queen's chamber.⁹¹ Throughout this ritual, the material surroundings of the queen—her clothing, bed, curtains, and cloth of state—were physical manifestations of the separation and then the emergence of the queen, while also highlighting the wealth and material splendors of her chambers.

During the churching, the queen's body was emphasized through the magnificent fabrics that clothed her. In the fourteenth century, Queen Philippa of Hainault ordered several lavish suits of clothes for her first churching after the birth of her son, Edward of Woodstock. These clothes included a luxurious purple velvet set of robes embroidered with golden squirrels and a second suit of red velvet.⁹² Although we do not know specifically what Catherine or Margaret would have worn, it is highly likely that their robes would have been costly. One entry in the Scottish accounts may reveal Margaret's churching gown. Two months after giving birth to her first son in 1507, Margaret received fourteen ells of cloth of gold and seven ells of velvet to be turned into a gown, for a total cost of £22 14s 9 Scots. It is possible that this gown was intended for her churching ceremony.⁹³ A sumptuous gown like Margaret's, when worn during a ceremony that celebrated the queen's recovery from childbirth and return to court life,

⁹¹Staniland, "Royal Entry into the World," 308.

⁹²Caroline Shenton, "Philippa of Hainault's Churchings: The Politics of Motherhood at the Court of Edward III," in *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. R. G. Eales (Donington, Lincolnshire: Shaun Tyas, 2003), 107–108.

⁹³ *LHTA* 3:269; Margaret had been very ill after her first delivery, which may suggest that she had a slightly longer lying-in period.

emphasized the political and dynastic importance of her physical body and proclaimed the fertility of the queen before the whole court.⁹⁴

The materiality of royal childbirth calls attention to the significance of a courtly ceremony that leaves little trace in the diplomatic or chronicle accounts of Henry and James's reign. The expensive furnishings made specifically for royal childbirth closely linked the queen's bodily duty, childbirth, with the honor and dignity of royal magnificence. Childbirth may have been a hidden moment for most of the royal court, but the ceremonies of confinement and churching insured that all the court understood its importance.

Both Margaret's bridal voyage and royal childbirth showed how courtly material culture—the tangible manifestation of magnificence—could focus and reaffirm the honor, dignity and status of queenship and by extension, the royal dynasty as a whole. Both of these case studies show that material magnificence was used by queens and their male relatives to maintain their elite status and assert their power and influence as members of the royal family, despite their isolation in childbirth or relative youth at the time of their marriages. In the next section, I will show how the material resources of queenship could be used to support and promote Catherine of Aragon's goals at an event that was probably the height of extravagance in Henry's reign, the Field of Cloth of Gold. While material culture supported Margaret and Catherine at moments when their embodiment of queenship was the focus of courtly attention, it could also be used to achieve the queen's political goals in the face of competing magnificence.

Material Diplomacy: Catherine of Aragon at the Field of Cloth of Gold

⁹⁴ No description of Tudor queens' churchings survive, so we do not know what was worn. However, in April of 1516, two months after the birth of Princess Mary, Catherine's Wardrobe of the Robes ordered a gown for the queen of blue velvet with Spanish sleeves. It is possible that this gown was meant to be for Catherine's churching, although blue was an unusual color for Catherine to wear, as it was also the color of royal mourning, TNA MS E101/418/6 38r; Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 59–60, 121; as discussed above, blue was used for Catherine's lying-in chamber, which seems to have been traditional, as Elizabeth of York also had blue hangings in her lying-in chambers, see Leland, *Collectanea*, 4:249.

The meeting between the courts of England and France in June of 1520 was one of the most costly and well-documented displays of magnificence and splendor of Henry VIII's reign. Its title, the Field of Cloth of Gold, literally refers to the expensive fabric that supposedly blanketed the fields in northern France when the king of France, Francis I, accompanied by his wife Queen Claude and his mother Louise of Savoy, met Henry and Catherine of Aragon for several days of jousting, entertainments, feasting, and diplomatic exchange, with nearly 6,000 members of the English court in attendance.⁹⁵ This meeting was bracketed by two other, less spectacular meetings between Henry VIII and the Emperor Charles V, Catherine's nephew.⁹⁶

The Field of Cloth of Gold, while anomalous in its scale and expense, provides us with an opportunity to discuss how the material culture of the court could allow Catherine of Aragon to pursue her own political agenda in 1520. For Catherine, the events of 1520 required her to negotiate her own multiple loyalties to her husband and her Spanish dynasty. Catherine relied on her not inconsiderable experience in diplomacy to promote her own pro-Spanish agenda while supporting her husband and conforming to the ideals of queenship. The magnificence and spectacle that surrounded the Field of Cloth of Gold was the medium through which Catherine was able to express her political message.

Catherine had a great deal of experience in the complex and treacherous world of early sixteenth-century European diplomacy, and she understood the importance of negotiation, manipulation, and compromise. Catherine's diplomatic career had begun after her brief marriage to Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales, in 1501. Left nearly alone in England after Arthur's sudden death mere months into the marriage, as a young widow Catherine had become her father's accredited ambassador to the English court of Henry VII, her father-in-law. Working alongside

⁹⁵Joycelyne Gledhill Russell, *The Field of Cloth of Gold* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), 2.

⁹⁶Glenn Richardson, "Eternal Peace, Occasional War: Anglo-French Relations under Henry VIII," in *Tudor England and Its Neighbours*, ed. Susan Doran and Glenn Richardson (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 46.

her father's other ambassador, Dr. de Puebla, Catherine learned during this period how to interpret the words and motivations of monarchs and ministers. She remarked in one dispatch that Henry VII's "words are kind but his deeds are as bad as ever."⁹⁷ Not only was Catherine able to represent her own cause in England, but also she gained valuable experience in the world of European diplomacy.

As a foreign queen consort, Catherine was expected to have loyalties to her Spanish dynasty, but these loyalties were rarely a problem for her in the early years of her marriage. In part because she had been living in England for over eight years before she became its queen, Catherine felt she understood the English character better than most foreigners, writing that "there is no people in the world more influenced by the good or bad fortunes of their enemies than the English."⁹⁸ Catherine's Spanish blood was an even greater advantage to England when Spain became united to the Low Countries through the inheritance of her nephew, Charles V. The Low Countries were England's market for its woolen cloth, and an alliance with Charles made economic and political sense.⁹⁹

Unsurprisingly, Catherine did not support the idea of a close alliance between England and France, an alliance that could potentially isolate and threaten her nephew Charles and Spain. Catherine's foreign policy was based partly on her personal loyalty to Spain and her genuine belief that Spain, not France, was England's best ally in Europe. But Catherine's dynastic loyalties were also complemented by her concern for the position of her daughter Princess Mary, heir presumptive to the English throne. The prospect of a French marriage for Mary, which would have united England and France dynastically, was Catherine's specific motivation for intervening in England's foreign politics during this period. With the example of her mother

⁹⁷ *CSP Spanish* 1:541.

⁹⁸ *CSP Spanish* 2:238.

⁹⁹ Susan Doran, *England and Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1999), 103.

Isabel, queen in her own right of Castile, Catherine would have seen no reason why Mary could not become queen of England. Thus, it was vitally important that the young princess be protected from a French marriage that would inhibit not only Spain's interests, but also Mary's own control over her inheritance. In 1520 Catherine used her diplomatic experience and material resources to promote her own dynastic ties and negate the threat of the French alliance.

In 1520 Catherine had been queen of England for over a decade, and she had been participating in the great game of European diplomacy for longer than that. She had the experience and resources to pursue her own goals in England, and she did so with a combination of defiance and acquiescence. She began by actively working towards a meeting between Henry VIII and Charles V, which would take place before the meeting in France. Believing that his personal presence would help to counteract French influence, Catherine worked with Marguerite of Austria, Charles's aunt and regent of the Netherlands, to ensure that the emperor visited England before the Field of Cloth of Gold. On April 30, 1520, Charles wrote to his aunt Catherine to thank her for all her efforts in organizing the meeting, saying "the arrangements...have given him the greatest satisfaction." He then asked Catherine that she use her influence with Henry to persuade the king to wait for him in case he was delayed by the wind.¹⁰⁰

Catherine's agency in arranging for Charles's visit and her attitude towards the meeting in France were no secret to the English court or the French ambassador there. In April 1520, it was reported by a nervous French ambassador that the queen's counselors had informed Henry that Catherine "had made such representations, and shown such reasons against the voyage, as one would not have supposed she would have dared to do, or even to imagine." Showing that at one point Henry enjoyed a little loyal opposition from his wife, it was reported that Catherine

¹⁰⁰ *LP* 3.1:776.

was then “held in greater esteem...than ever she was,” by Henry and his court.¹⁰¹ Her actions were seen as influential and potentially popular, even as they seemed to skirt the bounds of propriety in the eyes of the French ambassador. As plans for the meeting with Francis went forward, Catherine’s opposition did not prevent her from preparing for it by equipping her own wardrobe and her household with the clothes and goods that would maintain her status and showcase her own magnificence. This was expected of her as England’s queen, and was a crucial political calculation that allowed Catherine to assert both her loyalties to England and her investment in the continuing alliance with Spain.

In April and May of 1520, Catherine’s Wardrobe staff began to order large amounts of clothing for her household in preparation for the voyage. Elis Hilton, Catherine’s yeoman of the Robes, oversaw the purchase and fabrication of livery clothing for Catherine’s male servants at the Field of Cloth of Gold. At court in general and the Field of Cloth of Gold in particular, livery served as an identifier within the court, distinguishing the queen’s household and her attendants from the general milieu at court, and thus acting as an extension of her own presence as the men and women of her household moved about on the queen’s business.

For an extraordinary event like the Field of Cloth of Gold, livery took on a special importance for Catherine, in scale, cost and significance. Ordinarily, when Hilton ordered liveries for the queen’s servants, about ninety men received cloth or clothing in black worth around £90 total.¹⁰² When he began preparing for the Field of Cloth of Gold, Hilton’s orders became larger and much more complex. In one account leading up to the great meeting, Hilton ordered clothing for fifty-five men of the Queen’s guard, seven henchmen, thirteen grooms and

¹⁰¹ *LP3.1:728*; this report was written by the French ambassador to England, who was understandably worried about Catherine’s opposition to the meeting, so his assessment of her actions must be treated carefully.

¹⁰² *JRL Latin MS 239, 2r-3v.*

pages of the chamber, six footmen, and many others, amounting to over 150 people. The total outlay for Hilton in one account book, from April and May 1520, was £710 3s 1 1/2d.¹⁰³

The liveries and clothing provided by Catherine to her household reflected her loyalties to both her marital and natal dynasties in England and Spain. Catherine's servants would have put on a magnificent display, with each group wearing different combinations of colors and fabrics. One of the largest groups, her fifty-five guardsmen and twelve yeomen and grooms of the Stables, wore the Tudor livery colors of green and white.¹⁰⁴ Catherine's footmen wore red and black, including doublets of red velvet upon which were embroidered cloth of gold sheaves of arrows, one of Catherine's personal badges probably based on her mother Isabel's emblem from Spain.¹⁰⁵ Catherine's emblems for her servants' liveries often combined her own dynastic badge of a sheaf of arrows with the Tudor rose, and this badge was most likely in use at the Field of Cloth of Gold as well.¹⁰⁶ Catherine's badges would identify her servants specifically and dynastic alliances that her queenship represented—alliances that in 1520 encompassed the Spanish, Burgundian and Austrian dynasty of Habsburg. The marked clothing of her servants—wearing Tudor colors and the queen's badges—proclaimed her loyalty to her marital and natal families.¹⁰⁷ Catherine took a close interest in the liveries of her household, and as discussed in

¹⁰³ LP 3.1:852; TNA MS E315/242/3, 31r; this sum was close to Catherine's Wardrobe expenses for an entire year, see Appendix, and most of the costs appear to have been paid out from Catherine's income, as her receiver Griffith Richards reimbursed Hilton for £549 3s 3d.

¹⁰⁴ LP 3.1:852; TNA MS E315/242/3, fol.22.

¹⁰⁵ It is important to note that Catherine's emblems were specifically symbols of her natal dynasty, and in particular her illustrious parents Ferdinand and Isabel, but they were not necessarily nationalistic emblems associated with the kingdom of Spain; LP 3.1:852; TNA MS E315/424/3 22v, 23r; Isabel's emblem was used extensively in Spain as her symbol and in conjunction with her husband Ferdinand's symbol of the yoke, see Barbara S. Weissberger, "Tanto Monta: The Catholic Monarchs' Nuptial Fiction and the Power of Isabel I of Castile," in *The Rule of Women in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Anne J. Cruz and Mihoko Suzuki (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 43–63.

¹⁰⁶ BL MS Royal 7 F XIV, 134v; this comes from an inventory of Catherine's Wardrobe taken after her death, and thus we cannot date the items themselves, but the quantity—35 coats of red and green stripes—would indicate that they were intended for an important ceremonial occasion, and possibly the Field of Cloth of Gold.

¹⁰⁷ Occasionally some members of Margaret's household in Scotland wore the livery colors of her husband's house, red and yellow, as when they accompanied the queen on a pilgrimage to Whithorn in 1507, LHT 3:321.

chapter 2, green cloth bought to make half of the coats for the queen's guard for the this occasion was given away because the queen did not like it.¹⁰⁸

One of the most gorgeously appareled groups of Catherine's household was her "henchmen" or pages of honor, who would have accompanied the queen and waited on her in the public spaces of the court.¹⁰⁹ Catherine's Wardrobe outfitted the seven pages with more items and variety of clothing than the rest of her escort. The pages were given several different coats, in colors ranging from cloth of gold to crimson. Their doublets were of yellow satin and yellow velvet, which would have stood out amongst the rest of her escort dressed in sedate blacks and greens.¹¹⁰ They would have also held their own surrounded by the English and French nobility dressed in their finest apparel. Because the pages were the queen's attendants for the ceremonial aspects of the Field of Cloth of Gold, their clothing needed to be more lavish and spectacular than that of the servants, such as the yeomen of the stables, who were behind the scenes.¹¹¹

The clothes worn by Catherine's gentlewomen and lady attendants, members of the nobility and gentry of England, were also reflections of the queen's own beauty, style, and wealth. The ambassadors who observed the events of the Field of Cloth of Gold did not hesitate to link the queen with her ladies and servants, and the English were well-aware of the scrutiny, as ambassador Richard Wingfield wrote shortly after his arrival at the French court in early 1520: "the Queen here, with the King's mother [Louise of Savoy], make all the search possible to bring at the assembly the fairest ladies and demoiselles that may be found... I hope at the least, Sir, that the Queen's Grace shall bring such in her band, that the visage of England, which hath

¹⁰⁸ LP 3.1:852; TNA MS E315/242/3, 26r.

¹⁰⁹ Nicholas Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530* (New York: Methuen, 1984), 50–52; henchmen were sons of the nobility living in great households, often on a long-term basis for education and training. Some may have been royal wards, but all were of noble rank and had servants of their own to attend upon them, and their duties were primarily ceremonial.

¹¹⁰ LP 3.1:852; TNA MS E315/242/3, 22v-25r

¹¹¹ Catherine's henchmen's liveries were on a par with what Henry VIII issued for his own henchmen, see Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 264.

always had the praise, shall not at this time lose the same.”¹¹² Catherine’s ladies excited comment for their appearance and dress as they followed the queen to the jousts held by Henry and Francis. Soardino, the Mantuan ambassador to France, observed that when Catherine ascended the gallery to watch the jousts, she was accompanied by a “great retinue of ladies, who were neither very handsome nor very graceful; they were ornamented in the English fashion, and not richly clad.” In comparison, the same ambassador favored the French Queen, whose ladies were “richly dressed and with jewels,” clearly more to his taste.¹¹³ Soardino may be considered an unusual critic, as the Gonzaga rulers of Mantua had always been pro-Imperial, and thus pro-Hapsburg.¹¹⁴ Other Italian ambassadors did not find such fault with Catherine’s ladies, describing them as “handsome and well-arrayed,” and in one case of faint praise, “well-dressed but ugly.”¹¹⁵ Edward Hall, by way of apologizing for not elaborating on the dress of the ladies, claimed that “[t]o tell you the apparel of the ladies, their riche attyres, their sumptuous luelles, their diuersities of beauties, and the goodly behauior from day to day sithe the fyrst metyng, I assure you ten mennes wittes can scarce declare it.”¹¹⁶

The liveries and clothes worn by Catherine’s servants and her ladies reflected, extended, and enhanced her own regal appearance. We have a few descriptions of what Catherine was wearing at the Field of Cloth of Gold, but no direct Wardrobe account specifically for the queen’s clothes for the Field of Cloth of Gold. At some point in 1520, Catherine ordered three

¹¹²*State Papers Relating to Henry VIII*, vol. 6 (London, 1849), 56, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433081633889>; quoted in Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, 31.

¹¹³ Rawdon Brown, ed., *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs: existing in the Archives and collections of Venice, and in other libraries of Northern Italy* Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (London: Longman, 1864) 3:81 <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>; early modern beauty consisted of a fairly consistent set of features: red lips, white skin, blond hair, and black eyebrows, see Snook, *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England*, 2–3. In their youth, Catherine and Margaret were praised for the beauty, although this was standard for young princesses. Both would have had the requisite pale skin and fair hair.

¹¹⁴Gordon Campbell, ed., “Gonzaga Family,” *The Oxford Dictionary of the Renaissance* (Oxford University Press, 2003), <http://www.oxfordreference.com/10.1093/acref/9780198601753.001.0001/acref-9780198601753-e-1687>.

¹¹⁵*CSP Venetian* 3:68, 50.

¹¹⁶Dillon, *Hall’s Chronicle*, 93.

gowns to be altered “after the devising of Sir Thomas Boleyn, when he came out of France,” at a cost of 13s 4d. She also ordered two other gowns “in the French fashion” and a pair of sleeves. The same list of clothing ordered gowns suitable for the spectacle and magnificence of the Field of Cloth of Gold, including a gown of cloth of tissue lined with crimson velvet, a gown of crimson velvet with gold embroidery, and in what must have been a striking combination, a gown of yellow damask of gold, edged with purple velvet and pearls.¹¹⁷ Though it is not explicitly stated that these gowns were for the meeting in France, they do correspond to the types of gowns some observers describe Catherine as wearing when she met both Francis I and her nephew Charles V, in the summer of 1520.

Catherine could use her Wardrobe and household together to make a subtle, political statement. When attending one of the jousts held between the French and English knights, Catherine wore a head-dress

in the Spanish fashion, with the tress of hair over her shoulders and gown, which last was all cloth of gold; and round her neck were most beautiful jewels and pearls. She was in a litter, covered completely with cloth of gold, embroidered with crimson satin foliage, which was wrought with gold... The horses and pages were all covered in like manner, as also the 40 hackneys [sic] of her ladies and the six waggons [sic].¹¹⁸

In wearing her hair in “the Spanish fashion” Catherine is proclaiming her dynastic allegiance during an event that threatens the Anglo-Spanish alliance with an Anglo-French one. The effect of this statement is magnified, moreover, by her attendants and pages, who were all dressed in a similar manner to the queen, extending the statement made by her clothing, and turning her personal body and its clothing into a communal one.

¹¹⁷ JRL Latin MS 239, 15v-16r; Justice’s account, though not consistently dated throughout, clearly included the period for the Field of Cloth of Gold, as it includes an entry for allowance for Justice and his two servants “with the Queen’s grace at Calais,” 17r.

¹¹⁸ *CSP Venetian* 3:85; Catherine had worn Spanish dress in the past for political purposes, such as during Maying festivities witnessed by the Spanish ambassador, *LP* 2.1:411.

Catherine had used her clothing to make political points before, sometimes in unexpected ways. In May 1520, Catherine and Henry had hosted Charles V, the king of Spain and Catherine's nephew, for a brief visit at Canterbury. During this event, Catherine chose to emphasize her own loyalty and support of her husband through her dress. Perhaps because she wanted to avoid appearing too partisan for her nephew during a delicate time in Anglo-Spanish relations, Catherine instead chose to emphasize her loyalty to England. During her nephew's visit, Catherine wore a gown of cloth of gold with violet velvet lining which was embroidered with Tudor roses in gold. Catherine's necklace of 5 strings of pearls featured the patron saint of England, St. George, slaying the dragon in diamonds.¹¹⁹ In this case, Catherine's wardrobe allowed her to make a statement of loyalty towards her husband and adopted country, while simultaneously advocating an alliance with her nephew.¹²⁰

The meaning and cost of the queen's wardrobe and the magnificence of her retinue indicates the importance of Catherine's role in the festivities at the Field of Cloth of Gold, and the diplomatic and political alliances that were at stake. Although the meeting between Henry VIII and Francis I is easily dismissed as "merely an excuse for a party on the grandest scale, banishing to oblivion many more weighty and serious achievements. Its title alone ensured remembrance,"¹²¹ Catherine's participation in the magnificence of the meeting allowed her to pursue her own political agenda. As the name implies, the Field of Cloth of Gold was above all about display: of military prowess in the jousts, of bountiful and rich food at the feasts, of clever and witty entertainment at the masques, and of gorgeous and expensive clothes and jewels at

¹¹⁹ *CSP Venetian* 3:50; Maria Hayward notes that Catherine's wearing of St. George was "very significant" as it was closely associated with the English Order of the Garter, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 227.

¹²⁰ In this way, Catherine of Aragon exemplifies the unstable and mutable relationship between styles of national dress and identity, which for a foreign-born queen could be a useful way of negotiating her dual allegiances, see Richardson, "Introduction," 20–21; Roze Hentschell, "A Question of Nation: Foreign Clothes on the English Subjects," in *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, ed. Catherine Richardson (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004), 49–50.

¹²¹ Russell, *The Field of Cloth of Gold*, 2.

every opportunity. Although chroniclers and observers pay far less attention to her than to the lances broken and the figures in masques, Catherine was in full view of the English and French courts as a spectator to her husband in the jousts, sitting with her ladies on a platform. At times, she was seen dining and conversing with her counterpart, Queen Claude of France and the French king's mother, Louise of Savoy. In fact, she was probably more recognizable and easily viewed on her platform by the majority of the French and English courts than the king, who was either jousting or off-stage.¹²²

Diplomatic negotiations in the sixteenth century were situated in a tradition of hospitality and welcome within the royal household. Catherine hosted Francis I at the English camp at Guines, while the queen of France did the same for Henry VIII at the French camp. Catherine presided over several banquets in the evenings and conversed with the French king, sometimes for half an hour, between the revels, which Catherine did not participate in.¹²³ Although Catherine did not support the Anglo-French alliance, she did not allow her political and dynastic loyalties to dictate her behavior. Instead, she remained the perfect hostess, receiving compliments and embraces from Francis, and exchanging gifts with Queen Claude.¹²⁴ On the final evening, Catherine ordered that prizes be distributed to the Frenchmen who had performed well at the jousts, and an official of her household gave rings, jewels, or collars to three or four prize-winners. She presented the French king with a diamond and a ruby ring. Francis then departed after kissing all the ladies.¹²⁵

¹²²Hall details Henry's and Francis's triumphs at the joust, but they are visible only when they enter the lists, whereas Catherine and her French counterpart Queen Claude remained on their platform throughout the competition, Dillon, *Hall's Chronicle*, 85–88.

¹²³*CSP Venetian* 3:50; although Catherine's ladies may have needed interpreters, as we have seen, Catherine herself could speak French, having practiced it in Spain with her sister-in-law, Marguerite of Austria, see *CSP Spanish* 1:203, 294.

¹²⁴*CSP Venetian* 3:94; Catherine gave Queen Claude palfrey horses with trappings of gold, while Claude gave Catherine a litter of cloth of gold with mules and pages to match.

¹²⁵*CSP Venetian* 3:50; Russell, *The Field of Cloth of Gold*, 178.

In the end, the Field of Cloth of Gold was a triumph for Catherine, perhaps more for her than anyone else. Despite the petty comments of some Italian observers, her retinue and ladies clearly played their roles in representing English magnificence and entertaining French guests at the banquets. Catherine was seen as a gracious hostess, accomplished in amusing her royal guests.¹²⁶ Politically, Catherine's aims were also met, as the Field of Cloth of Gold did not result in a lasting alliance between France and England. Instead, the meetings with Charles V, which bracketed the Field of Cloth of Gold, and which Charles personally thanked his aunt for arranging, resulted in a treaty between England and Spain that nullified any French gains by forbidding either side to enter into a matrimonial alliance.¹²⁷ These meetings would not have been a success if Catherine had not bided her time, fulfilled her role as queen, and participated in the rituals of spectacle at the Field of Cloth of Gold. In turn, Catherine saw to it that her only daughter, Mary, would not marry the French dauphin, as previously planned. While the Field of Cloth of Gold might be remembered chiefly as "a spectacular affirmation of Anglo-French rivalry,"¹²⁸ it was, for Catherine, a confirmation of her skill in using the material and ritual culture of queenship to further her political and dynastic goals. Ultimately, Catherine believed that Spain and England were natural allies, and she sought to use her influence to encourage this alliance. During the spectacle of the Field of Cloth of Gold, Catherine knew how to use the material wealth of the court and her own role as queen and hostess both to fulfill her duties and to assert her own political agenda.

This chapter has shown that Catherine of Aragon and Margaret Tudor used the material culture of the sixteenth-century court to define their own status and to further their own political

¹²⁶Mary Tudor, Henry's sister and former Queen of France, led the revels on the English side, *ibid.*, 164.

¹²⁷*LP* 3.1:776; Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 169.

¹²⁸*Ibid.*, 169.

goals. In doing so, they were enacting recognized humanistic virtues of liberality and magnificence, which were seen as necessary to the successful reign of a pre-modern king or queen. Catherine and Margaret used the material culture of court, including expensive fabrics, bright colors, and rich furnishings, to proclaim and enhance their own status as queen. During crucial junctures of their lives—weddings, coronations, childbirth—clothing and material goods helped these queens achieve their goals and cement their status during periods of transition and change. For Margaret, the wardrobe provided by her father and husband for her wedding was part of the process by which a thirteen-year old princess became the Queen of Scots. Catherine used material culture to make political statements that were not explicitly part of her husband's agenda, while continuing to be a loyal wife and gracious hostess to her diplomatic opponents. Material magnificence was frequently deployed in the pursuit of royal hospitality, and hospitality is one of the most overlooked aspects of the performance of queenship. In chapter 4, I will turn from the physical embodiment of magnificence through clothing and wardrobe to the performance of spectacular queenship as Catherine and Margaret successfully fulfilled their roles as honored audience and royal hostess at the royal courts of England and Scotland.

CHAPTER 4

The Queen at Court: Hospitality, Sociability and the Queen as Audience

Thirde and last cam down the Duke of York[the future Henry VIII], havying with him the Lady Margaret his sister on his hond, and dauncyd two baas daunces. And aftirward he, perceyvyng himself to be accombred with his clothis, sodenly cast of his gowne and dauncyd in his jaket with the seid Lady Margaret in so goodly and pleasaunt maner that hit was to the Kynge and Quene right great and singler pleasure.¹

Margaret Tudor first met her sister-in-law Catherine of Aragon at the lavish wedding celebrations for Catherine's first marriage to Margaret's brother Arthur in 1501. Margaret, then eleven years old, joined the other ladies of the court in welcoming Catherine to England.² She danced before the court with her younger brother Henry, Catherine's future second husband. As with many of the acts of welcome for Catherine, Margaret's dancing with Henry was part of her father's attempts to impress the Spanish visitors by displaying the wealth, splendor, and sophistication of his court. Her dancing was probably especially memorable, because after she and her brother performed two bass dances (slow, gliding dances popular throughout Europe) Henry threw off his gown and danced with Margaret in only his jacket, much to the delight of their parents.³

When they became queens, both Catherine and Margaret had a traditional role to perform as royal hostess at their marital courts. This role had evolved from the older medieval tradition of the king's household as a domestic establishment, in which the wife of the king, like many elite women, managed the provisioning of the household and welcomed guests and visitors. Catherine and Margaret had very little to do with the practical management of the royal household, but the idea of the queen as the domestic partner of the king, and thus the hostess for his guests,

¹Kipling, *Receyt*, 58.

²Ibid., 31, 53.

³ Margaret's departure for Scotland in 1503 probably limited any other interaction with Catherine, who was quite isolated at court after Arthur's death in early 1502.

remained a part of the responsibilities of late medieval and early modern queenship.⁴ Both Catherine and Margaret hosted ambassadors and visitors at court, and their chambers became an entertaining space for the king, his companions, and their own households. Both queens were also audiences and occasional participants in their husbands' spectacles and entertainments. Members of their households and their chambers became part of the magnificence of monarchy as well, as they hosted dancing, plays, and revels for the king and his court.

This chapter examines Catherine's and Margaret's duties and roles as queens within the wider world of the court. At the princely courts of Europe in the pre-modern period, queens helped to establish international prestige and magnificence through the exclusivity of their royal blood, yet it is often difficult to understand how queens fitted into the wider world of court. From certain perspectives, European queens, even those as independently powerful as Anne of Brittany, often disappear from the historical gaze, and yet, royal courts were incomplete without them, and their presence established the necessary gendered balance to chivalrous, pre-modern kingships. I argue that although Catherine and Margaret are seemingly confined to passive or even "dull" performances at court, their behavior actually shows they were the kingdom's foremost audience and hostess. By hosting entertainments, often in their chambers, and witnessing the tournaments and disguisings at court, Catherine and Margaret allowed Henry and James to conduct diplomacy and display their magnificence, which were morally and politically important duties for a sixteenth-century prince.⁵

⁴Pizan, *Treasure*, 40–41; Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 246; Sharon D. Michalove, "Equal in Opportunity? The Education of Aristocratic Women, 1450–1550," in *Women's Education in Early Modern Europe: A History, 1500–1800*, ed. Barbara J. Whitehead (New York: Garland Publishing, 1999), 53, 58.

⁵Christian and Classical ideals of good government and princely virtue encouraged princes to be liberal in their generosity and display their status through material goods, including clothing, see Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 127.

Catherine's and Margaret's duties at court were based on their relationship to their husbands as wives as well as queens and thus were born out of sixteenth-century gender roles. Their role as hostess was rooted in medieval responsibilities of the lady as mistress of the household, whose duties included welcoming guests and providing hospitality. The queen's role as audience originated in the ideals of chivalry, in which the lady was a source of inspiration for valorous deeds and the principal witness and authenticator of knightly renown.⁶ These roles were amplified by the consistent support of the queen's ladies, who were in constant attendance on the queen and represented the only large group of women permanently fixed at the royal court. As this chapter will show, when Catherine or Margaret watched a court spectacle or entertained in their chambers, they did so surrounded by a group of noble ladies who extended the queen's presence. When we think of the king and his knights competing in a tournament, the queen watches, not alone, but attended by sumptuously dressed, beautiful and noble ladies and gentlewomen, creating an atmosphere of chivalry and magnificence that balances the warlike spectacle.

The first section of this chapter considers how Catherine and Margaret and their ladies participated in the court spectacles of the early sixteenth century. Although it is true that Catherine and Margaret participated in court spectacles primarily as the audience, this role has been misunderstood by scholars who have focused on the content of the performances under theatrical categories of audience and performer. Instead, I shall focus on the relationship between participants in court spectacle, which included the king and the queen, on "stage" and in the

⁶Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 116–117; Joachim Bumke, *Courtly Culture: Literature and Society in the High Middle Ages*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991), 335; chivalry is a somewhat vexed term in medieval and early modern scholarship. Here I use it to denote the chivalric culture that experienced a resurgence in the early sixteenth century as part of the elaborate culture of spectacle developed by the Burgundian, and later English, Scottish and French courts, see Roy C. Strong, *Splendor at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and the Theater of Power* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), 38; Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood*, 82–83.

“audience”. Additionally, I show that Catherine’s and Margaret’s ladies acted as extensions of their queenly presence by enhancing their own magnificence through their beauty and physical presence. In the second section, I turn to the smaller, more intimate pastimes of the queen’s chamber, which I show was a space of sociability amongst her ladies, courtiers, the king, diplomats, and honored guests. These activities, including music and dance, were part of Catherine’s and Margaret’s duties as hostess, and their hospitality allowed them to gain both praise and political and cultural influence.

The Queen as Audience: Spectacles, Tournaments, and the Queen’s Ladies

In 1516 Margaret’s arrival in London began with lavish celebrations that featured Margaret, Catherine and occasionally Margaret’s younger sister, Mary Tudor, the dowager queen of France as spectators to the Henry VIII’s tournaments. The role of honored audience to the king’s exploits was an important and often-overlooked aspect of the public display of queenly dignity. The celebrations of Margaret’s arrival encompassed two days of jousting, banquets, and a play. Both Henry VIII and James IV were masters of the royal spectacle, and employed a great number of men within their household to insure that their courts were culturally competitive on a European stage. The English and Scottish courts in the early sixteenth century were known for their brilliance. Henry and James employed artists from around Europe to provide music, dancing, masques, poetry and plays, in addition to the hundreds of artisans who created the material goods necessary for tournaments, masques, hunting expeditions and royal ceremonies such as coronations, weddings, and baptisms.⁷ Both James and Henry held lavish, complex

⁷For example, David Starkey, ed., *Henry VIII: A European Court in England* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991); Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry*; Sydney Anglo, “The Evolution of the Early Tudor Disguising, Pageant, and Mask,” *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 1 (1968): 3–44; Henry VIII expanded his father’s Revels establishment, employing William Cornish to supervise and devise entertainments that were the precursors to early seventeenth-century masques, W.R. Streitberger, “The Development of Henry VIII’s Revel’s Establishment,” *Medieval English Theatre* 7, no. 2 (1985): 87; Louise Olga Fradenburg, *City, Marriage, Tournament: Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991); A. A. MacDonald, “Princely Culture in Scotland under James

tournaments designed to exhibit the kings' own skill as well as entertain ambassadors and noble visitors at their court.⁸

At the center of these entertainments was the royal couple, the king and queen. Queens were involved in appearances at court ceremonies and entertainments in which they were both the honored hostess and objects of chivalrous attention with reciprocal roles to play in the spectacle. Acting as audiences to the entertainments at the royal court may seem passive to modern eyes, but at the courts of James IV and Henry VIII, each entertainment was presented in front of the queen. The tournament began with her permission or in her honor, usually with the king and his knights doing reverence to the queen and her ladies, as Henry VIII and Francis I did at the Field of Cloth of Gold: "[th]us with honour and noble courage these two noble kynges with their compaignies entered into the feld, and them presented unto the Quenes, and after reverence dooen to them, thei roade round about the tilte."⁹ By refocusing our analysis on the queen as audience, the traditional theatrical notions of "performer" and "audience" must give way to an understanding of early modern court spectacles as a dynamic interaction between different types of participants, some of whom presented an entertainment while others served as witnesses to the splendor, valor, or magnificence of the occasion, giving legitimacy and approval to those presenters.

Catherine and Margaret were responsible for distributing prizes to the winners of the jousts and often this took place while they were hosting a banquet in their own chambers at the end of the day's activities. In this way, Catherine's and Margaret's participation in their husbands' tournaments marked their status as the public partner of the king and the first hostess

III and James IV," in *Princes and Princely Culture, 1450-1650*, ed. Martin Gosman, Alasdair A. MacDonald, and Ari Johan Vanderjagt, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 147–72.

⁸Streitberger, "Revel's Establishment," 87; Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood*, 90–93.

⁹Dillon, *Hall's Chronicle*, 84.

of the kingdom. The preparations for the tournament in Margaret's honor in 1516 were lavish and featured both Henry and his brother-in-law, Mary Tudor's husband Charles Brandon Duke of Suffolk in the jousts. Henry and his knights were dressed all in blue velvet trimmed with cloth of gold, and the challengers were dressed in white satin and cloth of gold.¹⁰ Margaret would have observed the jousts from the stands, probably with her sister Mary and sister-in-law Catherine and, as the tournament was in her honor, would in all likelihood have awarded the prizes. After the second tournament day, the knights went to a banquet in honor of the queen of Scots in Catherine's Chamber, further emphasizing Catherine's role as hostess for her sister-in-law and the royal court as a whole.¹¹

Catherine's and Margaret's participation in court spectacle, along with their ladies, as spectators to their husbands' displays is an especially important part of their performance at court and one that I argue has not been fully incorporated into our understanding of the performance of queenship in pre-modern Europe. Because neither Catherine nor Margaret seems to have acted in the grand courtly spectacles or sponsored them, their attendance at royal spectacles has been overlooked and they have faded into the historical background.¹² Yet, their participation was just as central to court spectacle as were those of the dancers, musicians, and noble actors who have captured the attention of historians.

The development of an elaborate and spectacular court culture during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries gave new prominence to the role of the queen's women at court. The dances, masques, and jousts of the court required women both to participate in the events

¹⁰W. R. Streitberger, "Henry VIII's Entertainment for the Queen of Scots, 1516: A New Revels Account and Cornish's Play," ed. J. Leeds Barroll, *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 1 (1984): 31.

¹¹Dillon, *Hall's Chronicle*, 59.

¹²Catherine especially is contrasted with her successor, Anne Boleyn, whose participation in Henrician court performances is well known, Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, 38–41; for studies of ceremonies and performances at the English and Scottish courts, see Anglo, "Early Tudor Disguising"; Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry*; Streitberger, "Revel's Establishment"; W.R. Streitberger, "William Cornish and the Players of the Chapel," *Medieval English Theatre* 8, no. 1 (1986): 3–20; Gray, "The Royal Entry in Sixteenth-Century Scotland"; Fradenburg, "Sovereign Love."

themselves and to act as appropriately flattered, proud, or surprised audiences, depending on the event.¹³ To appear beautiful and splendid in public was one of their most public roles, and their dress, behavior, and personal appearance reflected glory not only on the queen, but on the king and kingdom as a whole. By helping the queen to fulfill courtly ideals of beauty and splendor, Catherine's and Margaret's ladies enhanced the queen's own power and image, and by extension, their ladies' opportunities for advancement, reward, and marriage.

Some historians of Tudor pageantry have mentioned Catherine's role as the audience for court spectacle, but these events have been discussed in isolation, without a wider consideration of their part in Catherine's performance of queenship. In his analysis of Catherine's first wedding entry to London, in 1501, Gordon Kipling argues that Catherine, rather than being a "passive witness" was "both audience and protagonist of the show." Catherine's role in the pageants was deliberately orchestrated so that the princess was the catalyst for key moments in the various pageants, for instance, her arrival to a pageant would cause gates to open.¹⁴ But, Kipling's excellent analysis could be taken much further in discussing the importance of queens to the spectacles at court.

Catherine's wedding pageants were part of a larger pattern of entertainment at court where the audience was the focal point of the entertainment itself. While accounts of performances at court naturally draw our historical gaze towards the dancing or drama unfolding in the narrative account, the gaze of the court itself was directed towards the royal audience sitting in chairs of estate.¹⁵ Garrett Mattingly noted, with reference to the early days of

¹³Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 232.

¹⁴Kipling, *Receyt*, xv; incorporating the audience into the performance was a common device for civic pageants on the continent, for example, Mary Tudor's wedding entry into Paris in 1515, Sadlack, *French Queen's Letters*, 67.

