THE HOUSEHOLD OF QUEEN KATHERINE PARR

Submitted to the History Faculty Board in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
Trinity Term, 1992

Dakota L. Hamilton
Somerville College
THE HOUSEHOLD OF QUEEN KATHERINE PARR

Submitted to the History Faculty Board in fulfillment of the degree Doctor of Philosophy, Trinity Term, 1992

Dakota L. Hamilton
Somerville College

This thesis is concerned primarily with determining the nature and degree of influence that Katherine Parr and the women of her household exercised over politics and religion in the last years of Henry VIII's reign. Katherine Parr's household, which was loosely modeled on that of the king's, was staffed with women who had marital and other family ties to men in the king's household and government. These important family relationships are examined in chapter one, parts I and II. The considerable material benefits which came to Katherine Parr and the members of her family after her marriage to the king are explored in chapter two. Katherine Parr and her women actively promoted the interests of their family, friends, and dependents, and cultivated the good will of potentially influential members of court. Yet despite the ambitions of the queen's women, and despite the king's confidence in Katherine Parr, as evidenced in his appointment of her as regent, neither the queen nor her women exercised much political influence. A full examination of this whole issue forms chapter three. Katherine Parr and her women may have been excluded from direct political power, but their religious activities nevertheless made them political figures. These religious activities are discussed in chapter four, part I. Part II concerns the patronage, and in two instances, authorship, of religious literature by the queen and her circle. Chapter five looks at Anne Askew and the two plots against Katherine Parr and a select number of her women in 1546. The conclusion emphasizes the point that Katherine Parr is an important historical figure not simply because she was Henry VIII's last wife, but because her experiences better highlight the circumstances of aristocratic women at the Tudor court.
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For a number of years, vigorous debate has been going on about Queen Katherine Parr's role at the English court in the last years of Henry VIII's reign. The debate was initiated by Professor J. K. McConica in 1965 by his book, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI*. For over twenty-five years, historians have generally accepted and repeated his view that Katherine Parr was an active and entirely benevolent influence on Henry VIII and his policies. However, Dr. Maria Dowling, particularly in her *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (1986), has disputed McConica's assertions: historians are slowly adopting her position. A careful study of the surviving material, however, shows that neither view is wholly accurate. Although there have been two biographies and numerous articles written on Katherine Parr, none have adequately addressed the question of the queen's impact on affairs in the 1540s. This thesis is concerned primarily, therefore, with determining the nature and degree of influence that Katherine Parr and the high-ranking women of her household exercised over politics and religion in the closing years of Henry VIII's reign.

Katherine Parr's household, which is examined in chapter one, part I, was loosely modeled on that of the
king's. She had her own chamber establishment 'upstairs', and a complete set of service departments below. Further, she had a full complement of household officers and religious officials, as well as a large number of male chamber staff. The one, critical difference between the two royal households was that a queen's intimate servants necessarily had to be women. At least forty-five women staffed the queen's chambers in 1547: twenty-six ladies, six gentlewomen, five chamberers, and seven maids of honor and their 'mother'. Despite the turmoil of the period, there was a surprising sense of continuity between the households of the king's wives, both above stairs and below, and many who served Katherine Parr had also attended her immediate predecessors.

Katherine Parr probably spent most of her time in the company of the women of her household. Many of the high-ranking women were related to each other, and almost all had husbands and other male relations in the king's household and government. These family relationships figured prominently in the two plots of 1546 against the queen and a select number of her ladies and their husbands. Background information on the queen's women, and their near male relations, is provided in part II of chapter one.

Chapter two concerns the material benefits which came to Katherine Parr and the members of her family through her marriage to the king. The king was willing
initially to reward the male relatives of his wives with offices, titles, and grants, but he continued to favor them only if they showed ability. In this respect, the earl of Hertford succeeded where Katherine Parr's brother, the earl of Essex, did not. Frequently, the rewards given to the relatives of the king's wives could easily be justified: Sir Thomas Boleyn, the earl of Hertford, and Sir William Parr of Horton, Katherine Parr's uncle, had all been in the crown's service long before the king cast his eyes on the female members of their respective families.

Of course, the person who benefited most of all was Katherine Parr herself. She inherited not only many of the household staff of her predecessors, but their jointure properties as well. Her whole estate consisted of 133 manors in twenty counties, fifteen boroughs, six castles, and other related property. Although Katherine Parr had a council to administer these properties, it nevertheless would seem as though final decisions concerning the appointment of officials and the granting of leases remained with the queen. Katherine Parr took advantage of her estate and frequently sent gifts of venison to a variety of people, including Prince Edward and the king himself. Her vast holdings also gave her some influence over parliamentary elections, and it probably is significant that in 1545 and 1547 a number of her servants were elected to seats from areas where her property was concentrated.
Katherine Parr's estate supported her royal dignity, and provided her with the opportunity not only to act like a queen, but to dress the part as well. Keeping up appearances was everything to the Tudor monarchs, and Katherine Parr spent considerable amounts of money on her wardrobe. She also had an impressive collection of jewelry. Katherine Parr acquired the outward visible signs of royalty almost immediately upon her marriage to the king. The only thing she lacked was political power, and she temporarily acquired even that in 1544.

Chapter three focuses on Katherine Parr's regency and the activities of the queen and her women in the promotion of their family, friends, and dependents. In July 1544, Henry VIII appointed Katherine Parr regent while he personally pursued his war with France. Historians have suggested that Katherine Parr was merely a figure-head for the council that the king left behind in England, but this could not be further from the truth. Although the council no doubt did the 'hands on' work, Katherine Parr nevertheless was fully involved in affairs. Anglo-Scottish relations were unstable, and the earl of Shrewsbury, lord lieutenant of the north, addressed his letters directly to the queen. The queen sent the earl instructions via the London council, sent personal letters of congratulation to the wardens of the marches, and in general advocated an aggressive policy against the Scots. She and the London council attended to the problems of supplying and financing an army in
France as well as troops in the north of England. The king's one surviving letter to Katherine Parr clearly shows that he expected his wife to be every bit as diligent as any other high-ranking servant of the crown. Certainly he expected her to be as able as Katherine of Aragon, the only other person the king ever appointed regent.

During her regency, Katherine Parr acquired not only the confidence to take advantage of her position but the more practical knowledge of how to exercise her influence. The queen promoted a number of suits and championed the cause of Cambridge University, whose officials feared that their university would be dissolved under the provisions of the 1545 Chantries Act. Although it is impossible to determine whether or not Katherine Parr's intercession was decisive, it probably was significant that it was to the queen that Henry VIII confided his plans for the university, and she who passed on the good news that Cambridge would be preserved.

Katherine Parr's activities were for the most part in line with those of her five predecessors. She promoted relatively minor suits and concerned herself with the affairs of one the two great universities of England. Although the queen does not appear to have taken a direct interest in foreign policy, as did Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn, the Imperial ambassador, Eustace Chapuys, certainly was interested in the potential influence Katherine Parr had over the king.
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king, the disastrous end of his second marriage had significantly lessened the king's susceptibility to influence by his later wives. While Queen Elizabeth's women appear to have been quite active in political affairs, the very fact of a male monarch also contributed to the virtual exclusion of women from high-politics in the last half of Henry VIII's reign. There was, however, one area in which it was permissible for women to take an active interest, and it was an area which actually became highly politicized towards the end of the reign: Katherine Parr and her women unwittingly became political figures through their religious activities.

An examination of the religious activities of Katherine Parr and the women of her household forms chapter four, part I. Katherine Parr was a humanist at heart. For her, education and religion were inseparable subjects. This fact has generated considerable discussion about the queen's own intellectual accomplishments. Although the queen was not as gifted as either Edward or Elizabeth, the surviving material would suggest that Katherine Parr was a fairly educated woman at a court which set a high standard for royal women. While she took an active interest in education at the highest levels, as her involvement with Cambridge University clearly indicates, it is unlikely that she was entrusted with the direction of Prince Edward's studies, as has been previously asserted. However, Katherine Parr did show an active concern for Elizabeth's academic work,
and may even have been responsible in part for the development of Lady Jane Grey's later radical religious views.

At the time of her marriage to the king, Katherine Parr probably happily complied with the king's religious policies, but by the middle of 1544, the queen was beginning to look towards the reformers. This transition is partially reflected in the queen's own work, *Prayers or meditations*, published in June 1545. It seems unlikely that the queen's religious officials converted her, as they all seem to have been conservative. Rather, it would appear as though Katherine Parr was introduced to reforming doctrines by a number of her high-ranking women. Certainly these women shared her newly acquired beliefs and seem to have encouraged and supported the queen's sympathies. However sincere the beliefs of the queen's women, though, a political element nevertheless can be detected behind the activities of a few individuals. There is some evidence to suggest that the king was sympathetic to the reformers in the last months of the reign, and it certainly would have been politically wise for these women, and their husbands, to align themselves with the reformers. After Edward VI's accession, the queen and her women gave full vent to their religious beliefs. In particular, they were active patrons of religious literature, as is demonstrated in chapter four, part II.

In 1547, Katherine Parr published a second, more
radical work in which she advocated the doctrine of justification by faith alone, a principle which Henry VIII had earlier rejected, and supported the idea that an English Bible should be made available to the common people, a matter on which the king had had deep reservations. Katherine Parr also sponsored Udall's Paraphrases, a book which was required by the Edwardian Injunctions of July 1547 to be made available in every parish church in England.

After Katherine Parr's death, a number of her high-ranking women took up where she left off, and enthusiastically gave their patronage to more radical writers of Edward VI's reign. The duchess of Somerset, formerly countess of Hertford, was particularly prominent in her patronage. Whatever the depth of sincerity behind the duchess's sponsorship, and it does appear as though political ambitions were her primary concern, as the wife of the Lord Protector her support was invaluable. There were no reservations about the sincerity of the widowed duchess of Suffolk's beliefs, and she even suffered exile on account of her faith.

Under Edward VI, Katherine Parr and her circle were able to give their support publicly to the reformers. Under Henry VIII, though, they had had to be more circumspect in their behavior; an analysis of the two summer plots of 1546 against Katherine Parr forms chapter five.

The first plot of 1546 centered on the suspected
unorthodox beliefs of Katherine Parr and a number of her high-ranking women. Anne Askew provided the first opportunity for conservatives at court to attack the queen, but the condemned woman refused to implicate anyone. The second plot took shape when Katherine Parr contradicted the king on a religious issue. The king was outraged at being lectured to, and consented to a search of the rooms of three of the queen relatives. It was expected that forbidden heretical books would be found, thus implicating Katherine Parr. But what incensed the king was not his wife's religious opinions, but rather the fact that she had dared to contradict him in front of others. When the queen submitted herself to the king's will, the conservatives' plot disintegrated.

Neither Katherine Parr nor the high-ranking women of her household had any significant influence over political affairs in the 1540s. The degree of influence they had over religious affairs is another question. Although Katherine Parr may not have been the leader of reform, certainly collectively she and her women contributed greatly to its flourishing under Edward VI. And this small group of women provided examples for later Elizabethan women to follow.

The conclusion highlights the fact that, in the midst of the continuing debate about Katherine Parr's role in the 1540s, one particular aspect has been completely missed or simply ignored. Her importance as an historical figure does not rest solely on the fact
that she was Henry VIII's last wife. Katherine Parr is an important figure in her own right because her experiences better highlight the circumstances of women at the Tudor court. Katherine Parr's life at court was very much like that of the high-ranking women appointed to attend her. What differentiates their experiences rests primarily on degree: Katherine Parr simply had more of everything. Even the queen's regency can be seen in a larger perspective; many men who had to be away from home, whether because of business or war, left the administration of their estates in the capable hands of their wives. The activities of this Tudor queen-consort were very much like those of the average aristocratic woman, and a study of Katherine Parr is also a study of women at the Tudor court.
NEW INFORMATION

p. 340, line 10 - should be eleven, not ten, dedications. The eleventh dedication was William Samuel's *The Abridgement of Goddes Statutes in Myter* (1551).

p. 349, second paragraph - should read: 'Over a thirty year period, the duchess of Suffolk received seven direct dedications: three dated to the first four years of Edward VI's reign, while the other four dated to the first half of Elizabeth's reign'.

p. 352, line 22, following note 65 - insert 'In 1562, Augustine Berhnher dedicated to her an edition of Hugh Latimer's sermons (*RSTC* 15276. *Certayn Godly Sermons*, made vpon the lords prayer* (London: John Day, 1562)). This work, which was especially popular, was enlarged and reprinted in 1571-1572 (*RSTC* 15277). A further four editions had been issued by the end of the century (*RSTC* 15278-15281).

p. 354, line 11 - should read '... seven works ...'
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INTRODUCTION

By the middle of 1543, war between England and France seemed inevitable. In February of that year, Henry VIII and Charles V had agreed to an alliance against Francis I: England and the Empire were to have troops in the field within two years. The subjugation of Scotland also seemed nearer than it had for years. A Scottish force several times the size of an opposing English command had been routed at Solway Moss in the fall of the previous year: thousands of prisoners were taken, many from the Scottish nobility. A few days after Scotland’s humiliating defeat, James V’s wife, Marie de Guise, gave birth to the much awaited heir to the throne: it was a girl. Completely demoralized by these events, some said, James V died, leaving Scotland more or less at the mercy of the English.

On the home-front, the publication of The King’s Book, which outlined official religious doctrine, and the passage of the Act for the Advancement of True Religion, which took away the right of the common people to read the English Bible, seemed to suggest that the king was about to pursue more conservative policies. Finally, the Catherine Howard episode was fading as Henry VIII enthusiastically prepared for war: it was time for the king to think about remarrying.

After the Catherine Howard affair, an act had been passed making it treasonous for any woman to conceal an
incontinent past should the king's affections light upon her. It was also treasonous for anyone else to conceal such information.¹ Eustace Chapuys, the Imperial ambassador, wryly commented that there were not likely to be very many women at court who would aspire to be the king's wife under those conditions.² Nevertheless, when Henry VIII's choice fell upon Katherine Parr, she gave up all thoughts of marrying Sir Thomas Seymour, who had been courting her since the death of her second husband, and resigned herself to obeying a higher calling.

Katherine Parr had strong connections with Henry VIII's court well before her marriage to the king. Her parents had been highly regarded at the English court earlier in the reign. Sir Thomas Parr, who had served in Henry VII's household as a squire of the body, had been created a knight on the occasion of Henry VIII's coronation.³ In October 1510, he had been made a knight of the body.⁴ Parr had accompanied the king during the war with France in 1513, and had been nominated, though not elected, to the garter in 1514.⁵ Parr died in 1517, probably in November.⁶ Lady Maud Parr probably had

¹ 33 Hen. VIII c. 21. This, and other statutes cited in the text, are from Danby Pickering, The Statutes at Large, vols. IV & V, (Cambridge, 1763).
² C.S.P.Sp., VI, i, 232 (LP, XVII, 124).
³ LP, I, i, 20 (p. 13), 81.
⁴ LP, I, i, 604(14).
⁵ LP, I, ii, 2053, 2838.
⁶ LP, II, ii, 3807.
served in Katherine of Aragon’s household well before 1519, when she first appears as a permanent member of the queen’s establishment. Lady Parr continued to serve Katherine of Aragon until her own death in 1531 or 1532.

The Parrs had a house in Blackfriars, London, and that probably is where Katherine Parr was born in 1513. Although there were negotiations for a marriage between Katherine Parr and Lord Scrope’s son in 1523 and 1524, nothing actually materialized. Instead, Katherine Parr married, probably around May 1529, Edward Borough, heir of Sir Thomas Borough of Gainsborough in Lincolnshire. The marriage, though, was short-lived, and Borough was

7. LP, III, i, 491.

8. James says that Lady Parr died 1 December 1531 ('The Parrs of Kendal', 277). J. G. Nichols and John Bruce, in their brief introduction to Lady Parr’s will, say that she died 1 September 1532 (Wills from Doctor’s Commons, (Camden Society no. 83, old s., 1863), 9). Whichever date is correct, she certainly did not die, as many have suggested, in May 1529, the date of her will. Lady Parr was still alive in November 1530, when she was given a grant confirming two earlier patents (LP, IV, iii, 675(26)).

9. Both Sir Thomas and Lady Maud Parr were buried in the church of the Blackfriars in London (Nichols and Bruce, eds., Wills from Doctor’s Commons, 9). The date of Katherine Parr’s birth is deduced from a wardrobe bill pertaining to the 1544 Maundy services: livery cloth was to be given to thirty-one poor women, each woman representing one year of Katherine Parr’s life (P.R.O., E101/423/12, f. 6v).

10. LP, III, ii, 3178, 3210, 3264, 3649; IV, i, 162, 189.

11. Susan E. James, 'The Parr’s of Kendal 1370-1571', (Cambridge, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1977), 278. James convincingly argues that Edward Borough was not an old man, as has been previously asserted, but rather was only in his early twenties when he married Katherine Parr.
dead by April 1533.\textsuperscript{12}

Some time between May 1534 and the end of that year, Katherine Parr married Sir John Neville, Lord Latimer.\textsuperscript{13} Latimer had connections both in London and in the north of England: he had been elected to parliament in 1529 and was later to sit in the house of Lords, and he was related to many of the leading families of the north.\textsuperscript{14} He was involved in the Pilgrimage of Grace, though to what degree is difficult to determine. The government suspected Latimer’s loyalty, but then, so did the rebels themselves: at one point, the rebels entered his manor of Snape and more or less held Katherine Parr, Latimer’s children, and his property in general as surety for his support of the cause.\textsuperscript{15} Latimer successfully pleaded his innocence in the uprising, and did not suffer the fate of the rebels. Latimer, who leased a house in London, continued to attend sessions of parliament up until his death on 2 March 1543.\textsuperscript{16}

It is impossible to say just when Henry VIII decided to marry Katherine Parr. Given her court connections, and the fact that Lord Latimer had had a house in London, it seems likely that the king at least knew Katherine

\textsuperscript{12}. LP, VI, 419(3).
\textsuperscript{13}. James, ‘The Parr’s of Kendal’, 278.
\textsuperscript{15}. LP, XII, i, 173.
\textsuperscript{16}. Bindoff, The House of Commons, III, 8-9.
Parr before becoming better acquainted in 1543. A clothing bill covering 1543 suggests that the king gave Katherine Parr gifts of clothing soon after Lord Latimer's death, possibly even before.\(^1\) On 20 June 1543, Sir John Dudley, Lord Lisle, wrote to Sir William Parr noting specifically that Parr's sisters, Katherine and Anne Herbert, were at court with Mary and Elizabeth.\(^2\) So by at least 20 June, Henry VIII had probably decided to marry Katherine Parr.

Henry VIII's courtship of Katherine Parr was decidedly brief. Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, issued a marriage license on 10 July, and the king married Katherine Parr on the 12th.\(^3\) On the 16th, a courtier noted that Katherine Parr's virtue, wisdom, and gentleness made her a particularly suitable wife for the king.\(^4\) On the 20th, Sir William Parr received three letters regarding his sister's marriage. Sir Thomas Wriothesley commented that the new queen was 'a most gratious lady, and to your lordship a moste kinde suster'.\(^5\) He hoped that Parr would 'fram yourself to be eu[er]ly day more and more an ornament to her ma[jes]te'. Sir Ralph Sadler wrote that the marriage had

\(^1\) P.R.O., SP 1/177, fols. 123-125 (LP, XVIII, i, 443) See chapter 2.

\(^2\) LP, XVIII, i, 740.

\(^3\) P.R.O., E30/1472, nos. 5 and 6 (LP, XVIII, i, 873 and 854 respectively.

\(^4\) LP, XVIII, i, 894.

\(^5\) P.R.O., SP 1/180, f. 84 (St.P., V, 321).
'revyved my troubled spryte, and tourned all my care into solace and rejoysing'. Sadler rejoiced not only for Parr's sake, 'but also for the greate and inestimable benefite and conforte, whiche therby shall ensue to the hole realme, whiche now, with the grace of God, shalbe stored with manye precious juelles'. Katherine Parr herself wrote to her brother announcing the marriage, saying that he, 'being my natural brother may rejoyse w[ith] me in the goodnes of god and of his Ma[jes]te as the person who by nature hath most cause of the same'. Her elevation in the world had not gone to her head, and she hoped that he would 'let me som tyme here of your healthe as frendly as ye wold have doon if god & his Ma[jes]te had not called me to this honor, which I assure you shal be mocch to my comfort'. Immediately upon Katherine Parr's marriage to the king, and perhaps even a little before, the queen acquired her own household, staffed, however, with many who had served Henry VIII's previous wives. Indeed, there was a surprising sense of continuity between the households of the king's wives, both in the chambers above stairs, and in the service departments below. Katherine Parr obviously benefited materially from her marriage to the king, but so did her immediate relatives. By virtue of her position as the king's wife, she also
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became a figure of some importance, and the king considered it appropriate to appoint her regent while he personally pursued his war with France. The king expected as much from his wife as he did from any servant of the crown, and she proved to be an able and informed regent. Despite this gesture of confidence, however, Katherine Parr actually had little real political power. She and the high-ranking women of her household actively promoted the interests of their family, friends, and dependents, but they did not deliberately seek to become involved in high politics. With a great deal of free time on their hands, the queen and her women turned their attentions to religious affairs, and only by doing so did they unwittingly become political figures. Their religious activities were feared to such an extent that there were two attempts on their lives in the summer of 1546. Had either or both of the plots succeeded, there probably would have been a similar purge in the king's household and government as well.

We turn first to the organization and administration of Katherine Parr's household.
CHAPTER ONE: KATHERINE PARR'S HOUSEHOLD

PART I: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A great deal of work has been done on the household of Henry VIII, much of it within the last twenty years.\textsuperscript{1} For the most part, scholars have concentrated their attentions on the king's 'side' of the household, his chambers 'upstairs' and the service departments 'below stairs'. If there has been any reference to the queen consort's establishment, it usually has been general and only in passing.

As most of these historians have suggested in their work, those closest to the monarch had the best chance of influencing the king and obtaining favors for family and friends. There were two possible avenues to this kind of intimacy: high government office and personal service -- often the two went hand in hand. In the consort's household, however, the situation was slightly different. Generally speaking, a queen consort was not in a position to proffer government offices, so the ambitious had to seek advancement through personal service alone. And because of the possible influence a queen might have over

the king, competition for places in the queen's establishment was tied directly to the king's own household and even government. The king's household favorites and government officials usually were the most successful of all competitors in placing their wives, daughters, and near relations in the queen's household, thus securing for themselves yet another opportunity, albeit indirect, to influence their royal master.

Because of this correlation between the queen's household and the king's household and government, it is necessary to examine the consort's establishment in order to have a full understanding of events in the last years of Henry VIII's reign. The focus of this chapter, then, is on the organization and administration of Queen Katherine Parr's household. The actual physical layout of the queen's apartments will be discussed first, followed by a brief overview of the structure of household in general. Because Katherine Parr's women were concentrated in the household above stairs, it will be that part of the household which will figure most prominently in this chapter. The number and variety of household positions available for women will be discussed, as will be duties, wages, and perquisites of appointments. Although the queen's immediate servants were women, her upstairs household nevertheless contained some male officials, and they, and their offices, will also be examined. Comparisons have been made to the king's household mainly because his was the one on which
the consort's establishment was loosely modeled. And where appropriate, mention has been made of the households of earlier queens consort and of the two queens regnant who followed Katherine Parr.

* * *

Katherine Parr's household was similar to that of the king's, though on a smaller scale, and like the king, she had her own set of apartments in most of the royal palaces. Each side of the royal household consisted of a great or watching chamber, a presence chamber, a privy chamber, and a bedchamber. Depending on individual royal houses, the king and queen may also have had a withdrawing chamber, a raying (or robing) chamber, a breakfast chamber, a closet or oratory for private devotions, a study or library, and some kind of provision for a jakes or portable latrine. Additionally, the royal apartments probably included a number of 'galleries', or rather, passage ways, lobbies, and, more substantially, areas for recreation. When, for example, there was hope in 1534 of a meeting between Henry VIII and Francis I, the Calais Exchequer was divided (on paper) into three sets of apartments, one each for the French king and the English king and queen. The plan provided for a total of

---

2. Loades, The Tudor Court, 41.

ten galleries, or rather, six passage ways, three lobbies, and, in only one instance, an area of recreation (see fig. 1).⁴ In the case of the queen’s apartments, the galleries indicated passage ways from two staircases.⁵ At Hampton Court, it would appear that at least two galleries were reserved solely for the queen’s use: one seems to have been a lobby, while the other, furnished with a ‘payre of Regalles’ and a number of tables and stools, was clearly an area of recreation.⁶

The placement of the royal apartments within each of the king’s houses seems to have varied only slightly. At Nonesuch, the royal apartments were located on the first floor around an inner courtyard, the king’s in the western side and the queen’s in the eastern side (see fig. 2).⁷ According to the 1534 plan for Calais, the English royal apartments were to be adjoining (see fig. 1).⁸ At The More, in Hertfordshire, the king’s and queen’s apartments probably were opposite each other, while at Hampton Court, they were side by side (see fig. 3).⁹ In an unexecuted design for a house at Waltham-in-Forest, the royal apartments again were to be next to

⁴. Ibid, IV, ii, 17; III, i, 350-1 (fig. 13).
⁵. Ibid, III, i, 350-1, fig. 13.
⁶. B.L., Harleian MS 1419A, fols. 249v-250.
⁷. Colvin, History of the King’s Works, IV, ii, 199, 197 (fig. 18).
⁸. Ibid, III, i, 350-1 (fig. 13).
⁹. Ibid, IV, ii, 131, 165.
each other. Based on these examples it seems likely that the king's and queen's apartments usually were situated as close together as possible.

Perhaps the clearest picture we have of the composition and arrangement of Katherine Parr's apartments is derived from the inventory taken at Hampton Court in 1547. The inventory, which was made while the court was not in residence, appears to have been taken progressively, that is to say, proceeding through one room, then through the next one to it, and so forth. Keeping in mind that beds and other personal furniture would literally have been carted from place to place when the court moved, the queen's appartments nevertheless were fairly well equiped with permanent items (see Table 1).