¹⁵Fradenburg, *City, Marriage, Tournament: Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland*, 254; for a discussion of the monarch as audience in the seventeenth century, see Roy C. Strong, *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals, 1450-1650* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1984), 5.

Catherine's and Henry's marriage, that the queen was "a necessary audience for all his [Henry's] triumphs."¹⁶ In an article on Robin Hood pageants and ballads of the sixteenth century, Victor Scherb sees Catherine's role, as the "passive" partner to the king, being a stimulus to Henry's entertainments but not initiating action on her own.¹⁷ Scherb's analysis does not, however, take into consideration that Henry's relationship with Catherine, in which she was the "passive" partner to his "active" one, reaffirms before the court the importance of the king's relationship with the queen, and thus Catherine's own access to power and influence through her husband. Catherine's performance as Henry's audience, while appearing passive to modern eyes, would have fulfilled sixteenth-century ideals of the queen as the public partner of the king.

Catherine's and Margaret's "passive" roles as spectators to the splendid entertainments of their husbands' courts gave them power and authority because their behavior was a "good social performance." By fulfilling the expectations of the court and sixteenth-century social and gender roles, these queens' "passive" roles were actually active ones in the court, roles which conferred upon them praise and positive reputations. These appearances established Catherine and Margaret as the devoted partners of their husbands and contributed to a reservoir of good behavior that established their authority and legitimacy. Therefore, we should consider their performances at these events as an important and powerful queenly duty that allowed Catherine and Margaret to navigate pre-modern systems of power by conforming to them, maintaining their dignity and status as queens, and thus acquiring good reputation and influence.¹⁸

¹⁶Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon*, 128.

¹⁷Scherb, "I'de Have a Shooting," 128; other authors have commented on Catherine's passive role, Jansen, *Female Rulers in Early Modern Europe*, 117, 120.

¹⁸For more on the idea of early modern women finding power within a patriarchal system see Barbara J. Harris, "The View from My Lady's Chamber: New Perspectives on the Early Tudor Monarchy," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (1997): 215–247, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3817675>; Sadlack, *French Queen's Letters*.

Their adoption of these seemingly passive roles was certainly not an unthinking posture for either queen, but a deliberate choice based on their own relationship with the king and the gender and social expectations of the royal court. When the occasion arose they understood how to intervene directly in court ceremony for their own ends. For instance, in May 1517 Catherine and Margaret performed a public and deliberately staged intercession before Henry VIII when they pleaded for the lives of a group of London apprentice boys who were about to be executed for their part in the Evil May Day riots a few weeks before.¹⁹ This act may have earned Catherine lasting fame as a champion of London's poor, and it was certainly a calculated decision by Catherine and Margaret to adopt a different type of performance role.²⁰

Tournaments were an especially important court entertainment that highlighted the relationship between the king and queen in the public performance of monarchy, which displayed before the court the access to power and favor that the queen had through the king. The new fashion for elaborately staged tournaments required a new degree of participation by the queen and her ladies. Developed at the courts of René of Anjou and the Dukes of Burgundy in the fifteenth century, tournaments featuring a dramatic plot and elaborate costumes were favored by monarchs across Europe, including Henry VIII in the early decades of his reign, and his brother-in-law, James IV. Above all, these productions required the presence of the queen in order to fulfill their dramatic plots, which were "a predetermined romantic saga which was always to find its hero and heroine in the king and his consort."²¹ In the late sixteenth century, Elizabeth I's success in harnessing romantic chivalry to her own personal cult of monarchy suggests that the presence of a strong warrior-king in the tiltyard was not required for chivalric

¹⁹ *CSP Venetian* 2:887.

²⁰ Catherine's actions were praised in a ballad still popular fifty years later, which may indicate her lasting personal popularity, Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon*, 172.

²¹ Strong, *Splendor at Court*, 38.

display to be effective. In France, Savoy, the Low Countries and elsewhere, tournaments celebrating queenly beauty, love and magnificence gave women access to influence and power “[w]ithin the rhetoric of politics and chivalry.”²² In both England and Scotland, the tournament created a public opportunity for both Catherine and Margaret to perform their roles as spectator, hostess, and public partner of the king before a large audience, receiving praise and dignity from this display.

Scottish tournament tradition has, until recently, been relatively neglected by historians, and the scarcity of sources makes it difficult to construct a detailed picture of any one Scottish tournament. The role of women in Scottish tournaments, moreover, is even more difficult to discover. Katie Stevenson acknowledged that the romantic tradition seems less developed in Scotland, but she does speculate that this may be due to the nature of Scottish sources, which are mostly financial records and have little detail about the events of tournaments themselves, including the participation of ladies.²³ She notes that “[a]s courtly literature was popular in Scotland, we can assume that some tournaments, if not all, were held with women in the audience, in the name of a lady, to win a lady’s honour or other such gesture.”²⁴ It is possible that the arrival of a young English princess sparked a trend for tournaments with a courtly love theme, as in both her wedding celebrations and at the tournaments in 1507 and 1508, Margaret or her ladies were incorporated into festivities.²⁵

From the beginning of her marriage, Margaret and her women were crucial participants in James’s court spectacles. During her wedding celebrations, Margaret was entertained in a variety

²²Sadlack, *French Queen’s Letters*, 86.

²³Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood*, 91–93.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 92.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 80–81. James III, James IV’s father, was notoriously uninterested in tournaments, and this in addition to being at odds with his queen for most of his reign, supports the idea that Margaret’s arrival signaled a change in Scottish tournaments.

of ways, most famously through elaborate entry pageants that greeted her when she entered the capital of Edinburgh riding pillion behind the king. Historians have focused on these pageants because they consisted of complex imagery and allegories that were part of the European tradition of royal entry and pageant ceremony.²⁶ But the civic pageants, staged by Edinburgh burgesses along the procession route through the town to Holyrood Palace, were not characteristic of most of the spectacles of James's reign. Rather, it was the entertainments and jousts held after the wedding at Holyrood Palace that were indicative of the courtly tournament spectacles that James developed during his reign, which became significantly more elaborate after his marriage in 1503.

Margaret's chamber at Holyrood became the focus of socialization for the wedding celebrations. The wedding jousts were performed in the lower court of the palace, as the queen with her ladies watched from the windows of her great chamber, accompanied by her Chamberlain.²⁷ After dinner they listened to musicians from Italy and England, and the evening often ended with dancing.²⁸ The queen and her ladies were the source of inspiration for the king as well:

The Kynge, for the luffe of the present Qwene and hyr Ladyes, did make XLI Knyghts... This doone, he sayed to the Qwene, and Lady—These are your Knyghts, and taking hyr by the Haund, led hyr to the Doore of hyr Chammer, and when they war well and honnestly served, as was also all the Felischip with Plenty of Ypocras.²⁹

²⁶see for example, Gray, "The Royal Entry in Sixteenth-Century Scotland"; Fradenburg, "Sovereign Love."

²⁷Young, "Fyancells," 298; hereafter *Fyancells*.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 297.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 298; Ypocras, or hippocras, was a type of spiced mulled wine.

Later in the narrative, Margaret's absence delays the creation of yet more knights, which was "put off to the next Day for the Luffe of hyr."³⁰ Without the queen to witness them, James's actions have no chivalric value and must thus be postponed until she is present.

We must not underestimate the importance of the female audience in the elaborate tournaments of the sixteenth century, despite the tendency for chroniclers and ambassadors to focus on the king's exploits and the overtly masculine and martial nature of the tournament itself. When we turn to the account books for Henry or James's revels, we can see how the queen as audience was part of the tournament. In the November tournament of 1510, a heavily-pregnant Catherine was given a dozen silk roses when the jousts began and was presented with a garland later on in the celebrations.³¹ These gifts were most likely presented by the knights to Catherine as part of the "storyline" of the tournament. Often these tournaments involved symbolic plots that incorporated the queen and her ladies into the dramatic action.³² Visual symbols of the queen pervaded Henry's tournaments as well. A gift of horse armor from Emperor Maximilian in 1509 was embossed with pomegranates, Catherine's personal badge.³³ Henry and his knights would often ride wearing H and K as part of their emblems, and Henry famously would ride as the knight "Coeur Loyale" or Loyal Heart.³⁴ Catherine also awarded prizes at Henry's tournaments, including one celebrating the birth of Prince Henry in 1511 and another at the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520.³⁵

The visual closeness of the king and queen at the tournament, though badges and emblems, stressed Catherine's personal and political closeness to Henry, and hence to the heart

³⁰Ibid., 300; Young does not tell us why Margaret was absent, but throughout the narrative she is frequently absent, most likely fatigued by the non-stop celebrations.

³¹LP 2.2:12.2.

³²Strong, *Splendor at Court*, 37–38.

³³Karen Watts, "Henry VIII and the Founding of the Greenwich Armouries," in *Henry VIII: A European Court in England*, ed. David Starkey (London: Collins & Brown, 1991), 42–43.

³⁴Dillon, *Hall's Chronicle*, 37.

³⁵LP 1.1:1491; CSP *Venetian*3:50.

of political power at court. Henry VIII's enthusiasm for tournaments, and particularly his personal participation in the joust, gave political significance to these entertainments. Those who were closely connected to the king were visually associated with him at the tournament as well. Henry's knights were dressed in a similar manner to the king, emphasizing their closeness to the monarch. The knights chosen to accompany the king were his closest companions, and many men, including Charles Brandon Duke of Suffolk, advanced their court careers through their skill in the lists.³⁶ Although Catherine may have been in the stands, her symbols and emblems visually connected her role as audience with the king's role as knight in an unmistakable way.

Like their mistress, the ladies of the queen's household were audiences for court spectacle. They also actively participated in court spectacle and entertainment with varying levels of involvement. As Olwen Hufton has observed, "a court without women is like a body without a nervous system."³⁷ A court was deemed incomplete if it did not include ladies, and most of the ladies at court were part of the queen's household. Throughout Europe, elite courts required the presence of women, even in the Vatican.³⁸ In France, the royal court was only deemed truly a court when men and women were socializing together, and this more often than not occurred in the household of the queen or the queen mother.³⁹

The ladies of the queen's household provided the queen with personal service, companionship, and appropriate magnificence, amplifying the queen's presence by accompanying her in public. As we will see in chapter 5, the queen's women were also well-

³⁶Steven Gunn, "The Early Tudor Tournament," in *Henry VIII: A European Court in England*, ed. David Starkey (London: Collins & Brown, 1991), 48.

³⁷Olwen Hufton, "Reflections on the Role of Women in the Early Modern Court," *The Court Historian* 5, no. 1 (2000): 1.

³⁸Renate Ago, "Maria Spada Veralli, La Buona Moglie," in *Barocco Al Femminile*, ed. Giulia Calvi (Rome: Editori Laterza, 1992), 53–70; Hufton, "The Role of Women in the Early Modern Court," 1–2.

³⁹Caroline zum Kolk, "Catherine de Médicis et l'espace: résidences, voyages et séjours," in *Moving Elites: Women and Cultural Transfers in the European Court System*, ed. Giulia Calvi and Isabelle Chabot, Proceedings of an International Workshop (Florence, 12-13 December 2008) (San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy: European University Institute, 2010), 54, <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/14234>.

rewarded with gifts, clothing, annuities, and marriages facilitated by the queen. Catherine's and Margaret's households offered the highest and most prestigious posts for women at the royal court. The queen's female household was of course, crucial to the idea of a "gendered balance" at court, and women at court have in recent years been given fuller attention by historians, such as Barbara Harris, who points out that Henry VIII's Privy Chamber was staffed by twenty men in the 1520s, while Catherine was served by a staff of sixteen women in analogous positions.⁴⁰ Because these ladies and gentlewomen attended the queen throughout the day and at court gatherings and ceremonies, they were by far the most visible aspect of the queens' households. Their appearance was commented upon by foreign ambassadors and observers, and they were constantly seen in the public spaces of the court with their mistresses.

Catherine's and Margaret's ladies held three positions in their households, and they were strictly organized in a hierarchy of precedence. Chamberers were women who oversaw the daily running of the queen's chambers and who were usually the wives or daughters of gentry. Gentlewomen were personal companions to the queen on a regular basis and were the wives and daughters of gentry and the nobility. Ladies-in-waiting or maids-of-honor were either older, high-ranking women who waited on the queen during ceremonial occasions, or very young, unmarried girls from noble families, who were often at court for brief periods of time until they married. Women could change positions over the course of their careers. For instance, Margaret Pennington was Catherine's chamberer in 1511, but after her marriage to Sir Thomas Cook, she became gentlewoman to the queen.

From the beginning of her marriage in Scotland, Margaret was served by three English ladies-in-waiting, three English gentlewomen or maids of honor (the records are unclear) and at

⁴⁰Harris, "View from My Lady's Chamber," 237.

least one English chamberer.⁴¹ It is likely that these numbers were supplemented by Scottish ladies, as in January 1506 James gave gifts to four women not listed as part of Margaret's English retinue, in addition to gifts to known members of the queen's household.⁴² The number of Catherine's ladies could increase considerably for major court ceremonies, such as her joint coronation with Henry VIII or the Field of Cloth of Gold. In October 1519, women serving Catherine were two ladies-in-waiting, seven gentlewomen, and six chamberers, for a total of fifteen women waiting on the queen.⁴³ In contrast, for Catherine's coronation, twenty-eight women are listed as part of the queen's household, including five countesses and ten baronesses. These women, who had families and estates of their own to attend to, clearly did not attend upon the queen daily.⁴⁴

As a group, the queen's ladies were part of her presence in public, accompanying the queen whenever she left her chambers, not only providing companionship and service, but also confirming and amplifying the queen's own status.⁴⁵ As such, their physical features and appearance were crucial, and the beauty and elegance of the queen's ladies was constantly the subject of comment by observers, including foreign ambassadors. Indeed, sometimes the queen's ladies received more praise than their lady, especially as Catherine moved into middle age. In

⁴¹ *LHTA* 2:336.

⁴² *LHTA* 3:177.

⁴³ *LP* 3.1:491; adding to the female presence surrounding the royal court were the maids and chamberers who served the queen's own ladies, as well as female servants in the *domus providencie*, such as the queen's laundress or women like Elizabeth Douglas, who was licensed to brew beer for Margaret and her household in 1507, M. Livingstone, ed., *The Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland*, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1908) 1:1423, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>.

⁴⁴ *LC*9/50, 216r; however, only 11 ladies and 10 gentlewomen are listed in the coronation accounts as ladies who "shall ride after the henchmen and after the Chairs in the queen's livery of crimson velvet bordered as is appointed," possibly indicating, through the use of livery, that these women were the permanent members of her household. The names on this list included three of Catherine's Spanish gentlewomen, as well as women who regularly occur in household accounts as members of the queen's household.

⁴⁵ Elizabeth Brown discusses this important role of the queen's ladies for Elizabeth I in "'Companion Me with My Mistress': Cleopatra, Elizabeth I, and Their Waiting Women," in *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*, ed. Susan Frye and Karen Robertson (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 132.

June 1515, the secretary to the Venetian ambassador wrote that the queen “is rather ugly than otherwise, and supposed to be pregnant; but the damsels of her court are handsome, and make a sumptuous appearance.”⁴⁶ His startlingly cutting description of the queen should not overshadow the importance that he places on the appearance of her ladies. Not only are Catherine’s ladies “handsome” but they also “make a sumptuous appearance.” The secretary here is probably referring to the ladies’ clothing and jewels, important elements in establishing the magnificence of the court.

Catherine’s ladies were supplied with livery clothes from the queen’s Wardrobe, though they were also expected to provide their own.⁴⁷ Catherine’s Wardrobe provided her ladies with gowns of tawny chamlet, sleeves in crimson satin, or kirtles of yellow satin.⁴⁸ Margaret’s ladies received livery gowns at New Year in tawny damask, black satin, or tawny velvet.⁴⁹ As discussed in chapter 2, liveries usually featured the queen’s badges with her personal emblems, and thus acted to associate visually her servants with the queen. When the queen formed part of the audience for the jousts or disguisings of her husband, her ladies would have attended on her, and created a glittering impression not only of the queen’s magnificence, but also of her own wealth and discrimination in outfitting her ladies.

As the audience to the king’s exploits, the queen and her ladies were also the center of attention, the axis around which events revolved. One morning in the early months of 1510 Henry and a few companions burst into Catherine’s chambers, disguised as out-laws or Robin Hood’s men. The queen and her ladies reacted suitably to this intrusion. Despite the fact that they

⁴⁶ *CSP Venetian* 2:624; it impossible to say how biased the secretary might have been against the queen, as Catherine supported a pro-Imperial and pro-Spanish English foreign policy, and Venice was frequently at odds with the Empire in northern Italy. Additionally, in June 1515, Catherine, at thirty years old, was probably two months pregnant with Princess Mary and had already experienced four pregnancies that had ended in stillbirths, miscarriages or the loss of the infant shortly after birth, all of which must have taken a physical toll on the queen.

⁴⁷ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 228–229.

⁴⁸ JRL Latin MS 289, 8v, fol. 9.

⁴⁹ *LHTA* 4:430, 228–230.

were “abashed” and surprised at the suddenness of the king’s arrival, dances and “pastime” were made before the king and his companions left.⁵⁰ Catherine and her ladies were crucial to the roles Henry was playing, and without them Henry’s disguising would have had little meaning.

The queen’s ladies could also actively participate in such court events as the pageants, disguisings, and masks that comprised the court entertainments of the early sixteenth century. Although Catherine was not an active participant in the disguisings, she continued in her role as an audience member. Her ladies, however, frequently danced with the king and his companions, as the conceit of many court entertainments revolved around the courtship of a group of ladies. Catherine’s ladies represented the queen because they were part of her household and an extension of her presence and status at court. When Catherine was confined to her chambers because of pregnancy, her ladies continued to participate in court revels as representations and, perhaps more importantly, in light of Henry’s wandering eye, reminders of the queen. For the New Year’s pageants of 1511, Catherine was confined to her chambers, about to give birth to Henry’s first son. The court, however, did not forget the queen, and the New Year’s pageants celebrated Catherine through her women, who danced “appareled in garmentes of Crymosyn Satyn enbroudered and traussed with cloth of gold, cut in Pomegranettes and yokes, strynged after the facion of Spayne.”⁵¹ The pomegranate was famously Catherine’s personal symbol taken from her parents’ arms, and the yokes were also another symbol usually associated with her father Ferdinand.⁵² The queen may not have been participating, or even present, during these pageants, but her presence was clearly felt through the appearance of her ladies.

Margaret’s ladies also participated in the entertainments of James’s court, although, again, the limitations of Scottish sources mean that their roles are less easily discerned than those

⁵⁰Dillon, *Hall’s Chronicle*, 31.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, 36–37.

⁵²Weissberger, “The Power of Isabel I of Castile.”

of Catherine's ladies. In June 1507 and again in May 1508, the court of James IV celebrated the tournament of the Wild Knight and the Black Lady, which probably featured the king as the Wild Knight, and one of Margaret's ladies as the Black Lady.⁵³ The June 1507 tournament was probably a celebration of the birth of James and Margaret's first child, Prince James, in February 1507.⁵⁴ After a severe illness, Margaret returned to court life in late March of 1507. The summer of 1507 saw not only James's tournament of the Wild Knight, but also a lengthy and elaborate pilgrimage by the king and queen to Whithorn, in the southwest of Scotland. Given the nature of the celebrations that summer, it is highly likely Margaret would have participated in some way in the tournament, at the very least as an honored audience to the king's exploits.

Margaret's participation in the May 1508 tournament was probably limited simply because the queen was again pregnant and unable or unwilling to join in any of the more physical activities, such as dancing.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, it appears that Margaret's ladies contributed to the spectacle of both tournaments and the subsequent banquets. The Black Lady was accompanied by two other maidens, also probably part of Margaret's household. William Ogilvy and Alexander Elphinstone, both members of the king's household, acted as her squires.⁵⁶

⁵³ Who the Black Lady actually was or her ethnic background is nearly impossible to determine. While Margaret was served by several Moorish women at court, including a lady named Ellen More who was particularly favored, the preparations for the tournament give no indication of the identity of the Lady or her maidens. Fradenburg even speculates that Margaret could have been the Black Lady, though given the complete lack of reference to the queen in connection with the Black Lady, this seems highly unlikely; Fradenburg, *City, Marriage, Tournament: Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland*, 255–259.

⁵⁴ Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood*, 95–96.

⁵⁵ Margaret gave birth to an unnamed daughter in July 1508 who died a few days later. It is unclear how far along into her pregnancy Margaret was at the time of the birth, so it is also difficult to say when she may have taken to her chamber, John Leslie, *The History of Scotland, from the Death of King James I, in the Year M.CCCC.XXXVI, to the Year M.D.LXI*, trans. James Dalrymple, vol. 2, Scottish Text Society 5 (Edinburgh, 1895), 129.

⁵⁶ *LHTA* 3:258, 259; both of these squires were closely connected to Margaret's household. Alexander Elphinstone married her favorite English gentlewoman, Elizabeth Barlow, in August 1507, and William Ogilvy was married to Alison Roull, one of Margaret's gentlewomen, John Balfour Paul, ed. *The Register of the Great Seal of Scotland*, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1882-1914) 1:3105, 3171, 3269, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>. It is tempting to speculate that Elizabeth Barlow and Alison Roull were the two gentlewomen attending upon the Black Lady, but as both were married by this time, it is unlikely that they would have been referred to as "maidens" in the accounts.

Throughout the tournament, Margaret's ladies were part of the celebrations, including the 1508 banquet which Lady Musgrove, Margaret's mistress of the wardrobe, helped to provide for and decorate.⁵⁷ This banquet also featured dancing, which included some sort of choreographed performance by the king's companions, who were probably the recipients of the five dancing coats of red and yellow satin, the royal livery colors, made "agane the bancat" in May.⁵⁸ The tournament of the Wild Knight and the Black Lady as a whole thus had many opportunities for the queen's ladies to participate and contribute to the spectacle at court.

In summary, the chivalric values that James and Henry embraced included the importance of performing acts of valor before a lady, thus winning her favor and approval, which made the female audience an integral and necessary part of the performance of chivalry before the court.⁵⁹ While the king was dancing before the court or jousting in a tournament, it was the queen, as both his public partner and the object of his chivalrous attention, who formed the audience.⁶⁰ The courts of Henry VIII and James IV featured active monarchs who were both audiences for and participants in tournaments, masks, disguisings and plays at court. These spectacles, although placing Catherine and Margaret in a passive role as audience, in fact required their participation as the appropriately magnificent, royal, and appreciative audience in order to fulfill the ideals of courtly chivalry and to give meaning and significance to the events themselves.

The Queen as Hostess: Dancing, Music and Socialization

⁵⁷ She was sent items by Sir John Ramsay for the banquet hosted by the king during the tournament; *LHTA* 4:125.

⁵⁸ *LHTA* 4:64.

⁵⁹ Sadlack, *French Queen's Letters*, 132–133; Keen, *Chivalry*, 116–117; Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood*, 91–92.

⁶⁰ For Margaret's role in Scottish tournaments and the importance of chivalry at the court of James IV, see Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood*, 91–93.

In May 1516, Margaret was escorted by Sir Thomas Parr into London, where she was brought to Baynard's Castle, Catherine's London palace. Margaret would use Baynard's Castle as her primary residence while in London, staying there with her own household, which included a number of Scots who had served her while she was queen consort.⁶¹ For the next year, Margaret was a guest at Henry's court. During this period, Catherine welcomed Margaret to England as her sister-in-law and hostess, incorporating her sister queen into the hospitality of the court and fulfilling her duties as hostess. Because Catherine and Margaret were integral to the entertainment of visiting ambassadors or foreign noble guests, their chambers became spaces for impromptu or private social gatherings that featured music and dancing by the queen's minstrels and her ladies.

Most of the court's entertainments were not large and costly spectacles discussed in the previous section; instead, they were smaller pastimes that frequently occurred in the queen's chamber. Although spectacles at court are featured in revels accounts, chronicles, and ambassador's accounts, these sources in fact over-represent the prevalence of major court entertainments. In all likelihood, the evening entertainments in the queen's chamber were more frequent than grand, expensive spectacles. They were certainly important spaces for members of the court to pass along news and gossip, request favors, or win distinction for their beauty, wit, or accomplishments. The informal business of the court, which women were skilled in conducting, often evades written sources because of its undocumented nature.⁶² The queen's

⁶¹ *LP* 2.2:pg.1475; English accounts for 1516 show payments to Margaret's household, including a number of familiar names from Scotland, including Luke Taylford (Lucas Taillefeir), her yeoman usher who had served in Scotland since 1506, Jammy Dogge (James Dog) her keeper of the wardrobe in Scotland since 1511, and Edward Benestede, an Englishman who had been her treasurer in Scotland until 1508 or possibly longer.

⁶²For more on the informal role of women at court and the opportunities they had, see Hufton, "The Role of Women in the Early Modern Court."

chamber provided the social opportunities for men and women of the court to gather and conduct this business, and her chamber was an important and often overlooked area of courtly influence.

The queen's chamber was a focus for courtly activities in part because of royal traditions of hospitality that were associated with the queen in her capacity as mistress of the household. Hospitality, which was closely related to notions of good lordship, patronage, and largesse, was important to the reputation of any great household, especially the royal household.⁶³ Hospitality was part of the Christian values that royalty and the elites of Europe were expected to perform as part of their duties as heads of households and social examples for the Christian community. Christine de Pizan, in her conduct book *The Treasure of the City of Ladies*, recommended that the queen in particular should provide welcome and hospitality to her husband's friends and courtiers.⁶⁴ Providing hospitality was frequently associated with women, and was "one of the most 'public' ways they [women] could acquire honor and maintain reputation."⁶⁵ One of the most popular works of courtly literature of the sixteenth century, Baldesar Castiglione's *The Book of the Courtier* (1528), was set at the gracious court of Elisabetta Gonzaga, duchess of Urbino, whose hospitality encourages the courtiers to refined and witty conversation.⁶⁶

Catherine's dominant role in courtly hospitality can be seen during Margaret's visit to London. From the beginning of Margaret's stay, Catherine acted as her sister-in-law's hostess through both symbolic gestures and material support. Baynard's Castle, where Margaret stayed, was the traditional storehouse for Catherine's wardrobe goods, in addition to being the official London residence of Tudor queens consort.⁶⁷ Baynard's Castle had both symbolic and mundane associations with Catherine as queen of England, and thus Margaret's time there was associated

⁶³Heal, *Hospitality*, 12–13, 22.

⁶⁴Pizan, *Treasure*, 40–41.

⁶⁵Heal, *Hospitality*, 182.

⁶⁶Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull, 1978 reprint (Penguin Classics, 1978).

⁶⁷Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, 78.

with Catherine's own hospitality. Margaret entered London riding on a white palfrey given to her by Catherine, and this gift of a horse was commensurate with other gifts Catherine gave to royal women, such as her gift to Queen Claude of France of two palfreys at the Field of Cloth of Gold. Gift-giving was a universal practice for welcoming guests or cementing allegiances for royalty and elites during this period.⁶⁸ Catherine's gift of a palfrey displayed her hospitality to the public. As a small saddle horse for female riders, the palfrey was specifically associated with women as riders, givers, and recipients. Additionally, the palfrey was prominently displayed as Margaret entered the city and the gift would have been seen by many observers, including the ambassadors who would report it to the rest of courtly Europe, establishing Catherine's *fama* as a hostess.⁶⁹ As queen, sister-in-law, and lady of Baynard's Castle, Catherine was Margaret's hostess on both a ceremonial and mundane level while she was in England.⁷⁰

The queen's hospitality in her chambers extended beyond her household to include foreign visitors and courtiers, including members of the king's household. Assisting Catherine and Margaret in their role as hostess were their ladies. When she visited the English court, Margaret participated in several performances of female sociability and hospitality with Catherine and her women. In October 1516 the Venetian ambassador Sebastiano Giustiniani visited Henry's court and stayed for dinner. After dinner he was sent for by Henry, whom he found in Catherine's chamber with Margaret, listening to music and dancing with her ladies. Even an informal entertainment at court required the presence of ladies, and the sight of two

⁶⁸Heal, *Hospitality*, 21.

⁶⁹Giustiniani, *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*, 1:222.

⁷⁰ *LP* 2.1:1861; Dillon, *Hall's Chronicle*, 58, Hall states that Sir Thomas Parr escorted Margaret into London. Parr was married to Maud Parr, who would eventually become gentlewoman to Catherine and the mother of Henry VIII's last wife Katherine Parr. It is possible that Parr's service to Margaret during this visit brought Maud to the notice of Catherine.

queens together would have impressed upon the ambassador the strength and connections of Henry's Tudor dynasty.⁷¹

As Giustiniani's account makes clear, Catherine hosted gatherings that included mixed groups of male and female courtiers. The queen's outer chambers, staffed by her male officers and female attendants, were never strictly sex-segregated, unless she was confined for childbirth, in which case all household duties were taken over by her ladies and gentlewomen.⁷² However, the queen's ladies played an important and unique role in contributing to the hospitality at court, because they were the only group of women consistently at court in attendance on the queen. These ladies would be featured in all of the ceremonial and social occasions in the queen's chamber, and they would have been interacting with the men of the court.⁷³ In the fifteenth century, the queen's lodgings were frequently used for court ceremony and spectacle, even for events that were not specifically "female," and queens played the hostess for the king's male guests, providing a gendered balance at court.⁷⁴

Entertainments in the queen's chamber were opportunities for socialization between the sexes and to display the talents of the queen, her ladies, and her musicians. These entertainments also gave the queen opportunities to observe courtly interactions and collect information in the

⁷¹ Giustiniani, *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*, 1:301.

⁷² It is perhaps worth noting that mixed-sex socializing, which was nearly universal amongst northern European elites, was not always socially acceptable elsewhere. In the Muslim world, elite women were physically, but not socially, isolated from men who were not related to them, although this separation did not prevent them from becoming powerful, see Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), esp. 119–125; Nadia Maria El Cheikh, "Caliphal Harems, Household Harems: Baghdad in the Fourth Century of the Islamic Era," in *Harem Histories: Envisioning Places and Living Spaces*, ed. Marilyn Booth (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 90–96.

⁷³ Historians have only recently begun to analyze the historical significance of the queen's ladies and the importance of the queen's chamber to the success of the court. J.L. Laynesmith and Barbara Harris have argued that the queen's chamber was an empowering arena that featured the unique ways the queen could contribute to her husband's court, Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 250; Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 234–237.

⁷⁴ Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 245–246; Barbara Harris argues that after 1530 revels and entertainments at court decline, and women were subsequently on the margins of court activities, so Catherine's queenship may have been a high point for female influence at court during Henry's lifetime, *English Aristocratic Women*, 237; Historians have noted this important duty for other queens, see Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 7.

form of gossip and news. Music and dancing featured heavily in the entertainments in the queen's chamber, as I will discuss below, and her ladies and her gentlemen would have been expected to perform dances for the amusement of the company, which they would have learned as part of their courtly education.⁷⁵ These occasions would have also facilitated another important function of the court, that of an elite marriage market.⁷⁶ Their chambers served as an important social space and point of contact between the queen, her husband, and the members of their households.

Casual social gatherings in the queen's chamber also included women and men of the court engaged in games and pastimes that could bring together courtiers outside of her household. These games often included wagers, and payment for gambling debts leave a record of the informal pastimes of the court. For instance, in February 1519, Henry Courtenay, Earl of Devon, paid out 40s in "playing money" at a game in Catherine's chamber.⁷⁷ Courtenay was Henry VIII's cousin and a prominent courtier, but he was not a member of Catherine's household. Six months after the gambling debt was recorded, he would marry Gertrude Blount, daughter of Catherine's Lord Chamberlain. It is entirely possible the match was discussed over a game in the queen's chambers.⁷⁸ Margaret often played cards with James and some of his companions, especially during the winter holiday season. On New Year's Eve 1503, James lost £70 Scots playing cards in Margaret's chamber, and on other occasions the royal couple played

⁷⁵Jennifer Nevile, "Dance in Europe, 1250-1750," in *Dance, Spectacle, and the Body Politick, 1250-1750*, ed. Jennifer Nevile (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 34-35, 38; John E. Stevens, *Music and Poetry in the Early Tudor Court* (London: Methuen, 1961), 244.

⁷⁶ See chapter 5 for a discussion of Catherine's ladies' marriages.

⁷⁷ *LP* 3.1:152.

⁷⁸ *ODNB* "Courtenay, Gertrude, marchioness of Exeter (d. 1558)."

cards with Alexander Stewart, Archbishop of St. Andrews and Andrew Forman, Bishop of Moray.⁷⁹

In an era when domestic politics and foreign diplomacy were conducted in settings of household hospitality, the queen's role as mistress of the household meant that she was placed to aid the king in achieving his political goals, in part by providing a relaxed atmosphere of conviviality that could soothe the tension of negotiations.⁸⁰ For instance, Catherine and her ladies would often entertain ambassadors alongside the king in her chambers. Henry liked to invite ambassadors to the Catherine's chamber for an evening's entertainment, which often featured music and dancing by her ladies. Catherine and her ladies also entertained and occupied members of foreign delegations while the king and his ministers negotiated with the envoy alone.⁸¹

Music and dance performances displayed the talent and sophistication of the court before foreign audiences, and even the intimate pastimes in the queen's chamber could help to establish magnificence.⁸² After a banquet for newly arrived French ambassadors, the king took one of the ambassadors to the Queen's chamber, where the queen and her ladies amused the company "the chief of which, however, and the most approved by his Majesty, was the instrumental music of the reverend Master Dionysius Memo, his chaplain, which lasted four consecutive hours."⁸³

Memo's performances before foreign diplomats were opportunities for Henry to show off his

⁷⁹ *LHTA* 2:412, 3:181, 4:99, 402; Alexander Stewart was James IV's illegitimate son by his mistress Marion Boyd. Born in 1493, he was only four years younger than the queen, see *ODNB* "Stewart, Alexander (c.1493-1513)." Andrew Forman was a career diplomat who had orchestrated James's marriage treaty in 1502 and had accompanied Margaret to Scotland in 1503, see *ODNB* "Forman, Andrew (c.1465-1521)."

⁸⁰ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 234.

⁸¹ Dillon, *Hall's Chronicle*, 64.

⁸² Dumitrescu addresses the importance of dance and entertainments in diplomatic spectacles, but he only discusses large-scale entertainments, not intimate pastimes, *The Early Tudor Court and International Musical Relations* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007), 21-24.

⁸³ Giustiniani, *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*, 2:97; Memo was an Italian friar who was the organist at San Marco, Venice, working for the Doge before being introduced to Henry by the Venetian ambassador. He had close access to the king at court, and keyboardists in general were highly regarded and much sought after in this period, Dumitrescu, *International Musical Relations*, 86, 95.

virtuoso musician. When Catherine and her ladies, combined with the new musician Memo, acted as impromptu entertainers for the ambassadors, they extended courtesy while displaying the sophistication of the English court.

Participating in musical events, providing the spaces in which they occurred, and supporting musicians were all aspects of Catherine's and Margaret's performance of hospitality. As queens, both women sought to promote socialization at court as part of their duties both to members of their own households and for the promotion of their husbands' own cultural and foreign policy agenda. As we shall see, Catherine and Margaret were particularly important in facilitating the exchange of international musical influences at the courts of their husbands through both the patronage of personnel and the exchange of intellectual and material culture. These exchanges should be seen within the scope of the queen's own performance of patronage on a larger scale, including scholars and clergy as well as musicians.⁸⁴ Finally, Catherine's and Margaret's musical patronage contributed to the magnificence of their husbands' courts as a whole, and music was an important way for the English and Scottish courts to demonstrate their international taste, importance, and competitiveness.

Some of the first interactions Catherine and Margaret had with their new husbands and subjects involved music and dance as an opportunity for socialization between elites and the performance of acceptable gender roles.⁸⁵ Catherine and Margaret had remarkably similar experiences in this respect. After her much-anticipated arrival in England in 1501, Catherine and her first fiancé Arthur used dance and music to express royal hospitality and good social manners. When Arthur, accompanied by his father Henry VII, visited Catherine in her chamber, she called for her minstrels to amuse the company, while the princess and her ladies "with rightly

⁸⁴ See chapter 5 for details.

⁸⁵ Stevens, *Music and Poetry in the Early Tudor Court*, 269.

goodly behaviour and maner they solacid theymself with the disportes of daunsyng, and afterward the Lorde Prince in like demeanure with the Lady Guldford daunced right plesant and honorably."⁸⁶ Margaret also danced before James with her companions on multiple occasions before her wedding ceremony.⁸⁷ This interaction was in and of itself a performance by Margaret, in front of her future husband, where she presents herself as an accomplished, well-educated young woman.⁸⁸ Margaret and James each played instruments for each other, and given the nearly always awkward beginnings of arranged marriages, music was likely to be a relaxing way for the royal couple to interact and get to know one another.

Dancing before the court was also an opportunity for Catherine and Margaret to perform appropriate gender roles, demonstrating physical grace, beauty and modesty. Neither Catherine nor Margaret danced with their husbands-to-be according to the accounts of their wedding celebrations. Significantly, Margaret is described as dancing with James several days after the wedding, possibly because only then was it appropriate for the two to dance.⁸⁹ It may have been deemed inappropriate for young unmarried princesses to dance with men who were not related to them.⁹⁰ Catherine's dancing likely featured modes of dance deemed acceptable for women, namely a graceful and modest style of dancing that avoided lifting her dress, no mean feat given the layers of fabric that made up a lady's skirt.⁹¹ Margaret too would have been expected to display herself in a modest manner that avoided any bouncing or jumping dance steps, which

⁸⁶Kipling, *Receyt*, 8.

⁸⁷Young, "Fyancells," 283–285.

⁸⁸Carpenter, "To Thexaltacyon of Noblesse," 111–112.

⁸⁹Young, "Fyancells," 299.

⁹⁰ Margaret did dance a round with Lord Grey on one of the evenings James came to visit her before the wedding, Young, "Fyancells," 284. It is difficult to determine who Lord Grey was, exactly. He may have been one of the many sons of Thomas Grey, first marquess of Dorset, and thus related to Margaret through her mother's side, or he may have been one of the sons of George Grey, earl of Kent, who himself accompanied Margaret as far as York.

⁹¹Emily F. Winerock, "'Performing' Gender and Status on the Dance Floor in Early Modern England," in *Worth and Repute: Valuing Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Essays in Honour of Barbara Todd*, ed. Kim Kippen and Lori Woods (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2011), 453.

were appropriate only for male dancers, such as her brother Henry, who was a notable dancer in his youth.