The first room appearing in the inventory which might have been used by the queen is a 'w[i]t[h] drawinge chambre on the Quenes syde'. Next follows 'the privye chambre' and 'the kinges bedchambre on the Quenes syde', leading to the 'Quenes galorie'. From there we proceed to 'the Quenes bedch[a]mbre', a second 'w[i]t[h] drawing chambr on the Quens syde', another 'privye chambre', and the 'privye Galorie'. Only Katherine Parr's closet seems to have been separated from her private appartments.  

10. Ibid, IV, ii, 15 (fig. 2).


12. B.L., Harleian MS 1419A, f. 257.
Just as Katherine Parr had her own apartments, so did she have her own chamber establishment and a complete set of service departments 'below stairs'. The upper division of the household publicly displayed the magnificence of the monarch, or in this case, the consort, and appropriately was known as the domus regie magnificencie in Edward IV's Liber Niger. Various household documents, which are discussed in detail in part II, indicate that as many as forty-five women contributed to Katherine Parr's 'magnificence': twenty-six ladies of the queen's chamber, six gentlewomen of the privy chamber, five chamberers, and seven maids of honor and their 'mother'. The fact that these women had servants of their own at court further enhanced the queen's status.

Excluding the officers of the household, the queen's council, her chaplains, clerk of the closet, secretary, physician, and apothecary, fifty-one men staffed Katherine Parr's upper household at the time of Henry VIII's funeral: four gentlemen ushers, one carver, one cup-bearer, two sewers for the mouth, three gentlemen waiters, six sewers for the chamber, one groom porter, twenty-four yeomen of the chamber, five grooms of the chamber, and four pages of the chamber. Under the category of 'artiscers' were a barge keeper, messenger,


14. B.L., Lansdowne MS 2, fols. 36-36v.
groom of the leash, goldsmith, 'branderer', and a tailor, all of whom probably were considered members of the queen's upstairs establishment.\textsuperscript{15} Like the queen's women, some of these men were allowed servants of their own.\textsuperscript{16}

These men were considered to be regular members of Katherine Parr's establishment. But in addition to these normal attendants were other, 'extraordinary', men who could be called upon to serve at the queen's, or king's, discretion, probably mainly on ceremonial occasions. At least two gentlemen ushers, four gentlemen waiters, and eight yeomen and grooms inclusive were attached to the queen's household as 'extraordinary' members at the time of the king's funeral in 1547, and all fourteen received cloth allowances, for themselves as well as their servants, for the occasion.\textsuperscript{17}

The queen had a second group of male servants who were distinguishable from the other chamber staff mainly in terms of authority or specialization. Administering the upper household, and supervising its members, were the queen's household officers. Heading this group was the queen's lord chamberlain and his assistant, the vice-chamberlain. Katherine Parr also had a chancellor, a master of the horse, a secretary, an almoner, four chaplains, a clerk of the closet, a physician, and an

\textsuperscript{15} P.R.O., LC 2/2, fols. 43v-46; HO, 167-70.
\textsuperscript{16} B.L., Lansdowne MS 2, fols. 36-36v.
\textsuperscript{17} P.R.O., LC 2/2, fols. 46-46v.
apothecary. Further, she had a 'learned' council made up of a receiver, surveyor, attorney, solicitor, auditor, and a clerk of the council. By 1547, a 'councillor' had been added to this learned group.

Again, the servants accompanying these men only added further to the queen's dignity.

The domus providencie, or rather, the household 'below stairs', contributed to the magnificence of the court through a number of service departments. Just as the queen's establishment upstairs was separate from the king's, so was her household below stairs. According to the household ordinances of 1539-1540, drawn-up at the time of the king's marriage to Anne of Cleves, the service departments for the queen's household consisted of a 'garnarye', bakehouse, pantry, brewhouse, buttery (which distributed beer), cellar, 'garderobe of spices', chaundy (candles and tapers), ewery (table linen), kitchen, slaughterhouse, scullery, and a hall and woodyard. Additionally, the ordinances regulated the almoner, porters of the gatehouse, and the garderobes.

Anne of Cleves's below stairs establishment, however, seems somewhat incomplete when compared to the king's service departments, which were outlined at the same time

18. P.R.O., LC 2/2, fols. 43v, 45; HQ, 167.
19. P.R.O., LC 2/2, fols. 43v, 46.
20. B.L., Lansdowne MS 2, fols. 36-36v.
22. B.L., Harleian MS 6807, fols. 12-17.
and which were unchanged at the time of the king's death: bakehouse, pantry, cellar, buttery, pitchercouse, spicery, waffery (biscuits), chaundry, confectionery, ewery, laundry, kitchen, larder, boilinghouse, acatry (meat and fish), poultry, scaldinghouse, pastry, scullery, and woodyard. Included with these departments were the king's harbingers, almoners, porters, and carttakers.  

Significantly, a list of service departments for Queen Mary's household, made early in her reign, and two lists for Elizabeth's establishment, one made at the time of her coronation in 1559 and one for her funeral in 1603, all mirrored exactly the number of service departments in their father's household in the 1540s.

Katherine Parr's service departments duplicated for the most part the arrangements in the king's household. A wage list covering the first months of Edward VI's reign indicated eighteen service departments within the very recently widowed queen's household: bakehouse, pantry, cellar, buttery, ewery, chaundry, spicery, kitchen, larder, acatry, poultry, scaldinghouse, pastry, sausery, scullery, woodyard and hall. The wage list also covered the almoner, gate porters, carttakers, and

---

23. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 22v-26v; P.R.O., LC 2/2, fols. 28-31v.

laundress. When compared to Henry VIII's household, Katherine Parr's dower establishment lacked only a pitcherhouse, waffery, and a boilinghouse. It may well have been that the responsibilities of these departments were carried out by others.

Until 1540, the lord steward for the queen's establishment had supervision over her household below stairs. Under Thomas Cromwell's household reforms of 1540, however, the offices of lord steward for the king's and queen's households were abolished in favor of a new creation, that of great master. The duties of the lord stewards were attached to the great master, who now had authority over both the king's and queen's lord chamberlains, thus bringing the management of both households under one office. Under the great master were four masterships of the household, apparently two each for the king's and queen's establishments. Thomas Welden, William Thymme, Edward Weldon, and Edward Shelley initially were appointed first, second, third, and fourth master respectively in the household reforms of 1539-1540. Although information on their exact duties is obscure, it would seem likely that they served as intermediaries between the respective royal chambers and

---


26. Loades, The Tudor Court, 42; Starkey, 'The King's Privy Chamber', 283.


28. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 3, 28v.
the countinghouse. 29

Outside the household proper were the wardrobe of the robes, the wardrobe of the beds, and the stables. Each department had its own staff.

Despite the rapid succession of queens between 1540 and 1543, there seems to have been a certain continuity of staff within the households of Henry VIII's last three wives, both above stairs and below. 30 Relative continuity in personnel, however, did not always indicate a stable atmosphere. The queen's chambers were a potential center for political and religious activity. Three of Katherine Parr's predecessors had been in the household of at least one of Henry's wives and considerable plotting by their respective families had assisted their rise to power: Anne Boleyn had served Katherine of Aragon, and was herself attended by her own successor, Jane Seymour, while Catherine Howard came to the king's notice through her place as maid of honor in the short-lived establishment of Anne of Cleves. Before the king's marriage to Katherine Parr, there was some speculation regarding the king's marked attentions to yet another maid of honor, Anne Basset, who had served Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, Catherine Howard, and was to

29. Loades, The Tudor Court, 61.

30. For a comparison of households, see B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 15v-18, P.R.O., E101/422/15, and E101/422/16 for Anne of Cleves; P.R.O., SP 1/157, fols. 15-16 for Catherine Howard; and P.R.O., E179/69/41, E179/69/48, E179/69/47, E179/69/55, E179/69/44, LC 2/2, E101/426/2, fols. 1-5, B.L., Royal MS App. 89, fols. 104v-105, and HQ, 167-170 for Katherine Parr.
become a member of Katherine Parr's household.\textsuperscript{31} In the early part of 1546, the Imperial ambassador reported a rumor that the king was to take a seventh wife and hinted that the duchess of Suffolk, one of Katherine Parr's ladies, was to be the king's choice.\textsuperscript{32} Women who did not attract the king's personal attention could also be dangerous to the king's wives: an unnamed maid of honor was one of Anne Boleyn's accusers,\textsuperscript{33} and Lady Rochford figured largely in Catherine Howard's downfall. Even women who were loyal relatives or close friends of the queen could unwittingly place their royal mistress in danger; note the two plots against Katherine Parr in 1546.

The considerable and significant activity which took place in the queen's chambers, then, necessarily made it the center of the queen's establishment, a primacy of place which again mirrored the situation in the king's household. The members of the queen's chambers, though, were not simply ornaments to the court, but, like their counterparts in the king's household, had certain duties to perform and were regulated by various ordinances. But before any member could take up his or her post, they had to be sworn a member of the household.

Every member of the household had to swear an oath

\textsuperscript{31}. C.S.P.Sp., VIII, 204; St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, V, 66.

\textsuperscript{32}. C.S.P.Sp., VIII, 204 (LP, XXI, i, 289).

\textsuperscript{33}. St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, III, 381.
of loyalty to the king. ³⁴ John Husee wrote to Honor, Lady Lisle, in 1537 that her daughter, Anne Basset, had been sworn one of the queen's maids of honor, which suggests strongly that the queen's servants also took some kind of oath of loyalty, no doubt to the queen as well as to the king. ³⁵

Once sworn a member of the household, the king's and queen's servants were expected to obey household regulations. In 1540, the queen's head officers were charged to read the ordinances 'openly in ye comptynghouse before all ye sayd s[er]uantes . . . at payment of ther wagges to thintent yt none of them by ignorauce or for lacke of knollege shall excuse him selfe'. ³⁶ The queen's servants were to be generally up-standing and dressed 'clenylye & decentlye'. ³⁷ They were to 'abstayne from vicious lyving blasphemy [and] sweryng', were not to 'frequent . . . taverns nor alhouses', or to participate in 'vnlawfull geemes as dyce, cardes & suche other p[ro]hibited by ye Kinges Lawes'. ³⁸ Members of the queen's household were not to be 'pickars of quarelles nor sowers of discorde & sedicion betwixe p[ar]te and parte'; were not to 'fighte

---

³⁴. Loades, The Tudor Court, 93.

³⁵. St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, VI, 163, and no. 895.

³⁶. B.L., Harleian MS 6807, f. 10v.

³⁷. Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, f. 14v; B.L., Harleian MSS 6807, f. 12.

³⁸. B.L., Harleian MS 6807, f. 11.
nor brawle nor give occacion so to do’; and were not to 'pike nor breake lokes nor dors of any house of offfe
nor chambr w[i]th in the said house'.\textsuperscript{39} Curfew was at 'nyne of of ye clocke'.\textsuperscript{40} To emphasize that members of the household were to be back before the doors were
locked, they were warned 'not to clyme . . . walles nor
gaffes by night'.\textsuperscript{41} The queen's servants were to 'kepe
scilence aswell within my Lades grace chambr as her hall
at dyn[ner] & soppar at ye com[m]aundement of thushers of
ye chambr and hushers of ye hall'.\textsuperscript{42} The first
transgression of a household ordinance carried a warning,
while a second offence brought dismissal.\textsuperscript{43} The sort of
rabble targeted in this ordinance almost beggars the
imagination. That they were a high-spirited, rowdy crew
we can be sure.

According to other household ordinances for the period, the king's and queen's chamberlains were to
ensure that members of the household did not retain 'a
gretter nombre of seruaunts in the courte then be
appointed and assigned vnto them'.\textsuperscript{44} This must have been
a problem of some scale, as it was a regulation that

\textsuperscript{39}. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{40}. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{41}. Ibid, f. 11v.

\textsuperscript{42}. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{43}. Ibid, fols. 10v-11.

\textsuperscript{44}. Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, f. 14v; HO, 147, cap. 33; B.L., Harleian MS 6807, f. 12.
appeared twice in the Eltham Ordinances of 1526.\textsuperscript{45} A related problem seems to have been caused by household officers employing others to do their own work, which was strictly forbidden.\textsuperscript{46} Even the highest within the privy chamber apparently had transgressed this particular stricture.\textsuperscript{47} Those servants admitted to the privy chamber were specifically warned not to gossip among themselves nor reveal what went on within the inner sanctum.\textsuperscript{48}

Perhaps the most important ordinance, though, and the most difficult to keep, was the one which admonished household servants not to approach the king, and presumably the queen, with their own suits or the suits of friends.\textsuperscript{49} They were not to 'intermeddle' in any affairs whatsoever unless specifically commanded to do so.\textsuperscript{50}

This probably was the most frequently violated of all the household ordinances. If, for example, the countesses of Sussex (later Arundel) and Rutland had not

\textsuperscript{45} Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, fols. 17-17v; HO, 147-8, cap. 34.

\textsuperscript{46} Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, f. 17v; HO, 148, cap. 36.

\textsuperscript{47} Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, fols. 25-25v; HO, 155, cap. 57.

\textsuperscript{48} Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, fols. 26v-27; HO, 156, cap 63.

\textsuperscript{49} Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, f. 24v; HO, p. 155, cap. 55.