In all of these early performative experiences, both Catherine and Margaret were on display before their new courts, and their skill at music and dance demonstrated their physical health and education. The physical fitness of a young princess before her marriage was taken seriously both by the bride's family and her betrothed. When Catherine arrived in England in 1501, Henry VII demanded to see the young princess without her veil, in defiance of Spanish custom, because he wanted to be certain that his heir was not marrying a cripple.⁹² On the other hand, Margaret's mother and grandmother famously intervened to prevent the princess from being sent to Scotland too young, because they were concerned that Margaret was not physically ready to consummate the marriage.⁹³ Dancing before the king, or playing an instrument for him, was another way for the princess to display her physical attributes and accomplishments before her marriage. Catherine and Margaret would have been taught since childhood that they were performers on a public stage, and dancing and playing music were the most visible type of performance that showcased both their physical health and education.

After their marriages, Catherine and Margaret had new expectations and responsibilities in their roles of audience and hostess at their marital courts. These roles continued to emphasize the importance of display in the performance of queenship; although married, Catherine and Margaret's behavior, dress, and physical looks continued to be important to maintaining their dignity and reputation as queens. The importance of their position as audience to their husbands' entertainments, as discussed above, was in part based on their continued performance of queenly dignity through the splendor and magnificence of their own appearance and the appearance of

⁹²Kipling, *Receyt*, 6–7.

⁹³*CSP Spanish* 1:210, pg. 176; royal women played critical roles in facilitating and negotiating marriages for their offspring, Parsons, "Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power," 63–64.

their ladies. Moreover, how the queen appeared in public was frequently commented upon by observers, including foreign ambassadors, especially if it was rumored that the queen was pregnant.

Music and dancing, especially informal or impromptu entertainments, primarily took place in the queen's chambers, often after a meal or in the evening. Some of Catherine's ladies played or sang and could entertain the queen in her chambers, and their talents often received positive notice by others at court, including the queen.⁹⁴ In 1525 Catherine inquired after one of her former ladies, Katherine Neville, Countess of Westmorland, asking "whether the good lady Neffyll did use to play so much as she was wont to do."⁹⁵ Catherine and Margaret supported and promoted musicians whose skills supported their entertainments, especially musicians who played dance music. It is difficult to determine what level of access musicians at court had to the inner rooms of the queen. Only musicians who had an independent position as gentlemen of the Privy Chamber had access to these rooms without the express invitation of the monarch, and there are no musicians who were gentlemen of Catherine's Privy Chamber. We cannot assume that musicians had easy or close access to the queen's most private chambers.⁹⁶ Throughout this section I have been discussing music and socialization in the "public" areas of the queen's chambers, the outer or Presence Chamber, although it should be noted, these areas were still limited as to who had access to them and were still associated with the queen as a part of her lodgings and under the purview of her servants and officials.⁹⁷

⁹⁴Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 231.

⁹⁵ *LP* Add. 1.1:467; this inquiry was directed towards Sir Arthur Darcy, the Earl of Westmorland's step-brother, who had delivered a token to the queen from Lady Neville.

⁹⁶Andrew Ashbee, "Groomed for Service: Musicians in the Privy Chamber at the English Court, c.1495-1558," *Early Music* 25, no. 2 (1997): 188, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3128516>. Giles Duwes was the only musician at the English court who may have had access to Catherine's Privy Chamber as part of his other duties as clerk of the queen's library, JRL Latin MS 239, 13v. But, Ashbee notes that even this idea is highly speculative.

⁹⁷ As I discuss in chapter 5, we know very little about the level of access allowed to male members of the queen's household to her privy chamber or inner rooms. For the purposes of this chapter, and in light of the lack of any

The musicians who played in the queen's chamber were usually a mixed consort of two or three whose instruments were suited to playing music for dancing. The queen's minstrels were a fixture at Henry VIII's court from the very beginning, receiving gifts at New Year starting in 1510.⁹⁸ In 1516, Catherine's wardrobe accounts show that Balthazar Roberts, a tabret (a small drum) player, and Richard Denows were part of the queen's musical establishment.⁹⁹ By 1519, we know that Catherine had a mixed band of three minstrels: Roberts, Jacques Roshard (tabret) and Thomas Evans (rebec, an early violin). The combination of tabrets and rebec would have been able to play many types of dance music for the queen and her ladies.¹⁰⁰ Dance music, including the popular French *basse dance* and the Italian *bassadanza*, could be played in intimate settings by a tabret keeping the beat and the rebec or pipe improvising a melody or tenor line.¹⁰¹ Less formal dancing, including rounds and English or Scottish folk dances, could also have been performed to this fairly simple instrumental grouping.

In March 1520, Roberts, Roshard and Giles Duwes, a lutenist and the clerk of the queen's library, were all issued tawny gowns and black doublets by Richard Justice, possibly indicating that these three were meant to play together at the Field of Cloth of Gold in the summer.¹⁰² As we have seen, liveries defined the musicians as members of the queen's household and usually featured her personal emblems embroidered upon them. Catherine's musicians would have thus been marked as the queen's minstrels whenever they performed in livery, and these

evidence to the contrary, I shall interpret references to the queen's chamber to mean one of her outer chambers, and not the inner, or Privy Chamber.

⁹⁸ *LP* 2.2, pg. 1444.

⁹⁹ TNA MS E101/418/6, 32r, 34v.

¹⁰⁰ Dumitrescu, *International Musical Relations*, 100; Dumitrescu adds that there was a close connection between tabret players and the households of queens, which possibly indicates that dance music had a specifically feminine association. Significantly, Roberts, Roshard and Evans were referred to as minstrels "of the queen's chamber" in 1519, indicating that their primary music function was to play music in the queen's chamber, *LP* 3.2, 1533.

¹⁰¹ Anthony Rooley, "Dance and Dance Music of the 16th Century," *Early Music* 2, no. 2 (April 1, 1974): 79–81, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3126128>.

¹⁰² JRL Latin MS 289, 13v, 14r.

performances served to remind anyone watching of the queen's hospitality, and, of course, her patronage. Margaret also had musicians for her dancing, specifically a tabret player, Jakes, who was probably accompanied by some of the many other musicians of the court, such as Guillian the tabret player who was paid three times in 1512 to play for the king and queen.¹⁰³

Music and dance could entertain different members of the court in the queen's rooms, as we can see in one of the Scottish court poet William Dunbar's works. "Ane Dance in the Quenis Chamber" was written sometime late in Margaret's reign, probably around 1511. The poem features a series of teasing descriptions of members of the Scottish court dancing in Margaret's rooms, although Margaret is not mentioned as being present.¹⁰⁴ The poem shows how socialization through music and dance might have occurred in the queen's chambers. Dunbar lists a range of courtiers, from Sir John Sinclair, a knight newly returned from France, to the fool John Bute. The poet himself, as well as the queen's almoner and two of her ladies, all join in. The dancing is mixed, two women and four men, though we cannot tell what kind of dance it is. Each dancer is hoping to impress the others, although only Mistress Musgrave, the object of Dunbar's affections, "mycht heff lernit all the laeffe."¹⁰⁵ Margaret may not have been present or, perhaps, she was only watching, but Dunbar's poem reveals how different members of the court would have congregated and socialized in her chamber using dance as a pastime and social tool.

Catherine and Margaret both brought musicians with them to their new kingdoms as part of their wedding parties. In 1502, one of the Spanish trumpeters in Catherine's wedding party, John de Cecil, was hired by Henry VII, immediately after the rest of Catherine's escort had left,

¹⁰³ *LHTA* 4:316, 331, 339, 356; It is important to keep in mind that these musicians would have likely played multiple instruments, and thus several different combinations of groupings could be produced from a limited number of players; Dumitrescu, *International Musical Relations*, 101.

¹⁰⁴ Priscilla J. Bawcutt, *Dunbar the Makar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 51.

¹⁰⁵ "may have learned all the others," Dunbar, *The Poems of William Dunbar*, 1979, K28, line 30.

and stayed at the English court until 1514.¹⁰⁶ The musicians of Catherine's chamber were mostly either French or English, but Henry relied on her Spanish connections as well to bring in Spanish musicians to the wider court. In 1519, her servant Francisco Felipez brought eight Spanish minstrels back to England.¹⁰⁷ When Margaret journeyed to Scotland in August 1503, she brought along an assortment of trumpeters, minstrels and one lutenist. Most of the minstrels seemed to have stayed only a few months, departing in October 1503, but at least two of these musicians stayed on at the court of James IV for some time.¹⁰⁸ Bountas the trumpeter stayed from August 1503 to February 1504, and is recorded as playing in the queen's chamber.¹⁰⁹ James Camner, the lutenist, stayed for even longer, and was especially favored by James IV, who gave him wages, livery, and New Year's gifts. Camner's fees were significantly higher than the other minstrels at court, indicating how highly his skills were valued.¹¹⁰ James and Margaret were unable to hold on to him, however, and Camner left for England in April 1505.

Musicians generally led a peripatetic existence in the pre-modern period, and many of these musicians stayed in England and Scotland for varying lengths of time, possibly influencing local musicians.¹¹¹ Catherine continued to support and patronize musicians from Spain even after her marriage. Aside from specific sources that cite the queen's involvement in an act of musical patronage, it is difficult to determine what foreign musicians enjoyed the queen's patronage.

Musicians were the most internationally diverse group at the court of both James and Henry, and

¹⁰⁶Cecil's name has been Anglicized by English sources. He is mentioned as a Spanish trumpeter for Catherine's brother-in-law, Philip of Burgundy, and later accompanied the English ambassador to the Spanish court in 1511; Dumitrescu, *International Musical Relations*, 67–68, Appendix A.3, 231.

¹⁰⁷*LP* 3.1:202; after Catherine's death, Felipez petitions Cromwell for payment of debts incurred while in the queen's service, including money lost when he was robbed in France while escorting the eight minstrels to England. The minstrels were escorted by Felipez to Windsor, but they are not mentioned thereafter.

¹⁰⁸*LHTA* 2:399.

¹⁰⁹*LHTA* 2:398, 418.

¹¹⁰*LHTA* 2:472.

¹¹¹James D. Ross, *Musick Fyne: Robert Carver and the Art of Music in the Sixteenth Century* (Edinburgh: The Mercat Press, 1993), 34; Ross argues that the motets found in the Scottish Carver Choirbook were brought north by Margaret's musicians in 1503.

so the presence of foreign musicians in the queen's household, for example, does not necessarily mean they were brought in through her foreign contacts.¹¹² Bearing this in mind, however, we must not underestimate the influence Catherine and Margaret could have exerted over royal musical tastes and personnel. The international links and contacts formed by their marriages presented many opportunities for musical patronage, and in the case of Scotland, the marriage itself was an occasion for the expansion of the royal musical establishment.¹¹³

James Camner's time in Scotland marks the beginning of English influence on Scottish court music. James D. Ross credits Margaret, herself a lutenist, for popularizing the instrument at James's court. English settings of some church songs, as well as motets from English composer Robert Fayrfax (1464-1521) made their way north after Margaret's marriage. Indeed it is possible that some of the English settings were used in her wedding ceremony.¹¹⁴ And the exchange worked both ways. A song of welcome for Margaret's marriage, "Now fayre, fayrest off every fayre," once ascribed to William Dunbar, and now in the British Library, was copied and brought back to England by a member of Margaret's escort.¹¹⁵

The "Now fayre" manuscript was only one of a number of manuscripts that were a part of a musical exchange of material culture between Catherine, Margaret, and their homelands. Catherine's familial contacts in the Habsburg Low Countries, which was a European center of musical manuscript production, were undoubtedly important in this regard. In the library of Henry VIII, for instance, several music books originating from the Low Countries can be associated with Catherine of Aragon. Music bearing Catherine's arms or pomegranate symbol

¹¹²For more on the foreign musicians at the courts of Henry VIII and James IV see Dumitrescu, *International Musical Relations*; Ross, *Musick Fyne*.

¹¹³Alexander McGrattan, "Italian Wind Instrumentalists at the Scottish Royal Court during the 16th Century," *Early Music* 29, no. 4 (November 1, 2001): 535–536, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3519115>.

¹¹⁴Ross, *Musick Fyne*, 6–8, 34.

¹¹⁵BL MS Royal App 58 17v-18v; William Dunbar, *The Poems of William Dunbar*, ed. Priscilla J. Bawcutt, vol. 1 (Glasgow: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 1998), 28–29.

was probably associated with her, and a cycle of Lady Mass settings with both Catherine and Henry's arms on it "was almost certainly used in one of the royal chapels, possibly in conjunction with Catherine's private devotions."¹¹⁶ Four music manuscripts from the Burgundian workshop of Pierre Alamire (Peter van den Hove, c. 1470-1636) featured English emblems that potentially link them to Catherine and Henry as patrons.

One of these manuscripts in particular has been associated by scholars with Catherine of Aragon. BL MS Royal 8.G.vii is an unusual collection of texts that feature, among other works, five settings about Dido, the abandoned Carthaginian queen from Virgil's *Aeneid*. The parallels between Catherine's struggles with the divorce in the late 1520s and the story of Dido have led some scholars to argue that the manuscript was a gift meant to show support for Catherine in her struggles. Jennifer Thomas has argued that Marguerite of Austria, governor of the Low Countries and Catherine's former sister-in-law, could have sent the manuscript to England as a way of passing along a message of sympathy to the queen.¹¹⁷ But Theodor Dumitrescu has pointed out that the lack of any clear evidence about the date of the manuscript, combined with the multiplicity of other royal women whose lives might also fit the Dido comparison, makes it impossible to say for certain why the manuscript was given to Henry and Catherine.¹¹⁸ Whether or not the manuscript was meant to be a message for Catherine, we can conclude that her queenship certainly encouraged the exchange of music manuscripts by providing links to, and a close diplomatic relationship with, centers of manuscript production in the Habsburg Low Countries.

¹¹⁶James P. Carley, *The Books of King Henry VIII and His Wives* (London: British Library, 2004), 117.

¹¹⁷Jennifer Thomas, "Patronage and Personal Narrative in a Music Manuscript: Marguerite of Austria, Katherine of Aragon, and London Royal 8 G.vii," in *Musical Voices of Early Modern Women: Many-Headed Melodies*, ed. Thomasin LaMay (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005), 340, 344; Marguerite of Austria married Catherine's brother Juan in 1497, although she was widowed after six months. Marguerite probably met young Catherine in Spain during her brief marriage.

¹¹⁸Dumitrescu, *International Musical Relations*, 125, fn 27.

Conclusion

There are a few other tantalizing glimpses of Margaret at the English court during her visit in 1516. The Chapel of the Vyne in Hampshire displays stained glass windows featuring Catherine, Margaret, and Henry with their name-saints, which certainly commemorate Margaret's visit to England. The Vyne is a magnificent Tudor country house built by Lord William Sandys, one of Henry's courtiers, in the 1510s and 1520s, and the chapel was probably completed between 1518 and 1527.¹¹⁹ The stained glass at the Vyne was not originally intended for the chapel, and Hilary Wayment has made a convincing argument that the stained glass originally belonged to the Chapel of the Holy Ghost in Basingstoke. He argues that Henry, Catherine, and Margaret probably visited Basingstoke while on a summer progress, and they might have offered to sponsor three donors' panels in the chapel.¹²⁰ The stained glass at the Vyne indicates that Margaret participated in the politically and socially important royal progresses, and that her status as queen of Scots added memorable and important luster to the royal progress that year.

Margaret's visit to the English court ended in May 1517, when she returned to Scotland after lengthy negotiations with the regency government there. She was evidently sad to leave her brother's court, as one member of her escort reported back to Cardinal Wolsey: "Her grace considereth now the honor of England, and the poverty and wretchedness of Scotland, which she did not affore, but in her opinion esteemed Scotland equal with England."¹²¹ She may have exchanged parting gifts at the English court. A Book of Hours, originally a gift to Margaret from her father Henry VII, was given by Margaret to someone she considered a sister, which could be

¹¹⁹Maurice Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics 1490-1550* (London: George Philip & Son, 1987), 115.

¹²⁰Hilary Wayment, "The Stained Glass in the Chapel of The Vyne," in *National Trust Studies*, 1980, 38–41.

¹²¹LP 2.2:3365.

either Catherine or Mary Tudor. Considering the role Catherine played in hosting Margaret and the time they spent together while Margaret was in England, it is entirely possible that Catherine was the recipient.¹²² Like the palfrey given to Margaret upon her entry, the gift of a Book of Hours to Catherine (or Mary) would have been a material reminder of their relationship and Margaret's visit. It would have acknowledged Margaret's own role as guest and Catherine's as hostess.

When Catherine and Margaret met in 1516, they had experience as queens consort who understood the duties of hospitality and sociability that were important elements in their performance of queenship. Although Margaret was no longer queen consort, her welcome at the Tudor court by her sister-in-law ensured her participation as an honored guest in similar activities—tournaments, banquets, informal music and dancing—that she presided over as hostess during her reign as queen consort in Scotland. Catherine and Margaret were often audiences for the grand spectacles and entertainments at court. When they were young princesses, music-making and dancing were opportunities for both women to socialize and display their talents and accomplishments to their new husbands. After their marriages, they did not often participate in the dancing or pageantry that made up some of the most vibrant moments at court, and yet they were always a necessary audience and spectator, reaffirming their place at court and their relationship with the king.

Hospitality and sociability at court were important queenly duties that could not be carried out without the support of the queen's household, especially the queen's ladies. Even

¹²²Janet Backhouse, "Illuminated Manuscripts, Associated with Henry VII and Members of His Immediate Family," in *The Reign of Henry VII: Proceedings of the 1993 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Benjamin Thompson (Stamford, UK: Paul Watkins, 1995), 184; Erin Sadlack believes this book was a gift to Mary Tudor, but both Mary, Catherine, and Margaret all addressed each other as sisters in their letters, so I believe the language is not definitive, *French Queen's Letters*, 156; for letters where Margaret refers to Catherine as her sister, see Mary Anne Everett Green, *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*, vol. 1 (London: H. Colburn, 1846), 231; TNA MS SP 1/32 fol. 179.

when the queen was not present at courtly ceremonies, such as when she was confined for her lying-in, her presence was felt through the performances of her ladies. In tournaments and disguisings, grand ceremonies and mundane duties, the queen's ladies were crucial to the extension and support of the queen's own image as a welcoming hostess and social leader of the court.

The successful performance of queenly duties and queenly roles at court was necessary for queens like Catherine and Margaret to create and maintain social and political relationships with their husbands and their courts as a whole. At court, their chambers were centers of sociability because as queens they were the king's public partner, hostess, and audience. In providing a convivial atmosphere through music and dance, Catherine and Margaret performed their expected role as hostess and in return, insured that they and their ladies maintained connections and influence with courtiers, ambassadors, and the king. Outside of their chambers, Catherine and Margaret participated in the spectacle of court entertainments in their roles as appreciative audience, chivalric ladies, and munificent hostesses. These were, of course, the expected social and gender roles of a queen consort, but we must also recognize that successfully fulfilling these duties—as audience or hostess—built and displayed the queen's relationship to the centers of power in the kingdom—the king and his household. In the next chapter, I will show how Catherine and Margaret used this relationship to reward the men and women of their households, thus fulfilling their duties as head of household and patron.

CHAPTER 5

Patronage through Partnership: Service, Largesse, and Rewards in the Queen's Household and Beyond

Sir as for newys I have none to send, but that my lorde of Surrey ys yn great favor with the Kyng her that he cannott forber the companey off hym no tyme off the day. He and the bichopp off Murrey orderth every thyng as nyght [near] as they can to the Kyngs pleasure. I pray God it may be for my por [poor] hartts ease in tyme to come. They calnot my Chamberlayne to them, whych I am sur wull speke better for my part than any off them that ben off that consell. And iff he speke any thyng for my cause my lord of Surrey hath such wordds unto hym that he dar speke no furdur.¹

A few days after her marriage to James IV of Scotland, Margaret Tudor, the thirteen-year-old Queen of Scots, dictated these words in a letter to her father. At first glance, this letter seems to be an example of the homesickness the young girl experienced in marrying a strange king sixteen years her senior. Scholars have noted the unhappiness of the young queen and commented on the difficulties faced by royal brides in the sixteenth century.² While Margaret was certainly unhappy, her unhappiness was not caused by a mere case of homesickness. Instead, it was the behavior of the English envoy, Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey, which was causing her distress. Surrey had become so friendly with the king of Scots that the king “cannott forber the companey off hym no tyme off the day.” This situation was distressing to Margaret because Surrey’s relationship with the king usurped the proper role of her chamberlain as the head of the queen’s household. Sir Ralph Verney was Margaret’s chamberlain and the head of her household in Scotland from 1503 until 1507. During the delicate first days of her marriage, Margaret’s first attempts at creating a relationship between the king and her household were hampered by Surrey’s special relationship with the king. Margaret claimed in the letter to her father that

¹Ellis, *Original Letters*, 1:42.

²Buchanan, *Margaret Tudor Queen of Scots*, 34–35; Barrow, “Marriage, Gift Exchange, and Politics,” 79–80; Pamela Tudor-Craig, “Margaret, Queen of Scotland, in Grantham, 8–9 July 1503,” in *The Reign of Henry VII: Proceedings of the 1993 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Benjamin Thompson (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995), 278; for a more nuanced consideration of Margaret’s letter, see Perry, *Sisters to the King*, 29–30.

Surrey would not allow Verney to speak for her, even though, as chamberlain, Verney was responsible for overseeing the queen's household and representing her interests to the wider court. Margaret's access to the king was thus restricted, and her ability to compensate those who accompanied her to England was limited. She was forced to ask her father to reward her footman Thomas because "I am not able to recompence hym, except the favor off your Grace."³

Even at such a young age, Margaret was well aware of the relationships and responsibilities that were part of her new role as queen and head of household. Her most important relationship as queen was, naturally, the one with her husband, and this too Surrey was putting in jeopardy by monopolizing the king's attention and preventing Margaret's chamberlain from establishing himself as her representative. This must have been an especially frustrating situation for Margaret and her household, as Surrey was due to leave within days and would be little help to them in Scotland in the years to come.⁴ Margaret knew that her success as a patron and a queen depended on her relationship with the king, and thus Verney as her chamberlain had to be able to help her at court.

The relationship between the king and queen formed a partnership that was at the heart of the early modern monarchy. For the queen, her relationship with the king granted her access and influence at the royal court, which yielded political power and patronage. The importance of a close relationship with the king can be seen in other studies of royal women: for instance, Marguerite de Navarre, sister of Francis I of France, was able to act as a patronage broker in much the same way that queens consort were, because she had a particularly close relationship with her brother.⁵ Paradoxically, the king and queen's partnership is so unremarkable—that is,

³Ellis, *Original Letters*, 1:42.

⁴ The ultimate irony of this episode is that the same earl of Surrey with whom James became such great friends with would command the English army that defeated the Scots and killed James IV at the battle of Flodden in 1513.

⁵Barbara Stephenson, *The Power and Patronage of Marguerite de Navarre* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004).

after all, what makes and defines a queen consort—that scholars have failed to examine in any detail its importance to the queen’s distribution of patronage.

By focusing on the interdependence and the connections between the king and queen’s household, this chapter reassesses how patronage at the early modern court was practiced and performed by queens. Just as aristocratic women worked with their husbands and families to maintain their position by seeking favor at court, Catherine and Margaret worked with their husbands to reward their households and expand their access to rewards and gifts.⁶ Throughout Europe royal consorts could expand their patronage opportunities by petitioning the king for rewards or favors for their servants and others outside their household who came to them for mediation.⁷ Catherine and Margaret were able to capitalize on their proximity and access to their husbands’ patronage in order to reward their own followers at court.

In chapter 4 I argued that we must understand that the queen’s role as audience and hostess at court continually reaffirmed her close relationship with the king and gave her social capital. This relationship in turn could be used by the queen to influence the distribution of rewards to her household and to arrange noble marriages for her ladies. The ideals of good government and princely virtue encouraged princes to be liberal in their generosity and to spend lavishly, both at court and through the distribution of lands, titles, offices and privileges, and princesses were encouraged to do the same.⁸ Catherine’s and Margaret’s patronage benefited their queenship by forming bonds of obligation through acts of patronage and enhancing their

⁶Harris, “View from My Lady’s Chamber”; Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 61–75.

⁷ Some scholars have argued that the early sixteenth century saw a redefinition of the queen’s role towards being as a patronage broker as opposed to an independent patron. Nicole Hochner argues that Anne of Brittany established French queens as negotiators of royal authority and intercessors during the reign of Louis XII, “Revisiting Anne de Bretagne’s Queenship: On Love and Bridles,” 150–152; Bercusson, “Duchess’ Court,” 132–133.

⁸Peck, “Perspectives on Court Patronage,” 36; Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 127.

own reputation and renown as virtuous queens, for as Christine de Pizan wrote in 1405, “munificence is one of things that most magnifies the reputation of great lords and ladies.”⁹

The households of Catherine and Margaret were dependent on their husbands’ households, and this dependence benefited these queens through their ability to capitalize on the politics of access at the royal court. The relationship between the king and queen’s household is best understood through a discussion of the structure and functioning of the queen’s household at court, which I will cover in the first part of this chapter. In the second section of this chapter I discuss how Catherine and Margaret worked with their husbands to reward members of their households. I show that fostering connections between the king and queen’s household through the marriage of her ladies with the native nobility was part of the queen’s practice of patronage, and that the marriages themselves acted as public performances of the queen’s own relationship and influence with the king. Finally, in the third section of this chapter I will discuss Catherine’s and Margaret’s education and their patronage of scholars and learning. I argue that Catherine’s and Margaret’s public patronage of scholars, disseminated through printed and manuscript references to their patronage, was not only another opportunity for them to fulfill ideal roles as virtuous rulers, but also, especially in the case of Catherine, part of their public performance of royal motherhood.

Formation and Organization of Catherine’s and Margaret’s Households

Catherine and Margaret were at the head of households that numbered in the hundreds. An array of servants, attendants and companions served the queens on a daily basis, providing a variety of services from the mundane to the ceremonial. In doing so, members of the queen’s household were part of the larger royal court, which included members of the king’s household, officials from governing institutions, as well as noblemen, churchmen, artisans and musicians

⁹Pizan, *Treasure*, 54.

and a host of others. For most of the reigns of both Catherine and Margaret, their household was the only other royal household in the kingdom, aside from the king's. The royal family was always at the heart of the English and Scottish courts, but for both the Tudor and the Stuart dynasties for much of the sixteenth century, there were very few royal offspring or siblings with independent households. Thus, the queen's household in the early sixteenth century was very much at the center of the royal court.

Both Catherine's and Margaret's households were tied to the king's household in a number of ways, from physical space to the sharing and creation of connections between their staffs. The proximity of the queen's household to the king's household and royal court was one of her greatest strengths and assets. Fiona Downie, discussing the fifteenth-century queens of Scotland Joan Beaufort and Mary of Guelders, wives of James I and James II respectively, argues that "the extent of the connections between the queen and the king's servants and between the king and her servants is indicative of the status of queen consort as inferior partner to her husband rather than as a separate and autonomous political and economic actor."¹⁰ While Downie focuses on the unequal status of the king and queen's households, other historians have looked past these differences to assess how the queen benefited from her position at court.¹¹ This section will consider the structure and formation of Catherine's and Margaret's households as entities that existed to serve the queen but that were closely connected to the households of her husband in a variety of ways that could benefit both the queen and her servants in pursuit of access and favor.¹²

¹⁰Downie, *She Is but a Woman*, 119.

¹¹Nelson, "Medieval Queenship," 202; St. John, *Three Medieval Queens*, chap. 4; Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 222, 230.

¹²In addition to the authors discussed above, the following authors have focused on the roles queens and their households played at the royal court of England and Scotland; Hibbard, "Role of the Queen Consort"; Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile*; Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*; Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*.

Before discussing Catherine's and Margaret's households, it is important to remember that their households were not created for them alone, appearing fully-formed when they became queens. Instead, both women inherited servants and attendants from their royal female relatives, and their households were built gradually during the early years of their reigns. Both women brought servants from their homeland to their new countries, but they also incorporated native servants, who often had experience serving the royal family in other royal households. Much of Margaret's English household in 1503 was composed of former servants of her mother, Elizabeth of York, who had died six months earlier from complications in childbirth. Catherine became queen in 1509, and her household expanded from its modest, mostly Spanish cohort of around twenty servants and attendants to encompass at least a hundred persons, if not more. The majority of the English servants who waited on their new queen came from the household of her predecessor, Elizabeth of York. As we have seen, some of these men briefly served Margaret in Scotland before entering into Catherine's service in England. The death of Henry VIII's grandmother, Margaret Beaufort, soon after Catherine's marriage caused some of her servants to move to Catherine's household.¹³ Catherine's early queenly household was therefore a blend of her original, largely Spanish, household, with those of both Elizabeth of York and Margaret Beaufort.

Margaret Tudor's household also evolved over time. From the beginning, her English household had not been large enough to fully staff her new establishment, and Scottish men and a few women made up the numbers, principally as ushers of Margaret's chamber and the staff of her stables.¹⁴ When her English household began to depart in significant numbers towards the

¹³Margaret Beaufort left bequests to her grandchildren Henry VIII, Margaret Tudor and Mary Tudor, as well as Catherine of Aragon. The colleges of Christ's and St. John's, Cambridge, were both endowed in her will as well; Jones and Underwood, *King's Mother*, 240–241.

¹⁴*LHTAA* 3:108-109.

end of 1507 and in 1508, Scots were brought in to take their place. In February of 1508, which was the last time Margaret's English household members were paid separate fees, only nine of the original twenty-five Englishmen and women were still being paid by James IV.¹⁵ By August 1508, many of Margaret's new officials had moved over from the king's household, and their addition to the queen's household would have given her household further connections with the king's. James Dog, for instance, Margaret's new master of the Wardrobe, had served in the king's Wardrobe for years before coming to the queen's household.¹⁶

There were different financial and administrative structures that supported each queen's household in England and Scotland. On a fiscal and administrative level, Catherine appears to have had many more opportunities for creating a household that was more distinct as a group and less dependent on her husband's household than Margaret. However, when discussing the differences between Catherine and Margaret, as well as their husbands' households, it is important to remember the problem of the sources themselves. Not only are there fewer sources that have survived for the queenly households of Catherine and Margaret compared to their husbands, but also there are generally fewer sources that have survived in Scotland compared to England.¹⁷ The picture that emerges of their households is thus partly determined by the availability of the sources themselves, and we must be sensitive to the disappearance of their households from the historical record.

As discussed in chapter 1, English queens consort were considered to be *femme sole*, which made them legally independent of the king, and they could administer their lands and sue in court in their own name. In the act granting Catherine's dower, she was also given the legal

¹⁵ *LHTA* 4:67; at least one of Margaret's English servants, Mistress Elizabeth Barlow, had married a Scottish nobleman, Lord Alexander Elphinstone, and thus was no longer listed for the fees. For Elizabeth Barlow see discussion below.

¹⁶ *LHTA* 1:146; *LHTA* 2:109.

¹⁷ See Introduction for a discussion of English and Scottish sources.

status to dispose of the revenues from her estates to cover the costs of her household.¹⁸ Catherine thus had the independent means, in the form of both revenue and legal status, to administer and oversee her household as if she were a widow. She had the resources to create and maintain a household that was a distinct entity at court, one that was centered on her own duties and rights as queen.

Scottish queens did not have such status or resources. Margaret only appears to have had a separately funded and administered household for eight or nine months in 1508, when her accounts were kept by her knight comptroller, Sir Duncan Forester. During the rest of her queenship, Margaret's household expenses were paid by James's officials, and the fees and liveries for her servants were covered by the king's household.¹⁹ Although Margaret's household was paid by the king's officials, it was still treated as a separate entity within the Exchequer documents. The fees for her household were paid and listed separately from the fees of the king's household, as were the liveries for her household in the Treasurer's accounts.²⁰ Significantly, after 1508, Forester became the comptroller of James IV's household as well, essentially combining the offices for both the king and queen's households.²¹ Despite this lack of fiscal independence, Margaret had opportunities to maintain and reward her household through her own personal patronage and her relationship with the king, as we will see below.

Although there are significantly more sources to have survived from the reign of Henry VIII than from that of James IV, Catherine of Aragon's household account books are not among

¹⁸Fisher, "Queene's Courte," 316.

¹⁹Murray, "Crown Revenue of Scotland," 219–220.

²⁰NAS MS E34/2, 6r–7r; *LHTA* 2:336; 3:118–120; NAS MS E21/ 7, 89r; *LHTA* 3:324–325; 4:67.

²¹John Stuart, George Burnett, and George Powell McNeill, eds, *The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (Edinburgh: General Register House, 1878) 13:lxix, 258–259, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>.

them.²² Members of the queen's household were included, however, in many of Henry's accounts, including the Treasurer of the Chamber's account in 1528, where Catherine's yeoman were paid from the king's account.²³ In these instances, only a handful of members of Catherine's household appear in Henry's accounts, in small groups or on an individual basis, such as when Dr. Fernando, the queen's physician, was paid £33 6s 8d for half a year's wages in 1520.²⁴ Although the fees accounted for do not encompass the whole of the queen's household, they show the connections between members of the queen's household and the king's household, and the opportunities for reward that could result from this interaction.

The omission of most of Catherine's household from the king's accounts suggests that for most of her household, fees were distributed by the queen's officials separately. Catherine's receiver-general, Griffith Richards, made a note of these payments as part of the queen's household expenses within his receiver's accounts, which exist in fragments from 1525 to 1530. For these years, Richards's accounts show that between £789 and £904 per year was spent on "fees and wages of knights, ladies, maids, and lawyers" for the queen.²⁵ Richards also records multiple other household expenses, all of which indicate that for the most part, Catherine's officials administered the payments for her household expenses, separately from the expenses of the king's household.²⁶

²² For Catherine's household specifically, there are only four personal account books relating to her Wardrobe, kept by members of her Wardrobe staff. Some account books for queens' households do survive; for the accounts of Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth Woodville, see A. R. Myers, *Crown, Household and Parliament in Fifteenth Century England* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1985), 135–210, 251–318.

²³ *LP* 5:685.

²⁴ *LP* 3.1:1114.

²⁵ *LP* 4.3:6121, see Appendix.

²⁶ Even the division of personnel, however, was not clear cut. As knight of the body to Henry VIII by at least 1515, Griffith Richards also served the king and was responsible for receiving large sums of cash from the treasurer of the king's chamber, Sir John Heron for "sundry purposes" in the early years of the reign, while he was also Catherine's clerk of the signet, TNA MS E101/417/2, Pt. 2 and Pt 3.

For certain categories of household expenses, both Margaret and Catherine, like other consorts, relied on their husbands. Catherine's and Margaret's household meals, called diets, bouge of court, or liveries in the accounts, were paid for by the king and probably provided by the king's kitchen.²⁷ This was a huge expense that both queens did not have to bear as long as their household was staying in the same palace as the king's. When the two households were separated, Catherine covered the expenses of her household's meals. Margaret appears to have been reimbursed for her household's meal expenses when she was apart from her husband, at a rate of around £6 or £7 Scots per day, which was given to her steward, Patrick Ballentyne.²⁸ Margaret's household was also reimbursed for the queen's stable expenses, but Catherine appears to have paid for at least some of her stable expenses.²⁹

The organizational and hierarchical structure of the queen's household mirrored the structure of the king's household, with some important differences. These parallel structures followed the model developed and refined across Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.³⁰ Catherine's and Margaret's households included roughly three "clusters" of departments: the Stables, which included officers for the hunt as well as the necessary transport for an itinerant court, the *domus providencie*, which included the domestic offices such as the kitchen, pantry, cellar, and the *domus magnificencie*, which included the queen's Chamber and

²⁷ A. Gibson and Thomas Christopher Smout, "Food and Hierarchy in Scotland 1550-1650," in *Perspectives in Scottish Social History: Essays in Honour of Rosalind Mitchison*, ed. Leah Leneman (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988), 33; Catherine and Margaret both had privy kitchens that cooked food exclusive for their tables, but their households appear to have eaten food prepared in the same kitchen as the king's households, see John G. Dunbar, *Scottish Royal Palaces: The Architecture of the Royal Residences During the Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Periods* (East Linton, UK: Tuckwell, 1999), 110; *Eltham Ordinances*, 142; Loades, *The Tudor Court*, 62–65.

²⁸ NAS MS E32/1, 2r, 3r, 5v, 13r.

²⁹ *LHTA* 3:148, 209; *LP* 4.3:6121.

³⁰ See for example Paul-Joachim Heinig, "How Large Was the Court of Emperor Frederick III?," in *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c.1450-1650*, ed. Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 140–141; Kolk, "Household."

her Hall.³¹ On the surface, these households look very similar to each other and to those of the king. When we delve deeper into their organizational structure, size, and personnel, however, it becomes clear that there were differences that reflected the queen's household's reliance on and subordination to the king's household.³²

The queen's apartments in the sixteenth century mirrored the organization of the king's apartments, which were divided into a series of rooms of increasingly restricted access and thus provided layers of security and privacy. Typically, the queen's apartments in Scotland were comprised of three tiers of rooms: the Hall, Great Chamber, and Chamber. In England, Catherine's lodgings were composed of three chambers as well, her Great Chamber, her Presence Chamber, and her Privy Chamber, which was actually a suite of rooms, similar to Margaret's second Chamber. Although the terminology is different, my discussion of Catherine's Privy Chamber likely applies to Margaret's Chamber as well. The queen's household officials were responsible for monitoring the doors of her chambers, although the organization of Margaret's staff did not reflect the three room system; instead, their positions, which divided into ushers of the outer and inner chambers, indicate that there was probably originally only a division of two rooms in the royal apartments.³³

The queen's Chamber suite was headed by a chamberlain or Lord Chamberlain. Margaret's chamberlain in 1503 was Sir Ralph Verney, and after his departure, her knight carver,

³¹Morgan, "The House of Policy," 32–33; A. R. Myers, *The Household of Edward IV: The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 14–15.

³²In Scotland it is hard to establish the structure of the king and queen's household because no ordinances concerning the royal household had been drawn up by any of James IV's predecessors. One document, which outlines the basic structure of the king's household, was created in January 1508 by James IV in an effort to reform his household and limit the numbers of "rascals and boys" that loitered around the court. This slim volume lists the departments of the king's household, their members, and how many servants each household member was permitted to bring with them to court. The manuscript does not include the queen's household. It was during this same period that Margaret's household was accounted for separately by her comptroller, Sir Duncan Forester, which is likely why her household is not included in James's new ordinance, NAS MS E34/1. See also Thomas, *Princelie Majestie*, 18–19.

³³Dunbar, *Scottish Royal Palaces*, 151.

Sir Michael Balfour of Burley fulfilled the role.³⁴ Catherine's Lord Chamberlain was firstly the Earl of Ormond (previously Lord Chamberlain to Elizabeth of York), who was succeeded by his stepson, William Blount, Lord Mountjoy.³⁵ The queen's rooms were staffed by gentlemen, yeomen, and groom ushers, whose duties included limiting and granting access to her various chambers. The ushers also assisted the queen's servitors, such as her carver, cup-bearer, and sewer, during formal banquets and meals in the outer chamber, and in turn were assisted by pages of the chamber.³⁶ The queen's private rooms, referred to in Scotland as the 'inner chamber,' and in England as the Privy Chamber, were the most private and hence most closely guarded area of her household.