\textsuperscript{50} Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, fols. 24v, 27v; HO, 155, cap 55, and 157, cap 66.
pressed Anne Basset's suit to be a maid of honor to Jane Seymour at a favorable moment in the summer of 1537,\(^5^1\) Anne might have fallen into disgrace with the rest of her family in 1540 before another opportunity presented itself. As it was, Anne's membership in Jane Seymour's household was cut short when the queen died a little over a month after her new maid of honor was sworn in. In that brief time of service, though, Anne had established herself as a permanent member of the queen's household, and, even more importantly, had come to the king's attention, as will be noted later.

Aside from granting favors directly, the queen might also serve as an indirect route to the king's favor. Katherine Parr spoke to the king on behalf of the duchess of Suffolk, who was trying to gain the wardship of her two sons after the death of her husband in 1545.\(^5^2\) The duchess was granted her petition in May 1546.\(^5^3\) The queen was also a potential source for privileged information; in 1544, the countess of Hertford was not above asking Katherine Parr, through Princess Mary, to find out when her husband would return from the north, where he had been sent on the king's business.\(^5^4\)

No queen was immune to 'intermeddling'. In Queen

\(^5^1\) St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, IV, 155-6.


\(^5^3\) LP, XXI, i, 963.

\(^5^4\) H.M.C., Salisbury I, 42; LP, XIX, i, 620.
horses. Each gentleman usher daily waiter usually had two servants, sharing one bed, and stabling for three horses.

From a letter of John Husee's dated 17 September 1537, it would appear that the queen's maids of honor were the equivalent of the yeoman ushers, or probably the gentlemen ushers, as the yeoman ushers seem to have become by the 1540s. The maids of honor, then, probably performed duties similar to those performed by the king's servants, that is to say, they supervised the grooms and pages, performed light duties at the queen's table, and assisted the queen at mass. The maids of honor were entitled to dinner, supper and bouch of court, and had stabling for one horse apiece. If Anne Basset's experience is at all representative, the maids of honor supplied their own clothing, according to the queen's specifications. They also had to provide their own bedding, though they probably were usually allowed cloth against ceremonial occasions, such as coronations and

74. B.L., Lansdowne MS 2, f. 36; HO, 198.

75. HO, 198.

76. St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, IV, 163, and no. 895.


78. B.L., Additional MS 45,617A, fols. 3v, 16; HO, 199; St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, IV, 192.

Mary's reign, the Imperial ambassador considered the help of Susan Clarencius, chief among Mary's women, essential to bringing about the queen's marriage to Prince Philip.\textsuperscript{55} Elizabeth's official position on the subject of 'intermeddling' was made quite clear at the beginning of her reign, when she called together her women and forbade them from speaking to her on business matters.\textsuperscript{56} But even with this admonition, Elizabeth's women nevertheless were viewed by their contemporaries, and with good reason, as having influence with the queen, who herself drew on their superior knowledge of court gossip.\textsuperscript{57} At times, it even would appear as though Elizabeth used her women to confuse various interest groups at court over her real intentions.\textsuperscript{58}

Although the queen's chambers were patterned on those of the king's, there was one significant difference

\textsuperscript{55} Loades, The Tudor Court, 69.


\textsuperscript{57} Haigh, Profiles in Power, 97-8; Charlotte Merton, 'The women who served Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth', (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Cambridge, 1992), chapter 6. Dr. Merton's thesis was unavailable through the usual channels at the time of the submission of my own thesis. Dr. Merton, however, very kindly provided me with her own copy. But because Dr. Merton's copy contains some changes not in the thesis deposited with Cambridge, I must refer here and throughout to chapters rather than specific pages.

\textsuperscript{58} Wright, 'A change in direction: the ramifications of a female household, 1558-1603', in The English Court, 167-8.
between the two, that being that most of a queen's immediate servants had to be women instead of men. Nevertheless, the duties of these women were not necessarily different from those of their counterparts in the king's household. The Eltham Ordinances of 1526 stipulated that the king's pages were to arise at 7:00 a.m., or shortly afterwards, and make the fire in the chamber. At the same time, they were to awaken the squires-of-the-body, who were sleeping in the chamber, and remove the 'night gere', which they had laid out the night before. The chamber had to be 'dressed' by 8:00 a.m., and if the squires refused to get up in a timely fashion, the pages were authorized to report them to the lord chamberlain or, if he was unavailable, to the vice-chamberlain.\textsuperscript{59} In the later part of the reign, Henry's pages and squires stood at four each.\textsuperscript{60} In 1547, Katherine Parr also had four pages,\textsuperscript{61} although no squires-for-the-body appear on the funeral ordinance. Possibly the queen's chamber was kept overnight either by several of her yeomen of the chamber or her grooms of the chamber.

In the Eltham Ordinances, the yeomen ushers and yeomen waiters were to be at the chamber door by 8:00 a.m., and were to keep the chamber clear of persons who

\textsuperscript{59} Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, fols. 20 -20v; HO, 151-2, cap 47.

\textsuperscript{60} B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 4v, 6; HO, 168, 166.

\textsuperscript{61} P.R.O., LC, 2/2, f.46.
did not belong there, by force if necessary.62 The duties of the yeomen ushers probably were similar to those performed by their counterparts in Henry VII’s household: supervision of the grooms and pages, who were to set the fires and dress the chamber; partial direction of the sewers and yeomen; attendance at various tables during meals; and fetching bread and wine at the command of the gentlemen ushers for snacks for the lords and gentlemen.63 The yeomen waiters were particularly charged in the 1526 ordinances with keeping the outer door of the chamber clear of ‘raskalls boyes and other[s]’ so that the king could have a clear passage to the queen’s apartments.64 They were also charged to make sure that left over food and drink were not left in the chamber.65

The Eltham Ordinances stipulated that one of the two gentleman ushers was to be in the king’s privy chamber by 7:00 a.m., or earlier if requested by the king, and was to watch the chamber doors, refusing entry to those who did not have a right to be there.66 The gentleman ushers were to keep records of the bread, ale, and wine that was

62. Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, fols. 20v-21v; HO, 152, caps. 48 & 49.

63. B.L., Additional MS 21,116, fols. 10-11v.

64. Bod., Laudian MS Misc., 597, f. 22; HO, 153, cap 51.

65. Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, fols. 22-22v; HO, 153, cap 51.

66. Bod., Laudian MS Misc. 597, f. 25v; HO, 155, cap. 58.
dispensed in the king's and queen's chambers, and were to fetch the king's and queen's 'all-night', the Tudor equivalent of a bedtime snack, between eight and nine o'clock. In Henry VII's household the gentlemen ushers supervised the work of the grooms and pages who prepared the chamber for the day, and attended the king's table when he dined. They had water brought for hand-washing for the king's guests, and supplied them with bread, ale, and wine at dinner when required. Additionally, they were to attend the king when he made his offering at mass.

By the end of the reign, the position of yeomen usher of the king's privy chamber seems to have merged with that of gentleman usher, while the daily waiters of the king's privy chamber appear to have become gentlemen ushers daily waiters. The change may have reflected the fact that men from the gentry now filled the said offices and so required grander titles. In the 1540s, the gentlemen ushers of the privy chamber numbered two, while the gentlemen ushers daily waiters of the privy chamber came to four. Their wages as well as their titles

67. HO, 144, caps 27 & 28.
68. B.L., Additional MS 21,116, fols. 7-8v; St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, IV, 165-6.
69. The two gentlemen ushers were Sir Philip Hoby and Sir Maurice Berkeley (HO, 165; B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, f. 5). They were listed at the time of the king's funeral with the 'Lordes and Gentilmen of the kinges ma[jes]te[s] p[ri]vye chambre' (P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 41). The four gentlemen ushers daily waiters were William Raynford, John Norris, Richard Greenway, and Richard Blount (HO, 165; B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, f.
reflected a distinction of some kind between the two posts: the king’s two gentlemen ushers received £30 a year while the four gentlemen ushers daily waiters received £20.\textsuperscript{70} In addition to their wages, they were allowed bouch of court, or rather, rations of bread, ale, wine, fuel, and candles, and they were entitled to eat in the king’s chamber.\textsuperscript{71} It would seem that they generally were allowed cloth against ceremonial occasions: at the time of the king’s funeral, each gentleman usher was allowed ten yards of black cloth for their personal use, and a further twenty-three yards for eight attendants.\textsuperscript{72} Each of the king’s four gentlemen ushers daily waiters received the slightly smaller personal allowance of nine yards of black cloth, while their respective three servants shared nine yards for the occasion.\textsuperscript{73} The number of servants these men were permitted to have in attendance for the king’s funeral may not be representative of the number of servants they normally were allowed to employ. Rather, it would seem that each gentleman usher usually was permitted to have four servants, who shared two beds, and stabling for four

\textsuperscript{5; P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 128).}

\textsuperscript{70. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, f. 13v; HO, 169.}

\textsuperscript{71. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 3v, 5; HO, 165.}

\textsuperscript{72. P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 41. See also note 71 above.}

\textsuperscript{73. P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 128.}
royal funerals. At the funeral of Henry VIII in 1547, each maid of honor was allowed nine yards of black cloth for her personal use, and a further three yards for her one servant. In this instance, the number of servants that were to attend the maids of honor for the king's funeral matched the number they usually were allowed to employ. The servants of the maids of honor were themselves allowed meals in the queen's chamber and apparently shared three beds among themselves. Jane Seymour's and Anne of Cleves's maids of honor were paid £10 a year, and presumably so were Catherine Howard's and Katherine Parr's. In respect of Anne Basset's previous service to Katherine Parr, Edward VI granted her a pension of £26 13s. 4d., a figure that may represent what a maid of honor's position was actually worth when the perquisites were added to the wages.

Anne of Cleves seems to have had seven maids of honor and a 'mother' of the maids, while her immediate successor curiously seems to have had only five, not
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83. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 16, 19; B.L., Lansdowne MS 2, f.40; HO, 173, 199.
86. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, f. 16.
including the 'mother'. Katherine Parr’s maids of honor were back up to seven, with their 'mother', in 1547.

Mrs. Stoner was the 'mother of the maids' under the king's last four queens and presumably her main duties were to supervise and chaperon the maids of honor. While in the household of Anne of Cleves, she appears to have received 50s. a quarter, with, in 1539 at least, a f5 Christmas bonus at the king's command. She was entitled to bouch of court and probably dinner and supper as well. It also seems likely that she was given an allowance for at least one servant and stabling for one horse. At the king's funeral, she was given the same allowances as the maids of honor: nine yards of black cloth for herself and three yards for one servant.

The maids of honor, then, in their positions as yeomen or gentleman ushers, supervised the grooms, who were to be in the privy chamber by 6:00 a.m. or 7:00 a.m., or even earlier if required. The grooms were to remove the pallet beds, which they had laid out the night before, start the fire, and make 'clene the same of al

87. P.R.O., SP 1/157, f. 16.
88. P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 45.
89. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, f. 92; St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, IV, 191; P.R.O., SP 1/157, f. 16; P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 45.
91. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 16, 20v.
92. P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 45.
maner of filthines'. In Henry VII's household the grooms took charge of the king's 'arras bedds formes stoolees carpetts cushions w[i]th all other stuffe belonginge to the said chambers'. They also were to help set up the meals and clean up afterwards. In 1539-1540, the king's four grooms were paid f20 a piece, ate in the king's chamber, and had bouch of court. The grooms were each allowed two horses for their servants. However, these servants collectively only had two beds to share among themselves, which suggests that perhaps only two grooms actually served at one time, each with two attendants and their servants' two horses. The grooms, and their servants, were given allowances for ceremonial occasions. For Henry VIII's funeral in 1547, each groom received nine yards of black cloth for his personal use, and a further twelve yards for four servants. Although the specially drawn-up funeral ordinance lists thirteen grooms of the privy chamber, it seems likely that only three of the men (who appear on earlier lists) out of the total were 'ordinary' of the household, the other ten probably being 'extraordinary' and summoned to
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96. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 5, 12v, 14; HQ, 165-86, 169.
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court specifically to attend the king’s funeral. The fourth ‘ordinary’ groom might have been in 1547 is uncertain.

Professor Loades suggests that Queen Mary’s three chamberers probably took over the duties of the grooms of the privy chamber. Dr. Wright’s demonstration that Elizabeth’s chamberer’s generally were held responsible for the everyday operation of the queen’s privy chamber lends weight to that hypothesis. Anne of Cleves’s chamberers do not appear to have been allowed bouch of court, although accounts do suggest that they generally were entitled to eat in the queen’s chamber. Anne of Cleves had places for two chamberers, while Catherine Howard had four. Although Katherine Parr had five chamberers attending her at the time of the king’s funeral, various subsidy lists covering the period from 1544 to early 1547 suggest that she usually
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only had four. Subsidy lists also suggest that the usual annual wage for Katherine Parr's chamberers was £6 13s. 4d.. Although three chamberers continued to receive that amount in the queen's dower establishment, two chamberers received the lesser amount of 50s. a quarter, or rather, £5 a year. Whether or not the chamberers were usually entitled to have servants, or stabling for horses, is unclear. For the king's funeral in 1547, each chamberer received nine yards of black cloth for their personal use, and a further three yards for one servant.

The Eltham Ordinances specified that two gentlemen of the privy chamber were to sleep in the privy chamber, and that all six gentlemen were to be at their posts by 7:00 a.m., or sooner if so required. Unless the king ordered differently, they were the only chamber staff permitted to help the king to dress. One of the six gentlemen was to be the groom of the stool, chief among the king's servants in the privy chamber. His exact duties are somewhat vague, excepting that he was permitted to attend the king in his bed chamber, and in

---
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'other privey places'.\textsuperscript{111}

It proved impossible to limit the king's gentlemen of the privy chamber to six members, and their numbers grew steadily throughout the king's reign, so that by the 1540s, his privy chamber boasted between sixteen and eighteen gentlemen.\textsuperscript{112} The gentlemen were entitled to dinner, supper, and bouch of court,\textsuperscript{113} and each were allowed at least four servants and stabling for six horses.\textsuperscript{114} In 1539-1540, thirteen of the king's sixteen gentlemen received £50, while the other three got 50 marks apiece.\textsuperscript{115} Five years later, however, all but two received the higher figure.\textsuperscript{116} In 1547, nineteen 'Lordes and gentilmen of the kinge's ma[jes]te[s] p[ri]vy chambre' were given allowances for the king's funeral in 1547: the earl of Hertford led the list with sixteen yards of black material for himself, and forty-eight yards for his sixteen servants. The lord privy seal, baron John Russell, the lord admiral, John Dudley, lord Lisle, and William Parr, earl of Essex, each were given sixteen yards of black cloth for their personal use, and
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a further thirty-six yards for their respective twelve attendants. Each of the remaining fifteen lords and gentlemen were allowed ten yards of black cloth, and a further thirteen yards for eight servants.\textsuperscript{117}

It seems likely that the gentlewomen of the queen's privy chamber paralleled the king's gentlemen of the privy chamber.\textsuperscript{118} Anne of Cleves may have had five such women\textsuperscript{119} and Catherine Howard probably had four.\textsuperscript{120} In 1547, Katherine Parr had six.\textsuperscript{121} Although the queen's gentlewomen are not referred to by position in the various accounts, it seems probable that, like their counterparts in the king's privy chamber, they received bough of court. No doubt they were entitled to eat in the queen's chamber; accounts make references to various groups of women who served in the queen's household and ate in her chamber,\textsuperscript{122} and probably the queen's gentlewomen made up one of those groups. The wages of the gentlewomen known to have served Katherine Parr were not as high as the king's servants, and seem to have varied from f6 13s. 4d. to f10 per annum.\textsuperscript{123} Although
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the gentlewomen were permitted an appropriate number of servants and horses, it would seem that their allowances varied according to the status of each individual gentlewoman.\textsuperscript{124} For the king's funeral in 1547, the queen's gentlewomen were given nine yards of black cloth each. Interestingly, it would appear that each gentlewoman was to be attended by one gentlewoman and one other servant for the occasion. The gentlewomen attendants and servants were themselves permitted three yards of black material each.\textsuperscript{125}

It is difficult to determine whether or not Katherine Parr had in her privy chamber the king's equivalent of a groom of the stool. John Foxe named Katherine Parr's sister, Lady Anne Herbert, as being chief of the queen's privy chamber, but exactly what Foxe meant by 'chief' is unclear.\textsuperscript{126} There seems to have been one woman in both Queen Mary's and Queen Elizabeth's households who was above the other privy chamber servants in authority. In Mary's case, it was Susan Clarendius,\textsuperscript{127} and in the first years of Elizabeth's reign, it was Katherine Ashley.\textsuperscript{128} Dr. Charlotte Merton

\textsuperscript{124} HO, 199.
\textsuperscript{125} P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 44v.
\textsuperscript{127} Loades, The Tudor Court, 56.
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notes that of all the women in the households of Mary and Elizabeth, only one woman was ever actually referred to as being groom of the stool: this was Katherine Carey-Howard in 1592.\footnote{129}

The only group of women not yet accounted for is the queen's ladies, who tended to be the wives, and near relations, of the king's government officers and his intimate friends. These women were socially above the queen's regular chamber servants and probably did not perform menial tasks; their formal duties were most likely supervisory and ceremonial. Anne of Cleves appears to have had in 'ordinary' eighteen ladies, all of whom were entitled to eat in the queen's chamber. Of the eighteen, though, only eight were permitted bouch of court.\footnote{130} The other ten probably received their allowances through their husbands who could have been listed as members of the king's household. Catherine Howard's establishment included six 'grete' ladies and four ladies (distinguishable from the gentlewomen) of the privy chamber. She may also have had nine ladies and gentlewomen attendants.\footnote{131} This last category of women may only have been a preliminary list, as this page of the relevant document was crossed through with a single diagonal line. Bearing this in mind, Catherine Howard's household could have consisted of nineteen 'ladies', only

\footnote{129}{Ibid.}
\footnote{130}{B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, f. 15v.}
\footnote{131}{P.R.O., SP 1/157, fols. 15-16.}
one short the number of her predecessor.

Various household documents for the last years of Henry VIII's reign seem to indicate that Katherine Parr had about twenty-six such ladies in regular attendance. The fact that these women were not servants in the strictest sense, and that they came from the upper ranks of society, suggests strongly that it was probably among this particular group that Katherine Parr spent much of her time. The inclusion of these ladies in the queen's establishment was convenient on all accounts: husbands and wives frequently were together at court, and while the men administered the government or the king's household, their wives and near relations could keep the queen company. In a sense, these women were agents and spys: they kept alert for opportunities to speak with the queen on behalf of family and friends, and no doubt kept their husbands and male relations abreast of affairs within the queen's establishment.

Katherine Parr's high-ranking women were all allowed meals and bouch of court.¹³² Allowances for personal servants and stabling for horses, though, varied according to the rank and marital status of each woman. Sixteen of Katherine Parr's ladies probably were the wives of knights: Ladies Berkeley, Browne, Carew,

¹³². B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 2-3, 18v; HO, 162-3, 173.
Carwarden, Cooxe, Denny, Gates, Herbert, Knyvet, Lane, Paget, Paston, Peckham, Petre, Tyrwhitt, and Wingfield. Had these women been widows, or had their husbands not resided at court, they would have been permitted three beds for six servants and stabling for eight horses. But because they were all married with husbands at court, these allowances were reduced, but to what degree the schedules do not reveal.

Four of Katherine Parr's ladies were the wives of barons, one rung up on the social ladder from the knights: Ladies Parr, Russell, St. John, and Wriothesley. They were allowed one bed for two servants and stabling for four horses. Had they been widows, or had their husbands not been at court, they would have been permitted three beds for six servants and stabling for ten horses.

Next in ascending order in Katherine Parr's household came viscountess Lisle and the countesses of Arundel, Lennox, and Hertford. Each of the countesses would have been allowed two beds for four servants and stabling for seven horses. Had they not had husbands at court, or had they been widows, they would have been permitted four beds for eight servants and stabling for
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fourteen horses.\textsuperscript{136} Although nothing specific is set out for a viscountess, her allowance for servants and horses probably would have been similar to those permitted for a countess.

Francis Grey, marchioness of Dorset, the only woman of that rank in Katherine Parr's establishment, would have been allowed two beds for four servants and eight horses. If her husband was not at court, those numbers would have increased to five beds for ten servants and stabling for sixteen horses.\textsuperscript{137} Since this particular woman was the king's niece, her provisions may actually have been more generous.

Katherine Brandon, duchess of Suffolk, was the only duchess in regular attendance on Katherine Parr. While her husband was alive, she would have been permitted two beds for four servants and stabling for eight horses.\textsuperscript{138} After the death of the duke of Suffolk in 1545, the duchess would have been entitled to seven beds for fourteen servants and stabling for twenty horses.\textsuperscript{139}

As is clear from the ordinance, most of these high-ranking women (and frequently other members of the queen's household as well) were officially permitted stabling for more horses than they had provision for servants. This suggests that probably more servants were

\begin{itemize}
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lodged in towns and cities near to the court at the expense of each court lady.

Katherine Parr's women had another extremely valuable perquisite, and this was the cloth allowance for ceremonial occasions (see Table 2). The arrangements for the funeral of Henry VIII were particularly generous: the marchioness of Dorset, the countesses of Hertford and Lennox, and Ladies Lisle, Wriothesley, St. John, and Russell, each received sixteen yards of black cloth, while the two gentlewomen attending each of these ladies shared seven yards. The two other servants attending each of these ladies shared six yards of cloth. The allowance for the duchess of Suffolk and her two gentlewomen was the same as the other ladies, but probably owing to her high rank, she was permitted twelve other servants, who were to share thirty-seven yards of cloth between themselves. Lady Parr, Katherine Parr's aunt, was given fourteen yards of cloth, while her two gentlewomen got seven yards between themselves. Lady Parr's one other servant received three yards. Ladies Herbert, Tyrwhit, Wingfield, Peckham, Paget, Denny, Browne, Petre, Paston, Lane, Cawarden, and Berkeley each received fourteen yards of material. Each of these ladies had one gentlewoman and one other servant in attendance who received three yards of cloth apiece. The remaining ranking women of the queen's household, Ladies Coxe, Gates, Knevett, and Carew each received nine yards of material. They, too, were each attended by one
gentlewoman and one other servant, who got three yards of cloth apiece.¹⁴⁰

Although none of the high-ranking women of Katherine Parr's household received wages, the many and varied benefits attached to the job more than compensated for the lack. These women and their allotted number of servants were lodged and fed free of charge, while their horses were stabled at the king's expense. They received bouch of court and were allowed cloth against expensive ceremonial occasions, such as Henry VIII's funeral. And, perhaps most important of all, they were particularly well placed to dispense patronage, for appropriate gratuities, forward the ambitions of their families and friends, and keep their husbands informed about the activities in the queen's household.

Katherine Parr had one last female 'attendant' who filled a unique office: Jane the fool.¹⁴¹ Jane, who previously had been in Mary's household, probably was in Katherine Parr's service by at least October 1544, when the queen purchased three geese and a hen for Jane to use in her office.¹⁴² It seems likely that Jane was permitted the usual court perquisites, such as bouch of court. It is doubtful, though, that she had servants

¹⁴⁰. P.R.O., LC 2/2, fols. 44-44v.

¹⁴¹. Katherine Parr had another fool by the name of Thomas Browne. Almost nothing is known about him except that in 1546 the queen was billed for a grey coat for him (LP, XXI, i, 645).

¹⁴². P.R.O., SP 1/195, f. 182 (LP, XIX, ii, 688 (p. 406)).
like the other women of the queen's household. Jane was given eight yards of black cloth for the king's funeral, but she was not permitted any attendants. Jane probably rejoined Mary's household sometime after 1547; she was still in her establishment when Mary was queen.\(^{143}\)

In charge of the queen's above stairs establishment was her lord chamberlain. As mentioned above, one of his duties was to ensure that members of the queen's household did not keep more servants than they were specifically allowed.\(^{144}\) The ordinances drafted for the household of Anne of Cleves specified that the queen's lord chamberlain or lord steward, though preferably both, was to consult frequently with the countinghouse regarding the provisions of the queen's household.\(^{145}\)

The queen's lord chamberlain was entitled to eat in the queen's chamber and received bouch of court.\(^{146}\) Dinning with the lord chamberlain of Anne of Cleves's household were the queen's vice-chamberlain, learned council, chaplains, clerk of the closet, gentlemen ushers, gentlemen waiters, sewers, sewers for the chamber, and 'straungers'.\(^{147}\) In addition to dinner, supper, and bouch of court, the queen's lord chamberlain was entitled

\(^{143}\) Loades, *The Tudor Court*, 56.
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\(^{146}\) B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 2v, 20v; B.L., Lansdowne MS 2, f. 40; *LP*, XX, ii, App. 2, 2.iii; *HO*, 167.
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to five beds for ten servants and stabling for sixteen horses.\textsuperscript{148} He was also allowed material against ceremonial occasions; for the funeral of Henry VIII, this came to ten yards of black cloth for himself, and twenty-four yards for eight servants.\textsuperscript{149} The only difference in allowances between the queen’s lord chamberlain and the king’s was that the king’s lord chamberlain had sixteen yards of cloth for his personal use.\textsuperscript{150} Anne of Cleves’s lord chamberlain appears to have received £10 a quarter in wages,\textsuperscript{151} but whether this was the usual wage is uncertain. In comparison, the king’s lord chamberlain in 1539-1540 received £100 per annum in wages.\textsuperscript{152}

After 1540, the office of great master superseded both the king’s and queen’s lord chamberlains in authority. At the same time, four masterships were created, apparently two each for the king and queen’s respective households. In 1543, the two masters for Katherine Parr’s household were Edward Shelley and James Gage.\textsuperscript{153} Their job probably was to improve communications between the queen’s chambers and the countinghouse;\textsuperscript{154} what effect they had on the lord
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chamberlain's office is unknown.

A nobleman, the earl of Rutland, served as lord chamberlain to both Anne of Cleves and Catherine Howard.\textsuperscript{155} Katherine Parr appointed her uncle, Sir William Parr, baron Parr of Horton, to the post when she married the king in 1543. However, he appears to have attended court infrequently after 1544. Poor health may have kept him away, as in June 1546 Parr apparently was seriously ill and he made his will.\textsuperscript{156} The queen's vice-chamberlain no doubt stood in for Parr during his absences.