The organizational structure of the queen's household generally followed the same plan as the king's household, until the door of the Privy Chamber. From that point on, it is difficult to know exactly which members of the queen's household had access to her Privy Chamber. For reasons of modesty and privacy, it would have been nearly all women, from among the queen's chamberers, gentlewomen, and ladies-in-waiting.³⁷ Of course, the king and certain specified members of the queen's household were granted access to the queen's Privy Chamber. In 1509 Catherine had two gentlemen ushers whose rank indicates that they may have been permitted access to the Privy Chamber.³⁸ According to a later addition to the 1526 Eltham Ordinances, the queen's household included a gentleman usher of the Privy Chamber, whose title suggests that he had access to the queen's Privy Chamber.³⁹

³⁴ *LHTA* 2:197; NAS MS E34/2, 6r.

³⁵ *LP* 1.1:82, 1.2:3049.

³⁶ *Eltham Ordinances*, 170-173.

³⁷ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 214-215.

³⁸ *LP* 1.1:82.

³⁹ *Eltham Ordinances*, 167.

Access to the queen's Privy Chamber was closely guarded by the male ushers of the queen's household, who were often trusted and familiar servants of the king as well as the queen. Margaret's usher of the inner chamber, William Sinclair, was the second-highest paid member of her household in 1510. William Sinclair had served James IV since 1497, and he was a close companion to the king, entering into wagers with him and receiving grants of lands from the king throughout the reign.⁴⁰ Another usher, Lucas Taillefeir, was responsible for keeping the queen's outer chamber, although he was not paid any more than his fellow gentleman ushers.⁴¹ In all, their duties were important for maintaining the queen's privacy and honor at court. Sinclair's position as usher of the queen's inner chamber gave him more access to the queen than her other ushers, and his previous experience and close relationship to the king was likely why he was chosen for the job once the queen's English ushers had left.

Although Margaret and Catherine relied on their husbands' households fiscally and administratively, their households were distinct entities. We know that Catherine's servants swore an oath to her as queen when they entered her service, because this oath became a point of contention when Henry tried to force them to swear to call her "princess dowager" after he had his marriage declared invalid. They refused to swear the new oath, on the grounds that "[t]hey were sworn to her as Queen, and they think the second oath would be perjury."⁴² Although not all of Catherine's servants remained loyal to her during this time, the political pressure of the divorce crisis revealed that the queen's household had a set of loyalties and cohesion of its own.

The queen's household could and would frequently function without the presence of her husband or his household. Royal courts in the early sixteenth century were constantly traveling

⁴⁰ For the wager, see *LHTA* 2:140; Sinclair was probably a younger son of one of the two branches of the Sinclair families descended from the earls of Caithness, see Balfour, *The Scots Peerage*, 2:337–338.

⁴¹ NAS MS E34/2, 6v.

⁴² *LP* 6:1541.

from one palace to another, and the Scottish and English courts followed this practice as well. The Scottish court under James IV had a particularly active and wide-ranging travel schedule, and the king was known for his constant travels. Margaret did not accompany her husband at all times, however. Frequently the queen and her household would stay in one royal palace for several weeks or months at a time while James would conduct business elsewhere. The king and queen would communicate via messenger, sending rings and letters to each other.⁴³ During these periods, Margaret's household would continue to function without the king's household. When separated from the king's household, the queen's steward, Patrick Ballentyne, would buy provisions for her household and then be reimbursed from the king's accounts.⁴⁴ Margaret and her household also traveled around Scotland without the king. In 1511, Margaret made an official royal entry into Aberdeen on her own, while the king traveled to the northern Highlands.⁴⁵

Catherine's household could also function without her husband's household in residence. The most famous example of this was during Henry VIII's 1513 war with France, when Catherine remained in England as Queen Regent and her household busily organized supplies and homeland defense. The queen was so busy, in fact, that she was unable to spare the time or manpower to properly host the captured duc de Longueville and instead had to deposit him in the Tower for safe-keeping.⁴⁶

This overview of Catherine's and Margaret's households has shown that their households were distinct entities that were structurally and fiscally connected to the kings' households. Both queens were served by a group of men and women who had connections to previous households

⁴³ *LHTA* 2:214, 464; 3:144.

⁴⁴ NAS MS E32/1, 30v, 38r-38v.

⁴⁵ *LHTA* 4:xxiv.

⁴⁶ Green, *Letters*, 1:163.

of royal women, and their households were not completely independent from the king's household and the rest of the royal court. Working within the existing historical understanding of the royal court as the center of the politics of access and patronage, we must assess queens like Catherine and Margaret not on the basis of how many men and women they could call their own, but in relation to how they successfully pursued patronage through their relationship with their husbands. Their patronage was made possible by the connections and access provided by the close relationship between the king and queen's households at the royal court, which placed the queen at the heart of the political center of the kingdom. As we shall see, queens benefited from the informal interchange between the king and queen's households, which often resulted in sharing or moving household servants between the establishments, thus providing constant access and opportunities for patronage between the king's and queen's households.

Patronage through Partnership

Although served by distinct households that were acknowledged as separate from the kings' households, Catherine and Margaret were hardly isolated from the households of their husbands, or the milieu of the royal court. The queens worked with their husbands to obtain patronage and rewards for their own households and to reward and support members of the king's households as well. As true Christian princes, kings were expected to be generous to their followers and to display their generosity conspicuously.⁴⁷ Queens were also expected to be generous and to distribute rewards to their households and clients. In pre-modern Europe, queens had access to patronage available from their own not insubstantial resources and through their relationship with the king. For instance, in early modern France, Anne of Brittany, independent ruler of Brittany and queen to Charles VIII and Louis XII, is an extreme example of the dual

⁴⁷Peck, "Perspectives on Court Patronage," 36.

opportunities available to queens as patrons, as her patronage could be accomplished through her independent resources as Duchess of Brittany or her royal access as queen of France.⁴⁸

Other types of queenly patronage could be pursued by working with the king. Henrietta Maria, consort of Charles I of England, collaborated with her husband over the artistic patronage for which he is famous.⁴⁹ In ducal Italy, where a duchess may not have had access to independent resources, her relationship with her husband was even more critical for exercising patronage. Sarah Bercusson uses the term “intercessory” to describe the activities Italian consorts engaged in to access patronage and create relationships of obligation with their courtiers.⁵⁰ This word indicates the role elite women played as brokers, go-betweens, and mediators of patronage. However, queenly intercession also denotes extraordinary requests for mercy from royal justice. To avoid confusion with this more ceremonial form of queenly intercession, I will not use intercession in relation to patronage in this chapter, although as we will see, Catherine and Margaret often acted as intermediaries to obtain patronage for their servants.⁵¹ In both England and Scotland, the royal couple worked together to recognize members of the queen’s household deserving of reward for services specifically to the queen. In turn, the queen sought to reward members of the king’s household, and the interdependent nature of their relationship resulted in the creation of connections through patronage in both directions.

⁴⁸Hochner, “Revisiting Anne de Bretagne’s Queenship: On Love and Bridles,” 150, 153.

⁴⁹Caroline Hibbard, “Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: Perspectives on the Role of Consort Queens in *Ancien Regime* Courts,” in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 99.

⁵⁰Bercusson, “Duchess’ Court,” 132–133.

⁵¹Historians of medieval England have extensively discussed this type of queenly intercession, Huneycutt, “Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos”; Parsons, “The Queen’s Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England”; Parsons, “The Pregnant Queen as Councilor”; Collette, *Performing Polity*, chap. 5; Strohm, *Hochon’s Arrow*, chap. 5; more recent work on English medieval queens has looked at queenly intercession as a range of requests, formal and informal, that the queen might make of her king, St. John, *Three Medieval Queens*, chap. 3.

Catherine's and Margaret's patronage was a duty expected of them as Christian queens and members of the elite. In addition to rewarding and honoring loyal servants, patronage by the king of the queen's servants reflected honor and respect for the queen herself and demonstrated her effectiveness as a patron. Early modern sources show that court observers were keenly interested in whom the queen favored and to whom she distributed rewards. For instance, Anne Boleyn's gift of a gold chain to Lord Leonard Grey before he left for Ireland was reported in a letter to Lady Lisle, who was away from court with her husband in Calais.⁵² Lady Lisle also heard from her court informant that Jane Seymour, the new queen, often spoke favorably of Lady Lisle after the two met at Dover.⁵³ Although we do not have similar reports on Catherine's activities, it is highly likely that the rewards her servants received would have been noted by others at court, especially those eager for reward themselves. Patronage was a practice that reinforced both bonds of obligation between the client and patron (in this case, the queen) and a performative act that established her own reputation for fulfilling her duties, which would encourage others to seek her out for patronage by establishing the queen's *fama* as a successful patron.

The king and queen worked together to reward servants from her household. Catherine's and Margaret's patronage was bolstered by the informal nature of patronage during the early modern period, which allowed them to use personal relationships and influence to gain rewards for their servants. However, this informality has made it difficult to ascertain the true extent of their involvement in the distribution of rewards, as their influence tends not to be documented.⁵⁴

⁵²Byrne, *The Lisle Letters*, 2:468.

⁵³*Ibid.*, 3:753.

⁵⁴Early modern women played an important, if complicated, role in the patronage networks of the elite of Europe. In the past, it has been difficult to understand how elite women acted as patrons for their families because patron-client relationships were informal and fluid, with the result that written sources, such as grants of land or offices, only scratch the surface of the relationship. The informal nature of patron-client relationships gave women significant opportunities to participate in the indirect exercise of influence, but its informality has also led to fewer records

The distribution of favor, positions, or assets was one of a whole range of informal exchanges which have not survived in existing documents. The extent of queenly patronage is often disguised by the survival of grants, charters, or royal warrants that only reveal the actions of the king and not the informal influence of the queen.⁵⁵ In most instances, the only evidence of a reward to a servant of Catherine's or Margaret's is a formal document signed by the king. However, the wide variety of patronage distributed to their households without specific reference to their intervention, which ranged from small items such as clothing to bailiffships, keeperships, lands, and privileges, indicate that Catherine and Margaret must have been successful in obtaining patronage for their households beyond what was within their own gift.

It is helpful to consider the king and queen in a partnership very similar to the aristocratic marriage partnerships that Barbara Harris discusses in her work. For aristocrats it was the family that was the key political unit through which noble families competed for resources, and wives as well as husbands used their kinship networks in pursuit of their goals.⁵⁶ Operating on a much larger scale, the king used his wife's household to foster patronage in order to distribute rewards and create important connections with the political elite, particularly through the marriages of her ladies to noblemen. The queen was not a passive partner in this process. Instead, she was actively involved in maintaining relationships and alliances in furtherance of not only her household, but also for the greater political security and benefit of her husband and the dynasty of which her children were a part.

available for historians to trace these relationships. Sharon Kettering, "The Patronage Power of Early Modern French Noblewomen," *The Historical Journal* 32, no. 4 (1989): 818, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2639686>.

⁵⁵During the later reign of Henry VIII, grants were prepared by a series of officials that similarly obscured the true identity of the patron; Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990), 40.

⁵⁶Harris, "View from My Lady's Chamber," 221–222.

This is not to say that there were no conflicts between the king and queen. As in any relationship, there were moments of tension and disagreement, when the king would assert his superior position over the queen and her household. The king could, and would, interfere with the queen's household to suit his own ends. For instance, if the king felt that the queen's household was meddling in his own affairs, he could dismiss some of its members. In early 1510, Henry VIII dismissed one of Catherine of Aragon's ladies, Elizabeth Stafford, sister of the Duke of Buckingham, after she interfered with an affair between Sir William Compton and her married sister, Lady Anne Hastings. The affair between Compton and Anne Hastings was believed to be a smokescreen for Henry's own pursuit of Lady Hastings, and when Elizabeth Stafford informed Catherine and the Duke of Buckingham of these goings-on, scandal erupted and the king was furious. The king, according to the Spanish ambassador, would have dismissed even more of Catherine's ladies, but he feared it would have caused an even greater scandal.⁵⁷

Catherine's relationship with Henry during the first two decades of their marriage should not be overshadowed by marital crisis precipitated by Henry's affair with Anne Boleyn. During the divorce crisis, Henry and Cardinal Wolsey would use their ability to control the composition of Catherine's household to isolate the queen from her supporters. However, this behavior was a highly anomalous and does not accurately reflect the more than two decades of relative marital peace that Henry and Catherine had experienced together. Likewise, there is very little evidence for any kind of serious disagreement between James IV and his young queen Margaret Tudor from their marriage in 1503 until the war with England in 1513.

The conflicts between the king and queen discussed above are known about because they became matters of public scandal and ambassadorial gossip. The true natures of Catherine's and Margaret's marital relationships are nearly impossible to determine. The level of formality of life

⁵⁷ *LP* 1.1:474.

at court, combined with sparse primary source material, makes it unlikely that we will ever understand their emotional lives. What we can glean from sources, and what I believe is evident from the following discussion and the previous chapters, is that both Catherine and Margaret got along well with their spouses and that they had relatively successful royal marriages. However, we must be careful not to assume that their relationships were modern, companionate marriages; rather, Barbara Harris's partnership model, discussed above, is probably the best way for us to understand royal marriages.

The rare survival of multiple royal warrants for one reward reveals how Catherine and Henry worked together to reward her servants. On February 4, 1511, Catherine issued a warrant (essentially a written order) to Sir John Cutt, under-treasurer of England. In the warrant, she states that the king has granted a reward of £40 to servants of her Wardrobe of the Beds: Henry Roper, yeoman, George Bridges, groom, Mathew Johns, page. Cutt had already received warrants from Henry specifying what funds the reward was to come from, and Catherine now pleads that her servants receive their reward "rather for our sake," stating that "ye shall minister under us full good pleasure to your thanks hereafter."⁵⁸ A few days later, on February 7, Henry reinforces his wife's warrant with a warrant of his own, restating his order, and referring to Roper, Bridges, and Johns as "servants to our dearest wife the Queen."⁵⁹ The series of warrants demonstrates how Catherine and Henry worked together to distribute rewards to her household. Her servants likely told her they were having difficulties with Cutt, and Catherine responded not only by writing a warrant of her own, but also by making Henry aware of the problem as well, hence his second warrant. This situation was obviously unusual, but it reveals the behind-the-scenes activities that Catherine could engage in to support her household and work with her

⁵⁸ TNA MS E404/87, no. 108, see also *LP* 1.1:683 for a summary of the warrant.

⁵⁹ TNA MS E404/87, no. 114.

husband. These activities show how queens could operate informally to obtain reward for their servants.

Catherine's influence in obtaining rewards for her servants may have lacked documentation, but that does not mean it went unnoticed. Even for relatively simple rewards such as the one above, a number of people, including secretaries, clerks, and messengers, were required to distribute the funds, which in the case above originated through a forfeit to the king from unnamed persons. We also cannot discount the oral circulation of news and gossip at the court, and it is more than likely that Roper, Bridges, and Johns would have shared news (and possibly the spoils) of their good fortune with their friends, thus spreading the *fama* of Catherine's act of patronage beyond the parties involved.

Margaret and James also worked together to reward members of her household, and occasionally the rewards indicate that it was specifically through the queen's influence that the reward was granted. In May 1507, Margaret's usher Charles Maxton was granted lands in Culcreif by James IV. The lands were "remittand hym at the instance of the qwene, to quham he standis in service."⁶⁰ Other members of Margaret's household received lands, wards and privileges from James, and they are named in these grants as members of the queen's household, such as the confirmation of lands given to William Ogilvy and his wife Alison Roule, who is named as a servant of the queen's.⁶¹ Although Margaret's specific influence was not acknowledged as it was in Charles Maxton's grant, her servants are identified with her household, perhaps indicating her behind the scenes influence.⁶²

Although Catherine and Margaret had considerably less patronage to bestow than their husbands, they had some opportunities for rewarding members of the king's household. Margaret

⁶⁰ RSS 1:1471.

⁶¹ RMS 1:3171, 3269.

⁶² RSS 1:1423, 1640, and App, 619.

seems to have been particularly fond of William Dunbar, James's court poet who celebrated her marriage in 1503 with the poem "The Thrissil and the Rois." Many of Dunbar's poems are set in the queen's chamber or in the company of the queen, and they paint a lively picture of life in the queen's household. Two of Dunbar's poems focus on his attempts to obtain a doublet from the Queen's master of the Wardrobe, James Dog. Although Dunbar uses this occasion as an opportunity to tease and humiliate Dog, his familiarity with the queen's household as well as her evident desire to reward him shows that Margaret understood the benefit of rewarding the king's household as well, and on this occasion her patronage was immortalized in verse.⁶³

Catherine rewarded members of her husband's household in similar ways to Dunbar's doublet. In 1520, her wardrobe gave two of the king's minstrels tawny broad cloth for a gown and black velvet for a doublet, paid for out of the accounts of Richard Justice, Catherine's groom of the robes. She also patronized Giles Duwes, another musical member of Henry's household. Duwes had a varied career at the early Tudor court, tutoring the children of Henry VII in music and going on to oversee Henry VII's library at Richmond. Catherine employed Duwes as a clerk for her own library and gave him cloth for a gown and doublet worth 52s 6d in 1520. Duwes still served the king through the 1520s, and his duties appear to have included service to both the king and queen.⁶⁴ Justice also delivered black satin for a doublet for Thomas More, clerk of the privy seal to the king, on the command of Sir Robert Poyntz, Catherine's Chancellor, and Richard Decons, her receiver.⁶⁵ As two of the chief administrators of Catherine's estates, Poyntz and

⁶³Dunbar, *The Poems of William Dunbar*, 1979, 101–102; there is speculation that Dunbar, who was also a cleric, was a chaplain in Margaret's household, but there is no direct evidence of this, aside from his clear familiarity with the queen's household in his poems, see; *ODNB*, "Dunbar, William." For more on Margaret's relationship with Dunbar, see below.

⁶⁴ In June 1527, the king granted Duwes the privilege of importing Gascon wine, a lucrative investment opportunity, *LP* 4.2:3213; the household accounts of Henry VIII also show that Duwes received robes from the king's Wardrobe, *LP* 4.1:1673.

⁶⁵ JRL Latin MS 239, 14r and 9r.

Decons would possibly have encountered More as they transacted business, and the doublet was an acknowledgement of their relationship with him, and by extension, the queen.

Catherine also used her household resources to strengthen her relationship with the king. Richard Justice made a scarlet and white satin bonnet “for the king’s grace” in 1520. Catherine was also personally known for sewing the king’s shirts, and this evidence of the close relationship between husband and wife became a point of contention during the divorce, when Anne Boleyn insisted in 1530 that Henry stop sending cloth to Catherine to have his shirts made.⁶⁶ Though this event was depicted by Eustace Chapuys, the Spanish ambassador, as an instance of Anne’s jealous and disrespectful treatment of Henry, what is at stake between the two women is not just domestic needlework, but the extent of Catherine and Henry’s personal and domestic connections formed by decades of marriage. The sewing of shirts, like the gift of a bonnet or a doublet by the Catherine, was part of the bond between the king, the queen, and their households.

The partnership between the king and queen led to the arrangement of marriages between the queen’s ladies and members of the king’s household. The most high-profile members of Catherine’s and Margaret’s foreign households were often their foreign ladies-in-waiting, gentlewomen, and chamberers. Native ladies served them as well, and a place in the queen’s household was often sought after by mothers wishing to arrange marriages for their daughters, as royal courts across Europe were elite marriage markets.⁶⁷ Moreover, it was the queen’s duty, as the head of the household, to see that her ladies were provided for, traditionally through highly advantageous matches with members of the native nobility. As these marriages were public,

⁶⁶ *CSP Spanish* 4.1:354, pg 600.

⁶⁷ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 217, 226; Barbara Stephenson, “Maintaining the Antiquity of the House: Marguerite de Navarre, Noble Marriage and Dynastic Culture in Early Sixteenth-Century France,” *The Court Historian* 10, no. 1 (2005): 15–24; Bercusson, “Duchess’ Court,” 132.

often festive occasions which produced (hopefully) lasting alliances, they were opportunities for queens not only to perform their duties as head of the household but also to celebrate publicly their own patronage and so attract or influence yet more clients or seekers of favor. Thus the marriage of Margaret's maid-of-honor, Elizabeth Barlow, to the Scottish nobleman Alexander Elphinstone, before August 1507, for example, was a triumph not only for the participants and the connections they formed but also for demonstrating Margaret's ability to secure favor for her ladies.

Often these matches resulted in higher-status husbands for the queen's women than they would have been able to secure if they had stayed home. In sixteenth-century France, for example, placing a girl in a royal woman's household, such as the household of Marguerite de Navarre, sister of King Francis I, improved her chances of making a good match.⁶⁸ Procuring good matches for her ladies was also a sign of success for the consort. It indicated the further commitment of the king to the foreign alliance cemented by his own marriage. As Henry wrote shortly after his marriage, writing to his father-in-law Ferdinand, it was "very desirable" to unite English and Spanish families through marriage.⁶⁹ Marie de Guise, Margaret's daughter-in-law, would successfully marry several of her French ladies to Scotsmen.⁷⁰ The failure of Catherine's sister, Juana of Aragon, to marry any of her ladies into the Burgundian nobility after her marriage to Philip of Burgundy was a sign of Juana's lack of authority and her own marginalized position at court.⁷¹

⁶⁸Stephenson, "Maintaining the Antiquity of the House," 44; Habsburg empresses in the seventeenth century also had a hand in arranging marriages, and the simultaneous existence of an empress-consort and two dowagers actually brought about friction and competition amongst the imperial women, Clarissa Campbell Orr, "Introduction," in *Queenship in Europe, 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort*, ed. Clarissa Campbell Orr (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 11.

⁶⁹*CSP Spanish* 2:20.

⁷⁰Rosalind K. Marshall, *Mary of Guise* (London: Collins, 1977), 72.

⁷¹Aram, *Juana the Mad*, 46.

Catherine and Margaret acted in the place of relatives in the delicate art of marriage negotiations, inquiring about marriage portions, providing dowries, and guaranteeing jointures through their household officials. When Catherine became queen in 1509, the Spanish ladies who remained with her in England made important marriages that closely linked Catherine's new English household officials with her loyal and trusted Spanish attendants. Of the three Spanish ladies-in-waiting who attended Catherine at the coronation, two married within the English nobility.⁷² Catherine's and Margaret's foreign attendants offered the king an opportunity to reiterate the original political and diplomatic alliances that were formed by his own marriage, confirming and strengthening not only his commitment to the alliance, but also, through marriages to the queen's women, the commitment of his nobility. For instance, Inez de Venegas had served Catherine since she came to England and probably knew the queen for far longer through her own mother, who had been Catherine's nurse. She married William Blount, Lord Mountjoy in 1509. Though his marriage to Inez de Venegas did not last long—Mountjoy had married his next wife by 1515—it is possible that Inez was with her husband when he was sent to Spain in early 1513 as the English envoy to Ferdinand, where she could have acted as a translator and a source of connections and information.⁷³

The marriage of another of Catherine's Spanish ladies to an English nobleman brought together several members of Catherine's household in a collective act of patronage. Maria de Salinas is well-known for her continuing loyalty to Catherine, but her early career in Catherine's household shows how the members of the queen's household as a whole were connected through networks of family and obligation to each other as well as to the queen. Maria married Lord

⁷² The other I have been unable to trace.

⁷³ Mountjoy was closely connected to the queen's new household through his step-father, the Earl of Ormond, the queen's Lord Chamberlain. His daughter Gertrude (by his first wife) married Henry Courtney, Earl of Devon in 1519, and she was one of Catherine's closest ladies-in-waiting. See *ODNB* "Blount, William, fourth Baron Mountjoy (c.1478–1534)."

William Willoughby d'Eresby after being naturalized as an English subject in May 1516. Lord Willoughby was a baron with manors in Lincolnshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk worth over £900 per annum.⁷⁴ The couple was granted manors in Lincolnshire as a gift from the king.⁷⁵ Catherine provided Maria with a handsome dowry of 1,100 marks, and key members of Catherine's household acted as guarantors of Maria's jointure, including the queen's Lord Chamberlain, vice-chamberlain, secretary, and chancellor. Lord Willoughby was connected to the queen's household through his cousin Christopher Jenny—Catherine's attorney—who was also a guarantor of Maria's jointure.⁷⁶ These connections and bonds of loyalty would be useful to both Catherine and Maria when Lord Willoughby died in 1526 and Maria entered into a protracted legal battle over his estates and the inheritance of her daughter, Katherine Willoughby. By using men she trusted from within her own household, Catherine did her best to ensure that Maria's jointure and marriage were legally protected, much in the same way a father would oversee his daughter's marriage portion and jointure.⁷⁷

Marriage to one of the queen's ladies could result in ongoing patronage relationships between the new couple and the king and queen. One of Margaret's maids of honor, Elizabeth Barlow, not only made a marriage above what she might have expected in England, but also she and her husband remained close to the royal court and continued to receive rewards. Elizabeth was probably the daughter of John Barlow and Christian Berlay, a minor gentry family.⁷⁸ The Barlows had a family connection to the de Vere Earls of Oxford, and it is likely that she was

⁷⁴ ODNB "Bertie, Katherine, duchess of Suffolk (1519–1580)."

⁷⁵ LP 2.1:1953, 2172; Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 50.

⁷⁶ Franklin-Harkrider, *Katherine Willoughby*, 30, 33.

⁷⁷ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 51–53.

⁷⁸ Barlow was attainted for his involvement in the Perkin Warbeck conspiracy, and his lands were given to the Earl of Oxford, Peter Sherlock, "Monuments, Reputation and Clerical Marriage in Reformation England: Bishop Barlow's Daughters," *Gender & History* 16, no. 1 (2004): 60, doi:10.1111/j.0953-5233.2004.326_1.x.

introduced at the English court by the countess of Oxford.⁷⁹ In March 1503 Elizabeth Barlow was paid a fee for attending upon Margaret, so she was in the young queen's household before they left for Scotland.⁸⁰ Elizabeth was probably roughly the same age as the queen, and it is clear that they became close.

In 1507 Elizabeth married Alexander Elphinstone, James IV's close friend and a courtier who would eventually become, through James's patronage, the first Lord Elphinstone. Although we have no documentation about the role Margaret played in negotiating her marriage, Elizabeth and Alexander were greatly favored by both Margaret and James. In August 1507, Elizabeth received a new gown, a featherbed and bedclothes from the Lord Treasurer.⁸¹ This entry, which is dated two days before the first royal charter that gave lands to Elizabeth and her new spouse, was clearly part of the preparations for her marriage, ensuring that the Queen's gentlewoman was taken care of. Elizabeth's dowry, provided by James IV, was to be the lands and the castle in Kildrummy, a valuable collection of lands and privileges.⁸²

The Elphinstone-Barlow marriage was merely the beginning of royal patronage towards the new couple, and this patronage was clearly linked to Elizabeth Barlow's relationship with the queen and the queen's own favor. The timing of James and Margaret's patronage towards the couple indicates that the patronage itself was closely tied to Margaret's own status. The Elphinstone-Barlow marriage itself took place by August 1507, after the birth of Margaret's first child in January 1507 and the court's spectacular progress to Whithorn that July.⁸³ Several years

⁷⁹Montague Barlow, *Barlow Family Records* (London: Bamrose, 1932), 46–47; Elizabeth may have been somewhat educated, as three of her four brothers took holy orders and became prominent clerics in the reformed Henrician church, *ODNB* “Barlow, William (d.1568).”

⁸⁰TNA MS E404/84.

⁸¹*LHTA* 3:322.

⁸²Sir William Fraser, *The Elphinstone Family Book of the Lords Elphinstone, Balmaerino, and Coupar*, vol. 1, *Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online* (Edinburgh, 1897), 42–46, <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/browser.php?ipid=623567>.

⁸³The first charter granting the couple lands is dated August 8, 1507, *RMS* 2:3115.

and grants of lands later, Alexander Elphinstone was created a lord of Parliament as part of the ceremonies surrounding the baptism of James and Margaret's second son, Prince Arthur.⁸⁴

During the marriage, the couple was granted the baronies of Inverlochty and Kildrummy, in addition to other lands and privileges. These gifts were ongoing through the reign of James IV, and despite no mention of Margaret's specific influence, the charters indicate that the lands were closely tied to the queen's continuing patronage and the marriage itself, stating that the lands were a continuation of Elizabeth's dowry, "whom we caused him [Alexander Elphinstone] to take to wife and made her live beyond her native land in service with our dearest consort the queen, within our kingdom."⁸⁵ The timing of these rewards, in addition to the charter explicitly citing Elizabeth's service to Margaret, indicates that James's patronage of Alexander Elphinstone was closely bound to his marriage to Margaret's lady and therefore, to Margaret. James's affirmation of the marriage at key moments in the reign through the formal granting and thus witnessing of charters for lands also re-affirmed Margaret's patronage of the couple and was performed before the court as a whole.

The matches made by Catherine and Margaret for their foreign ladies allowed them to extend their own connections to the nobility of their marital kingdoms. The nobility of early modern Scotland and England interacted through complex networks of kin, friends, and neighbors, and Catherine and Margaret used their ladies' marriages to form bonds of kinship and loyalty to their subjects, while at the same time fulfilling their duties to their ladies.⁸⁶ In return, Scottish and English men who married one of the queen's ladies forged links to court and gained access to patronage and support through their wives' relationships with the queen.

⁸⁴Fraser, *Elphinstone Family Book*, 1:46–47.

⁸⁵Quoted in *ibid.*, 1:48–49.

⁸⁶On the role of wives in the creation of networks through marriage in the English nobility, see Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 175–205.

The partnership between the king and queen was the most important factor in enabling the queen to successfully reward her household and act as a patron at court. Because Catherine and Margaret had good relationships with their husbands, which were frequently displayed at court through sociability and hospitality, they were able to use their close connections and access to the king to influence the distribution of patronage. This patronage was often informal or behind-the-scenes, but when Catherine and Margaret were enacting appropriate gender roles by arranging marriages for their ladies, their activities as patrons were more marked. Their ladies' marriages created lasting connections between their households and the nobilities of England and Scotland, and moreover, these lasting connections continually reasserted the queen's success as a patron before those who also might wish to gain favor at court. The links between Margaret's own status as queen and the continuing favor of James IV towards Lord and Lady Elphinstone show that patronage was an ongoing performance for these queens, one in which a reciprocal cycle of service, obligation and reward could play out many times over the years.

Securing good marriages for their ladies and rewards for their servants was part of the expected duties and ideals of queens as heads of households. In the next section, I will consider Catherine's and Margaret's patronage as it relates to their expectations and duties as mothers. Royal maternity conferred upon Catherine and Margaret responsibilities towards their children and sanctioned their involvement in the education of their children. Catherine's support for the education of her daughter Mary, a far more unconventional situation than Margaret's support of her son's education, was also an opportunity for Catherine to publicly rehearse arguments in favor of Mary's right to rule.

Reputation, Learning and Influence through Patronage

Catherine and Margaret were interested in and promoted education and learning through acts of patronage that were also public performances of their roles as queens and, perhaps most significantly, mothers. In this area of their patronage, Catherine and Margaret supported causes closely tied to their own educational experience and interest in the education of their children. Catherine's and Margaret's acts of patronage have often been noted in passing insofar as they relate to different scholarly topics: for example, the education of Catherine's daughter, Mary,⁸⁷ or the queens' support for scholars and poets such as Juan Luis Vives and William Dunbar.⁸⁸ In this section, I will argue that their patronage of scholars was closely connected to their own educations and their roles as royal mothers.⁸⁹

At the beginning of his most well-known work, *The Education of a Christian Woman* (1524), Juan Luis Vives wrote this assessment in his elegant and classically-inspired dedication to Catherine of Aragon:

I dedicate this work to you, glorious Queen... But you prefer that virtues be praised rather than yourself. Although no one can praise female virtues without including you in that same praise, I shall nonetheless obey you, provided that you know that under the rubric of excellent and outstanding virtues other women similar to you may be mentioned by name, but it is you always, even if tacitly, who are spoken of...⁹⁰

Written for her daughter Mary, and inspired by Catherine's own life and reputation, Vives presented *The Education of a Christian Woman* as a written embodiment of Catherine's own

⁸⁷Elston, "Transformation or Continuity?"

⁸⁸Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, 46, 149; Bawcutt, *Dunbar the Makar*, 87–93.

⁸⁹One notable exception to the lack of studies of Catherine's patronage is James P. Carley's *The Books of Henry VIII and his Wives* (2004). Carley's chapter on Catherine comprehensively covers her major commissions on a variety of topics, from religious polemics against Lutheranism to the education of women to music to translations of Spanish, Italian and ancient Roman authors. I shall not attempt to cover all of the works and authors discussed by Carley in this section; instead, I shall use his excellent research as a starting point for understanding Catherine's performance of cultural patronage and how that patronage enhanced her own political and cultural influence as queen.

⁹⁰Juan Luis Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*, ed. Charles Fantazzi (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 50.

values and virtues.⁹¹ Although Vives's work produced an idealized image of Catherine, the work itself served to reiterate her reputation as a patron of education for women. Catherine understood the value of her reputation as a learned woman and used her relationships with humanist writers such as Sir Thomas More, Desiderus Erasmus, Thomas Wyatt, and Vives to expand her cultural patronage at the Henrician court. Much of Catherine's patronage was specifically in support of one of her most personal concerns in the 1520s, educating her daughter to rule England.

Catherine's active role in her daughter Mary's education in the early years of the princess's life has been discussed by many scholars who have arrived at different conclusions about the ultimate results of Catherine's involvement. Alternately, Catherine has either received praise for continuing her mother's educational program for women and "pioneering" humanistic education for women in England, or blamed for grossly under-preparing Mary to rule by educating her as a princess, not as a future ruler.⁹² Timothy Elston has argued that Catherine's own education clearly influenced the decisions she made for the education of her daughter and her patronage of Spanish and English humanists.⁹³ Building on the work of these scholars, I argue that Catherine used her patronage of humanist writers at the English court to advocate widely for her daughter's right to rule. Catherine's own reputation for learning, alluded to by Vives and proclaimed by others across Europe, gave her patronage authority backed not only by her own performance of the role, but by the powerful queenship of her mother Isabel as well.

⁹¹As flattering as this may have been to Catherine, in recent years scholars have argued that Vives' portrait in *The Education* owed far more to the ideals and expectations of sixteenth-century gender roles than to the actions and beliefs of Catherine herself, Timothy G. Elston, "Almost the Perfect Woman: Public and Private Expectations of Catherine of Aragon, 1501-1536" (PhD diss., The University of Nebraska, 2004), <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305160291?accountid=14553>.

⁹²Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, 246; Kathi Vosevich, "The Education of a Prince(ss): Tutoring the Tudors," in *Women, Writing and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*, ed. Mary Burke (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000), 61-76.

⁹³Elston, "Transformation or Continuity?"; renewed interest in Catherine's educational program has complemented the recent rehabilitation of the reputation of her daughter Mary as queen. More sympathetic considerations of the reign of Mary have meant an increased interest in understanding the influence of her Spanish mother; see Richards, "Mary Tudor"; Judith M. Richards, "'To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule': Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28 (1997): 101-121, doi:10.2307/2543225.

As the daughters of Queen Isabel of Castile, Catherine and her sisters carried with them from their mother's court both an excellent humanistic education and the lasting memory and reputation of Isabel as an exemplary monarch.⁹⁴ More than two decades after Isabel's death, her reign was held up as a model of rule not just for women but for monarchs in general in Baldesar Castiglione's *The Book of the Courtier* (1528): "those realms are still governed by her fame and by the methods she instituted, in such a way that, although she is no longer living, her authority endures..."⁹⁵ Catherine was, indeed, continually being compared to her mother, perhaps more so than any of her sisters.⁹⁶ When Catherine organized the defense of England in 1513 while Henry was campaigning in France, her behavior was compared by one Spanish diplomat to Isabel:

Queen Katharine, in imitation of her mother Isabella, who had been left regent in the King's absence, made a splendid oration to the English captains, told them to be ready to defend their territory, that the Lord smiled upon those who stood in defence of their own, and they should remember that English courage excelled that of all other nations. Fired by these words, the nobles marched against the Scots, who were then wasting the Borders, and defeated them.⁹⁷

This description must be read with some skepticism, as the author was considerably biased in Catherine's favor. Not only was Catherine currently the daughter of the reigning Spanish king, Ferdinand, but also Catherine's husband was fighting the French in alliance with Spain. However, the veracity of this report (the only one that mentions Catherine's oration) is less important than the association between Catherine and her mother, nearly a decade after her mother's death. It may have been a comparison that sprang to the minds of others as well.

⁹⁴For background on Catherine's sisters, see Jansen, *Female Rulers in Early Modern Europe*, 67–110.

⁹⁵Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, 239.

⁹⁶One of Isabel's biographers wrote that "of all the children, Catalina [Catherine] would most resemble her mother," Peggy K Liss, *Isabel the Queen: Life and Times*, Rev. ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 234. Catherine's sisters did not achieve the same profile on the European stage as she did: Isabel died in childbirth in 1498, Juana was proclaimed mad and confined from 1507 to 1555, and Maria, Queen of Portugal, was rather busy producing ten children in seventeen years, dying in 1517.

⁹⁷*LP* 1.2: 2299.

Catherine and her sisters were known throughout Europe for their learning and piety. Isabel took care in providing for the education of all her children, four daughters and one son, by hiring tutors to teach them Latin, theology, literature, and music.⁹⁸ Catherine was the youngest of the family, and seems to have shared her tutors with her next older sister Maria. Both princesses were taught by Alessandro Geraldini, a noted Italian scholar and poet who eventually accompanied Catherine to England as her chaplain. Catherine was celebrated for her Latinity, which during this period was not only the language of scholarship and the church, but of international diplomacy as well. Catherine was better educated than most English women, including her royal in-laws, Margaret Beaufort and Elizabeth of York. She learned at least a smattering of French at their request in 1498, because “these ladies do not understand Latin, and much less, Spanish.”⁹⁹ As we have already seen, Catherine’s learning greatly added to her ability to manage her own estates and conduct diplomacy in foreign languages.

When Catherine began her own patronage activities as queen of England, she had not only an education far in advance of women for her time, but also a reputation that emphasized the learning of her family in general and her mother Isabel in particular. Thus when Catherine began supporting humanist scholars and education in England in earnest, beginning in the early 1520s, she had not only her status as wife of the king, but also the “cultural capital” associated with her own reputation, widely praised by European scholars such as Erasmus, who wrote to a friend in 1518 that she “is astonishingly well read, far beyond what would be surprising for a woman.”¹⁰⁰ Just as Catherine’s political or social capital could be used by the queen to pursue patronage and rewards for her household, Catherine’s cultural capital allowed her to perform acts

⁹⁸Liss, *Isabel the Queen*, 247.

⁹⁹*CSP Spanish* 1:203.

¹⁰⁰Desiderius Erasmus, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, ed. Richard J. Schoek and Beatrice Corrigan, trans. R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thomson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 6:63.

of patronage that carried multiple layers of significance. Her patronage thus was worth more than just material rewards, because her patronage associated the scholars themselves with her own reflected glory and the glory of her family.¹⁰¹ In turn, works commissioned by Catherine or dedicated to her not only advanced her educational and religious goals, but also indicated to a wider audience the generosity and support of the queen herself, performing her patronage in print and manuscript for any reader to see.

Catherine's patronage of humanist scholars probably began through her household connections to the northern humanist circles of Erasmus. William Blount, Lord Mountjoy, Catherine's Lord Chamberlain from 1512 until 1533, was a close friend of Erasmus and a strong supporter of the new learning at court. Catherine's links with Erasmus eventually meant that other scholars, including Juan Luis Vives, came to her attention through his network of friends in England, which included Sir Thomas More, among others.¹⁰² Her almoner Robert Bekinsall was president of Queen's College Cambridge, and he was one of many links that Catherine had to that university as a result of her connections to the former household of Margaret Beaufort, the foundress of two colleges at Cambridge.¹⁰³ Her confessor, Alphonsus de Villa Sancta, was also a learned scholar and penned a number of anti-Lutheran tracts while serving the queen.¹⁰⁴

Learning and scholarship flourished in other parts of Catherine's household as well. Catherine's yeoman of the cellar, a rising gentleman named Brian Annesley, translated the *Livre de la Cité des Dames* of Christine de Pizan into English in 1521.¹⁰⁵ Elis Hilton, Catherine's yeoman of the Wardrobe, brought the young scholar John Ainsworth to Catherine's attention in

¹⁰¹For a discussion of this type of patronage through association, see Thomas F. Mayer, "When Maecenas Was Broke: Cardinal Pole's 'Spiritual' Patronage," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996): 419–435, doi:10.2307/2544142.

¹⁰²Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, 149, Vives was receiving patronage from Catherine by 1521, and he came to England in 1523.

¹⁰³*Ibid.*, 23, 25–26.

¹⁰⁴Carley, *Books of Henry VIII*, 114–115. For a discussion of Catherine's anti-Lutheran activities, see chapter 6.

¹⁰⁵Johnston, "How the *Livre*," 387.

the 1510s; the queen then supported Ainsworth through grammar school and until he received his B.A. at St. John's College, Cambridge.¹⁰⁶ Catherine was probably surrounded by other men and women of talent and learning whose endeavors have not survived, though traces can be seen, for instance, in the gift from Catherine of a printed book of hours to her gentlewoman Margaret Cook.¹⁰⁷

Margaret Cook was the step-mother of Sir Anthony Cook, a tutor to Edward VI whose five daughters became known for their scholarly abilities as well as their Protestantism. Sir Anthony Cook was raised by Margaret from the age of five or six and he appears to have been self-taught or educated entirely at home. Margaret Cook's influence on Sir Anthony's education is impossible to determine, but it seems that Margaret, who was a "practical and acquisitive businesswoman" was intelligent and may have acquired some learning.¹⁰⁸ In turn, her example likely influenced Sir Anthony's ideas about the education of women. Margaret Cook is perhaps one of many men and women whose education and knowledge are untraceable, yet served in Catherine's household and were potential links for the queen's support of learned endeavors in England.

Although connections between members of her household and learned men and women were in place in the early days of her reign as queen, Catherine's sustained patronage of writers and scholars began in the late 1510s and early 1520s, after the birth of her only surviving daughter, Princess Mary. Hence many scholars have argued that Catherine's patronage of works during this period was part of a concerted effort to provide for her daughter Mary's education

¹⁰⁶ *LP* 13.1:533.

¹⁰⁷ Duffy, *Marking the Hours*, 24.

¹⁰⁸ *ODNB* "Cooke, Sir Anthony (1505/6-1576)"; McIntosh, "The Cookes of Gidea Hall," 133; for a discussion on how a woman like Margaret Cook could be educated without necessarily conforming to ideas of traditional scholarship see Sharon D. Michalove, "The Education of Aristocratic Women in Fifteenth-Century England," in *Estrangement, Enterprise and Education in Fifteenth-Century England*, ed. Sharon D. Michalove and A. Compton Reeves (Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1998), 117–139.

and to make a case for her succession to the English throne as heir presumptive.¹⁰⁹ Vives's works on educating women, both the now famous *The Education of a Christian Woman* (1523) and the more workmanlike *On a Plan of Study for Children* (1524), as well as the translation of Christine's *Livre* (which Hope Johnston and Constance Jordan have convincingly linked to Catherine's household if not to her direct patronage) all appear after Catherine's childbearing years seem to have ceased.¹¹⁰ Scholars have noted that after the birth of Henry Fitzroy (Henry VIII's illegitimate son) in 1519, Catherine began a more concerted campaign in favor of her daughter's right to inherit the throne.¹¹¹ However, Fitzroy was not perceived as an immediate threat to Mary's inheritance, and it was only his elevation to Duke of Richmond and Somerset in 1525 that seems to have provoked a reaction from Catherine. Catherine's flurry of patronage activities in the early 1520s is more likely linked to the complementary facts that Mary was old enough to begin her education and that Catherine had not conceived a child since 1518.

Catherine was, of course, performing established duties of queenship by educating her child and protecting her child's inheritance.¹¹² What was unusual about her situation was that the heir she was protecting was female and thus needed an almost entirely new educational program designed for her, one which would prepare a female princess to rule.¹¹³ More generally, Catherine was interested in education. As Maria Dowling has put it, "[u]nlike her husband, who reportedly went no closer to that seat of learning than good hunting took him, she visited Oxford

¹⁰⁹ Aysha Pollnitz, "Christian Women or Sovereign Queens? The Schooling of Mary and Elizabeth," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, ed. Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 129–131, www.palgraveconnect.com; Andrew W. Taylor also discusses Mary's humanist education, although he only briefly touches upon Catherine's influence, Andrew W. Taylor, "'Ad Omne Virtutum Genus'? Mary between Piety, Pedagogy and Praise in Early Tudor Humanism," in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, ed. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 103–104.

¹¹⁰ Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 106; Johnston, "How the *Livre*."

¹¹¹ Johnston, "How the *Livre*," 388.

¹¹² Nelson, "Medieval Queenship," 194–198; Stafford, *Queens, Concubines, and Dowagers*, 156–160.

¹¹³ Elston, "Transformation or Continuity?," 11.

to discuss matters of learning with the scholars there.”¹¹⁴ John Longland, bishop of Lincoln, made a point of seeking her out to describe the organization of Cardinal Wolsey’s new college at Oxford, including where the scholars would come from and “what provision should be made for the exposition of the Bible.”¹¹⁵ In addition to visiting both Oxford and Cambridge, she acted as a patron of St. John’s College, Cambridge, granting the college the manors of Ridgewell and Thornington in 1520.¹¹⁶ She supported poor scholars as well, recommending John Lambert to Queens’ College and sponsoring John Ainsworth at grammar school.¹¹⁷

When Catherine began commissioning works on the education of women from Juan Luis Vives, she sought to plan for her daughter’s education as the only child of Henry VIII. In patronizing works from Vives that were subsequently printed, Catherine was performing her duties as a mother and queen in an unusually public way.¹¹⁸ Catherine’s status as queen, mother, and Spanish princess were invoked in the dedications to *The Education* in both its original Latin and its subsequent English and Spanish translations.¹¹⁹ The title page of the presentation copy invokes her name before the dedication even begins.¹²⁰ Catherine would find her own image reflected in the work, according to Vives, and English readers would in turn see in Vives’s work an idealized reflection of their queen and her daughter.¹²¹ Moreover, an English translation, a far more accessible work for a broader audience than Vives’s Latin version, was commissioned by

¹¹⁴Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, 29.

¹¹⁵LP 4.1:995.

¹¹⁶SJCA MS D14.171.

¹¹⁷LP 2.2:A46; J.H. Gray, *The Queens’ College* (London: F.E. Robinson & Co, 1899), 64–65, http://www.archive.org/stream/queenscollegeofs00grayrich/queenscollegeofs00grayrich_djvu.txt.

¹¹⁸Catherine understood the emerging power of print and its importance for reaching a wide audience; while she was queen regent for Henry VIII in 1513, she signed a warrant rewarding Richard Pynson, the king’s printer, for pamphlets that condemned James IV’s invasion of England as part of a propaganda campaign in support of her own forces and her husband’s goals in France; TNA MS E101/417/12.

¹¹⁹Vives, *Education of a Christian Woman*, 30–31, 45–46.

¹²⁰Carley, *Books of Henry VIII*, 117.

¹²¹*Ibid.*, 116.

Catherine and printed in 1528.¹²² The queen clearly wished that Vives's work be read as far and wide as possible. Her object was not to merely guide the education of her daughter, but also to advocate publicly for the education of women modeled after her own education. Richard Hyrde's preface to the 1529 translation of *The Education* praises Catherine's "gracious zeale that ye beare to the vertuous education of the woman kynde of this realme, wherof our lorde hath ordeyned you to be quene."¹²³ Catherine's patronage of Vives went beyond material support and scholarly inspiration; she clearly fostered the spread of the work itself, and Vives's work would continue to spread her own reputation for learning and piety.¹²⁴

As we have seen elsewhere, Margaret Tudor had much less time and fewer resources in Scotland to develop her patronage there. Nevertheless, there are some indications that Margaret's patronage, like Catherine's, centered on the education of her son, especially if we consider her patronage activities after the death of James IV at Flodden. Additionally, because Margaret married James at the age of thirteen, it is possible that Margaret's interest in fostering the patronage of scholars may not have been limited to the education of her son, but may have extended to her own education as well.

Very little is known about Margaret's own education in England. Hester Chapman, one of her biographers asserts that "Margaret Tudor was more carefully educated than most princesses of her day," although she was never celebrated for her learning the way Catherine of

¹²²Ibid.; Vives, *Education of a Christian Woman*, 30–31.

¹²³Juan Luis Vives, *A Very Frutefull and Pleasant Booke Called the Instructio[n] of a Christen Woma[n], Made Fyrst in Laten, and Dedicated Vnto the Quenes Good Grace...*, trans. Richard. Hyrde, Early English Books Online (London, 1529), <http://name.umd.umich.edu/B00841.0001.001, A3r>; for a detailed discussion of this passage in different editions of Hyrde's work, see Betty S. Travitsky, "Reprinting Tudor History: The Case of Catherine of Aragon," *Renaissance Quarterly* 50, no. 1 (April 1, 1997): 169–170, doi:10.2307/3039332.

¹²⁴Aysha Pollnitz speculates that Vives may have composed his second work, *On a Plan of Study for Children* after discussing Mary's future with Catherine while he was at Oxford, Pollnitz, "Christian Women or Sovereign Queens?," 130–131.

Aragon was.¹²⁵ She shared a household and tutors with her younger siblings, Henry and Mary, probably until she left for Scotland in 1503. The Tudors were widely known for their musical abilities, and Margaret certainly enjoyed music, although the rest of her education may have been more haphazard. Giles Duwes, a French lutenist and librarian to Henry VII and Henry VIII, was her lute teacher and later claimed to have taught Margaret and her siblings French as well.¹²⁶ Margaret may have joined her brother in his lessons in Latin and history, as we know Henry had an excellent education. Latin instruction had started early for her eldest brother Arthur, who at thirteen could write letters in Latin to Catherine of Aragon, his betrothed, so Margaret may have been fairly advanced in her studies, whatever they were, by 1503.¹²⁷ Whatever book learning she did manage to pick up, her education was undoubtedly interrupted by her marriage and departure for Scotland at the age of thirteen. Unlike Catherine, whose chaplain in her 1501 Spanish household was also her tutor, none of Margaret's chaplains were known to have tutored the young queen before or after her marriage.¹²⁸

Much of Margaret's education as an elite woman would have concerned areas not always considered part of "education" today, such as religious instruction, dancing, etiquette, and public comportment. Both Catherine and Margaret were celebrated for having skills and accomplishments, such as weaving or sewing, that today we do not immediately recognize as "learning." Margaret was well-trained in these crucial areas of public performance, which can be seen in her participation at the English court in tournaments and celebrations for her brother Arthur's marriage to Catherine of Aragon and her own proxy wedding ceremony. These skills

¹²⁵ Chapman, *The Sisters of Henry VIII*, 26.

¹²⁶ ODNB "Duwes, Giles [Aegidius de Vadis] (d. 1535)."

¹²⁷ Steven J. Gunn, "Prince Arthur's Preparation for Kingship," in *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death and Commemoration*, ed. Linda Monckton and Steven J. Gunn (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2009), 7.

¹²⁸ Margaret's two known chaplains, Dr. Henry Babington and James Carvenall, acted as treasurers and almoners for her household, but there is no indication that they tutored the queen.

would allow Margaret to fulfill her duties as hostess and social leader of her husband's court, which I have discussed in chapter 4.¹²⁹ In this section, I will concentrate on Margaret's education as it relates to her patronage and the education of her son.

Although here are no direct references to Margaret continuing any kind of instruction in Scotland, she may have had opportunities to do so. She has been associated by scholars with at least five manuscripts, primarily books of hours, although only two of those books can be definitely linked to the queen, the Chatsworth Book of Hours given to her by her father Henry VII, and the Book of Hours of James IV and Margaret Tudor, a gift to from James.¹³⁰ James's gift may be the "rare book" that was brought to Margaret in December 1503, and there is a record of at least one book she brought with her into Scotland, which may have been her father's gift.¹³¹ A few other instances in the Scottish accounts reveal that Margaret wished to have access to books. Twice in 1508 books were sent to Margaret while she was in Edinburgh.¹³² In 1512 a book was purchased for Margaret for the princely sum of £11 Scots, equivalent to the yearly wages of one of her chamberwomen.¹³³ Even if Margaret was not continuing her studies in Scotland under a tutor, these accounts hint that she may have been interested in some form of literate culture.¹³⁴

Margaret's education in courtly skills and virtues may have continued through her apparently close relationship with James IV's famed court poet William Dunbar (born c. 1460). Dunbar was probably a graduate of the University of St. Andrews and he may have spent time in

¹²⁹Michalove, "Education of Aristocratic Women," 129–130.

¹³⁰Priscilla Bawcutt, "'My Bright Buke': Women and Their Books in Medieval and Renaissance Scotland," in *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain: Essays for Felicity Riddy*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne and Felicity Riddy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2000), 20–21.

¹³¹*LHTA* 2:411; *CDS* 4:1725.

¹³²*LHTA* 4:95, 132.

¹³³*LHTA* 4:339.

¹³⁴It is tempting to speculate that James IV, who was intensely interested in learning and had hired Erasmus as a tutor for his illegitimate son in Rome, would have encouraged Margaret's continued education in Scotland, but there is no evidence of this beyond the quite common gift of the Book of Hours at their wedding.

France furthering his studies.¹³⁵ Although evidence for his life and career is spotty, he seems to have arrived at the Scottish court in 1500, and in 1501 the payment of his half-yearly pension was issued “after he com furth of Ingland,” a possible indication that Dunbar was involved in Margaret’s marriage negotiations.¹³⁶ A number of Dunbar’s poems, including his poem on the occasion of Margaret’s wedding, “The Thrissill and the Rois” address Margaret as a young queen. Dunbar also wrote several poems set in or about Margaret’s household, including “Ane Dance in the Quenis Chamber” and “Of James Dog, Kepar of the Queen’s Wardrep.”¹³⁷ Dunbar’s connection to Margaret may have exposed the young queen to new vernacular literature and broadened her literary experience.

Dunbar’s poetry sheds light on life at court in many different ways, but what is most interesting for our discussion here is the didactic element in one of Dunbar’s poems addressed to the queen. Dunbar composed a tribute to Margaret on the occasion of her visit and triumphal entry to Aberdeen in 1511. In this poem Dunbar describes the welcome Margaret received from the town, which included singing maidens and pageants, in a manner that indicates that Dunbar composed the poem shortly after the event, perhaps for recital at an evening banquet.¹³⁸ At the end of the poem, Dunbar counsels Margaret to note the generosity of the citizens and “sa lang as quein thow beiris croun/Be thankfull to this burcht of Aberdein.”¹³⁹ After memorializing the queen, Dunbar turns to encouraging the young woman (she would have been twenty-two in 1511) to fulfill her duties and remember the welcome she was given at Aberdeen.¹⁴⁰ If Dunbar,

¹³⁵ Bawcutt, *Dunbar the Makar*, 7.

¹³⁶ *LHTA* 2:95.

¹³⁷ Dunbar, *The Poems of William Dunbar*, 1979, K50, K28, K29.

¹³⁸ Bawcutt, *Dunbar the Makar*, 92.

¹³⁹ “So long as queen thou bear crown/Be thankful to this burgh of Aberdeen,” Dunbar, *The Poems of William Dunbar*, 1979 K48, 71-72.

¹⁴⁰ Dunbar often complained of a lack of reward or the misuse of royal patronage in his poems, so his counsel to Margaret could be seen as part of an overall concern that patrons in general and the queen in particular performed

as Patricia Bawcutt has argued, composed the poem as an occasional piece meant to be recited at a banquet, then Dunbar's instruction of Margaret in her patronage duties would have served an additional purpose. As Dunbar reminds Margaret that she should be thankful to Aberdeen, he simultaneously reminds those in the audience that Margaret has the influence to give aid to Aberdeen in some way. Dunbar's poem both educates the queen in her duties and educates the audience on her potential as a patron.

Although we know little of Margaret's patronage activities beyond her relationship with Dunbar, we do know that Margaret was involved in her son's education through his tutor, David Lindsay, who later became a noted writer and herald. David Lindsay is first mentioned at court in accounts for 1507 to 1508 in a payment from Margaret's comptroller when he was serving Margaret's first son, the young Prince James, who died in 1508.¹⁴¹ Thereafter he can be found performing plays before the king and queen and was later appointed to the household of the future James V in 1512. Lindsay was closely associated with Sir James Inglis, another Scottish courtier who authored ballads and "plays" for the court and became Margaret's secretary after the death of James IV.¹⁴² The fragmented sources for Margaret's household while queen do not reveal if she had any closer interaction with Lindsay, but since he served in her household it is likely she had some knowledge of him and the education he might provide for her sons.¹⁴³

Conclusion

Patronage was an expected duty of queenship, and Catherine's and Margaret's patronage was successful because it was performed in partnership with their husbands. The queen's

their duties. For Dunbar's complaints against the misuse of royal patronage, see Bawcutt, *Dunbar the Makar*, 118–119.

¹⁴¹ *ERS* 13:127.

¹⁴² Carol Edington, *Court and Culture in Renaissance Scotland: Sir David Lindsay of the Mount* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), 14–15.

¹⁴³ Margaret Tudor continued to patronize members of the Scottish court during her widowhood, including Gavin Douglas, another Scottish poet and bishop, see Janet Hadley Williams, "James V of Scots as Literary Patron," in *Tradition and Innovation in an Era of Change* (Frankfurt am Main; New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 176–177.

household was a large and important part of the royal court, and it was connected to the king's household through its finances, administration, and membership. Catherine's and Margaret's relationships with their husbands gave them the influence necessary to see that their servants were well-rewarded and their ladies provided for in marriage. As the heads of their own households, Catherine and Margaret had a duty to their ladies, especially those who followed them from their homelands, to see that they were provided for with honorable marriages. When Catherine or Margaret married one of their ladies to a nobleman, the couple became a lasting testament to the queen's patronage and influence, and often the couple continued to benefit from their mistress's patronage throughout their lives.

As queens and mothers, Catherine and Margaret independently supported the work of scholars and poets as part of their patronage. Both Catherine and Margaret had been educated at royal courts and were considered accomplished and learned women. Catherine had an international reputation for learning, and it helped her to attract scholars to her own patronage. Her patronage was specifically concerned with the education of women in general and her daughter in particular. Catherine's interest in Vives and the humanist educational program was not separate from her other patronage activities within her household. Instead, the education and care that Catherine fostered in her own household, through the rearing of often quite young women and their eventual transition into adulthood and marriage was complementary to her patronage of Vives and humanist learning for women. Whether as literary patrons or marriage brokers, Catherine and Margaret's ability to distribute rewards and largesse was a duty to their clients and households and a simultaneous affirmation of their own influence and power at the royal court. This performance of patronage was closely tied to the queen's own household and its connections to and dependence on the king's household. The structure of the royal household

encouraged and facilitated the close partnership between the king and queen in matters of patronage. The performative nature of their patronage meant that many patronage acts, such as arranged marriages, were ongoing opportunities for Catherine and Margaret to fulfill their duties and to demonstrate their potential as good patrons, as well as to reward members of their courts.

CHAPTER 6

Queenship and the Performance of Piety

...the said quene remayned in the said Towne of York. At Ten of the Clok that Day she was conveyed to the Church, with the sayd Archbyschop, the Byschops of Durham, Morrey, aud Norrwysche, the Prelates before mentioned, and other honourable Folks of the Churche, my Lord of Surrey, the Lord hyr Chammerlayn, and other Nobles, Knyghts, Squyers and Gentylnen, and the said Mayre, Aldermen, and Scheryffes, to the Number of Two hundreth and more: with hyr wer Ladies and Gentylwomen of hyr Company, and Straungers, to the Nombre of xl. And so was shee conveyed to the Church.¹

When Margaret Tudor attended Mass in the city of York, she did so in full view of over two hundred people, including members of her household, local prelates and governors, and probably a throng of curious onlookers and passers-by. As described by the herald John Young, this was merely one in a series of pious practices that Margaret observed as she and her entourage journeyed to Scotland in 1503. When she entered the town of Tuxford, for example, the Bishop of Moray offered her a cross to kiss, and at Hexham Margaret was greeted by the abbess and the nuns, and again kissed a cross.² Young's account clearly shows that Margaret's observance of Catholic religious rites when she entered a town was witnessed by her own entourage and common folk and thus was a performance of piety before a wide audience. As the queen of Scotland and an English princess, Margaret was expected to be a devout and pious Christian, but she was also expected to display this piety as a moral leader of her people.

Margaret's performance of piety on her wedding journey was one in an array of practices that made up her personal piety in the early sixteenth-century. Margaret and Catherine were queens whose success was based on the performance of queenship before a variety of audiences. The audiences for queenly piety were perhaps the most widespread of any Catherine and Margaret touched. Their piety was witnessed by God and his ecclesiastical representatives,

¹Young, "Fyancells," 273.

²Ibid., 269, 275.

courtiers, the poor and indigent, and the common people along pilgrimage routes. Their public display of piety took place in a variety of circumstances, from elaborate courtly ceremonies and rituals to the distribution of alms and largesse at their gates and thus served as an exemplar before the entire kingdom.³

Queenly piety and devotion to God and the church were probably the most prominent and public aspects of Catherine and Margaret's queenship. Religious ritual and liturgy, including the celebration of the Mass, were daily aspects of court ceremonial. Court life was dominated by the liturgical calendar, and religious processions were often significant moments of interaction between the monarch and courtiers.⁴ Catherine and Margaret practiced their piety in a number of ways which conformed to queenly practice before a variety of audiences, from important courtly ceremonies such as the Royal Maundy to lengthy pilgrimages which were viewed by large segments of the population and directly connected the queen's piety with the practice of popular religion. In doing so, Catherine and Margaret "performed" their piety in two modes: as public acts before an audience and as the fulfillment of duties to both God and the kingdom as a whole.

Catherine and Margaret were queens in the British Isles at the dawn of the Reformation, and before the end of both of their lives evangelical reform and Lutheranism would challenge the church in both England and Scotland. Both Catherine and Margaret were pious individuals, although Catherine's faith has tended to be singled out (for good or ill) specifically because of the role it played in the divorce crisis which precipitated Henry VIII's break from Rome in 1533.

³Anne Crawford argues that late medieval queens could substantially influence society and the king's court through their piety "The Piety of Late Medieval English Queens," 48–49; Sybil Jack has argued that in seventeenth-century Britain, a queen's identity was a public presentation based on a variety of appearances at court and instances of patronage through petitions and granting access to women at court. Moreover, many queens were popular with the larger public and their images were useful in establishing models and ideals of social behavior, "In Praise of Queens: The Public Presentation of the Virtuous Consort in Seventeenth-Century Britain," in *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Susan Broomhall and Stephanie Tarbin (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008).

⁴Fiona Kisby, "'When the King Goeth a Procession': Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547," *The Journal of British Studies* 40, no. 1 (2001): 45, 56–57, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3070769>.

Nearly every historical discussion of Catherine's religion has focused on the role her loyalty to Rome played in resisting Henry's divorce and her ultimate rejection of his claims to Royal Supremacy over the English church. There has been little historical investigation into Catherine's pious practice and belief without a teleological reference to the 1530s. Moreover, Catherine's piety has not been considered in relation to her queenship as a whole.

Catherine's posthumous reputation has received scholarly attention because of its use in anti-Protestant propaganda by English Catholics, although it was later reclaimed and rehabilitated by English Protestants.⁵ Judith Richards has noted that as the sixteenth century wore on, Catherine's reputation in England began to improve. She was no longer the Catholic "villain" of the Henrician Reformation, and partisan historians such as Foxe and Hall had to acknowledge that Catherine was personally popular. Richards suggests this resurgence "may reflect understandable popular distaste for Henry's marital history" and that "support for Katherine may have been much wider than usually understood."⁶ Richards is careful to point out that the true nature of Catherine's public support is difficult for historians to assess, because it seems to be based on oral traditions and rumor.⁷

Matthew Hansen also argues that Catherine's reputation began to change in the later sixteenth century, but he notes that later discussions of Catherine tend to de-emphasize the religious controversy of Henry's divorce by transforming Catherine into a Patient Griselda figure, and thus a sympathetic portrayal of suffering womanhood.⁸ This transformation made it possible for even staunch Protestant propagandists like John Foxe to valorize Catherine without

⁵Hansen, "And a Queen of England, Too"; Georgianna Ziegler, "Re-Imagining a Renaissance Queen: Catherine of Aragon among the Victorians," in *High and Mighty Queens of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 203–22; Levin, "The Taming of the Queen"; Richards, "Public Identity and Public Memory"; Collette, *Performing Polity*, chap. 6.

⁶Richards, "Public Identity and Public Memory," 208, 207.

⁷*Ibid.*, 208.

⁸Hansen, "And a Queen of England, Too," 81, 86; Collette, *Performing Polity*, chap. 6.

confronting her Catholicism.⁹ By the seventeenth century, even Catherine's foreignness has been "Englished," thus removing the two most controversial elements of Catherine's history—her Catholicism and her Spanishness—to allow her fully to inhabit the roles of suffering queen and wronged woman.¹⁰

Despite interest in Catherine's later reputation as queen—she has been called the "Last Medieval Queen, First Recusant Martyr," by Shakespeare scholar Amy Appleford—very little scholarly attention has been given to the pious practice of the last pre-Reformation queens in the British Isles.¹¹ As with many aspects of their queenships, later controversies about religion and politics have obscured our understanding of how Catherine and Margaret fulfilled their roles as queens. Instead, Catherine's famed piety has been described in somewhat dour generalities: "[t]he strain of piety which had made Isabella's last years seem those of a crowned nun was beginning to show in the daughter."¹² Margaret as well has been described as "devout in an entirely orthodox way," and like her sister-in-law, resistant to her brother's break from Rome.¹³ But, aside from the later political ramifications of their faiths, little has been said about how their piety informed their queenship.

"Piety" generally refers to the "consistent state or attitude about the religious meaning of life, expressed in actions symbolizing dependence upon and preoccupation with the divine," as defined by Robert W. Scribner.¹⁴ In the late medieval, pre-Reformation world that Catherine and

⁹Hansen, "And a Queen of England, Too," 91.

¹⁰Ibid.; other authors have noted that Catherine is no longer the subject of political or religious controversy by the seventeenth century, see Scherb, "I'de Have a Shooting," 136–137.

¹¹Amy Appleford, "Shakespeare's Katherine of Aragon: Last Medieval Queen, First Recusant Martyr," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40, no. 1 (2010): 149–71, doi:10.1215/10829636-2009-017.

¹²Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon*, 168; See also Starkey, *Six Wives*, 36–37; Weir, *Six Wives*, 84–85.

¹³Chapman, *The Sisters of Henry VIII*, 154; Audrey-Beth Fitch, "Mothers and Their Sons: Mary and Jesus in Scotland, 1450-1560," in *The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland*, ed. Steve Boardman and Eila Williamson (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell & Brewer, 2010), 164.

¹⁴Robert W. Scribner, "The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the 'Disenchantment of the World,'" *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 23, no. 3 (1993): 477, doi:10.2307/206099.

Margaret inhabited, piety was both belief and action, internal and external. Pious lay belief and ritual practice had grown in intensity and variety since the thirteenth century. Devotion to the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, and the sustained popular participation in lay fraternities and pilgrimages were community-based beliefs and practices of the laity.¹⁵

Catherine and Margaret's personal piety cannot be separated from their queenship. Their religious practices and devotions were both intensely personal and public at the same time. They participated in devotions that reflected to their concerns as wives and mothers, and they continued to support chaplains and orders that had a long history of serving them and their families. Their late-medieval religious devotions were similar in many respects to those of other men and women, both elite and popular. Moreover, their piety was played out in a pre-Reformation society that experienced personal piety as part of a public display, and that expected devotional behavior to be displayed before the community. As Eamon Duffy has argued, late medieval, pre-Reformation Britain expected and supported forms of piety that emphasized the community, and queens, of course, were a crucial part of the community of the realm.¹⁶

Catherine and Margaret were pious individuals, but they were pious in a distinctly queenly way. The very material manifestations of their piety were inseparable from their role as queens. For instance, in Margaret's chapel, the English royal arms were emblazoned on her

¹⁵ In recent decades, many historians have investigated the changing nature of lay belief in late medieval Europe and its vibrancy and strength before the Reformation, see also Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005); John Bossy, *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), chap. 4; Gail McMurray Gibson, *The Theater of Devotion: East Anglian Drama and Society in the Late Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

¹⁶ Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, chap. 4; Catherine and Margaret also expressed their devotion in a more individualistic manner, such as prayers and the reading of devotional texts, that probably reflected beliefs similar to Margaret Beaufort, whose piety combined personal austerity and devotion to the Eucharist with her continuing obligations as a great householder, Jones and Underwood, *King's Mother*, 197–199.

candlesticks and on the vestments of her priests.¹⁷ Margaret's Book of Hours, commissioned by James IV in Flanders as a wedding-gift, featured detailed and accurate royal arms for both Margaret and James, as well as floral decorations featuring the thistle (for Scotland), roses (for England) and the marguerite (a play on Margaret's name).¹⁸ The material objects that Margaret used in her worship, both privately and publicly, visually connected her piety with her identity and role as queen of Scotland and princess of England.

This chapter will address two forms of queenly piety that served different but complementary purposes: almsgiving and pilgrimages. The first section discusses how Catherine and Margaret fulfilled their duties before God and their kingdoms through the distribution of alms. Their acts of charity positioned Catherine and Margaret to act both as charitable Christian heads of households and as important participants in the semi-priestly ritual of the Royal Maundy. Their almsgiving thus separated Catherine and Margaret, as queens, from the pious practices of most of their people, who could not access these forms of pious almsgiving on the same scale or in the ritual fashion that Catherine and Margaret did. In the second section of this chapter, I show how Catherine's and Margaret's pilgrimages to shrines in England and Scotland brought them closer to the shared pious experiences of their subjects, and thus were expressions of both queenly and popular piety. Together these two elements of queenly piety served to establish Catherine and Margaret as both "high and mighty queens" while also linking their beliefs and religious devotion to those of their subjects.

In order to fully understand the practice of queenly piety, we must also take into account that it was always practiced in front of an audience, whether it was the king, his court, or the country as a whole. The nature of the royal court meant that as soon as the queen left her inner

¹⁷Eeles, "The Inventory of the Chapel Royal at Stirling, 1505," 315.

¹⁸Leslie McFarlane, "The Book of Hours of James IV and Margaret Tudor," *Innes Review* 11 (1960): 3, 8.

chamber, she was before an audience of some type. At the English court, when the king or queen heard Mass in the royal chapel, they did so on major church feast days which involved a ritual procession from their chambers to the chapel. According to Fiona Kisby, for Henry VII and Henry VIII, this was a “moment of emergence from the private to the public arena, a crucial instant set in a devotional context that drew attention to the king’s conventional and conspicuous piety.”¹⁹ As I discussed in chapter 5, the organizational structure of Catherine’s household closely mirrored the king’s, and thus her procession to the royal chapel took place in a very similar manner and context. Of course, not every pious act Catherine or Margaret performed was part of such well-defined ritual and liturgy as their attendance at Mass in the royal chapel, but because as queens Catherine and Margaret were considered moral leaders and exemplars of the kingdom, and nearly every pious act, from gifts of alms to public pilgrimage, had a role in influencing others.²⁰

Catherine’s and Margaret’s chaplains, their personal priests, almoners, and confessors, were important members of their households. Both Catherine and Margaret relied on their chaplains for more than spiritual guidance, and they rewarded these members of their household through church patronage. Their patronage of the church and its clerics was not solely based on their personal piety, but instead was part of their larger pattern of the performance of patronage and piety together. Their chaplains performed tasks beyond the spiritual care of their mistresses, and they were also prominent members of their households from their natal homelands, often making them Catherine’s and Margaret’s most trusted servants and confidants.

¹⁹Kisby, “Chapel Ceremonies and Services,” 56.

²⁰The Mass itself was an important ritual performance and royal attendance at Mass was a ritual itself. Attendance at Mass allowed kings and queens to become models of piety for their court and kingdom, and such modelling was itself a performance. For more on rituals, models, and religious liturgy, see Edward Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), chap. 5 and 7.

Catherine's and Margaret's most important chaplains were their almoners, who had a great deal of responsibility as the distributor of their household charity and alms.²¹ Their almoners were highly-educated clerics who held other positions in the English or Scottish churches, often obtained through the patronage of their mistresses. In general, both queens preferred and promoted chaplains from their natal lands. In Scotland, Margaret's two known chaplains, Dr. Henry Babington and James Carvenall, were both English and had traveled to Scotland as part of Margaret's initial household. Babington remained in Scotland until his death in 1507, while James Carvenall returned to England sometime after 1512 to become chaplain to Henry VIII.²² As Margaret's almoner, Dr. Babington received yearly fees of £20 Sterling, and was greatly favored by James IV.²³ After his death in 1507, it is unclear who may have taken his place in Margaret's household, although Carvenall would have been a strong candidate. Certainly, she would have been attended by other chaplains who may have acted as almoners.

Catherine's almoner was initially John de Rebelos, an Englishman who had served Isabel in Spain; however, he, like many of her household staff, seems to have left her service before she became queen.²⁴ When she became queen in 1509, Catherine's almoner was Dr. Robert Bekinsall, a cleric who had probably served in Elizabeth of York's household as well.²⁵ Bekinsall probably served Catherine until his death in 1526; his successor, Dr. Robert Shorton, is

²¹In sixteenth-century France the queen's almoner was the head of her chapel establishment, but the English king's chapel was headed by a dean, so it is unclear if Catherine's almoners were also the head of her private chapel, or if that role was filled by another chaplain, Kolk, "Household," 18; Kisby, "The Early-Tudor Royal Household Chapel," 75–76.

²²*LHTAA* 3:278, *LP* 2.2:2837; Andrew D. M. Barrell, "Royal Presentations to Ecclesiastical Benefices in Late Medieval Scotland," *Innes Review* 55, no. 2 (2004): 197–199, <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=194..>

²³*LHTA* 3:118.

²⁴*CSP Spanish* 1:288, Antonio de la Torre, ed., *La Casa de Isabel la Católica* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Patronato Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, 1954), 130.

²⁵*LP* 1.1:82; Neal, "The Queen's Grace," 161. Bekinsall held a doctorate of divinity from Cambridge, and, in addition to his duties as queen's almoner, was also president of Queen's College, Cambridge, see the entry on his kinsman, *ODNB* "Bekinsall, John (1499/1500–1559)."

mentioned as Catherine's almoner beginning in 1528.²⁶ Shorton had risen to prominence through his administration of St. John's College, Cambridge, and later he became the dean of Cardinal Thomas Wolsey's chapel.²⁷ Given his numerous connections, it is therefore difficult to determine precisely what Catherine might have done for Shorton's career, although it is likely that his appointment in 1529 as dean of the college of Stoke by Clare was Catherine's doing, as this post had been held by one of his predecessors, Bekinsall, from 1517 to 1525.²⁸

Serving as Catherine or Margaret's almoner was clearly an advantageous position. In addition to the potential for further career advancement and the patronage of the queen, almoners had access to the royal court as members of the queen's household. They received diets at the queen's table and liveries. At New Year, Catherine's almoner received valuable gifts of plate. In 1522 he was given a large gilt cup with a cover.²⁹ Catherine's almoner, moreover, served on her council and was involved in administering her estates. At least one petition to the queen's council was initially addressed to her almoner, as "one of her most distinguished council."³⁰ This petition may have been directed towards the queen's almoner because of his role as an intermediary between the queen's household and the wider world.³¹

Margaret's almoner may also have performed administrative tasks for the queen's religious establishment, possibly because he was already accounting for the distribution of alms and thus was a reliable administrator. In December 1511 Margaret's almoner was given cloth for

²⁶John Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541* (London: University of London, Institute of Historical Research, 1964), 1:29.

²⁷*ODNB* "Shorton, Robert (d.1535)"

²⁸"Colleges: Stoke by Clare."

²⁹*LP* Add. 1.1:367; the cup weighed 34oz, roughly the same as cups given to Catherine's chancellor and larger than the cups given to most of the other members of her household. Catherine's almoner also received New Year's gifts in 1528, *LP* 4.2:3748.

³⁰TNA MS E298/6; the petition is undated, although the catalogue at The National Archives assigns the petition to Catherine's council.

³¹R. A. Houston, "What Did the Royal Almoner Do in Britain and Ireland, C. 1450–1700?," *The English Historical Review* 125, no. 513 (2010): 286, doi:10.2307/25639997.

vestments and towels for the queen's altar, which indicates he was responsible for furnishing the queen's chapel as well as distributing alms.³² On a practical level, because the almoner was responsible for large amounts of money and goods assigned for the distribution to the poor, it would make sense for him to be involved in the financial administration of the queen's revenues or the organization of her chapel.³³

While the almoner was institutionally the most prominent chaplain in the queen's household, her confessor was the cleric who would have been her closest spiritual advisor. Royal confessors were often a source of controversy at the royal court because of their close access to the monarch and their potential influence over both political and moral decisions of the monarch. Catherine's and Margaret's confessors do not seem to have stirred up this type of controversy, although Luis Caroz, an incompetent Spanish ambassador early in Henry VIII's reign, complained about Catherine's confessor to her father Ferdinand.³⁴ One of Margaret's English chaplains may have acted as her confessor, although they are never named as such. Catherine was known for her preference for Spanish confessors, who were usually members of the order of Observant Franciscans, an order favored by Catherine, her family, and the Tudors.³⁵ In 1506 she wrote to her father requesting he send her a Spanish confessor.³⁶ She wished to have Spanish confessors because she felt she could not confess adequately in English. Henry used his wife's Spanish chaplains as translators, although one chaplain at least was "not so perfecte in the understandyng off our tonge."³⁷

³² *LHTA* 4:209.