The vice-chamberlain appears to have been the lord chamberlain's assistant and deputy. It probably was standard procedure for the vice-chamberlain to stand in for the lord chamberlain when the latter was simply unavailable. The queen's vice-chamberlain received bouch of court and ate in the queen's chamber, sitting at the lord chamberlain's table.\textsuperscript{157} He had two beds for four servants, and stabling for seven horses.\textsuperscript{158} He was permitted nine yards of cloth against the funeral of Henry VIII, while his four attendants shared twelve yards among themselves.\textsuperscript{159} The king's vice-chamberlain got ten
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yards for the occasion, and twenty-four yards for eight attendants.\textsuperscript{160} Under Anne of Cleves and Katherine Parr, and probably Catherine Howard as well, the queen's vice-chamberlain was paid £6 13s. 4d. a quarter.\textsuperscript{161} His counterpart in the king's household received one hundred marks per annum in 1539-1540.\textsuperscript{162}

Sir Edward Baynton was vice-chamberlain to Anne Boleyn, Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, Catherine Howard, and Katherine Parr.\textsuperscript{163} He died in 1544 and was succeed by Sir Edmund Walsingham.\textsuperscript{164} Walsingham was replaced at some time by Sir Anthony Cope, as in 1547, Cope appears in wages as Katherine Parr's vice-chamberlain.\textsuperscript{165}

The duties and responsibilities of the queen's chancellor are somewhat elusive. It would seem that at least one of his duties was to head the queen's learned council.\textsuperscript{166} The queen's chancellor took his meals in the queen's chambers, received bouch of court, and was permitted three beds for six servants and stabling for
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seven horses.\textsuperscript{167} For the king's funeral, he was given nine yards for his personal use and a further twelve yards for his four servants.\textsuperscript{168} There is some confusion about the chancellor's usual wage. Sir Thomas Denys, chancellor to Anne of Cleves and Catherine Howard,\textsuperscript{169} received f12 10s. for the Christmas quarter 1539 and for another unspecified quarter.\textsuperscript{170} Yet in the first pay period of 1540, he received only f7 10s.\textsuperscript{171} It seems reasonable to suppose that f7 10s. was the usual wage, as the Christmas figure probably included the yuletide bonus often given to royal servants. The undated schedule may also cover a Christmas quarter. Whether Sir Thomas Denys's experience was typical for those who filled the office after him is unknown. By early 1544 Sir Thomas Arundel, who was a half-brother to the countess of Arundel, had become Katherine Parr's chancellor.\textsuperscript{172} It seems likely that the restored office of lord steward, filled by Sir Robert Tyrwhit in 1547,\textsuperscript{173} replaced that of chancellor in the queen's dower household.
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The queen's master of the horse was generally in charge of the queen's stables. The position brought him into close contact with the queen whenever she rode which, with Henry VIII's peripatetic court, must have been often. It would seem likely that Anne of Cleves's and Catherine Howard's master of the horse, Sir John Dudley, claimed the usual household allowances through his position in the king's household rather than through his place in the queen's establishment. The situation for Sir Robert Tyrwhit, Katherine Parr's master of the horse, was somewhat different. Tyrwhit, who had been a member of the king's privy chamber since 1540, had become Katherine Parr's master of horse by 1544 and it would seem that it was the only major post he held in the queen's household until after the king's death, at which time he became the queen's steward. By virtue of his office, Tyrwhit claimed meals and bough of court through the queen's establishment. But whether or not servants and stabling for horses were attached to the position is unclear. As a knight, though, Tyrwhit was entitled to at least two beds for four servants and
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stabling for six horses.¹⁷⁸ Wages were certainly part of the job, and in at least Anne of Cleves's household, Sir John Dudley received £10 a quarter.¹⁷⁹ Material for ceremonial occasion also went with the position: for the king's funeral, Tyrwhit was allowed nine yards of black material for himself, and twelve yards for four attendants.¹⁸⁰

These officers of the queen's household were in unique positions of power and influence. In addition to the immediate material benefits of office, though, there were other perquisites to be had. Sir Edward Baynton was Katherine Parr's vice-chamberlain for only a very brief period, from the time of the queen's marriage to the king in July 1543 until his own death in November 1544. Nevertheless, Baynton certainly had benefited from his position as vice-chamberlain to king's previous four wives and might have continued to do so in Katherine Parr's household.¹⁸¹ There is very little information on his successor, Sir Edmund Walsingham, so it is impossible to say just how he may have profited from his position in the queen's household. Sir Anthony Cope, who replaced Walsingham at some point, was a noted humanist scholar and reformer, and it is tempting to speculate that he found favor with Katherine Parr, who was herself greatly

¹⁷⁸. HO, 198.
¹⁸⁰. P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 43v.
interested in humanism and reform.182

Sir Thomas Arundel was already well-known at court through his ties to first Wolsey and then Cromwell; his appointment as Katherine Parr’s chancellor only further strengthened his position at court. He obtained several extremely valuable grants of land, and was elected to the parliament of 1545. During Katherine Parr’s time as queen, Arundel’s career was progressing smoothly. His good fortune, though, came to an end in 1552, when he was accused of conspiring against the earl of Warick; Arundel was attainted and beheaded.183

It is difficult to assess how much the office of master of the horse to the queen affected the advancement of its holders. For Sir John Dudley, the position was but one briefly held post in a career of accumulating offices which had yet to peak. For Sir Robert Tyrwhit, the position may have been more important. Tyrwhit had become Katherine Parr’s steward by early 1547, but until that time, his only major post in the queen’s household was that of master of the horse. His position in the queen’s establishment probably was the main reason for his wife’s appointment as one of Katherine Parr’s ladies. Both Sir Robert and Lady Tyrwhit were well favored by the queen and they continued to serve her after her fourth marriage. The degree of familiarity that had been built


up by 1548 between the Tyrwhits and Katherine Parr is perhaps evidenced by Sir Robert's promotion in the queen-dowager's household. And, of course, Lady Tyrwhit was the queen's constant companion. She was at least close enough to Katherine Parr to repeat the queen's dying words in a deposition given to the privy council during their investigation of Sir Thomas Seymour.

Sir William Parr, Katherine Parr's uncle and her lord chamberlain, appears to have been the only officer of high rank in the queen's household who did not seek advancement. He had held various offices in the 1530s, including that of chamberlain to the king's natural son, Henry Fitzroy, duke of Richmond. But in spite of his appointment as Katherine Parr's lord chamberlain in 1543, Parr apparently spent little time at court in the last years of the reign; it may have been ill health rather than lack of ambition that prevented him from taking a more active role during his niece's tenure as queen.184

Interestingly, these high-ranking officers may actually have had less opportunity for confidential contact with the queen than did her servants in less prestigious positions. The queen's secretary no doubt would have been a trusted servant indeed. He would have drafted the queen's replies to letters, taken dictation, and probably read the queen's incoming correspondence. He probably ate in the queen's chambers and certainly was

---

entitled to bouch of court.\textsuperscript{185} He had two beds for four servants and stabling for three horses.\textsuperscript{186} He also was permitted material for ceremonial occasions: for the king's funeral in 1547, he received nine yards of cloth for himself, and twelve yards for four servants.\textsuperscript{187} Sir William Paget served as secretary to Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, and, briefly, Catherine Howard.\textsuperscript{188} In the household of Anne of Cleves, Paget received 50s. a quarter in wages.\textsuperscript{189} John Huttoft took Paget's place in Catherine Howard's household in 1540. Huttoft did not live to serve Katherine Parr, as he died in 1542, probably not long after Catherine Howard's execution.\textsuperscript{190} Walter Bucler was Katherine Parr's secretary for at least her first years as queen.\textsuperscript{191} But by January 1545, Bucler was in Germany as an envoy for Henry VIII.\textsuperscript{192} He was recalled in November of that year, and presumably he returned to his secretarial duties after his arrival back in England.\textsuperscript{193} By 1547, however, Bucler had been
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\textsuperscript{186} HO, 199.

\textsuperscript{187} P.R.O., 2/2, f. 43v.

\textsuperscript{188} Bindoff, \textit{The House of Commons}, III, 42-3.

\textsuperscript{189} P.R.O., E101/422/15; E101/422/16, f. 63.

\textsuperscript{190} Bindoff, \textit{The House of Commons}, II, 429; P.R.O., SP 1/157, fols. 13, 14 (LP, XV, 21).

\textsuperscript{191} LP, XIX, ii, 47, 165, 688, 724, 765.

\textsuperscript{192} LP, XX, i, 7 (p. 6).
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replaced by Hugh Aglionby, who previously had been clerk of the queen's council. Aglionby received 50s. a quarter in wages, just as Sir William Paget had done some seven years before.

Ministering to Katherine Parr's spiritual needs were an almoner, four chaplains, and a clerk of the closet. The king's and queen's almoners, who were usually high-ranking clerics, distributed royal charity to the needy. This included giving left-overs from the royal tables to the hungry who begged at the palace gates. Although the distribution of money probably formed part of the almoner's duties at one time, by the 1540s the king's cash donations appear to have been handled by his chief gentleman of the privy chamber. Whether this was the procedure in the queen's household is unclear. In Anne of Cleves's household, her almoner, Dr. Day, ate in the queen's chamber and was entitled to bouch of court. Dr. Day may have continued in his position under Catherine Howard, as he was also almoner to Katherine Parr. In Katherine Parr's household Dr. Day, created bishop of Chichester in 1543, was entitled to meals in the queen's chamber but curiously did not

194. P.R.O., E101/426/2, fols. 1, 5; E315/161, no. 97.
196. Loades, The Tudor Court, 43-4.
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receive bouch of court. As a bishop, Day was permitted ten servants in attendance at court; he presumably had stabling for a specific number of horses as well. Katherine Parr's almoner was given nine yards of cloth for the king's funeral in 1547, while his four attendants shared twelve yards.

Although Katherine Parr had four chaplains in 1547 -- Doctor Mallet, Mr. Pekyns, Mr. Reynoldes, and Mr. Layton -- she probably was closest to her clerk of the closet, William Harper, who appears to have been the queen's private chaplain. The queen's clerk was entitled to eat in the queen's chambers and sat at the lord chamberlain's table. Like the king's clerk of the closet, Harper received £6 16s. 10 1/2d. per annum in wages. He also was entitled to cloth allowances for ceremonial occasions: in 1547, he was given nine yards of material for the king's funeral, while his three servants shared nine yards among themselves.

---
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king's clerk of the closet had similar allowances.\textsuperscript{206}

The queen's clerk maintained the furniture of the closet, which included plate, linen, alter fronts, vestments, and so on, acted as confidential messenger, and in general gave close attendance to the queen when she traveled. In light of the queen's reforming sympathies, especially towards the end of the reign, it is interesting that Harper was later prosecuted for popish practices.\textsuperscript{207}

Administering to the king's and queen's physical needs were the royal physicians, who were perhaps the best placed of all the royal servants to have intimate conversation with the king and his consort. Just how intimate, and perhaps politically charged, a physician's conversation with a royal patient could be was easily demonstrated by the king's command that the doctors treating the disgraced Princess Mary in 1534 speak only English so that her spying attendants could understand her conversation and thus report it to the king.\textsuperscript{208}

The royal physicians were uniquely well-placed to influence royal opinion: by the very nature of their profession, they were physically close to the king and queen and in their trust. In the last years of the reign, at least two such royal physicians took advantage of their privileged position. During the Prebendaries'
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\textsuperscript{207}. Rose-Troup, 'Two Book Bills of Katherine Parr', 46-7.

\textsuperscript{208}. H. F. M. Prescott, Mary Tudor, (London, 1940; revised edn. 1952), 55.
Plot of 1543, Dr. William Butts, the king's physician, played some role in protecting Cranmer from the conspirators. He also successfully petitioned the king on behalf of his friend, Richard Turner, vicar of Chatham, who had been targeted in the same plot. In 1546, it supposedly was Dr. Thomas Wendy, one of the king's physicians, who confirmed to Katherine Parr the plot against her and advised her on how to submit herself to the king.

The very figure of a royal physician could indicate where an individual stood in the king's favor: the king sent Dr. Butts and three other of his own physicians, along with a ring and a message of good will, to Cardinal Wolsey in 1529 when the prelate was ill and in disgrace which, taken altogether, was seen as a sign of hope and encouragement by the patient. And if Dr. Wendy was deliberately sent by the king to warn Katherine Parr, as Foxe suggested, it was indeed a mark of favor, as the king usually did not warn intended victims.