³³ Dakota Hamilton does not include the queen's almoner as a typical member of her council, so it is possible that his involvement was based on personal ability rather than institutional organization, see "Learned Councils," 87.

³⁴ *CSP Spanish* 2:201; Nicole Reinhardt, "Spin Doctor of Conscience? The Royal Confessor and the Christian Prince," *Renaissance Studies* 23, no. 4 (2009): 570, 578, doi:10.1111/j.1477-4658.2009.00611.x.

³⁵ John E. Paul, *Catherine of Aragon and Her Friends* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1966), 143–147.

³⁶ Green, *Letters*, 1:140.

³⁷ TNA MS SP 1/23 fol. 57, *State Papers Online* (accessed February 2, 2010), <http://gale.cengage.co.uk/state-papers-online-15091714.aspx>; see also *LP* 3.1:1582.

Catherine's chaplains, especially her confessors, had the potential to spread their beliefs when they began to engage with and publish works against Martin Luther in the 1520s, and their activities reflected on their mistress. Henry VIII is well-known for his early defiance of Luther, which took the form of publications written by the king and his close associates, such as Sir Thomas More. Henry's activities before the break with Rome earned him a reputation for learning and the title of Defender of the Faith bestowed by the Pope. The Lutheran heresy deeply concerned Catherine as well, even before Henry's divorce made heresy a personal issue for her. James P. Carley shows that Catherine and Henry were very much early partners in the struggle against Lutheranism, and that their patronage and publishing activities worked together to form an anti-Lutheran campaign. This campaign presented Catherine and Henry as "a matched intellectual/theological team."³⁸ While Henry wrote (or at least claimed to write) tracts against Luther, Catherine enlisted her Spanish confessor Alphonsus de Villa Sancta to write two Latin treatises against Luther in 1523, both of which were dedicated to the queen.³⁹ Villa Sancta's two treatises included prefaces that addressed Catherine as "Defendress of the Faith," clearly pairing her with her husband.⁴⁰ Villa Sancta also claimed that Catherine discussed the problem of Luther with her confessor, thus implying Catherine's close involvement in the creation of Villa Sancta's tracts. Villa Sancta's prefaces were part of Catherine's public piety because they promulgated, through the medium of print, Catherine's own views about Luther and her desire to counter the threat of heresy.⁴¹

³⁸Carley, *Books of Henry VIII*, 115.

³⁹Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, 38–41.

⁴⁰Carley, *Books of Henry VIII*, 115–116.

⁴¹Villa Sancta's works were published by the king's printer Richard Pynson and were probably financed by the king, thus further tying Catherine's confessor more closely to Henry's efforts against Luther; Pamela Ayers Neville, "Richard Pynson, King's Printer (1506-1529): Printing and Propaganda in Early Tudor England." (PhD diss., London, 1990), 172–173, <http://ethos.bl.uk/Home.do>.

We should not assume that Catherine's and Henry's opposition to Lutheranism, which they saw as dangerous and heretical, was indicative of any overall hostility to criticism of the Catholic Church, or to the spread of new forms of humanist learning in England, especially at the universities. Maria Dowling has shown that Catherine herself was a strong supporter of humanists such as Sir Thomas More and Desiderus Erasmus, and her chaplains too were almost all from the reforming Observant Franciscan order.⁴² Catherine played a key part in encouraging humanism at English universities, and the college most closely associated with her, St. John's, Cambridge, had been founded by Margaret Beaufort to become a center of the "new learning."⁴³ Catherine was no hardline reactionary, and, as Dowling notes, it was the divorce crisis that brought a significant and lasting rift in English humanism.⁴⁴ Catherine and Henry may have worked together to oppose the influence of Luther and evangelical reform in the 1520s, but Catherine was equally interested in and supportive of humanistic reforms in education.⁴⁵

Catherine's and Margaret's chaplains, in addition to being members of their households, also received advancement in the church as a result of their service. Margaret's chaplains, despite their short time in Scotland, were favored by James IV. James made Babington the archdeacon of Aberdeen, and Carvenall was nominated to the archdeaconry of Dunkeld.⁴⁶ Carvenall had a particularly hard time with his appointment, however, as it was contested in Rome by George Ferne, a clerk at Dunkeld, who claimed the appointment was his. James even enlisted his brother-in-law Henry VIII in support of "zowre familiare clerk and chaplane," possibly the only

⁴²Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, 17, 50, 55.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 23–25.

⁴⁴Maria Dowling, "Humanist Support for Katherine of Aragon," *Historical Research* 57, no. 135 (1984): 46–55, doi:10.1111/j.1468-2281.1984.tb01258.x.

⁴⁵For a more detailed discussion of Catherine and education, see chapter 5.

⁴⁶*LHTA* 3:278; *LP* 1.1:1300; James IV held the right of appointment to certain ecclesiastical benefices in the Scottish church from a papal Indult of 1487, but this did not stop rival claimants from frequently appealing to Rome. The archdeaconry of Aberdeen had been a contested appointment in 1499 as well; Peter Iver Kaufman, "Piety and Proprietary Rights: James IV of Scotland, 1488-1513," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 13, no. 1 (1982): 85–88, doi:10.2307/2539919.

time the two kings ever worked harmoniously together.⁴⁷ Catherine's chaplains were also promoted within the church. Her longest-serving confessor, Jorge de Ateca, was made bishop of Llandaff in 1517, while her other chaplains obtained lesser positions throughout the course of her queenship.⁴⁸

By supporting and patronizing their chaplains in England and Scotland, Catherine and Margaret rewarded important members of their households, while also linking their piety with support for the church and its clerics. Their chaplains were well-placed to serve as public reminders of the queens' interests in church affairs and their continued reliance on worthy, devout men for their religious devotions. Thus the combination of pious practice and the performance of church patronage formed multiple relationships between Catherine and Margaret and the church which provided support for them and their chaplains.

The selection and advancement of chaplains and almoners was an important part of Catherine's and Margaret's personal piety, and these officials in turn aided them in the distribution of alms and largesse, which was one of the most publicly pious acts they were expected to perform. Charity was an expected duty for all early modern elites, especially queens. Indeed, Catherine's public almsgiving became a point of political significance after Henry VIII divorced her in order to marry Anne Boleyn. According to the Spanish ambassador, Anne Boleyn forbade any contact between Catherine and the poor, because "the alms she has been accustomed to give have attracted the love of the people."⁴⁹ Almsgiving was recognized by

⁴⁷ *LP* 1.1:1296, 1300.

⁴⁸ *ODNB* "D'Athequa, George (d. 1545)"; Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541*, 1:22, 25, 28, 124. Although interested in the new learning and certainly distrustful of some powerful, corrupt churchmen, such as Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, Catherine seems to have taken a pragmatic approach to the realities of church patronage and, in the case of Llandaff, absentee bishoprics.

⁴⁹ *LP* 7:469.

contemporaries as a powerful public performance of piety and an important mark of elite, queenly status.

Christian principles of charity and generosity towards the poor were, of course, an important influence in encouraging queens to give alms. Conduct books like Christine de Pizan's *Treasure of the City of Ladies* encouraged princesses to distribute largesse in many different circumstances, "with great discretion and prudence."⁵⁰ Juan Luis Vives argued that wives were responsible, as managers of the household, to give generously to the poor and to see that their servants were well taken care of.⁵¹ Queens especially were expected to give charity in a prominent and public way, so that their own generosity would inspire generosity in others. Christine de Pizan urged princesses to distribute alms to foreigners so that the princess's reputation for generosity would spread beyond the borders of her own kingdom.⁵²

Catherine and Margaret gave alms both institutionally through their almoners and more spontaneously through other members of their household. Anne Crawford identifies the distribution of alms, "small-scale but universal," as being a key component in the successful practice of queenly piety, which in turn ensured a positive reputation and widespread affection amongst the populace.⁵³ For instance, Elizabeth of York, the mother of Margaret and Catherine's predecessor, had given offerings at Mass, being especially generous on major feast days, and had had her almoner distribute food, money and clothing as part of her household alms. Elizabeth's

⁵⁰Pizan, *Treasure*, 54; almsgiving was also particularly praised by Pizan in her more well-known work, *The Book of the City of Ladies*, which was translated into English by a member of Catherine's household and was probably read by Catherine herself, Christine de Pizan, *The Book of the City of Ladies*, trans. Rosalind Brown-Grant (London: Penguin Books, 1999), 192–195; Johnston, "How the *Livre*."

⁵¹Vives, *Education of a Christian Woman*, 261.

⁵²Pizan, *Treasure*, 55.

⁵³Crawford, "The Piety of Late Medieval English Queens," 52–53.

privy purse accounts reveal that she gave alms informally to those she encountered in need: to a friar of St. John's, or to a man who had lodged her uncle, Earl Rivers, before he was executed.⁵⁴

However, the sources available for Catherine and Margaret necessarily limit our understanding about how their charity was performed. Unlike Elizabeth of York's accounts, privy purse accounts for neither Catherine nor Margaret have not survived, although there is evidence that both women had access to similar types of funds.⁵⁵ Therefore, although the evidence is more scattered and piecemeal for Catherine and Margaret, it is important to realize that the different pictures which emerge of their charity owes more to the survival of sources than to changes in queenly piety.

Charitable giving was part of Catherine's and Margaret's piety and a duty for them as the heads of great households. This giving took several different forms. Like their predecessors, in addition to the institutional charity performed through the queen's almoner and her household, Catherine and Margaret also distributed spontaneous gifts to the poor when they were traveling about their kingdoms. Additionally, some church holy days were specifically associated with poor relief, the most prominent being Maundy Thursday. Both Catherine and Margaret practiced the traditional Maundy ceremony of washing the feet of poor women and giving clothes and money, which I will discuss later. Although the amount, location, and reason for their charity varied widely depending on circumstance, Catherine and Margaret consistently followed a policy of traditional charity as part of the performance of queenship.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵ Catherine of Aragon's receiver's accounts lists the queen's privy purse expenses as being between £260 and £160 per year, which was probably accounted for in a now lost privy purse account book, see *LP* 4.3:6121; Margaret was given a pension of £1000 Scots per year, at least part of which was probably considered her "privy purse."

The queen's almoner was responsible for overseeing her household alms, and the position was an important one which handled money as head of the department of the almonry.⁵⁶ The sums given out by the queens' almoners could vary, but we have only piecemeal evidence of what queens gave as alms on a yearly basis. Catherine's receiver's accounts show that Catherine's almsgiving was between £160 and £190 a year from 1525 to 1530, though this sum does not include alms given using other sources of funds, for instance, Catherine's privy purse, or in her name by the king.⁵⁷ The queen's almoner was not the only official who distributed charity on her behalf. Catherine's receivers gave alms to specific foundations or individuals associated with her estates, and often these gifts were a continuation of what her predecessors had given. For instance, the convent of Sheen received £7 6s 8d from Catherine's receiver as part of a grant originally made by Henry's ancestors out of the lordship of Wareham. Catherine herself also directed that alms be granted by her receivers, for instance giving 13s 4d to John Benton, an anchorite of Marlborough in April 1518.

Margaret's alms are more difficult to trace because of the lack of household accounts. The Scottish Lord High Treasurer recorded offerings made by the king in the royal accounts, but apart from a few isolated entries, there are no entries for Margaret's offerings. Therefore, it is difficult to say how much her almoner distributed. Additionally, because most of her household accounting was not independent of the king's, any household-based alms, such as the broken meats from her table, are indistinguishable from the king's.⁵⁸ Margaret did have a small pension of £1000 Scots per year, and it is likely that at least some of her offerings and alms came out of this purse. These alms, if they existed, were most likely of the occasional variety and were

⁵⁶Houston, "Royal Almoner," 288.

⁵⁷*LP* 4.3:6121; Catherine's alms were, unsurprisingly, small compared to her husband's, whose household alms in 1518 were £36 per month, roughly £432 a year, see *LP* 2.2:A58; Anne Boleyn's alms were probably more, and her biographer argues that £1500 a year, though an exaggeration, is "just about credible," Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, 284.

⁵⁸For a fuller discussion of Margaret's household and its relation to James IV's household, see chapter 5.

probably similar to the few references to Margaret's charity in the Lord High Treasurer's accounts, such as when Margaret's chaplain was given £3 12s Scots to give away after presenting a token from Margaret to the Lord High Treasurer. This exchange indicates that Margaret had access to some sort of system which allowed her to distribute funds from the king's accounts.⁵⁹

We can gain a slightly clearer picture of Catherine of Aragon's occasional charity because of the survival of some of her wardrobe accounts. Catherine distributed charity both in money and in kind, and her wardrobe accounts show that she gave aid to the poor or the pious she encountered. Catherine supported poor friars from her Spanish homeland by giving two of them grey habits worth 21s 4d (probably indicating they were Observant Franciscans, one of Catherine's favorite orders).⁶⁰ The same account book reveals that Catherine also ordered clothing of linen and russet, as well as shoes, for nine poor women, a similar provision to her Maundy charity, which we will discuss below.⁶¹ Elizabeth of York also had given occasional alms to poor friars or nuns, and it is reasonable to assume that Catherine's privy purse accounts would have reflected similar donations in coin as well as the gifts of clothing recorded in her wardrobe accounts.⁶²

The most important almsgiving for Catherine and Margaret during the ritual year was the Royal Maundy, a ceremony that was a powerful statement about the sacerdotal power of the king and also his queen. Maundy Thursday (also called Skire Thursday in Scotland) occurred the day before Good Friday, and since at least the fourteenth century, had been celebrated by the kings of England by giving alms to poor men and women. By the Tudor period, the ceremony had

⁵⁹ *LHTA* 2:470.

⁶⁰ TNA MS E101/418/6, 30r.

⁶¹ TNA E101/418/6, 34v.

⁶² Crawford, "The Piety of Late Medieval English Queens," 52–53.

evolved into a solemn court spectacle, taking place in the royal chapel.⁶³ At the English court on Maundy Thursday, the king would process from his chamber to the royal chapel, where he would hear a Mass. After the Mass, he returned to his chamber for a meal. The king then processed back to the chapel in the afternoon, where he would kneel on a cushion while the dean would strip and wash the altars. Only then would the king perform the *pedilavium*, the ritual washing of the feet of selected poor men, having been given a towel, basin, and perfumes by his almoner. After the washing the king distributed clothes and alms to the poor men and then returned to his chambers.⁶⁴ Washing the feet was meant to emulate the Last Supper, where Jesus washed the feet of his disciples.⁶⁵ The ceremony was thus a part of the sacralization of the monarch by associating him with Christ, and monarchs used ceremonies such as the Royal Maundy to enhance their prestige.⁶⁶ Catherine and Margaret, who almost certainly participated in the same ceremony alongside their husbands, shared their claims about the sacred nature of royalty.

After Henry VIII's reign the Royal Maundy became a religious ritual that was useful in supporting the Royal Supremacy as a new aspect of the power of the Tudor monarchy. The Royal Maundy has been of particular interest to scholars of Mary I and Elizabeth I, the first English queens regnant, both of whom had to adapt new strategies for legitimating their rule.⁶⁷

⁶³ There is no eyewitness description that I can find of the Scottish Maundy. The English Ambassador, Nicholas West, was at the Scottish court during Holy Week 1513, and does not record a Maundy ceremony, though he spoke to Margaret on Holy Saturday within her traverse of the Royal Chapel, *LP*1.1:1735; James IV had a tradition of retreating to the convent of the Observant Franciscans at Stirling during Holy Week, so it is possible that he did not take full advantage of the performance opportunities of the Royal Maundy, although he certainly distributed alms both at Stirling and at the gates of his other castles, Linlithgow and Edinburgh, MacDonald, "Princely Culture in Scotland," 150; *LHT* 2:71.

⁶⁴ Kisby, "The Early-Tudor Royal Household Chapel," 159–160.

⁶⁵ Brian Robinson, *The Royal Maundy* (London: Kaye & Ward, 1977), 25–26.

⁶⁶ Kisby, "Chapel Ceremonies and Services," 62; Carole Levin, "'Would I Could Give You Help and Succour': Elizabeth I and the Politics of Touch," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 21, no. 2 (July 1, 1989): 195, doi:10.2307/4049925.

⁶⁷ See for example, Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994); Caroline McManus, "Queen Elizabeth, Dol Common, and the Performance of the Royal Maundy," *English Literary Renaissance* 32, no. 2 (2002): 189–213, doi:10.1111/1475-6757.00008.

Carole Levin in particular has argued that the Royal Maundy ceremony was part of Elizabeth's deliberate attempts to use liturgical ceremonies to claim sacred status for the monarchy. The Royal Maundy and touching for the king's evil were two potent rituals that Elizabeth could use to claim religious power for the monarch.⁶⁸ In the Tudor period, the number of poor recipients of royal alms was made equal to the age of the monarch.⁶⁹ By having the number of poor recipients corresponding to the age of the monarch, the focus of the ceremony was retained by the monarch personally, and "marks a major difference from other Maundies, and places more emphasis on the specific monarch as Christ figure, rather than simply as an anonymous representative of the church." Additionally, Levin argues that Elizabeth's and Mary's gender was emphasized through the performance of the *pedilavium* on women, not men, as had been the case with male monarchs.⁷⁰

Yet Elizabeth's and Mary's Maundies were not uniquely gendered re-interpretations of the rituals of their father Henry VIII and grandfather Henry VII. Their rituals drew upon a much older, more common, and less revolutionary variation of the Royal Maundy, that of the Maundies practiced by pre-Reformation queens consort, such as Catherine of Aragon and Margaret Tudor. Their Maundy ceremonies were an important part of the royal ritual year and an important symbol of their status as public partners of their husbands, Henry VIII and James IV. Both women participated in Royal Maundy ceremonies that were gendered in the same way that Mary's and Elizabeth's Maundies were by washing the feet of poor women. Performed in the same ritual space and in a similar manner as their husbands' Maundies, the ceremony made implicit claims for the sacredness of their queenship. This ritual, which spoke to both courtly and

⁶⁸Levin, "Would I Could Give You Help and Succour," 198.

⁶⁹Robinson, *The Royal Maundy*, 25; sometimes the number of recipients equaled the monarch's age plus one, for "a year of grace."

⁷⁰Levin, "Would I Could Give You Help and Succour," 202.

non-courtly audiences, was a religious performance of the queen's status as an anointed consort, her relationship with her husband, and her fulfillment of pious Christian ideals of charity.⁷¹ Moreover, Margaret's Maundy ceremony, as we shall see, incorporated unique elements that tied its performance closely to her identity as both the wife of James IV and also an English princess and physical embodiment of a political alliance.

I argue that Catherine's and Margaret's almsgiving and the *pedilavium* on Maundy Thursday were profound statements of their own sacred status as anointed queens.⁷² By placing the queen's ritual on a near-equal footing to her husband's, the Royal Maundy reaffirmed their partnership and asserted the queen's high estate next to the king. The Royal Maundy ritual for queens encompassed (and thus did not ignore) their gender through the use of female recipients of the *pedilavium*, but their gender did not prevent Catherine and Margaret from fully participating in the sacralizing rite of the Maundy. Because the Maundy was above all a ritual of charity, it was entirely within the appropriate gender expectations for queens to participate in its rites, but because it was a ritual closely associated with the actions of Christ and a Christocentric monarch, it elevated their charity. When performed alongside their husbands, the Maundy was a quasi-sacerdotal act that reaffirmed their own sacred authority as anointed queens. The rite is therefore an excellent example of how Catherine and Margaret both conformed to widely-held

⁷¹ In 1509, Catherine of Aragon was anointed with chrism during her joint coronation with her husband Henry VIII, whereupon she drank from a chalice, a practice usually reserved only for priests. Margaret was anointed during her coronation, which immediately followed her marriage ceremony. Because they were anointed queens, Catherine and Margaret were transformed into a quasi-sacerdotal figures who had been blessed and chosen by God to be queen; for more on Catherine's coronation, see Alice Hunt, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 32; for Margaret's anointing, see Young, "Fyancells," 294.

⁷² The *pedilavium* was itself a priestly rite, which when performed by Mary I and Elizabeth I, included the queen making the sign of the cross upon the feet of the almswoman, Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, 34–35.

social expectations for women while also superseding those gendered roles through their unique status as the king's public partner.⁷³

Early modern kings understood the distinctive power and quasi-sacred authority that Royal Maundies could give to queens. During Henry's divorce crisis the celebration of the Royal Maundy by Catherine as queen became a point of contention. In 1534, Catherine was prevented from holding her Maundy while she was under house arrest. In 1535 Catherine insisted on holding her Maundy, and her jailor wrote to the king for instructions on how to handle the situation.⁷⁴ Henry decided that Catherine could hold her Maundy *only* if she did so as a royal widow, in conformity with how other elite women, including Henry's grandmother Margaret Beaufort, held their Maundies, and not as a queen. Although it is unclear what the specific differences were between Margaret Beaufort's Maundies and Catherine's Maundies, the restrictions placed upon Catherine perhaps hint that non-queenly Maundies were less public affairs, taking place in private chapels and chambers rather than churches or the chapel royal. Catherine was "to keep her Maundy in her chamber" thus lessening the potential audience for the ceremony, had it been held in her chapel or the parish church. Moreover, if Catherine attempted to keep the Maundy as queen, "she is to be told that she and all her officers and such as receive it will be guilty of high treason."⁷⁵ Henry's instructions on this occasion reveal that the public performance of the queen's Maundy, which normally was held in the royal chapel in full view of many members of the royal court, was a distinct privilege of queens consort which set them apart from other Maundies. Henry, and his contemporaries, understood that queenly Maundies were

⁷³ Royal Maundies were especially elaborate and sacred, but Maundy Thursday was observed by other Christians as well. Many pre-Reformation religious, including abbesses, and lay men and women distributed alms on Maundy Thursday. For instance, instructions for the household of the Earl of Northumberland show that both the earl and his countess gave alms to poor men and women equal to each of their ages, Robinson, *The Royal Maundy*, 26; Cardinal Wolsey, along with other high-ranking clerics, also held Maundies.

⁷⁴ "Original Documents Relating to Queen Katharine of Arragon," *Gentlemen's Magazine and Historical Review* 135 Pt. 2 (1854): 573–574.

⁷⁵ *LP* 8:435.

powerful rituals that gave Catherine a spiritual authority and moral capital that can be seen when we see how her defiant actions during the divorce were viewed by the populace.⁷⁶

Maundy Thursday was a solemn church feast day and day of mourning, and at the Tudor court it was an occasion for crown-wearing and dressing in either blue (the color of royal mourning) or purple.⁷⁷ In March 1504, Margaret's Wardrobe made the queen a gown of purple velvet and cloth of gold, possibly in preparation for the Royal Maundy.⁷⁸ In 1514, Catherine's Maundy gown was of violet cloth.⁷⁹ The Maundy gown was of particular significance because traditionally it was given to one of the poor almswomen after the ritual was complete. Although no eyewitness descriptions of their Maundies survive, account books show that Catherine and Margaret both followed the tradition of distributing suits of clothes to a number of recipients related to their own ages. For Margaret's first Maundy in Scotland in April 1504, clothing was ordered for 15 poor women which equaled Margaret's current age plus one "year of grace."⁸⁰ Like her husband Henry VIII, Catherine also distributed alms in line with her age. In March 1520, her wardrobe bought 96 yards of cloth for the gowns of 35 poor women, in addition to smocks for a total cost of £16 9s 5d. Like their royal predecessors, both queens gave alms to poor women, gendering the ceremony to their queenship.⁸¹ Catherine and Margaret's performance of the Maundy was specifically tied to them based on their age and the gender of the recipients, thus tying this ceremony to them as individuals.

⁷⁶Kisby, "Chapel Ceremonies and Services," 62; for a discussion of public opinion of Catherine during the divorce, see Elston, "Widow Princess or Neglected Queen?," 19–23, 26–27; Elston has noted that during this incident Catherine is attempting to continue her charitable ritual while calling out Henry's bluff that she is now "merely" a royal widow. Elston does not discuss the importance of Henry's restriction of Catherine's Maundy to her chamber or its importance as a sacralizing ritual.

⁷⁷Hayward, *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII*, 132–133.

⁷⁸*LHTA* 2:225.

⁷⁹TNA MS E101/416/8, 21v.

⁸⁰*LHTA* 2:259; this order sharply illuminates the difference in ages between the royal couple, as James IV's gift was to 32 poor men.

⁸¹Elizabeth of York also gave alms to thirty-seven poor women (her age) in 1502, Robinson, *The Royal Maundy*, 26.

By using sources that record the material expenses of Catherine's and Margaret's Maundies, I argue that their roles conformed closely to the Maundy ceremonies performed by Mary I and Elizabeth I and were thus specifically focused on queens as individuals and not as universal representatives of Christian charity.⁸² The footwashing portion of the Royal Maundy was perhaps the most significant element of the ritual, because it most directly imitated the actions of Christ and placed the king in a priestly, almost divine role. This aspect of the ceremony is the most difficult to discern in the sources for Catherine and Margaret, but there is evidence that both women also performed the footwashing. The purchase of items needed for the footwashing ceremony is a good indication that Catherine and Margaret participated in this aspect of the Maundy. Tudor protocol books describe Henry VIII being provided with a towel, basin and perfumes before performing the *pedilavium*.⁸³ When Elizabeth I performed the Royal Maundy in the late sixteenth century, she and her ladies were provided with aprons before washing the feet of the poor women (their feet had already been washed by three other household officials).⁸⁴ For Margaret's Maundy in 1504, one indication that she may have participated in the footwashing was the purchase of four ells of Holland cloth for the queen and her almoner.⁸⁵ The account entry shows that the remainder of the fabric was made into towels for the king. This fabric, clearly suitable for towels, was not the type of fabric used for the other elements of the Maundy—clothing for the poor women or the queen—and thus it is highly likely that it went to make the queen's own towels for the footwashing ceremony. Similarly, the purchase of aprons

⁸²Carole Levin states, following Robinson, that queens consort did not perform the footwashing portion of the Maundy. Neither scholar cites the sources I cite below; Levin, "Would I Could Give You Help and Succour," 194, 202; Robinson, *The Royal Maundy*, 26.

⁸³Kisby, "The Early-Tudor Royal Household Chapel," 160.

⁸⁴McManus, "Performance of the Royal Maundy," 195–196.

⁸⁵*LHTA* 2:426.

and towels for Catherine and her almoner in both 1514 and 1520 suggest that she may have participated in the *pedilavium* as well.⁸⁶

Margaret's Royal Maundy featured a unique aspect that identified the ritual with the queen personally as both a Scottish queen consort and an English princess. As discussed above, in addition to the distribution of clothing and the *pedilavium* at the Royal Maundy, the poor men and women were also given purses with alms. For instance, in 1505, James IV gave thirty-three men 33s Scots as alms on Maundy Thursday. Margaret also distributed alms in purses, and in 1505, she gave sixteen women 16d in English coin.⁸⁷ While there is no indication in the accounts as to why Margaret's alms were in English coin, it was a practice that continued throughout her marriage.⁸⁸ This custom would have served to reassert Margaret's identity as both Scottish queen and English princess, while also making her part of the Royal Maundy distinctive from the king's.⁸⁹

The Royal Maundy was a ceremony that even before the Reformation in England and Scotland was an important ritual that enhanced the status of the monarchy and had political as well as religious significance. Evidence based on the purchase of material goods for both Margaret Tudor and Catherine of Aragon indicates that both performed the *pedilavium* and almsgiving as queens consort. Their Maundies were specifically tailored to their personal status as queen, reflecting their age, gender, and in the case of Margaret Tudor, her national origin. By

⁸⁶ TNA MS E101/418/6, 22r; JRL Latin MS 239, 1v.

⁸⁷ *LHTA* 3:57.

⁸⁸ For the 1512 Royal Maundy alms, see *LHTA* 4:185; see also *LHTA* 2:259, 3:289, 4:40.

⁸⁹ It may appear that this practice was part of an attempt to inflate the value of Margaret's alms: as Margaret was significantly younger than the king, her alms would have been significantly less than his. By using English pennies instead of Scottish shillings, the value of Margaret's alms came closer to the value of the king's, and thus may have preserved some notion of "fairness." However, the decision to use pennies instead of shillings negates any increase in value gained by using different currency. As James gave out his alms in Scottish shillings, which were worth 12 Scottish pence or roughly 36 English pence, his alms were worth far more than Margaret's even when currency conversions are taken into account. It seems unlikely that there was a deliberate economic motivation behind using English currency.

performing this important religious and royal ceremony, Margaret and Catherine incorporated the sacrality of monarchy into their own queenship and claimed a significant place alongside their husbands as part of divinely sanctioned royal partnership. In the profoundly religious society and culture of the early sixteenth-century, the participation by the monarchy in religious rituals reaffirmed the status of the monarch as one chosen by God.⁹⁰ By sharing in these same rituals, Catherine and Margaret claimed the importance of their queenly piety by placing their pious acts alongside their husbands' Maundies.

While Catherine's and Margaret's Royal Maundies served to exalt their authority and link their queenly piety to their husbands, their participation in royal pilgrimages brought them significantly closer to the beliefs and religious practices of pre-Reformation Britons. At the same time, Catherine's and Margaret's pilgrimages were necessarily different in form and scale from most early sixteenth-century pilgrimages. Neil Samman has argued that for the king and queen, going on pilgrimage in the early sixteenth century was a form of royal progress which allowed monarchs to display themselves and their piety to their subjects.⁹¹ These official pilgrimages by the royal court, either with the king and queen or with the queen alone, were highly public performances of royal piety and devotion. Both Catherine and Margaret went on several prominent pilgrimages, but they also performed many more minor, "everyday" visits to local holy sites as the court moved throughout the year.

Any royal progress or lengthy journey, whether its destination was a holy site or royal palace, was a type of pilgrimage that featured the prominent display of kingly or queenly piety. While traveling across the countryside beyond the usual routes of the royal court, Catherine and

⁹⁰Glenn Richardson, *Renaissance Monarchy: The Reigns of Henry VIII, Francis I and Charles V* (London: Arnold, 2002), 22.

⁹¹Neil Samman, "The Henrician Court During Cardinal Wolsey's Ascendancy c.1514-1529" (PhD diss., University of Wales, 1988), 63, <http://ethos.bl.uk/Home.do>.

Margaret stopped in towns, monasteries or colleges to venerate local relics and pay their respects to local churchmen. Thus both queens performed their piety to a wide public audience, and nearly every journey included veneration at local shrines or chapels. When they entered towns, they were welcomed by the leaders of the community and then immediately performed an act of devotion. For instance, on the first stop of Margaret's wedding journey to Scotland in 1503, she had entered the English town of Grantham, where she was given a cross to kiss by the Bishop of Norwich. According to John Young, this began a series of public displays of piety by the young queen: "[a]nd thus was doon continually, lastyng the said Veyage thorough the Reyme of Inglaund in all the Places wher she cam."⁹² Catherine too visited local shrines or chapels in the areas where she stayed.

Official pilgrimages for both Catherine and Margaret were specifically tied to their desire for children and the troubles they faced in childbirth. Their trips to pilgrimage sites associated with childbirth or timed specifically after a difficult birth reinforced their roles as the continuators of the royal dynasty and communicated both their anxieties and their hopes to the kingdom at large. Catherine's and Margaret's motivations for going on pilgrimage were similar to those of many other women pilgrims of the period, whose primary concerns centered around fertility, childbirth, and the health of their family.⁹³ In July 1507 Margaret, accompanied by her husband, household and the royal court, made a pilgrimage to St. Ninian's, Whithorn, as a thanksgiving for her recovery from a difficult birth. Catherine made several pilgrimages to the shrine of the Virgin at Walsingham, in Norfolk, which had a special affinity for women and fertility. Both pilgrimages took the queens beyond the usual areas of the kingdom frequented by the royal court and displayed their piety to a wider audience of the kingdom.

⁹²Young, "Fyancells," 268..

⁹³Susan Signe Morrison, *Women Pilgrims in Late Medieval England: Private Piety as Public Performance* (London: Routledge, 2000), 16.

Margaret's journey to St. Ninian's took place in the summer of 1507, five months after the birth of her first child, Prince James. The birth had been difficult for the seventeen-year-old queen, and her husband, James IV, had ridden to Whithorn immediately after the birth to pray for her recovery.⁹⁴ Margaret's pilgrimage in the summer was therefore one of thanksgiving for her own recovery and for the successful fulfillment of her primary duty, that of providing an heir to the throne.⁹⁵ Whithorn was a favorite pilgrimage site for James IV, who visited it nearly every year around Easter.⁹⁶ In 1473, James IV's parents, James III and Margaret of Denmark, had made a pilgrimage to Whithorn to give thanks for the birth of the heir.⁹⁷

Whithorn was devoted to the shrine of St. Ninian, a Scottish saint whose supplicants primarily came from the Irish Sea zone, although some English pilgrims did receive safe passage to visit the shrine in the sixteenth century.⁹⁸ As it was in the southwestern portion of Scotland, in Galloway, the shrine itself was quite a distance from the court's usual territory around Edinburgh. The pilgrimage to St. Ninian's involved the additional complication of a language and culture barrier. Galloway was still primarily Gaelic-speaking in the sixteenth century.⁹⁹ Nevertheless, St Ninian was probably Scotland's most popular native saint, and a broad range of Scots traveled to Whithorn on pilgrimage to seek his aid or to give thanks.¹⁰⁰

Margaret's journey was a public occasion that allowed the royal couple to see and be seen across their kingdom. Great care was taken to ensure that the queen's retinue would make

⁹⁴Leslie, *History of Scotland*, 2:122.

⁹⁵ Prince James lived for a year before dying in February 1508, so he was not the future James V, but in July 1507, the succession looked assured.

⁹⁶ Margaret did not accompany him on these trips, but James would make an offering there for the queen as well, *LHTA* 3:39.

⁹⁷Mairi A. R. Cowan, "Lay Piety in Scotland Before the Protestant Reformation: Individuals, Communities, and Nation" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2003), 236, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305273406?accountid=14553>.

⁹⁸*Ibid.*, 238.

⁹⁹David Ditchburn, "'Saints at the Door Don't Make Miracles?' The Contrasting Fortunes of Scottish Pilgrimage c 1450-1550," in *Sixteenth-Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, ed. Julian Goodare and A. A. MacDonald (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 91.

¹⁰⁰Cowan, "Lay Piety in Scotland," 141.

the correct impression of royal splendor and magnificence. The Lord Treasurer's accounts give us an understanding of the scale and expense of Margaret's journey in 1507, which included not only the king and queen, but also retinues from both their households. Three new gowns of satin and a new cloak were made for Margaret in June in preparation for her journey.¹⁰¹ Additionally, the queen's stables were busy preparing her stable gear and harnesses in anticipation of the journey, providing her with practical necessities such as bits and stirrups, as well as more elaborate and ornate items such as a cloth of gold harness and two velvet saddles.¹⁰²

Margaret was accompanied by her ladies and gentlewomen, who rode horses and were accompanied by their own servants. While at Whithorn, the accounts record the purchase of a horse for Mistress Margaret Dennet, one of Margaret's gentlewomen, at a cost of £5 Scots. The most visible of Margaret's servants, her footmen and littermen, were outfitted to match the royal splendor with new suits of clothes in the Scottish royal livery colors of red and yellow.¹⁰³

Margaret's journey was clearly an occasion that allowed James and his queen to visit with important members of the noble and clerical elite, thus serving a political purpose as well as a spiritual one. It took the royal court about a month for the whole journey, which was conducted at a leisurely pace and eschewed a direct route, instead stopping at major Scottish towns including Glasgow, Paisley and Peebles.¹⁰⁴ The royal accounts give a festive picture of a large court on the move. In addition to their servants and personal attendants, James and Margaret brought Italian minstrels to entertain them along the route.¹⁰⁵ Local musicians entertained the royal couple as well, such as the "clarschaar" (an Irish harpist) of Ayr to whom the king gave 5s.

¹⁰¹ *LHTA* 3:269-70.

¹⁰² *LHTA* 3:399

¹⁰³ *LHTA* 3:321.

¹⁰⁴ Ditchburn, "Scottish Pilgrimages," 95; Mairi Cowan states that the distance from Edinburgh to Whithorn at 120 miles, but the journey could be much longer if James went out of his way to stop by Glasgow and other major towns, as he did in 1507, Cowan, "Lay Piety in Scotland," 137.

¹⁰⁵ *LHTA* 3:399, 404.

Local elites greeted James with gifts ranging from cherries to two horses given by the abbot of Paisley. A 14s tip to the Bishop of Glasgow's master cook indicates that the king and queen attended feasts and banquets as well.¹⁰⁶

The journey provided opportunities for Margaret to see more of her kingdom and interact with her subjects. Along the route to Whithorn, Margaret and her ladies stopped for refreshments, pausing to drink "by the gate" with a local woman, who was given 14d for her trouble.¹⁰⁷ In another instance Margaret stopped to drink and gave 14s for "belcher" or good entertainment, at the village of Monaebrugh, on the road from Glasgow to Stirling.¹⁰⁸ These are small instances that probably indicate a larger pattern of Margaret's interactions along her pilgrimage with the villages and towns where the royal entourage stopped, either to spend the night or to take refreshment on a summer's day. When taken together with James's similar gifts and interactions, it is possible to argue that Margaret's pilgrimage to Whithorn in July 1507 was an important royal progress, possibly the most important progress since her wedding in 1503.¹⁰⁹ Because the journey was a festive occasion, giving thanks for the birth of an heir and the queen's recovery, Margaret and James had an opportunity to proclaim the strength and success of the monarchy through their splendid display. However, we should not allow the triumphal nature of their pilgrimage to obscure the impulse at the root of Margaret's journey, which was one of personal thanksgiving after her recovery from illness after childbirth.¹¹⁰ Indeed, the timing of the

¹⁰⁶ *LHTA* 3:405.

¹⁰⁷ *LHTA* 3:401

¹⁰⁸ *LHTA* 3:405.

¹⁰⁹ Mairi Cowan makes a similar point in her discussion of James's pilgrimages, but 1507 was the first time Margaret and her household were included in this important royal performance; Cowan, "Lay Piety in Scotland," 140–141.

¹¹⁰ Margaret made other pilgrimage journeys to Scottish shrines, including the shrine of St. Duthac at Tain, in the far northeast of the kingdom, though none of these were explicitly associated with her childbearing or fertility. In the spring of 1510, Margaret and James traveled to Tain by way of Elgin, *ERS* 13:292.

pilgrimage and its thankful nature loudly echoed the atmosphere and motivation behind women's churchings, and Margaret's journey could be seen in one sense as a kingdom-wide churching.¹¹¹

Margaret's journey of thanksgiving to Whithorn stands in contrast to the great many pilgrimages made by English and Scottish queens in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which were journeys of supplication. A far more common reason for pilgrimages was to pray for the birth of an heir to the throne, not to celebrate the birth itself.¹¹² Catherine's pilgrimages to the shrine of the Virgin at Walsingham appear to conform to this type of practice, though it should be emphasized that she was not unique amongst English and Scottish queens in seeking divine help with fertility issues, and no contemporary sources explicitly state the motivations for Catherine's pilgrimages. Because of its association with fertility and childbirth, Walsingham was a natural focus of queens worried about fulfilling their dynastic duties.