Katherine Parr had at least two physicians: Dr. Thomas Wendy and Dr. Robert Huick. Dr. Wendy seems to

---


210. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, 480; Ridley, Henry VIII, 402.

have become the queen's physician rather late in the reign. His service to Katherine Parr, however brief, was nevertheless invaluable: Foxe recalls his part in saving the queen from one of the two plots against her in the summer of 1546. 212 Of the two men, Dr. Huick seems to have been the queen's most regular physician. Huick had been principal of St. Alban's Hall in the early 1530s, but his reforming sympathies had led to his dismissal by the commissary of Oxford. 213 He entered the king's household as an ordinary physician in 1538 and continued to minister to the king even after his appointment as Katherine Parr's physician in 1543. 214 Huick was entitled to the usual perquisites as a member of the queen's establishment: he ate in the queen's chambers, received bough of court, and probably was allowed a certain number of servants in attendance. 215 Huick, who not only attended Henry in his last illness but also witnessed his will, 216 was given allowances as a member of the queen's household for the king's funeral: he got nine yards of black cloth, while his three servants
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shared nine yards among themselves.\textsuperscript{217} The king's four physicians did only slightly better: they, too, got nine yards each for their personal use, but had twelve yards apiece for their respective four servants.\textsuperscript{218}

Huick apparently was charged personally by Henry VIII to attend upon Katherine Parr for the rest of her life; Huick kept his promise.\textsuperscript{219} In 1548, he attended the queen's confinement and deathbed, and was a witness to the queen's oral will.\textsuperscript{220} In July 1550, he was given an annuity of 50s. in respect of his services to Henry VIII and Katherine Parr, and appointed physician extraordinary to Edward VI. The patent stated that payment of the annuity would be back-dated to Michaelmas the previous year because Huick had 'neither fee nor wage' during his service to Katherine Parr.\textsuperscript{221} This last information is probably a mistake, as Huick was recorded as receiving £16 13s. 4d. in a wage list for Katherine Parr's newly established dower household.\textsuperscript{222} Huick's strong reforming tenancies probably prevented him from continuing in his position under queen Mary. In 1560, though, Queen Elizabeth reappointed him a royal
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physician, a position he held until his death in 1580.\textsuperscript{223}

The households of Anne of Cleves and Katherine Parr, and probably Catherine Howard as well, boasted an apothecary, supervised no doubt by the queen's physician. He ate in the queen's chamber and received bouch of court.\textsuperscript{224} Whether or not he was permitted servants or stabling for horses is unknown. At the time of the king's funeral in 1547, each of the king's two apothecaries was given nine yards of black cloth for their personal use, and a further six yards for two attendants.\textsuperscript{225} It may be that Katherine Parr's apothecary at the time was actually one of the two listed for the king's household. This would explain why there was no specific allowance made in the schedule for the queen's apothecary; he would officially have claimed his material through the king's, and not the queen's, household. Nevertheless, Katherine Parr certainly had a personal apothecary by the middle of 1547, as a wage list for the queen-dowager's household indicated a 'John potycary' receiving 66s. 8d. a quarter in wages.\textsuperscript{226}

\* \* \*
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In addition to these resident household servants, the queen had a 'learned' council which consisted of a receiver-general, attorney, surveyor, solicitor, auditor, and clerk.\textsuperscript{227} The queen's council was primarily concerned with administering the queen's properties, which were extensive, and with collecting fees and debts on the queen's behalf. The council had its own chambers, probably at Westminster, in which to do business. In February 1544, William Austen, underkeeper of the council chambers, recorded having purchased such items as coal, perfume, brushes, and needles and thread for the chambers.\textsuperscript{228} Another undated bill records the purchase of hinges for a door and a lock and key.\textsuperscript{229}

Sir Wymond Carew, who had served Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, and Catherine Howard, was Katherine Parr's receiver-general by May 1544. He relinquished the post in September 1545, by which time he was Katherine Parr's treasurer of the household.\textsuperscript{230} As receiver-general in Anne of Cleves's establishment, he received £15 11s. 8d. a quarter in wages, a practice which may have been continued in the households of the king's last two wives.\textsuperscript{231} Carew was appointed treasurer of the court of first fruits and tenths on 21 April 1545, and the duties
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\textsuperscript{228}. P.R.O., E315/161, no. 80.
\textsuperscript{229}. P.R.O., 315/161, no. 142.
\textsuperscript{230}. Bindoff, The House of Commons, I, 581.
\textsuperscript{231}. P.R.O., E101/422/15; E101/422/16, f. 63.
of this office occupied most of Sir Wymond's time in the last two years of the reign.\textsuperscript{232}

John Cock replaced Carew in 1545 as receiver-general and remained in the post until 1548. He was not new to the queen's council: he had become the queen's attorney in 1543 and was her treasurer of the chamber by 1545. As Katherine Parr's attorney, he was retained on £10 a year and received additional fees for legal work.\textsuperscript{233} Cock may have been replaced as attorney by 'Mr Haydon', who was Katherine Parr's attorney in 1547.\textsuperscript{234}

John Bassett, who may have been recommended to Katherine Parr by her brother-in-law, Sir William Herbert, had become the queen's surveyor by 1544; he was still her surveyor in 1547.\textsuperscript{235} The surveyor on Anne of Cleves's council received £10 a quarter in wages, but whether this was the case for Bassett is unknown.\textsuperscript{236}

Katherine Parr's solicitor in 1547 was William Shelton.\textsuperscript{237} In Anne of Cleves's household, the solicitor seems to have usually received 13s. 4d. a quarter in wages,\textsuperscript{238} although in one quarter he was recorded as
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receiving 33s. 4d. ²³⁹ Again, whether this was representative of later officers is unknown.

Anthony Bourchier was Katherine Parr's auditor by November 1544, and he was still in his office in 1547. ²⁴⁰ What wages were attached to this office is unknown.

The date of Hugh Aglionby's appointment as clerk of the council is unknown, but as noted earlier he was serving as the queen's secretary by at least 1547. Thomas Smith, clerk of the council for Anne of Cleves and Catherine Howard, ²⁴¹ received between 25s. and 30s. a quarter in wages, ²⁴² but whether this was also true for Aglionby is unknown. Completing Katherine Parr's council in 1547 was a 'councillor', 'Mr Nevell'. ²⁴³

The council chambers were looked after by William Austen. Austen seems to have worn the queen's livery, as in May 1544 the council agreed that he 'shalhaue for his gowne according as he had in the late Queene katherynes tyme iiij yards of brode clothe at 6s. the yarde'. ²⁴⁴ The total cost of the gowne came to 18s. Austen also seems to have been given allowances for meat, drink, and
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lodging when he was in attendance on the council.\footnote{P.R.O., E315/161, no. 144.} The councillors themselves would have been allowed certain expenses, especially when they travelled about the country on the queen's business. Although they seem to have been allowed dinner when business kept them late at the council chambers, it is unclear as to whether they were allowed living expenses similar to those given to Austen.\footnote{P.R.O., E315/161, no. 143.} The councillors were given cloth allowances for the king's funeral: each member received nine yards for their personal use and a further nine yards for their respective three attendants.\footnote{P.R.O., LC 2/2, fols. 43v, 46.}

In addition to these perquisites, the members of the council prospered in other ways from their association with Katherine Parr. They were the first to know when offices involving the queen's lands were about to become available, and they no doubt exercised their influence accordingly. And, of course, there were other rewards attached to these positions. John Cock's advancement at court, for example, can not be entirely separated from the fact that he had strong ties to Katherine Parr.\footnote{Bindoff, The House of Commons, I, 663.} In 1545, when he became the queen's receiver-general, he was appointed to a similar post in the king's household, a post which he held until the king's death in 1547. In 1548, he was steward of various properties for Sir Thomas
Seymour, baron Sudeley, Katherine Parr's fourth husband. Cock was not implicated in Seymour's treason, and he became master of requests in March 1550, an office he held until 1553. The high point of his career, however, came in 1552, when he was sworn a privy councillor.\textsuperscript{249} If nothing else, Cock's association with Katherine Parr at least provided him with an opportunity for advancement which he might not otherwise have had. Other councillors, like Sir Wymond Carew, did not fare as well nor rise as high as Cock, but they did well enough.\textsuperscript{250}

* * *

The initial impression of Katherine Parr's household is one of serious overcrowding. At the time of the king's funeral in 1547, Katherine Parr probably had about forty-five women in regular attendance. Her ordinary male chamber staff numbered fifty-seven, including six artisans, while the household officers and those in specialized positions came to fifteen. In total, then, Katherine Parr's upstairs household in early 1547 came to at least one hundred and seventeen members. Even allowing for absences, due to illness and other business, it would appear that the queen's chambers probably were seriously overcrowded most of the time, and not necessarily with just her own staff. It seems likely

\textsuperscript{249} Bindoff, \textit{The House of Commons}, I, 662-3.
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that men from the king's household regularly loitered about the queen's chambers when not on duty, as Lord Thomas Howard clearly did in 1546 when he was accused of making rash religious statements in and around the queen's chambers.\(^{251}\)

In spite of these numbers, private access to the queen was limited. Because the nature of a queen's household demanded that most of her immediate servants be female, the women of Katherine Parr's establishment generally were best-placed to influence the queen. Katherine Parr probably spent most of her time with the ladies of her household and so this group of women in particular probably was especially influential with the queen. Certainly it was women from this group who were targeted in the two plots against Katherine Parr in 1546.

It would seem likely that Katherine Parr was consulted by her officers about household matters, but just exactly how much contact there was is impossible to tell. The queen no doubt was on a familiar basis with Sir William Parr, her uncle and lord chamberlain. But Parr probably was away from court frequently in the last years of the reign. Filling in for him would have been the queen's vice-chamberlain, Sir Anthony Cope. It is tempting to speculate that Cope's humanism and reforming sympathies endeared him to the queen. Certainly the language of his dedicatory epistle to Katherine Parr from his *A godly meditacion upon xx. select psalms of David*,

\(^{251}\). See Chapter 5.
presented as a New Year's gift in 1548, suggests a strong degree of familiarity between the two. Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell whether this friendship developed while Katherine Parr was queen or after she was widowed. Sir Robert Tyrwhit's promotion in 1547 from master of the horse to steward of the queen establishment also probably indicated some kind of personal relationship, even if by way of his wife, who was very close to Katherine Parr.

The relationship between Katherine Parr and those servants in rather specialized positions is somewhat speculative. Although she had an almoner and four chaplains, it seems most likely that, as far as spiritual matters were concerned, she was closest to her clerk of the closet, who appears to have been her personal chaplain. It seems probable that Bucler's and Aglionby's contact with the queen simply was consistent with their position as her secretaries: that is, taking dictation, drafting correspondence, and possibly reading incoming mail.

Of all the male servants, it would seem that the queen's physician was in the best position to have private conversation with her. The experiences of Dr. Butts easily demonstrate the influence a royal physician could exercise. And Dr. Wendy, by virtue of his position, was physically and psychologically close enough to the king to have been entrusted with the secret of the plot against Katherine Parr. It simply seems too convenient for the king to have divulged such an
important matter to Wendy by accident. Probably only one of the king's physicians would have had the opportunity of personally passing the warning along to Katherine Parr at the critical moment, a fact which the king certainly would have known when he confided in Dr. Wendy. Although Katherine Parr's regular physician, Dr. Huick, was not caught up in political intrigue to the degree of either Dr. Butts or Dr. Wendy, he nevertheless seems to have enjoyed both the king and queen's favor, ministering to both on their deathbeds. The queen's apothecary probably practiced his trade mainly through the physicians, so his contact with the queen may have been quite limited.

Serving in the queen's household could be a lucrative proposition. In addition to wages, most members of the queen's household were entitled to meals, bough of court, personal servants, stabling for horses, and material for ceremonial occasions. Aside from these immediate benefits were other, potentially more valuable rewards. Those close to Katherine Parr could petition her directly for favors for family and friends as well as for themselves. And associations with the queen could also mean career advancement. Thus while positions in the king's household might be preferred above all else, membership in the queen's establishment was equally valuable.
TABLE 1
HAMPTON COURT INVENTORY 1547

In the w[i]t[h] drawing chambr on the Quenes syde
  Itm a ioyned copboure
  Itm one wycker skrene
  Itm one paire of Andyrons of yron
  Itm a glasse off steele covered w[i]t[h] p[ur]ple
      satten and enbraudered w[i]t[h] venice golde

In the privye chambr
  Itm one table and a payre of Trestells
  Itm two cupbourdzes
  Itm two formes
  Itm a wycker Skryne
  Itm one payre of Andyrons

In the kingses bedchambre on the Quenes syde
  Itm two ioyned cupbordes
  Itm one ioyned Stoole
  Itm two Anndyrongs
  Itm a steele glasse covered w[i]t[h] yellowe vellat

In the Quenes galorie
  Itm ix painted tables
  Itm glasses of steele set in copper
  Itm a glasse of steele set in wood
  Itm payre of Regalles in a case of lether
  Itm a bourde covered w[i]t[h] grene clothe
  Itm a ltytle bourde lykewise covered
  Itm three ioyned stooles
  Itm a Settell of wainscotte
  Itm a cupborde of wainscotte thone covered w[i]t[h]
      grene clothe
  Itm foure ioyned Stoole

In the Quenes bedch[a]mbr
  Itm two cupbordes of wainscotte thone covered with
      grene clothe
  Itm foure ioyned Stoole

In the w[i]t[h] drawing chambr on the Quens syde
  Itm a cupborde of wainscotte
  Itm a table covered w[i]t[h] grene clothe
  Itm a ioyned forme & a ioyned stoole

2. Formes were benches.
3. This was a cupboard-like seat with a high back and arms
   or two or more people.
In the privy chamber
  Itm a Table covered w[i]t[h] grene clothe
  Itm two ioyned formes
  Itm three ioyned cupbordes
  Itm v ioyned Stooles
  Itm one paire of annyrons of yron

In the privy galerie
  Itm a table covered w[i]t[h] grene clothe
  Itm two candelstickes standing vppon yron the bell
  there of is woode
  Itm a Stele glasse in a case cou[er]ed w[i]t[h]
  russet vellat