The Chapel of Our Lady at Walsingham had always had close association with devout women and the Virgin: in the legend of the shrine's founding, a wealthy widow Richeldis de Faveraches had founded the shrine based on a vision of Mary's house in Nazareth. She then built the shrine as a re-creation of Mary's house. Richard Pynson had printed the legend in ballad form in 1496; his edition was based on an earlier thirteenth-century ballad. Pynson's decision to print the ballad suggests not only the shrine's popularity, but also the widespread knowledge and appeal of its founding legend, which placed devout women and the Virgin at the center of events.¹¹³

¹¹¹ For more on queenly churching, see chapter 3.

¹¹² For instance, Mary of Guise, Margaret's daughter-in-law, went on pilgrimage to St. Adrian's shrine on the Isle of May in 1539 to pray for a child, Marshall, *Mary of Guise*, 78; James IV visited the Isle of May nearly every year, though there is no record of Margaret joining him.

¹¹³ J. C. Dickinson, *The Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 124–130.

Walsingham was a popular shrine in late medieval and early modern England with elites as well as more humble folk. English queens visited the shrine with their husbands, but queens facing fertility problems made journeys on their own. In the fifteenth century, both Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth Woodville had gone on separate pilgrimages to Walsingham. Margaret went to give thanks for her long-awaited pregnancy and to pray for a son.¹¹⁴ Elizabeth Woodville had planned to go to Walsingham in 1469, though it is unclear if the visit was cancelled because of the rebellion of the Earl of Warwick. If she made the journey, she was probably praying for the birth of a prince after a succession of four daughters.¹¹⁵ Elizabeth of York, too, had visited the shrine in 1495, possibly because of the recent loss of her four-year old daughter and the birth of a premature son.¹¹⁶

Catherine was devoted to Walsingham and traveled there on at least four pilgrimages during her reign as queen, in 1515, 1517, 1519, and 1521. On a practical level, Catherine had a strong association with Walsingham and the pilgrimage route there. As queen she had been assigned the manors of Great and Little Walsingham as part of her dower, and while on pilgrimage she could have stayed at those manors. Catherine held many other manors in Suffolk and Norfolk as well, which she may have visited along the way. She was also hosted by the local nobility and friends during these trips, including her close friend, her Spanish lady-in-waiting, now Lady Maria Willoughby, and Catherine's brother-in-law, Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴Pre-modern popular and learned authorities held a variety of beliefs on when the sex of the fetus was determined in the uterus, so Margaret's prayers for a son after conception would have seemed appropriate to many of her subjects anxious for a male heir, Ian Maclean, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman: A Study in the Fortunes of Scholasticism and Medical Science in European Intellectual Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 37–39.

¹¹⁵Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, 111, 134.

¹¹⁶*Ibid.*, 111.

¹¹⁷Brandon was married to Henry VIII's sister Mary; *LP* 1.1:94; Samman, "Henrician Court," 62.

Catherine's association with Walsingham began from the moment of her first successful pregnancy, in 1511. The birth of Prince Henry on New Year's Day caused enormous celebration at court, and the new father, Henry VIII, immediately ordered a pageant performed that celebrated the royal couple, using Catherine's badge of pomegranates and the Tudor rose. Before Catherine was churched and returned to court life, Henry also rode to Walsingham to give thanks for his heir.¹¹⁸ Catherine appears to have been planning to visit the shrine as well. In a letter to her husband in 1513, she mentions wishing to go to the shrine to fulfill a vow she made long ago.¹¹⁹ Events seemed to have prevented Catherine from going to Walsingham until 1515, at which time she had had two additional unsuccessful pregnancies that had resulted in miscarriages or stillbirths.¹²⁰ Although Catherine did not visit the shrine until six years into her queenship, from the earliest moments of her marriage, Catherine and the English court associated the shrine at Walsingham with prayers for childbirth and pregnancy.

Catherine of Aragon's childbearing problems and tragedies have been much discussed by historians, because of Catherine's "failure" to produce a living son, which consequently contributed to Henry's desire for a divorce. The emotional toll that Catherine's pregnancies, miscarriages and stillbirths took on the royal couple was documented by ambassadors at court, who reported fact and rumor back to their sovereigns and councils. Catherine was pregnant between five and six times between her marriage in 1509 and 1518.¹²¹ Three of those

¹¹⁸Dillon, *Hall's Chronicle*, 37.

¹¹⁹*LP* 1.2:2268. It is possible that this vow was initially made after (or during) her successful delivery in 1511, which would have been the most appropriate moment for the vow before 1513.

¹²⁰Dewhurst, "Alleged Miscarriages," 51–52; Timothy G. Elston claims that Catherine went to Walsingham in 1513 to give thanks for her victory over the Scots at Flodden, but I can find no reference to the queen actually going to Walsingham in 1513, and Samman does not mention the trip, Elston, "Public and Private Expectations of Catherine of Aragon," 96–101.

¹²¹The number and dates of Catherine's pregnancies and their tragic outcomes are surprisingly difficult to pin down, but they are outlined in great detail in Dewhurst, "Alleged Miscarriages," 49–54; see also Catrina Banks Whitley and Kyra Kramer, "A New Explanation for the Reproductive Woes and Midlife Decline of Henry VIII," *Historical Journal* 53, no. 4 (December 2010): 829–830, doi:10.1017/S0018246X10000452.

pregnancies resulted in a miscarriage or a stillbirth, and two resulted in children who lived a month or more. Prince Henry was born in January 1511 and died six weeks later. In 1516, Catherine gave birth to Princess Mary, the future queen regnant of England.¹²²

The period during which Catherine performed her pilgrimages to Walsingham coincides with her most difficult childbearing years. Her pilgrimages to Walsingham took place from 1515, after her third failed pregnancy, to 1521, three years after her last pregnancy. Catherine probably entered menopause shortly after this last pilgrimage, which may be why she appears to have stopped visiting the shrine.¹²³ Although her pilgrimages may have stopped, Catherine continued her devotion to the shrine until the end of her life, requesting in her will that “some personage” make a pilgrimage to Walsingham and distribute 20 gold nobles along the way.¹²⁴

Each time Catherine went on pilgrimage to Walsingham, she was hosted by friends and local elites, whose company also served to expand her own entourage and project magnificence. She also followed a slightly different route each time, and thus she was seen by different groups of people and hosted by different towns and noblemen. For the 1517 pilgrimage, for example, Catherine was accompanied by Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, and his wife, Mary Tudor, dowager queen of France. The couple brought along their own substantial households, which, in addition to Catherine’s train, would have created an impressive and memorable spectacle. Brandon, who had been informed of the queen’s route by the king’s chief minister Cardinal Wolsey, met her at Pykenham Wade and the following day his wife and her servants joined them.¹²⁵ Brandon wrote to Wolsey that he and his wife attended to Catherine “with as good herte

¹²² ODNB “Katherine (1485–1536).”

¹²³ Starkey, *Six Wives*, 163; Samman, “Henrician Court,” 63.

¹²⁴ BL MS Cott. Titus C.vii.44b

¹²⁵ TNA MS SP 1/15, fol. 33, *State Papers Online* (accessed February 2, 2010), <http://gale.cengage.co.uk/state-papers-online-15091714.aspx>; *LP* 2.2:3018.

and mynd as hir own servantes, according to our duties.”¹²⁶ Other groups also sought to accommodate the queen as she made her pilgrimages; for example, 1521 the city of Norwich presented her with one hundred marks upon her entry into the city.¹²⁷ Catherine’s pilgrimages were highly public affairs that were seen by many different groups of people across the countryside and served to project not only Catherine’s piety but also her queenly splendor.

Local audiences and other current and former pilgrims to Walsingham would have associated Catherine’s pilgrimages to Walsingham with her concerns about childbearing and fertility, because the shrine itself was widely associated with women’s concerns about fertility. East Anglian art was dominated by the imagery of childbirth, which complemented and magnified the shrine at Walsingham. The route to Walsingham was lined with churches and smaller shrines that featured images of female saints or saintly mothers and their children.¹²⁸ Catherine and her entourage stopped at these churches along the way, performing devotions to local manifestations of the Walsingham shrine. On at least three of her pilgrimages, for example, Catherine stayed in the town of Litcham, which was known for its rood screen depicting female saints.¹²⁹ The overall experience of her pilgrimages would have emphasized for Catherine, her household, and any observers, not only the queen’s own public piety but also her anxiety about having children. News of the queen’s pilgrimages would have been widely reported throughout the countryside as important and interesting events.¹³⁰ Ambassadors at the court mentioned Catherine’s absences for these trips in their dispatches, and those who saw Catherine or Margaret along the road would have passed their news along to others they met.¹³¹ Their journeys would

¹²⁶TNA MS SP 1/15, fol. 33.

¹²⁷Samman, “Henrician Court,” 62.

¹²⁸I have relied on Susan Signe Morrison’s excellent work on women pilgrims and Walsingham, *Women Pilgrims*, 27–28.

¹²⁹Samman, “Henrician Court,” 338, 354, 359; Morrison, *Women Pilgrims*, 27.

¹³⁰Morrison, *Women Pilgrims*, 17.

¹³¹*CSP Venetian* 3:167.

have been an experience repeated (with significantly less pomp and fanfare) by numerous pilgrims during the early sixteenth century, and Catherine's and Margaret's pilgrimages would have connected their own piety to those of their subjects.

Thus, Catherine's and Margaret's piety was closely connected to a tradition of queenly piety that encompassed almsgiving, pilgrimages, and church patronage as expressions of faith and good works which could also serve as Christian exemplars to their English and Scottish subjects. Participation in ceremonies like the Royal Maundy closely allied Catherine's and Margaret's queenships with the sacerdotal character of the English and Scottish monarchies as a whole and drew upon personal and gendered signs of piety to associate both queens with powerful conceptions of royal holiness. On another level, the Royal Maundy was part of a larger program of almsgiving that was both a duty for queens as social and moral leaders of their people and also a potentially political performance of their own elite nobility and largesse.

Beyond the court, pilgrimages made by Catherine and Margaret exhibited their piety to a wider audience, while also acknowledging the personal triumphs and tragedies that both women experienced as queens, wives, and mothers. Pilgrimages linked the queens' own piety with the beliefs and experiences of their subjects, emphasizing their role as members of the Christian community. Their people largely shared Catherine and Margaret's entirely orthodox beliefs, and a range of audiences witnessed their piety. These audiences could connect the queens' performances with their own lives, thus creating a powerful bond between Catherine and Margaret and their people.

As queens of England and Scotland, Catherine and Margaret were social and moral leaders of their people, and as such their piety was a performance of duty and ceremony. Catherine and Margaret modeled their piety before a variety of audiences in their kingdoms

through the distribution of alms, participation in elaborate royal religious rituals, and pilgrimages. Their performance of piety, moreover, was part of the sacralization of monarchy in the early sixteenth century that brought their queenships closer to God. Rituals like the Royal Maundy claimed a place for the queen by the king's side in the holiness of monarchy, while their pilgrimages across the countryside performed their piety in a manner closely related to and relatable by their own subjects' pious practice. Catherine and Margaret's piety was a duty before God, but it was publicly displayed as a social duty, one that sought to foster the Christian community of the realm and brought social and political capital for the queen herself. Catherine and Margaret's piety established them as Christian queens whose personal triumphs and tragedies were shared by their people in the same way that the queens shared their alms with the poor at their gates.

CONCLUSION

My husband, for hastynesse, w[ith] Rogecrosse I coude not sende your Grace the pece of the King of Scotts cote which John Glyn now bringeth. In this your grace shal see how I can kepe my premys, sending you for your banners a King's cote. I thought to send hymself unto you, but our Englishmens herts wold not suffre it. It shulde have been better for hym to have been in peax than have this rewarde. Al that God sendeth is for the best.¹

Catherine of Aragon wrote this excerpt in a letter to Henry VIII on September 16, 1513. Henry was campaigning in northern France, and he had made his wife Regent and Governess of England in his absence. While the bulk of Henry's armies were fighting in France, James IV, Margaret's husband, invaded the north of England and sacked several towns before meeting the English army led by Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey. In a stunning victory, Surrey decimated the Scottish army at the Battle of Flodden Field on September 9, killing the Scottish king and nearly a hundred of his nobility. It was probably the greatest military victory of Henry's reign and made the Scottish border secure for the English for a generation. Flodden also caused havoc in Scotland, with a number of the Scottish nobility unwilling to accept the minority government of James V, which was headed by Margaret as appointed by James IV in his will.

Catherine's letter reveals more about her relationship with her husband and her personality than most of the documents cited in this study. Her tone implies intimacy and partnership between the married couple, one that belies the formal wording of sixteenth-century correspondence. In this letter Catherine is witty, jesting with Henry that she has sent him a king's coat for his banners in France. Catherine may have been referring to her activities of a few months ago, when she and her ladies were busy sewing standards, banners and badges for the English army. Catherine has now sent Henry a new banner, one created in a more martial

¹Ellis, *Original Letters*, 1:88.

setting.² This jest may also have been a reference to Henry's earlier "gift" of a prisoner, the duc de Longueville, whom he had captured while on campaign and had sent to England in late August.³ As ambassadors around Europe passed along the news of Catherine's victory, some observed that while Henry had sent Catherine a captive duke, Catherine could send him the body of a king.⁴ The queen was just as bloody-minded as her male contemporaries, if not more so, a trait she may have picked up from her mother Isabel. Catherine had marched north with the English vanguard, making it as far as Buckingham before news of the English victory reached her. She may even, according to one report, have made a speech to the troops "in imitation of her mother Isabella."⁵ She certainly considered sending James's body to Henry as proof of her victory, but it seems the more squeamish English thought that was a bad idea.

Catherine's brief tenure as regent of England allows us to see her in a different role. For a few months in 1513, she became the center of government in England, and her name is everywhere: appointing bailiffs, issuing commissions to seize the property of Scotsmen in England, or reproving the town of Gloucester for not responding to her call to arms.⁶ Her household was also busy during this time; standards with the arms of England and the arms of England and Spain were issued to Richard Justice, her groom of the Robes, presumably in preparation for Catherine's army.⁷ Although Catherine faded into the background once again when Henry returned to England in October, it is hard to believe that her time as regent did not give her an understanding of the machinery of Tudor government that she could use in the future.

²Ibid., 1:83.

³Green, *Letters*, 1:163–165.

⁴*CSP Venetian* 2:328.

⁵*LP* 1.2:2299.

⁶*LP* 1.2:30, pg. 967; 16, pg. 996; 2143, pg. 968.

⁷*LP* 1.2:2243.

During her time as regent, Catherine continued to perform the usual duties of queenship. Her letters during this period are full of her concerns for the king's health and spiritual well-being. Because Catherine did not wish to distract the king, she sent some of her letters to Thomas Wolsey, then the king's almoner, who reported back news of the king's health and his movements. Catherine also insured that she would have a steady stream of information from the campaign in France, using a system of two messengers, where one "shal tarye there til another commeth and thi[s] [w]ay I shal here every weke fromthens [sic]."⁸ In the same letter to Henry cited above, she thanks God for the victory at Flodden, and gently reminds the king to do the same: "I am suer your Grace forgetteth not to doo this."⁹ Her performance of piety goes further, as she then informs Henry that she will make a pilgrimage to Walsingham to pray for his safe return.

Catherine's regency was a once in a lifetime event, an extraordinary opportunity for her to wield power and govern England at the head of a regency council appointed by the king. Her success in that role probably cemented her reputation in England and across Europe as an admirable queen and formidable opponent.¹⁰ But, as we can see from Catherine's letters, her position as regent was inseparable from her position as queen consort. Her concern with her husband's well-being, her close relationship with him and his household (shown in her letters to Wolsey), her deployment of magnificence to outfit her army correctly with royal banners (flying not only the king's arms but her own as well), and her thanks to God after Flodden were all natural extensions of her queenship. The circumstances of her regency brought her actions into greater relief, by requiring the use of letters to convey thoughts that might have otherwise been

⁸Ellis, *Original Letters*, 1:80.

⁹*Ibid.*, 1:88.

¹⁰ The popular prose pamphlet *Jack of Newbury* (1597) retains the memory of Catherine's regency during the Scottish invasion, for example, see Roze Hentschell, *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England: Textual Construction of a National Identity* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008), 64–66.

expressed verbally, and by highlighting Catherine's actions because she was also the center of government for a time. But when looked at closely, we see that underneath the exciting stories of battlefield speeches was a truly competent queen carrying out her duties to king and kingdom as she always had done.¹¹

This study has sought to understand what it meant to be a queen consort in the early sixteenth-century British Isles. Catherine and Margaret could easily be defined solely in terms of their relationships to their families: as daughters, wives, or mothers. And these were important relationships to them, as we have seen in their activities as patrons, courtly audiences, educators, and diplomats. But, as this study has shown, there were ultimately other rights and responsibilities that were part of Catherine's and Margaret's queenships. They were landed magnates, heads of households, literary patrons, pilgrims, and gift-givers. Taken together, these roles gave Catherine and Margaret access to loyal service, honorable *fama*, cultural influence, and political power. The pre-modern monarchies of England and Scotland greatly benefited from these queens, and not solely because they provided for the continuation of their dynasties. Catherine's and Margaret's queenships meant opportunities for the expansion of monarchical power, as Henry and James worked with their wives to distribute rewards at court, amplify the monarchy through spectacle and magnificence, and foster alliances amongst their nobility and abroad. And sixteenth-century moralists would have argued that their people benefited from their social and moral examples as virtuous, pious, and Christian queens.

Queenship was not something that was simply given to Catherine and Margaret.

Throughout their lives, both women continually performed their queenships in order to claim and

¹¹ Catherine's appointment as Queen Regent while Henry was in France was entirely normal for the sixteenth century. French kings such as Henry II appointed their wives or close female relatives to head regency councils while the king was on campaign. Henry VIII also made Katherine Parr, his sixth wife, regent while he campaigned in France in the 1540s, although none of his other wives were thus appointed. For more on French regency see Crawford, *Perilous Performances*, 21–22.

maintain their honor and status as queens. Catherine and Margaret repeatedly used magnificence to maintain their queenly estate. This magnificence required the extensive use of material culture and court spectacle to work. The use of fine fabrics for clothing and furniture was an expected and necessary part of being a queen, and the colors, furs, clothes, and gems served to embody their queenly dignity to any who might see and know them as queens. Fine apparel supported Catherine and Margaret at tournaments, court entertainments, and public almsgivings, and their magnificence included the granting of liveries and gowns to their servants, officers, and ladies, who in turn amplified their performance of queenship whenever they accompanied the queen or acted in her name.

Catherine and Margaret were supported by their households in both form and function. These chapters have shown how the officers of their households, and in Catherine's case, her council, oversaw a large number of servants whose overarching purpose was to provide their mistresses with service and royal dignity by regulating access to their rooms, accompanying them in public, and forming connections with the royal court and beyond. A queen was expected to "acquire men and women servants of such calibre as is in keeping with the exalted position of the prince or lord to whom she has been given in marriage," in order to maintain her dignity.¹² Catherine's and Margaret's households were closely connected, through these servants and others, to the households of their husbands; this relationship between the two households provided the opportunities for patronage and reward which made Catherine and Margaret successful queens.

This study has also shown that Catherine and Margaret connected and interacted with their subjects in a number of ways not easily understood from narrative accounts of their reigns. Catherine and Margaret's performance of piety linked their personal religious beliefs and

¹²Pizan, *Treasure*, 64.

practices with their people through the distribution of alms and their pilgrimages. As devout Catholic queens, Catherine's and Margaret's religious practices were intended to be a Christian example to their people, and their piety was in many cases similar to the beliefs of most pre-Reformation Britons, creating a Christian community of the realm. In the secular realm, the dowers of queens consort in England and Scotland meant that Catherine and Margaret were also local landlords to a number of their subjects. Although Margaret never personally oversaw her lands while she was queen consort, Catherine was an active landowner whose council was a significant point of contact between the queen and her tenants. Catherine's dower also allowed her to create extensive connections between her household and her lands through administration and tenancy. For many people in England, their primary interactions with Catherine were not as queen but as territorial lord.

At the conclusion of this study, it is perhaps allowable to go beyond the scope of this thesis to speculate what other implications can be drawn from Catherine's and Margaret's practices and performances of queenship. There are differences in their queenships that I believe help to shed light on what happened when they ceased to be queen consort. Broadly speaking, Margaret was dependent on her relationship with her husband to successfully practice and perform queenship. Her financial resources, household organization, and relative youth meant that much of her patronage, influence, and financial support were closely bound up with her dependence on James. I believe that this understanding of her queenship does much to explain the problems Margaret faced after the death of her husband at Flodden in 1513. Despite being appointed regent for her infant son James V, Margaret's rule was never truly accepted by the Scots, and she had to flee to England in 1516 after being ousted from power. There are many other factors which contributed to the problems she faced in Scotland: the old hatred of the Scots

for the English; the determined opposition led by John, Duke of Albany, the heir presumptive, who had the backing of the king of France; and most of all, her critical error in hastily marrying the entirely untrustworthy and unscrupulous Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus. Yet, when reading Margaret's letters to her brother and his advisors Wolsey and Lord Dacre, we see that one of Margaret's constant concerns was her inability to access her dower funds, and thus properly reward her household and equip herself as queen mother.¹³ This work puts into context Margaret's problems with her regency and may provide a basis for a new assessment of her career after Flodden.

Catherine's queenship sheds some light on how she was able to resist Henry's attempts to divorce her for many years without facing criticism or popular derision for assuming such an uncharacteristically antagonistic position against her king. Considering the wealth of scholarship on Catherine's divorce is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but I hope that my work points towards new questions and considerations of Catherine during the divorce crisis. She was not merely a "Catholic martyr" or a dependent of her nephew, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. Although many extant accounts concerning the divorce show Catherine in these roles, they do not explain her personal popularity or her unblemished reputation that protected her from the types of misogynistic insults leveled at her successor, Anne Boleyn.¹⁴ Instead, we must ask how Catherine's successful performance of queenship for over two decades may have helped her during the divorce. Was her support amongst the common people connected to memories of her pilgrimages and almsgiving? Were regions where she held lands more likely to sympathize with her daughter Mary's bid for the throne in 1553? This dissertation provides the first steps towards

¹³Green, *Letters*, 1:224–225, 229–230, 233.

¹⁴For a consideration of the nature of Catherine's public support after 1533, see Elston, "Widow Princess or Neglected Queen?," 20–24.

answering these questions, which will hopefully expand Catherine's history beyond the religious, diplomatic, and personal themes that typically feature in analyses of the divorce.

These questions reiterate the importance of successful queenship to the functioning of pre-modern monarchy. This analysis has shown that a partnership between the king and queen not only enhanced the queen's power and authority, but also gave the king new opportunities to assert his own magnificence, largesse, and dynastic prestige. By establishing the queen as his true public partner, Henry VIII certainly did not intend to provide the foundation for Catherine's future opposition to the divorce. What he surely did foresee, however, was that his queen was the most valuable ally he could hope for in insuring the success of their dynasty, and their partnership greatly added to her ability to support their children. Margaret was certainly on her way to establishing a similar type of partnership with her husband, and James's decision to appoint her guardian and regent for their son indicates his confidence in her. The differences between Margaret's and Catherine's queenships show that this process was incomplete in 1513. The political chaos after James's death indicates that a fuller partnership between the king and queen would have given her the power and authority to protect the Scottish monarchy during the minority of her son James V. For pre-modern dynasties to survive and the power of the monarchy to continue, monarchs needed their queens to be more than royal babymakers. Queens were necessary public partners without whom few kings could succeed

APPENDIX

Household expenses, taken from the accounts of Griffith Richards, receiver-general to Catherine of Aragon, rounded to the nearest pound. *LP* 4.3:6121 (BL MS Cott. App. LXV).

Although we have only fragmented accounts from Catherine's household, they do indicate that the money she received from her estates went to fund her household. The accounts of her receiver-general, Griffith Richards, from the late 1520s, although partial and damaged, show that he dispersed funds to the queen's household that covered most of her major expenses, including fees for her ladies and knights, wardrobe, and stable expenses.

Entry	1525-26	1526-27	1527-28	1528-29	1529-30
Rewards	326	551	318	385	180
Costs and expenses for the Queen's use	600	619	728	384	158
Fees and wages of knights, ladies, maids, and lawyers	789	827	904	887	903
Wardrobe of robes	866	878	1,153	768	759
Wardrobe of beds	55	12	57	14	6
Stables	779	807	779	754	665
Preparing the household in divers places	30	32	24	19	24
Boat-hire	33	20	22	48	[damaged]
Rewards to persons bringing presents	97	97	101	100	[damaged]
Presents	367	425	414	357	[damaged]
For the Queen's purse	267	186	163	194	[damaged]
Offerings to the Dean of the Chapel Royal	27	28	27	26	27
Other offerings	5	8	7	7	6
Alms	195	184	187	187	163
Laundress	3	4	3	3	3
Total	4,440	4,677	4,830	4,135	[damaged]

GLOSSARY

Sources:

- Dickson, Thomas, ed. *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: H.M. Register House, 1877.
- Hayward, Maria. *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII: The Wardrobe Book of the Wardrobe of the Robes Prepared by James Worsley in December 1516; Edited from MS Harley 2284, and His Inventory Prepared on 17 January 1521, Edited from Harley MS 4217, Both in the British Library*. Leeds: Maney Publishing, 2007.
- Owen-Crocker, Gale R., Elizabeth Coatsworth, and Maria Hayward, eds. *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles in the British Isles C. 450-1450*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. OED Online. Oxford University Press. www.oed.com.

Arras (cloth of arras): A rich woven tapestry, depicting figures and scenes.

Buckram: A linen or cotton fabric that can be either fine or coarse.

Calaber: Originally, squirrel fur imported from Calabria, but in the sixteenth century it probably refers to squirrel fur more generally.

Chamlet: Also spelled camlet, a rich silk, wool, or mohair cloth that could be figured or waved.

Cloth of gold: Fabric that consists of gold or silver thread woven on a ground of varying types of fabrics and colors, and in the 16th century, reserved only for royal use.

Cloth of tissue: The most expensive form of cloth of gold, incorporating gold and silver thread woven on a ground of fine fabrics such as velvet or silk.

Damask: An expensive figured cloth, usually woven of satin, in which the pattern is made by the contrast of the weave itself.

Danzig skins: A special type of leather from Danzig, Poland.

Ermine: Fur of the stoat, usually all-white from its winter coat, except for the tip of its tail. Its use was restricted to the elite, and it was seen as a symbol of royalty and purity.

French hood: Style of headwear that included a small bonnet, worn at the back of the head, with a wide, decorative band that stretched from ear to ear.

Girdles: Bands of fabric worn around the waist used to hang objects.

Gray: The thickest winter furs of squirrels, usually imported from Scandinavia or Russia.

Holland: Fine linen cloth.

Kersey: Coarse woolen cloth.

Kirtle: Long garments similar to gowns, usually worn under gowns and in this period consisting of a fitted bodice, sleeves, and a skirt only some of which would have been visible under the gown itself.

Lettice: Whitish gray fur from the snow weasel, priced between miniver and ermine.

Miniver: White fur taken from bellies of squirrels.

Pampilion: Lambskin imported from Navarre.

Purfil: A decorative edging or border.

Pyerrery: Precious stones or pearls

Sarsenet: Fine silk material.

Say: Fine textured cloth that was made of silk and wool.

Scarlet: Can refer to both a color and a fine-textured, luxury woolen broadcloth available in many colors.

Stomacher: V-shaped panel, often ornately decorated and usually stiffened for women, pinned or laced between the gown and kirtle.

Tawny: Can refer to a fabric (French tawny) or an orange-brown color.

Tinsel: Expensive silk cloth that could be plain or figured with gold, silver, or silver gilt.

Tippets: In this period, short shoulder capes worn over a gown.

Watermellis: A type of fur, possibly an obscure reference to water-mole fur.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS

Cambridge

St. John's College, Cambridge Archives

- | | |
|---------|---|
| D56.131 | Rewards to Margaret Beaufort's Household, February 1509 |
| D106.11 | Expenses of the Master of St John's College, January 1524-Easter 1537 |

Edinburgh

The National Archives of Scotland

- | | |
|----------|---|
| E21/6-12 | Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, 16 September 1502-8 August 1513 |
| E32/1 | Exchequer Records: Household Expenditure, September 1511-August 1512 |
| SP 13/23 | State Papers: Indenture on receipt by William Husband, et al, citizens of Carlisle, on behalf of Queen Margaret, of specified jewels and material belonging to her, 16 September 1516 |

London

The British Library

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Additional MS 21481 | Household Book of Henry VIII, 1509-1518 |
| Additional MS 46454 | Talbot Papers, c.1496-1509 |
| Additional Charter 22308 | Charter attesting to payment of the Queen's Gold, October 1510 |
| Cotton Appendix LXV | Accounts of Griffith Richards, Receiver-General to Catherine of Aragon, 1525-1530 |
| Egerton MS 985 | Ceremonials and Heraldic Proceedings, c.1485-c.1537 |
| Harley MS 2284 | King's Wardrobe Book, December 1516 |
| Royal Appendix MS 58 | Madrigals, Motets, Canons, etc., early 16 th century |
| Royal MS 7 F XIV | State Papers, Henry VIII, 1534-1535 |

The National Archives

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| E101/412/15 | Warrants to the Keeper of the Great Wardrobe, Edward IV and Henry VII, March 1461-April 1509 |
| E101/415/7 | Documents subsidiary to accounts of the great wardrobe., August 1501-August 1503 |
| E101/417/6 | Warrants subsidiary to accounts of the Wardrobe and Household, April 1511-April 1513 |

E101/418/6	Account book of Richard Justice, Groom of the Robes to Catherine of Aragon, April 1515-April 1517
E101/420/4	New Year's Gifts Given at Greenwich, 1528
E111	Exchequer, Council and Other Courts: Miscellaneous Equity Proceedings and Special Commissions, 1461-1603
E135/22/15	Petition to the Queen, undated, likely between 1509 and 1535
E163/10/11	Certificate by queen's commissioners as to pasturage upon Alderholt heath, Dorset, April 1527-April 1528
E163/11	Bills and Petitions to the King or Queen to the king's or queen's council, 1509-1547
E163/26/6	Acts of the Queen's Council, April 1525-April 1527
E179/69/15	Particulars of Account and other records relating to Lay and Clerical Taxation, Assessment of the Subsidy of 1523
E298/5-31	Petitions and Proceedings in Equity before the Queen's Council, c.1509-1532
E315/176	Indenture of Lands for English Queens, 1494, 1503, 1510-1532
E315/242/3	Account book of Elis Hilton, Yeoman of the Robes, April-May, 1520
PROB/11	Will Registers, Probate Court of Canterbury
SP 1	State Papers Series, Henry VIII, accessed on-site via <i>State Papers Online</i> http://gale.cengage.co.uk/state-papers-online-15091714.aspx
SP 49	State Papers Scotland Series, accessed on-site via <i>State Papers Online</i> http://gale.cengage.co.uk/state-papers-online-15091714.aspx

Manchester

John Rylands Library, University of Manchester

Latin MS 239 Account books of Elis Hilton and Richard Justice, 1520

York

York City Archives

B9 Minutes of the York City Council, 1503-1519

PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Bain, Joseph, ed. *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*. 5 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1881-1888.
<http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>

Barlow, Montague. *Barlow Family Records*. London: Bamrose, 1932.

- Bergenroth, G. A., ed., et al. *Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain Preserved in the Archives of Simancas and Elsewhere*. 28 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862-1954. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>
- Brewer, J. S., J. Gairdner, and R. H. Brodie, eds. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547*. 21 vols. and addenda vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1862. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>
- Brown, Rawdon, ed. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs: existing in the Archives and collections of Venice, and in other libraries of Northern Italy*. 38 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London: Longman, 1864. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>
- Byrne, Muriel St. Clare, ed. *The Lisle Letters*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Castiglione, Baldesar. *The Book of the Courtier*. Translated by George Bull. 1978 reprint. Penguin Classics, 1978.
- Coke, Sir Edward. *The First Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England, Or, A Commentary upon Littleton : Not the Name of the Author Only, but of the Law Itself*. Edited by Charles Butler. Vol. 1. 19th ed. The Making of Modern Law. London, 1832. <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/MOML?af=RN&ae=F100288223&srchtp=a&ste=14>
- Crawford, Anne, ed. *Letters of the Queens of England, 1100-1547*. Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1994.
- Dickson, Thomas, ed., et al. *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*. 13 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1877-1978. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>
- Dillon, Janette. *Performance and Spectacle in Hall's Chronicle*. London: Society for Theatre Research, 2002.
- Dunbar, William. *The Poems of William Dunbar*. Edited by James Kinsley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- . *The Poems of William Dunbar*. Edited by Priscilla J. Bawcutt. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Glasgow: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 1998.
- Eeles, F. C. "The Inventory of the Chapel Royal at Stirling, 1505." *Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society* 3 (1911): 310–325.
- Ellis, Henry, ed. *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*. Vol. 1. 11 vols. Facsimile edition. First Series. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1969.

- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Collected Works of Erasmus*. Edited by Richard J. Schoek and Beatrice Corrigan. Translated by R. A. B. Mynors and D. F. S. Thomson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- Fraser, Sir William. *The Elphinstone Family Book of the Lords Elphinstone, Balmaerino, and Coupar*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh, 1897. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/browser.php?ipid=623567>.
- . *The Lennox*. Vol. 2. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh, 1874. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com>.
- Giustiniani, Sebastiano. *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*. Edited by Rawdon Brown. 2 vols. London: Smith, Elder, 1854.
- Green, Mary Anne Everett. *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*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. London: H. Colburn, 1846.
- Jessopp, A., ed. *Visitations of the Diocese of Norwich*. Vol. 43. The Camden Society New Series. Westminster: Nichols and Sons, 1888.
- Kipling, Gordon, ed. *The Receyt of the Ladie Kateryne*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Leland, John. *Joannis Lelandi Antiquarii de Rebus Britannicis Collectanea....* 6 vols. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. London, 1770. <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/start.do?prodId=ECCO>.
- Le Neve, John. *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541*. 12 vols. London: University of London, Institute of Historical Research, 1964.
- Leslie, John. *The History of Scotland, from the Death of King James I, in the Year M.CCCC.XXXVI, to the Year M.D.LXI*. Translated by James Dalrymple. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Scottish Text Society 5. Edinburgh, 1895.
- Livingstone, M., ed. *The Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland*. Vol. 1. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1908. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>
- Myers, A. R. *The Household of Edward IV: The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- Nicholas, Sir Nicholas Harris, ed. *Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York: Wardrobe Accounts of Edward the Fourth*. Facsimile edition. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1972.
- “Ordinances for the Household Made at Eltham in the XVIIth Year of King Henry VIII A.D. 1526.” In *A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, Made in Divers Reigns...* Eighteenth Century Collections Online. London, 1790. Gale. 173-281. <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/>.

“Original Documents Relating to Queen Katharine of Arragon.” *Gentlemen’s Magazine and Historical Review* 135 Pt. 2 (1854): 572–575.

Paul, John Balfour, ed. *The Register of the Great Seal of Scotland*. 11 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1882-1914.
<http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>

Pizan, Christine de. *The Book of the City of Ladies*. Translated by Rosalind Brown-Grant. London: Penguin Books, 1999.

———. *The Treasure of the City of Ladies*. Translated by Sarah Lawson. Rev. ed. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

Prynne, William. *Aurum Reginae: Or, a Compendious Tractate, and Chronological Collection of Records in the Tower and Court of Exchequer Concerning Queen-Gold*. London: T. Ratcliffe, 1668.

Rymer, Thomas. *Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, Et Cujuscunque Generis Acta Publica Inter Reges Angliae*. 20 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London, 1704.
<http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>

Statutes of the Realm. Vol. 3 (1509–1545). Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. London, 1817. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>

State Papers Relating to Henry VIII. Vol. 6. London, 1849.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433081633889>

Stuart, John, George Burnett, and George Powell McNeill, eds. *The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*. 23 vols. Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online. Edinburgh: General Register House, 1878. <http://sources.tannerritchie.com/earlymodern.php>

Thomson, Thomas, ed. *A Collection of Inventories and Other Records of the Royal Wardrobe and Jewelhouse; and of the Artillery and Munitioun in Some of the Royal Castles*. Edinburgh, 1815.

Torre, Antonio de la, ed. *La Casa de Isabel la Católica*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Patronato Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, 1954.

Vives, Juan Luis. *A Very Frutefull and Pleasant Boke Called the Instructio[n] of a Christen Woma[n], Made Fyrst in Laten, and Dedicated Vnto the Quenes Good Grace...* Translated by Richard Hyrde. Early English Books Online. London, 1529.
<http://name.umd.umich.edu/B00841.0001.001>

———. *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*. Edited by Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Young, John. "The Fyancells of Margaret, Eldest Daughter of King Henry VIIIth to James King of Scotland." In *Joannis Lelandi Antiquarii de Rebus Britannicis Collectanea...*, edited by John Leland, 4:258–300. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. London: William and John Richardson, 1770. <http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/start.do?prodId=ECCO>

SECONDARY SOURCES

Ago, Renate. "Maria Spada Veralli, La Buona Moglie." In *Barocco Al Femminile*, edited by Giulia Calvi, 53–70. Rome: Editori Laterza, 1992.

Anderson, Ruth Matilda. *Hispanic Costume, 1480-1530*. New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1979.

Anglo, Sydney. *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

———. "The Evolution of the Early Tudor Disguising, Pageant, and Mask." *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 1 (1968): 3–44.

———. "The London Pageants for the Reception of Katharine of Aragon: November 1501." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 26 (1963): 53–89.

Appleford, Amy. "Shakespeare's Katherine of Aragon: Last Medieval Queen, First Recusant Martyr." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40, no. 1 (2010): 149–71. doi:10.1215/10829636-2009-017.

Aram, Bethany. *Juana the Mad: Sovereignty and Dynasty in Renaissance Europe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

Arthurson, Ian. "'The King of Spain's Daughter Came to Visit Me': Marriage, Princes and Politics." In *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death and Commemoration*, edited by Linda Monckton and Steven J. Gunn, 20–30. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2009.

Ashbee, Andrew. "Groomed for Service: Musicians in the Privy Chamber at the English Court, c.1495-1558." *Early Music* 25, no. 2 (1997): 185–97. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3128516>.

Backhouse, Janet. "Illuminated Manuscripts, Associated with Henry VII and Members of His Immediate Family." In *The Reign of Henry VII: Proceedings of the 1993 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Benjamin Thompson, 175–187. Stamford, UK: Paul Watkins, 1995.

Balfour, James. *The Scots Peerage: Founded on Wood's Edition of Sir Robert Douglas's Peerage of Scotland*. 9 vols. Edinburgh, 1904. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015046819846>.

- Barrell, Andrew D. M. "Royal Presentations to Ecclesiastical Benefices in Late Medieval Scotland." *Innes Review* 55, no. 2 (2004): 181–204.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=194>.
- Barrow, Lorna G. "'the Kynge Sent to the Qwene, by a Gentyman, a Grett Tame Hart' Marriage, Gift Exchange, and Politics: Margaret Tudor and James IV 1502-13." *Parergon: Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 21 (2004): 65–84.
- Bawcutt, Priscilla. "'My Bright Buke': Women and Their Books in Medieval and Renaissance Scotland." In *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain: Essays for Felicity Riddy*, edited by Jocelyn Wogan-Browne and Felicity Riddy. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2000.
- Bawcutt, Priscilla J. *Dunbar the Makar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Beer, Michelle L. "Royal Limbo: The Spanish Household of Catherine of Aragon as Princess of Wales, 1501-1509." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America, Washington, DC, March 2011.
- Bercusson, Sarah. "The Duchess' Court in Sixteenth-Century Italy: A Comparison of Female Experience." In *Moving Elites: Women and Cultural Transfers in the European Court System*, edited by Giulia Calvi and Isabelle Chabot, 127–140. Proceedings of an International Workshop (Florence, 12-13 December 2008). San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy: European University Institute, 2010. <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/14234>.
- Bossy, John. *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Brodie, D. M. "Edmund Dudley: Minister of Henry VII." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 15 (1932): 133–161. doi:10.2307/3678645.
- Broomhall, Susan. "Gendering the Culture of Honour at the Fifteenth-Century Burgundian Court." In *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Susan Broomhall and Stephanie Tarbin, 181–193. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008.
- Brown, Elizabeth A. "'Companion Me with My Mistress': Cleopatra, Elizabeth I, and Their Waiting Women." In *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*, edited by Susan Frye and Karen Robertson, 131–148. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Buchanan, Patricia Hill. *Margaret Tudor Queen of Scots*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985.
- Bumke, Joachim. *Courtly Culture: Literature and Society in the High Middle Ages*. Translated by Thomas Dunlap. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991.

- Campbell, Gordon, ed. "Gonzaga Family." *The Oxford Dictionary of the Renaissance*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
<http://www.oxfordreference.com/10.1093/acref/9780198601753.001.0001/acref-9780198601753-e-1687>.
- Carley, James P. *The Books of King Henry VIII and His Wives*. London: British Library, 2004.
- Carpenter, Sarah. "'Gely Wyth Tharmys of Scotland England': Word, Image and Performance at the Marriage of James IV and Margaret Tudor." In *Fresche Fontanis: Studies in the Culture of Medieval and Early Modern Scotland*, edited by Janet Hadley Williams and J. Derrick McClure, 165–178. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013.
- . "'To Thexaltacyon of Noblesse': A Herald's Account of the Marriage of Margaret Tudor and James IV." *Medieval English Theatre* 29 (2007): 104–20.
- Chapman, Hester W. *The Sisters of Henry VIII*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1969.
- Chrimes, S. B. *Henry VII*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1972.
- Coatsworth, Elizabeth. "Ell." In *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles in the British Isles C. 450-1450*, edited by Gale R. Owen-Crocker, Elizabeth Coatsworth, and Maria Hayward, 189. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Coester, Christine. "Crossing Boundaries and Traversing Space. The Voyage of the Bride in Early Modern Europe." In *Moving Elites: Women and Cultural Transfers in the European Court System*, edited by Giulia Calvi and Isabelle Chabot, 9–20. Proceedings of an International Workshop (Florence, 12-13 December 2008). San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy: European University Institute, 2010.
<http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/14234>.
- Collette, Carolyn P. *Performing Polity: Women and Agency in the Anglo-French Tradition, 1385-1620*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.
- Colvin, H. M. *The History of the King's Works*. 6 vols. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1963.
- Cowan, Mairi A. R. "Lay Piety in Scotland Before the Protestant Reformation: Individuals, Communities, and Nation." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2003.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/305273406?accountid=14553>.
- Crane, Susan. *The Performance of Self: Ritual, Clothing, and Identity during the Hundred Years War*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.
- Crawford, Anne. "The King's Burden?: The Consequences of Royal Marriage in Fifteenth-Century England." In *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England*, edited by Ralph A. Griffiths, 33–56. Gloucester: A. Sutton, 1981.

- . “The Piety of Late Medieval English Queens.” In *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society: Essays in Honour of F.R.H. Du Boulay*, edited by Caroline M. Barron and Christopher Harper-Bill, 48–57. Dover, N.H.: Boydell Press, 1985.
- . “The Queen’s Council in the Middle Ages.” *The English Historical Review* 116, no. 469 (2001): 1193–1211. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1562291>.
- Crawford, Katherine. *Perilous Performances: Gender and Regency in Early Modern France*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Cressy, David. “Purification, Thanksgiving and the Churching of Women in Post-Reformation England.” *Past & Present* no. 141 (1993): 106–146. doi:10.2307/651031.
- Cunningham, Sean. *Henry VII*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000.
- Dewhurst, Sir John. “The Alleged Miscarriages of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn.” *Medical History* 28, no. 1 (1984): 49–56.
- Dickinson, J. C. *The Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Ditchburn, David. “‘Saints at the Door Don’t Make Miracles?’ The Contrasting Fortunes of Scottish Pilgrimage c 1450–1550.” In *Sixteenth-Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, edited by Julian Goodare and A. A. MacDonald, 69–98. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Doran, Susan. *England and Europe in the Sixteenth Century*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan, 1999.
- Dowling, Maria. *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
- . “Humanist Support for Katherine of Aragon.” *Historical Research* 57, no. 135 (1984): 46–55. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2281.1984.tb01258.x.
- Downie, Fiona. “Queenship in Late Medieval Scotland.” In *Scottish Kingship, 1306–1542: Essays in Honour of Norman Macdougall*, edited by Michael Brown, Roland Tanner, and Norman Macdougall, 232–254. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2008.
- . *She Is but a Woman: Queenship in Scotland, 1424–1463*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2006.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Marking the Hours: English People and Their Prayers, 1240–1570*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.

- . *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580*. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Dumitrescu, Theodor. *The Early Tudor Court and International Musical Relations*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007.
- Dunbar, John G. *Scottish Royal Palaces: The Architecture of the Royal Residences During the Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Periods*. East Linton, UK: Tuckwell, 1999.
- Dunlop, David. "The 'Masked Comedian': Perkin Warbeck's Adventures in Scotland and England from 1495 to 1497." *The Scottish Historical Review* 70, no. 190 (October 1, 1991): 97–128. doi:10.2307/25530509.
- . "The Politics of Peace-Keeping: Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1503-1511." *Renaissance Studies* 8, no. 2 (1994): 138–161. doi:10.1111/j.1477-4658.1994.tb00289.x.
- Earenfight, Theresa, ed. *Queenship and Political Power in Medieval and Early Modern Spain*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005.
- Edington, Carol. *Court and Culture in Renaissance Scotland: Sir David Lindsay of the Mount*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.
- El Cheikh, Nadia Maria. "Caliphal Harems, Household Harems: Baghdad in the Fourth Century of the Islamic Era." In *Harem Histories: Envisioning Places and Living Spaces*, edited by Marilyn Booth, 87–103. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Elliott, Dyan. "Dress as Mediator between Inner and Outer Self: The Pious Matron of the High and Later Middle Ages." *Mediaeval Studies* 53 (1991): 279–308.
- Elston, Timothy G. "Almost the Perfect Woman: Public and Private Expectations of Catherine of Aragon, 1501-1536." PhD diss., The University of Nebraska, 2004. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305160291?accountid=14553>.
- . "Transformation or Continuity? Sixteenth-Century Education and the Legacy of Catherine of Aragon, Mary I, and Juan Luis Vives." In *"High and Mighty Queens" of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, edited by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves, 11–26. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- . "Widow Princess or Neglected Queen? Catherine of Aragon, Henry VIII and English Public Opinion 1533-1536." In *Queens & Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, edited by Carole Levin and Robert O. Bucholz, 16–30. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.
- Fenster, Thelma, and Daniel Lord Smail, eds. *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

- Fisher, N. R. R. ““The Queenes Courte in Her Councell Chamber at Westminster.”” *The English Historical Review* 108, no. 427 (1993): 314–337. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/573709>.
- Fitch, Audrey-Beth. “Mothers and Their Sons: Mary and Jesus in Scotland, 1450-1560.” In *The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland*, edited by Steve Boardman and Eila Williamson, 159–176. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell & Brewer, 2010.
- Forrester, Colin D. I. G. *The Forresters: A Lowland Clan and Its Lands*. London: Gronow Press, 1989.
- Fradenburg, Louise Olga. *City, Marriage, Tournament: Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- . “Sovereign Love: The Wedding of Margaret Tudor and James IV of Scotland.” In *Women and Sovereignty*, edited by Louise Olga Fradenburg, 78–100. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.
- . “Troubled Times: Margaret Tudor and the Historians.” In *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, edited by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood, 38–58. East Linton, UK: Tuckwell, 1998.
- Franklin-Harkrider, Melissa. *Women, Reform and Community in Early Modern England: Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk, and Lincolnshire’s Godly Aristocracy, 1519-1580*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2008.
- Fraser, Antonia. *The Six Wives of Henry VIII*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1993. Six Wives.
- Gibbons, Rachel C. “The Queen as ‘Social Mannequin’. Consumerism and Expenditure at the Court of Isabeau of Bavaria, 1393-1422.” *Journal of Medieval History* 26, no. 4 (2000): 371–395. doi:10.1016/S0304-4181(00)00010-5.
- Gibson, A., and Thomas Christopher Smout. “Food and Hierarchy in Scotland 1550-1650.” In *Perspectives in Scottish Social History: Essays in Honour of Rosalind Mitchison*, edited by Leah Leneman, 33–52. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988.
- Gibson, Gail McMurray. “Blessing from Sun and Moon: Churching as Women’s Theater.” In *Bodies and Disciplines: Intersections of Literature and History in Fifteenth-Century England*, edited by David Wallace and Barbara A. Hanawalt, 139–154. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- . *The Theater of Devotion: East Anglian Drama and Society in the Late Middle Ages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959.

- Gowing, Laura. "Women, Status and the Popular Culture of Dishonour." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (January 1, 1996): 225–234.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3679238>.
- Grant, Alexander. *Independence and Nationhood: Scotland 1306-1469*. London: Edward Arnold, 1984.
- Gray, Douglas. "The Royal Entry in Sixteenth-Century Scotland." In *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of Late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, edited by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood, 10–37. East Linton, UK: Tuckwell, 1998.
- Gray, J.H. *The Queens' College*. London: F.E. Robinson & Co, 1899.
http://www.archive.org/stream/queenscollegeofs00grayrich/queenscollegeofs00grayrich_djvu.txt.
- Gunn, Steven J. *Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, C.1484-1545*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- . "Prince Arthur's Preparation for Kingship." In *Arthur Tudor, Prince of Wales: Life, Death and Commemoration*, edited by Linda Monckton and Steven J. Gunn, 7–19. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2009.
- . "The Early Tudor Tournament." In *Henry VIII: A European Court in England*, edited by David Starkey, 47–49. London: Collins & Brown, 1991.
- . "War, Dynasty and Public Opinion in Early Tudor England." In *Authority and Consent in Tudor England: Essays Presented to C.S.L. Davies*, edited by G. W. Bernard and Steven J. Gunn, 131–149. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2002.
- Hamilton, Dakota L. "The Learned Councils of the Tudor Queens Consort." In *State, Sovereigns & Society in Early Modern England: Essays in Honour of A.J. Slavin*, edited by Charles Carlton, 87–101. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Hansen, Matthew C. "'And a Queen of England, Too': The 'Englishing' of Catherine of Aragon in Sixteenth-Century English Literary and Chronicle History." In *"High and Mighty Queens" of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, edited by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves, 79–100. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Harris, Barbara J. *English Aristocratic Women 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- . "The View from My Lady's Chamber: New Perspectives on the Early Tudor Monarchy." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (1997): 215–247.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3817675>.
- Harvey, Nancy Lenz. *The Rose and the Thorn: The Lives of Mary and Margaret Tudor*. New York: Macmillan, 1975.

- Harvey, Sheridan. "The Cooke Sisters: A Study of Tudor Gentlewomen." PhD diss., Indiana University, 1981. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/303018817?accountid=14553>.
- Hayward, Maria. *Dress at the Court of King Henry VIII: The Wardrobe Book of the Wardrobe of the Robes Prepared by James Worsley in December 1516; Edited from MS Harley 2284, and His Inventory Prepared on 17 January 1521, Edited from Harley MS 4217, Both in the British Library*. Leeds, UK: Maney Publishing, 2007.
- . "Fashion, Finance, Foreign Politics and the Wardrobe of Henry VIII." In *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, edited by Catherine Richardson, 165–178. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004.
- . "Gift Giving at the Court of Henry VIII: The 1539 New Year's Gift Roll in Context." *Antiquaries Journal* 85 (2005): 124–175.
- . *Rich Apparel: Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII's England*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2009.
- . , ed. *The Great Wardrobe Accounts of Henry VII and Henry VIII*. London Record Society 47. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2012.
- Heal, Felicity. *Hospitality in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Heinig, Paul-Joachim. "How Large Was the Court of Emperor Frederick III?" In *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c.1450-1650*, edited by Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke, 139–156. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Hentschell, Roze. "A Question of Nation: Foreign Clothes on the English Subjects." In *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, edited by Catherine Richardson, 49–62. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004.
- . *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England: Textual Construction of a National Identity*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008.
- Herrup, Cynthia. "The King's Two Genders." *The Journal of British Studies* 45 (2006): 493–510. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/503588>.
- Hibbard, Caroline. "Early Modern Queens Revived and Revised." *Journal of Women's History* 22, no. 2 (2010): 181–190.
- . "Henrietta Maria in the 1630s: Perspectives on the Role of Consort Queens in *Ancien Regime* Courts." In *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, edited by Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders, 92–110. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- . "The Role of a Queen Consort: The Household and Court of Henrietta Maria, 1625-1642." In *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the*

- Modern Age, c.1450-1650*, edited by Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke, 393–414. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Hochner, Nicole. “Revisiting Anne de Bretagne’s Queenship: On Love and Bridles.” In *The Cultural and Political Legacy of Anne de Bretagne: Negotiating Convention in Books and Documents*, edited by Cynthia J. Brown, 147–162. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010.
- Horowitz, Mark R. “Richard Empson, Minister of Henry VII.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 55 (1982): 35–49. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2281.1982.tb01143.x.
- Houston, R. A. “What Did the Royal Almoner Do in Britain and Ireland, C. 1450–1700?” *The English Historical Review* 125, no. 513 (2010): 279–313. doi:10.2307/25639997.
- Howard, Maurice. *The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics 1490-1550*. London: George Philip & Son, 1987.
- Howell, Margaret. *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- Howey, Catherine L. “Fashioning Monarchy: Women, Dress and Power at the Court of Elizabeth I: 1553-1603.” In *The Rule of Women in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Anne J. Cruz and Mihoko Suzuki, 142–156. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Hoyle, Richard W. “Introduction: Aspects of the Crown’s Estate, c.1558-1640.” In *The Estates of the English Crown, 1558-1640*, edited by Richard W. Hoyle, 1–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hufton, Olwen. “Reflections on the Role of Women in the Early Modern Court.” *The Court Historian* 5, no. 1 (2000): 1–14.
- Huneycutt, Lois L. “Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos.” In *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, edited by Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth Maclean, 126–146. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- . *Matilda of Scotland: A Study in Medieval Queenship*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Hunt, Alice. *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- . “The Reformation of Tradition: The Coronations of Mary and Elizabeth.” In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, edited by Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt, 63–80. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. www.palgraveconnect.com.
- Ives, E. W. *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Jack, Sybil. “In Praise of Queens: The Public Presentation of the Virtuous Consort in Seventeenth-Century Britain.” In *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern*

- Europe*, edited by Susan Broomhall and Stephanie Tarbin. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008.
- Jansen, Sharon L., ed. *Anne of France: Lessons for My Daughter*. Woodbridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 2004.
- . *Dangerous Talk and Strange Behavior: Women and Popular Resistance to the Reforms of Henry VIII*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- . *The Monstrous Regiment of Women: Female Rulers in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Johnston, Hope. "How the *Livre de La Cité Des Dames* First Came to Be Printed in England." In *Desireuse de plus Avant Enquerre*, edited by Liliane Dulac, Anne Paupert, Christine Reno, and Bernard Ribémont, 385–396. Paris: Champion, 2008.
- Johnstone, Hilda. "The Queen's Exchequer under the Three Edwards." In *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, edited by John Goronwy Edwards, V. H. Galbraith, and E. F. Jacob, 143–53. Manchester, 1933.
- . "The Queen's Household." In *Chapters in Medieval Administrative History*, by T.F. Tout. Vol. 5. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1930.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind, and Peter Stallybrass. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Jones, Michael K., and Malcolm G. Underwood. *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Jordan, Constance. *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- . "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought." *Renaissance Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (1987): 421–451. doi:10.2307/2862518.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press, 2007.
- Kaufman, Peter Iver. "Piety and Proprietary Rights: James IV of Scotland, 1488-1513." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 13, no. 1 (1982): 83–99. doi:10.2307/2539919.
- Keen, Maurice. *Chivalry*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Kettering, Sharon. "The Patronage Power of Early Modern French Noblewomen." *The Historical Journal* 32, no. 4 (1989): 817–841. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2639686>.

- Kisby, Fiona. "The Early-Tudor Royal Household Chapel, 1485-1547." PhD diss., Royal Holloway, University of London, 1996. <http://ethos.bl.uk/Home.do>.
- . "'When the King Goeth a Procession': Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547." *The Journal of British Studies* 40, no. 1 (2001): 44–75. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3070769>.
- Kolk, Caroline zum. "Catherine de Médicis et l'espace: résidences, voyages et séjours." In *Moving Elites: Women and Cultural Transfers in the European Court System*, edited by Giulia Calvi and Isabelle Chabot, 51–61. Proceedings of an International Workshop (Florence, 12-13 December 2008). San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy: European University Institute, 2010. <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/14234>.
- . "The Household of the Queen of France in the Sixteenth Century." *The Court Historian* 14, no. 1 (2009): 3–22.
- Laynesmith, Joanna L. *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445-1503*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lerer, Seth. "'Representyd Now in Yower Syght': The Culture of Spectatorship in Late-Fifteenth Century England." In *Bodies and Disciplines: Intersections of Literature and History in Fifteenth-Century England*, edited by Barbara A. Hanawalt and Gail McMurray Gibson, 139–154. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.
- . "The Taming of the Queen: Foxe's Catherine and Shakespeare's Kate." In *"High and Mighty Queens" of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, edited by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves, 171–86. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- . "'Would I Could Give You Help and Succour': Elizabeth I and the Politics of Touch." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 21, no. 2 (July 1, 1989): 191–205. doi:10.2307/4049925.
- Levin, Carole, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves, eds. *"High and Mighty Queens" of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Liss, Peggy K. *Isabel the Queen: Life and Times*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Loades, D. M. *Henry VIII and His Queens*. Pbk. ed. Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1996.
- . *The Tudor Court*. London: Batsford, 1986.

- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- MacDonald, A. A. "Princely Culture in Scotland under James III and James IV." In *Princes and Princely Culture, 1450-1650*, edited by Martin Gosman, Alasdair A. MacDonald, and Ari Johan Vanderjagt, 1:147–72. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- MacHardy, Karin J. "Cultural Capital, Family Strategies and Noble Identity in Early Modern Habsburg Austria 1579-1620." *Past & Present* no. 163 (May 1, 1999): 36–75. doi:10.2307/651169.
- Maclean, Ian. *The Renaissance Notion of Woman: A Study in the Fortunes of Scholasticism and Medical Science in European Intellectual Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Madden, Craig. "The Feuing of Ettrick Forest." *Innes Review* 27 (1976): 70–84.
- Marshall, Rosalind K. *Mary of Guise*. London: Collins, 1977.
- Matthew, H. C. G., Brian Harrison, eds. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition. Lawrence Goldman, ed. www.oxforddnb.com.
- Mattingly, Garrett. *Catherine of Aragon*. New York: Vintage Books, 1941.
- Maurer, Helen E. *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Mayer, Thomas F. "When Maecenas Was Broke: Cardinal Pole's 'Spiritual' Patronage." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996): 419–435. doi:10.2307/2544142.
- McFarlane, Leslie. "The Book of Hours of James IV and Margaret Tudor." *Innes Review* 11 (1960): 3–21.
- McGrattan, Alexander. "Italian Wind Instrumentalists at the Scottish Royal Court during the 16th Century." *Early Music* 29, no. 4 (November 1, 2001): 535–551. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3519115>.
- McIntosh, Jeri L. *From Heads of Household to Heads of State: The Preaccession Households of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, 1516-1558*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- McIntosh, Marjorie K. *A Community Transformed: The Manor and Liberty of Havering, 1500-1620*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . *Autonomy and Community: The Royal Manor of Havering, 1200-1500*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

- . “Sir Anthony Cooke: Tudor Humanist, Educator, and Religious Reformer.” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 119, no. 3 (1975): 233–250. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/986673>.
- . “Some New Gentry in Early Tudor Essex: The Cookes of Gidea Hall, 1480-1550.” *Essex Archaeology and History* 9 (1977): 129–138.
- . “The Benefits and Drawbacks of Femme Sole Status in England, 1300–1630.” *The Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 3 (July 1, 2005): 410–438. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/429708>.
- . “The Cooke Family of Gidea Hall, Essex 1460-1661.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1967. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/302225832?accountid=14553>.
- McLaren, Anne. “Queenship in Early Modern England and Scotland.” *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006): 935–952. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4091589>.
- McManus, Caroline. “Queen Elizabeth, Dol Common, and the Performance of the Royal Maundy.” *English Literary Renaissance* 32, no. 2 (2002): 189–213. doi:10.1111/1475-6757.00008.
- McNeill, Peter, and Ranald Nicholson, eds. *An Historical Atlas of Scotland, c 400 - c.1600*. St Andrews: Atlas Committee of the Conference of Scottish Medievalists, 1975.
- Meikle, Maureen M. “‘Holde Her at the Oeconomicke Rule of the House’: Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Finances, 1589-1603.” In *Women in Scotland, c.1100-c.1750*, edited by Maureen M. Meikle and Elizabeth Ewan, 105–11. East Linton, UK: Tuckwell, 1999.
- Merton, Charlotte. “Women, Friendship, and Memory.” In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, edited by Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt, 239–50. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. www.palgraveconnect.com.
- Michalove, Sharon D. “Equal in Opportunity? The Education of Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550.” In *Women’s Education in Early Modern Europe: A History, 1500-1800*, edited by Barbara J. Whitehead. New York: Garland Publishing, 1999.
- . “The Education of Aristocratic Women in Fifteenth-Century England.” In *Estrangement, Enterprise and Education in Fifteenth-Century England*, edited by Sharon D. Michalove and A. Compton Reeves, 117–139. Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1998.
- Miller, Edward, ed. *The History of Parliament*. 3 vols. CD-ROM. Cambridge University Press and The History of Parliament Trust, 1998.
- Monnas, Lisa. “Cloth of Gold.” In *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles in the British Isles C. 450-1450*, edited by Gale R. Owen-Crocker, Elizabeth Coatsworth, and Maria Hayward, 132–133. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

- Mooney, Colleen Lily. "Queenship in Fifteenth-Century France." PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 1977. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/302849950?accountid=14553>.
- Morgan, D. A. L. "The House of Policy: The Political Role of the Late Plantagenet Household, 1422-1485." In *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, edited by David Starkey, 25–70. London: Longman, 1987.
- Morrison, Susan Signe. *Women Pilgrims in Late Medieval England: Private Piety as Public Performance*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Muir, Edward. *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Murphy, John. "The Illusion of Decline: The Privy Chamber, 1547-1558." In *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, edited by David Starkey, 119–146. London: Longman, 1987.
- Murphy, Neil. "Receiving Royals in Later Medieval York: Civic Ceremony and the Municipal Elite, 1478-1503." *Northern History* 43, no. 2 (2006): 241–255. doi:10.1179/174587006X116167.
- Murphy, Virginia. "The Literature and Propaganda of Henry VIII's First Divorce." In *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, edited by Diarmaid MacCulloch, 135–58. London: Macmillan, 1995.
- Murray, Athol L. "The Exchequer and Crown Revenue of Scotland, 1437-1542." PhD diss., Edinburgh, 1961.
- Musson, Anthony J. "Queenship, Lordship and Petitioning in Late Medieval England." In *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance*, edited by W. Mark Ormrod, Gwilym Dodd, and Anthony Musson, 156–172. York: York Medieval Press, 2009.
- Myers, A. R. *Crown, Household and Parliament in Fifteenth Century England*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1985.
- Nassiet, Michel. "Anne de Bretagne, a Woman of State." In *The Cultural and Political Legacy of Anne de Bretagne: Negotiating Convention in Books and Documents*, edited by Cynthia J. Brown, 163–176. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010.
- Neal, Derek. "The Queen's Grace: English Queenship, 1464-1503." Master's thesis, McMaster University, 1996.
- Nelson, Janet L. "Medieval Queenship." In *Women in Medieval Western European Culture*, edited by Linda Elizabeth Mitchell, 179–207. New York: Garland, 1999.
- Nelson, Jessica. "Scottish Queenship in the Thirteenth Century." In *Thirteenth Century England XI: Proceedings of the Gregynog Conference, 2005*, edited by Bjorn Weiler, Janet Burton, and Phillipp Scholfield, 61–81. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell and Brewer, 2007.

- Nevile, Jennifer. "Dance in Europe, 1250-1750." In *Dance, Spectacle, and the Body Politick, 1250-1750*, edited by Jennifer Nevile, 7–66. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Neville, Pamela Ayers. "Richard Pynson, King's Printer (1506-1529): Printing and Propaganda in Early Tudor England." PhD diss., London, 1990. <http://ethos.bl.uk/Home.do>.
- O'Sullivan, Deirdre. "The 'Little Dissolution' of the 1520s." *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 40, no. 2 (2006): 227–58. doi:10.1179/174581306X143043.
- Oakley-Brown, Liz, and Louise J. Wilkinson. *The Rituals and Rhetoric of Queenship: Medieval to Early Modern*. Dublin: Four Courts, 2009.
- Orme, Nicholas. *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530*. New York: Methuen, 1984.
- Orr, Clarissa Campbell. "Introduction." In *Queenship in Europe, 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort*, edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr, 1–15. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . , ed. *Queenship in Europe, 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Page, William, ed. "Colleges: Stoke by Clare." In *A History of the County of Suffolk: Volume 2*. British History Online, n.d. <http://british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=37945>.
- Parsons, John Carmi. *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-Century England*. 1st ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- . , ed. *Medieval Queenship*. Pbk. ed. Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1998.
- . "Mothers, Daughters, Marriage, Power: Some Plantagenet Evidence, 1150-1500." In *Medieval Queenship*, edited by John Carmi Parsons, 63–78. Pbk. ed. Stroud, UK: Sutton, 1998.
- . "'Never Was a Body Buried in England with Such Solemnity and Honour': The Burials and Posthumous Commemorations of English Queens to 1500." In *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe: Proceedings of a Conference Held at King's College London, April 1995*, edited by Anne Duggan, 317–337. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1997.
- . "Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500." In *Women and Sovereignty*, edited by Louise Olga Fradenburg, 60–77. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.
- . "The Pregnant Queen as Councilor and the Medieval Construction of Motherhood." In *Medieval Mothering*, edited by John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler. New York: Garland, 1996.

- . “The Queen’s Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England.” In *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, edited by Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth Maclean, 147–177. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- Paul, John E. *Catherine of Aragon and Her Friends*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1966.
- Peck, Linda Levy. “Benefits, Brokers and Beneficiaries: The Culture of Exchange in Seventeenth-Century England.” In *Court, Country and Culture: Essays on Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin*, edited by B. Y. Kunze and D. D. Brautigam, 109–27. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1992.
- . *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990.
- . “‘For a King Not to Be Bountiful Were a Fault’: Perspectives on Court Patronage in Early Stuart England.” *The Journal of British Studies* 25, no. 1 (1986): 31–61. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/175610>.
- Peirce, Leslie P. *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Perry, Maria. *Sisters to the King: The Tumultuous Lives of Henry VIII’s Sisters, Margaret of Scotland and Mary of France*. London: André Deutsch, 1998.
- Pierce, Hazel. *Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, 1473-1541: Loyalty, Lineage and Leadership*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003.
- Pollnitz, Aysha. “Christian Women or Sovereign Queens? The Schooling of Mary and Elizabeth.” In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, edited by Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt, 127–44. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. www.palgraveconnect.com.
- Pollock, Linda A. “Honor, Gender, and Reconciliation in Elite Culture, 1570–1700.” *The Journal of British Studies* 46, no. 1 (January 1, 2007): 3–29. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/508396>.
- Powell, W. R. “Parishes: Havering-Atte-Bower.” In *A History of the County of Essex: Volume 7*. British History Online, n.d. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=42806>.
- Reinhardt, Nicole. “Spin Doctor of Conscience? The Royal Confessor and the Christian Prince.” *Renaissance Studies* 23, no. 4 (2009): 568–590. doi:10.1111/j.1477-4658.2009.00611.x.
- Richards, Judith M. “Mary Tudor as ‘Sole Quene’?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy.” *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 4 (1997): 895–924. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640128>.

- . “Mary Tudor: Renaissance Queen of England.” In *“High and Mighty Queens” of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, edited by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves, 27–44. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- . “Public Identity and Public Memory: Case Studies of Two Tudor Women.” In *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Susan Broomhall and Stephanie Tarbin, 195–210. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008.
- . “‘To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule’: Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England.” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28 (1997): 101–121. doi:10.2307/2543225.
- Richardson, Catherine. “Introduction.” In *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, edited by Catherine Richardson, 1–28. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004.
- Richardson, Glenn. “Eternal Peace, Occasional War: Anglo-French Relations under Henry VIII.” In *Tudor England and Its Neighbours*, edited by Susan Doran and Glenn Richardson, 44–73. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- . *Renaissance Monarchy: The Reigns of Henry VIII, Francis I and Charles V*. London: Arnold, 2002.
- Rigby, Stephen. “Political Thought.” In *Encyclopedia of Dress and Textiles in the British Isles C. 450-1450*, edited by Gale R. Owen-Crocker, Elizabeth Coatsworth, and Maria Hayward, 422–426. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Robinson, Brian. *The Royal Maundy*. London: Kaye & Ward, 1977.
- Rooley, Anthony. “Dance and Dance Music of the 16th Century.” *Early Music* 2, no. 2 (April 1, 1974): 79–83. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3126128>.
- Ross, James D. *Musick Fyne: Robert Carver and the Art of Music in the Sixteenth Century*. Edinburgh: The Mercat Press, 1993.
- Rubin, Miri. *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Russell, Joycelyne Gledhill. *The Field of Cloth of Gold*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Sadlack, Erin A. *The French Queen’s Letters: Mary Tudor Brandon and the Politics of Marriage in Sixteenth-Century Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. www.palgraveconnect.com.
- Samman, Neil. “The Henrician Court During Cardinal Wolsey’s Ascendancy c.1514-1529.” PhD diss., University of Wales, 1988. <http://ethos.bl.uk/Home.do>.
- . “The Progresses of Henry VIII, 1509-1529.” In *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, edited by Diarmaid MacCulloch, 59–74. London: Macmillan, 1995.

- Sánchez, Magdalena S. *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun: Women and Power at the Court of Philip III of Spain*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Scarisbrick, J. J. *Henry VIII*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Scherb, Victor I. "'I'de Have a Shooting': Catherine of Aragon's Receptions of Robin Hood." *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 42 (2003): 124–46.
- Schuessler, Melanie. "French Hoods: Development of a Sixteenth-Century Court Fashion." Edited by Robin Netherton and Gale R. Owen-Crocker. *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 5 (2005): 129–155.
- Schulte, Regina, ed. *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500-2000*. New York: Berghahn, 2006.
- Scott, Margaret. "A Burgundian Visit to Scotland in 1449." *Costume* 21 (1987): 16–25.
- Scottish Record Office. *Guide to the National Archives of Scotland*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office, 1996.
- Scribner, Robert W. "The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the 'Disenchantment of the World.'" *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 23, no. 3 (1993): 475–494. doi:10.2307/206099.
- Shenton, Caroline. "Philippa of Hainault's Churchings: The Politics of Motherhood at the Court of Edward III." In *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by R. G. Eales, 105–121. Donington, Lincolnshire: Shaun Tyas, 2003.
- Sherlock, Peter. "Monuments, Reputation and Clerical Marriage in Reformation England: Bishop Barlow's Daughters." *Gender & History* 16, no. 1 (2004): 57–82. doi:10.1111/j.0953-5233.2004.326_1.x.
- Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Vol. 1 Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Smuts, Malcolm R., and Melissa Gough. "Queens and the International Transmission of Political Culture." *The Court Historian* 10, no. 1 (2005): 1–13.
- Snook, Edith. *Women, Beauty and Power in Early Modern England: A Feminist Literary History*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Somerville, R. "Henry VII's 'Council Learned in the Law.'" *The English Historical Review* 54, no. 215 (1939): 427–442. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/554405>.
- Somerville, Robert. "The Duchy of Lancaster Council and Court of Duchy Chamber." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 23 (1941): 159–77.

- St. John, Lisa Benz. *Three Medieval Queens: Queenship and the Crown in Fourteenth-Century England*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Stafford, Pauline. *Queens, Concubines, and Dowagers: The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1983.
- Staniland, Kay. "Royal Entry into the World." In *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Daniel Williams, 297–313. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1987.
- Starkey, David. "Henry VI's Old Blue Gown: The English Court under the Lancastrians and Yorkists." *Court Historian* 4, no. 1 (1999): 1–28.
- . , ed. *Henry VIII: A European Court in England*. London: Collins & Brown, 1991.
- . *Six Wives: The Queens of Henry VIII*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2003.
- Stephenson, Barbara. "Maintaining the Antiquity of the House: Marguerite de Navarre, Noble Marriage and Dynastic Culture in Early Sixteenth-Century France." *The Court Historian* 10, no. 1 (2005): 15–24.
- . *The Power and Patronage of Marguerite de Navarre*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004.
- Stevens, John E. *Music and Poetry in the Early Tudor Court*. London: Methuen, 1961.
- Stevenson, Jane. "Texts and Textiles: Self-Presentation among the Elite in Renaissance England." *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 3, no. 1 (Autumn 2011): 39–57. <http://northernrenaissance.org/>.
- Stevenson, Katie. *Chivalry and Knighthood in Scotland, 1424-1513*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2006.
- Streitberger, W. R. "Henry VIII's Entertainment for the Queen of Scots, 1516: A New Revels Account and Cornish's Play." Edited by J. Leeds Barroll. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 1 (1984): 29–35.
- Streitberger, W.R. "The Development of Henry VIII's Revel's Establishment." *Medieval English Theatre* 7, no. 2 (1985): 83–100.
- . "William Cornish and the Players of the Chapel." *Medieval English Theatre* 8, no. 1 (1986): 3–20.
- Strohm, Paul. *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Strong, Roy C. *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals, 1450-1650*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1984.

- . *Splendor at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and the Theater of Power*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
- Taylor, Andrew W. ““Ad Omne Virtutum Genus”? Mary between Piety, Pedagogy and Praise in Early Tudor Humanism.” In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, edited by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, 103–122. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Thomas, Andrea. *Princelie Majestie: The Court of James V of Scotland*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2005.
- Thomas, Jennifer. “Patronage and Personal Narrative in a Music Manuscript: Marguerite of Austria, Katherine of Aragon, and London Royal 8 G.vii.” In *Musical Voices of Early Modern Women: Many-Headed Melodies*, edited by Thomasin LaMay, 337–64. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005.
- Thurley, Simon. *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Travitsky, Betty S. “Reprinting Tudor History: The Case of Catherine of Aragon.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 50, no. 1 (April 1, 1997): 164–174. doi:10.2307/3039332.
- Tremlett, Giles. *Catherine of Aragon: The Spanish Queen of Henry VIII*. New York: Walker & Company, 2010.
- Tudor-Craig, Pamela. “Margaret, Queen of Scotland, in Grantham, 8-9 July 1503.” In *The Reign of Henry VII: Proceedings of the 1993 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Benjamin Thompson, 261–279. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995.
- Veevers, Erica. *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Vosevich, Kathi. “The Education of a Prince(ss): Tutoring the Tudors.” In *Women, Writing and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*, edited by Mary Burke, 61–76. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000.
- Walker, Garthine. “Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour in Early Modern England.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (January 1, 1996): 235–245. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3679239>.
- Watts, Karen. “Henry VIII and the Founding of the Greenwich Armouries.” In *Henry VIII: A European Court in England*, edited by David Starkey, 42–46. London: Collins & Brown, 1991.
- Wayment, Hilary. “The Stained Glass in the Chapel of The Vyne.” In *National Trust Studies*, 35–49, 1980.

- Weil, Rachel Judith. "Royal Flesh, Gender and the Construction of Monarchy." In *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500-2000*, edited by Regina Schulte, 88–100. New York: Berghahn, 2006.
- Weir, Alison. *The Six Wives of Henry VIII*. London: Pimlico, 1997.
- Weissberger, Barbara S. "Tanto Monta: The Catholic Monarchs' Nuptial Fiction and the Power of Isabel I of Castile." In *The Rule of Women in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Anne J. Cruz and Mihoko Suzuki, 43–63. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Whitley, Catrina Banks, and Kyra Kramer. "A New Explanation for the Reproductive Woes and Midlife Decline of Henry VIII." *Historical Journal* 53, no. 4 (December 2010): 827–848. doi:10.1017/S0018246X10000452.
- Williams, Janet Hadley. "James V of Scots as Literary Patron." In *Tradition and Innovation in an Era of Change, 175–198*. Frankfurt am Main; New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Winerock, Emily F. "'Performing' Gender and Status on the Dance Floor in Early Modern England." In *Worth and Repute: Valuing Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Essays in Honour of Barbara Todd*, edited by Kim Kippen and Lori Woods, 449–473. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2011.
- Wolffe, B. P. *The Crown Lands, 1461-1536*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970.
- . "The Management of English Royal Estates under the Yorkist Kings." *The English Historical Review* 71, no. 278 (1956): 1–27. doi:10.2307/558623.
- Wormald, Jenny. *Lords and Men in Scotland: Bonds of Manrent, 1442-1603*. Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1985.
- Wright, Pam. "A Change in Direction: The Ramifications of a Female Household." In *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, edited by David Starkey, 147–172. London: Longman, 1987.
- Zanger, Abby. "Fashioning the Body Politic: Imagining the Queen in the Marriage of Louis XIV." In *Women and Sovereignty*, edited by Louise Olga Fradenburg, 101–120. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.
- Ziegler, Georgianna. "Re-Imagining a Renaissance Queen: Catherine of Aragon among the Victorians." In *"High and Mighty Queens" of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations*, edited by Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves, 203–22. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.