Closet stuff for the Queene
  Itm two fronntes of white and crimson cloth of golde
  w[i]t[h] roosed & potecloth and twoo
  vestamentes of crimson clothe of tissue
  Itm two fronntes of white clothe of bawdkine and two
  vestmentes of white cloth of golde church
  wourke
  Itm two fronntes of white & purple bawdkine and two
  vestm[en]tes of white bawdkin to the same
  Itm three corporas cases whereof two be of clothe of
  golde and thother of blewe vellat w[i]t[h]
  their kercers
### TABLE 2

**ALLOWANCES FOR HENRY VIII’S FUNERAL 1547**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name or position</th>
<th>Personal allowance</th>
<th>(Gentlewomen attendants)</th>
<th>Other servants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gentleman of the king’s privy chamber</td>
<td>10 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 sharing 23 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maid of honor</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 with 3 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother of the maids</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 with 3 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groom of the king’s privy chamber</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 sharing 12 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamberers</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 with 3 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentlemen of the king’s privy chamber:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earl of Hertford</td>
<td>16 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 sharing 48 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baron Russell viscount Lisle earl of Essex</td>
<td>16 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 sharing 36 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remaining 15 lords and gentlemen of the privy chamber</td>
<td>10 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 sharing 13 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentlewomen of the queen’s privy chamber</td>
<td>9 yds 1 with 3 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 with 3 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladies of the queen’s household:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duchess of Suffolk</td>
<td>16 yds 2 sharing 7 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 sharing 37 yds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. P.R.O., LC 2/2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name or position</th>
<th>Personal allowance</th>
<th>(Gentlewomen attendants)</th>
<th>Other servants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ladies of the queen's household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cont):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marchioness of Dorset</td>
<td>16 yds</td>
<td>2 sharing 7 yds</td>
<td>2 sharing 6 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countess of Hertford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Lisle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Wriothesley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady St. John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Lennox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Parr</td>
<td>14 yds</td>
<td>2 sharing 7 yds</td>
<td>1 with 3 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Herbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Tyrwhit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Wingfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Peckham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Paget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Denny</td>
<td>14 yds</td>
<td>1 with 3 yds</td>
<td>1 with 3 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Browne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Petre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Paston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Cawarden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's lord chamberlain</td>
<td>10 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 sharing 24 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's vice-chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's master of horse</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 sharing 12 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's almoner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's four chaplains (each)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's clerk of the closet</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 sharing 9 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen's council (each)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's lord chamberlain</td>
<td>16 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 sharing 24 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's vice-chamberlain</td>
<td>10 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 sharing 24 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name or position</td>
<td>Personal allowance</td>
<td>(Gentlewomen attendants)</td>
<td>Other servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's master of horse</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 sharing 24 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's almoner</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 sharing 24 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's seven chaplains (each)</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 sharing 9 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's clerk of the closet</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 sharing 9 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's four physicians (each)</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 sharing 12 yds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king's two apothecaries</td>
<td>9 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 sharing 6 yds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Calais Exchequer (Colvin, History of the King's Works, vol. III, i, 350-1.)

The king's apartments: 1-19
The French king's apartments: 34-48
The queen's apartments:
20 - the gallery from the stair to the queen's chamber
21 - the queen's great chamber
22 - closet
23 - the queen's dining chamber
24 - the queen's rayyng chamber
25 - the queen's bed chamber
26 - a halpas to set wood and coal for the king's and queen's chambers
27 - a chamber
28 - jakes
29 - an inner chamber
30 - gallery to the queen's stair for the garden
31 - tower
32 - an inner chamber
33 - the queen's garden chamber
Fig. 2. Nonesuch Palace (Colvin, History of the King's Works, vol. IV, ii, 197.)
Fig. 3. Hampton Court (Colvin, History of the King's Works, vol. IV, ii, 131.)
CHAPTER ONE: KATHERINE PARR'S HOUSEHOLD

PART II: THE WOMEN OF THE QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD

The women discussed here have at least one thing in common — they all served in the household of Queen Katherine Parr. The majority of these women also appear on the household list drawn up shortly after the death of Henry VIII in 1547.¹ I place particular importance on this document primarily because it is the most comprehensive description available for Katherine Parr's household: distinction is made between the 'ordinary' (regular) and 'extraordinary' (non-regular) members of the queen's establishment, while the position each member held within the household is conveniently specified.

Three other documents — two concerning the visiting French embassy in August 1546² and the other relating to wages in the queen's dower establishment³ — also neatly set out select members of the queen's household and their respective positions. All of this material is further supplemented by wage and subsidy lists, letters, bills,

¹. P.R.O., LC 2/2.

². B.L., Royal MS App. 89, fols. 103-105v (LP, XXI, i, 1384); B.L. Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV, fols. 107-107v (LP, XXI, i, 969(ii, iii)). The second document, which is a 1586 copy, almost certainly refers to the visit of the French admiral in August 1546 and distinguishes between the regular and extraordinary members of court. Although the first document does not differentiate between these two categories, it seems likely that both documents actually concern the 1546 French embassy as they are remarkably similar to each other.

³. P.R.O., E101/426/2, fols. 1-2, 5-6.
and related documents covering the years 1543 to 1547.\footnote{P.R.O., E179/69/41; E179/69/48; E179/69/47; E179/69/55; E179/69/44; E30/1472, no. 5 (LP, XVIII, i, 873); XIX, ii, 688}

From these various documents it is possible to reconstruct, albeit imperfectly, the membership of Katherine Parr's household.

One further set of documents are used to determine how long members of Katherine Parr’s household had been at court and in royal service: the list of attendants for Jane Seymour's funeral;\footnote{B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 91v-92v (LP, XII, ii, 1060).} a letter sent collectively in 1539 from ten members of the queen's privy chamber;\footnote{B.L., Cotton MS Vespasian F XIII, no. 251 (St. Clare Byrne, The Lisle Letters, V, 616 (no. 1513a)).} two wage lists and the 1539-1540 ordinance for Anne of Cleves's household;\footnote{P.R.O., E101/422/15, E101/422/16, fols. 63-63v; B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 15v-18.} and a membership list for Catherine Howard’s establishment.\footnote{P.R.O., SP 1/157, fols. 13-16 (LP, XV, 21). The editors of LP indicate that this document refers to the household of Anne of Cleves. Both Agnes Strickland (Lives of the Queens of England, [London, 1844], IV, 392-3) and L. B. Smith (A Tudor Tragedy: The Life and Times of Catherine Howard, [London, 1961], 148) work on the assumption that it refers to the household of Catherine Howard. Strickland and Smith must surely be correct. One of the women appearing on the list was an old acquaintance of Catherine Howard. Given that Mistress Tynney's main contact at court was Catherine, she probably would have been included in the queen's household only at Catherine's request. On first entering Anne of Cleves's household, Catherine was not in a position to grant such requests, hence it is unlikely that she would have been asked to find a place for her friend from Horsham until after her marriage to the king. Additionally, Catherine Howard’s own name is missing from}
especially important to establish as it helps to
demonstrate the continuity between the 'upstairs'
households of Henry VIII's last four wives. Katherine
Parr inherited much from her immediate predecessors, and
this legacy included a fully staffed household.

There is a table at the end of this appendix listing
the women of Katherine Parr's household and indicating
which of the household documents mentioned above have
been used to determine membership in the queen's
establishment.

A few points should be kept in mind about the use of
these documents in general. First, women who appear on
the 1547 funeral list may have been in the household of a
previous queen, but do not show up in earlier documents
because of pregnancy, illness (either their own or a
member of their family), or for some other unknown
reason. Another difficulty surrounds length of a typical
'shift'. It seems likely that some of these women were
in constant attendance on Katherine Parr, if only because
their husbands were themselves constantly at court. In
several other instances, family ties, (however distant),
to the queen may have kept a number of these women
continuously at court. But some of these women, in
particular those who were in the last stages of
pregnancy, clearly spent time away from court.

One last difficulty remains to be discussed. Naming

this document, a curious omission indeed if this paper is
suppose to describe the household of Anne of Cleves.
the women who served in Katherine Parr's household is but the first step in correctly identifying them. The high-ranking women of the household are relatively easy to identify if only because they usually were the wives, or near relations, of men who held court positions. With the exception of the queen's relatives and the king's nieces, most of these women in fact owed their places in Katherine Parr's establishment to their husbands' membership in the king's household or government. Thus, we must also identify the husbands, and brothers where appropriate, of the women in Katherine Parr's household so that we may later have a better understanding of the interplay between the queen's establishment and the king's household and government.

The biographical sketches which follow are necessarily brief and highlight only the most important points; more detailed information on most of these women will appear in later chapters. Because a full discussion of the religious inclinations of a number of these women also appears later, I indicate here (when possible) the religious beliefs of primarily those women and men who are not featured elsewhere. In doing this, I use 'conservative' and 'reformer' to distinguish between the two main religious positions, (though not necessarily groups or factions), at court in the 1540s. By 'conservative' I mean Henrician, those who followed and supported Henry VIII's personal lead in religion and were reluctant to see radical changes in doctrine. By
'reformer' I mean those who supported the king's religious policies but who would also have favored mild to radical changes in doctrine and practice. 'Catholic' refers solely to Roman Catholicism. In using these designations I am as specific as the material allows.

* * *

Mary, countess of Arundel, was the daughter of Sir John Arundel of Lanherne, Cornwall, by his second wife Katherine, who was descended from Thomas Grenville of Stow, Devon. In January 1537, Mary Arundel became the third wife of Robert Radcliffe, earl of Sussex. The countess was widowed in November 1542 and three years later she remarried, becoming the second wife of Henry Fitzalan, earl of Arundel. The countess died on 20 October 1557.⁹

Like his wife, the earl of Arundel had long been at court, but it was not until the last decade of Henry VIII's life that he became a prominent figure. The earl, when still Lord Maltravers, replaced Arthur, viscount Lisle, as deputy of Calais in 1540 when Lisle was arrested for high treason.¹⁰ In April 1543, Arundel was given the garter, and in June he was replaced as

---


¹⁰. LP, XV, 832; 942(10).
deputy by Sir George Brooke, Lord Cobham. On 25 July 1546 Arundel became lord chamberlain and was given a seat on the king's privy council. The earl was left £200 in Henry VIII's will. Arundel, who later was considered as a possible husband for Queen Elizabeth, died on 24 February 1580.

Lady Catherine Berkeley, daughter of William Blount, fourth Lord Mountjoy, was first married to Lady Denny's brother, John Champernon of Modbury, Devon, who died in 1542. Lady Berkeley had married her second husband, Sir Maurice Berkeley, by at least 1547 and probably earlier, as her name appears on the household list prepared in advance of the French embassy in 1546. Lady Berkeley's husband served first in Cromwell's household before entering the king's service as a gentleman usher to the chamber in 1539. Berkeley was knighted by the king in 1544 for his service in France and was left 200 marks in the king's will. Lady Berkeley died in March 1560 and her husband died on 11 August 1581.

11. LP, XIX, i, 384; 717, 812(59).
12. LP, XXI, i, 1342; A.P.C., I, 495.
13. B.L., Harleian MS 293, f. 114 (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).
15. Bindoff, The House of Commons, I, 418-9; B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, f. 5.
16. LP, XIX, ii, 334(2); B.L., Harleian MS 293, f. 113v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).
Lady Elizabeth Browne was born in Ireland about 1528. She was the daughter of Gerald Fitzgerald, ninth earl of Kildare, by his second wife Elizabeth, a daughter of Thomas Grey, marquis of Dorset. She arrived in England in 1533, probably accompanying her father who had gone to London to answer charges of rebellion. As will be discussed later, Lady Browne was the 'fair Geraldine' of Henry Howard, earl of Surrey's poems. In 1542, aged 14 or 15 years, Lady Elizabeth married Sir Anthony Browne, a man of about 45 years.

Sir Anthony Browne, knighted in 1522, served as ambassador to France in 1527, and later served on an embassy led by the duke of Norfolk in 1533. Henry VIII was known to have been deeply attached to Browne, who had been a gentleman of the king's privy chamber since 1526, master of the horse since 1539, and captain of the gentlemen pensioners since 1540. Browne continued to hold these offices under Edward VI. Browne was given the garter in 1540. Browne, who was appointed an executor of Henry VIII's will, was named to


22. LP, XV, 560.
the privy council and left £300 by the king.  

Sir Anthony Browne was, like his royal master, conservative in matters of religion. In 1543, Browne's chaplain was linked to the prebendaries plot against Cranmer.  

Shortly before the king's death, Browne twice tried to persuade the dying king to include the conservative Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, on the regency council, attempts which failed.  

Nevertheless, Browne did not oppose the earl of Hertford's bid to become lord protector in 1547.  

Browne, who died in April 1548, left instructions in his will that masses be said and £20 be paid to the poor to pray for his soul.  

Lady Browne married her second husband Edward, ninth Lord Clinton and later earl of Lincoln, in October 1552. She died in 1590.  

The Lady Carew who appears on the 1547 funeral list is probably Mary, daughter of Henry Norris of Bray, Berkshire.  

She had married Sir George Carew by

---

23. B.L., Harleian MS 293, fols. 111, 112, 113v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).

24. LP, XVIII, ii, 546(p. 303).


29. The only other possibility is Martha, daughter of Sir Edmund Denny of Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, and sister of Sir Anthony Denny. By July 1519, she had
February 1541. In 1544, Carew was made a gentleman of the king's privy chamber. The following year he was made vice-admiral, and it was while the royal fleet was preparing to defend the coast against a possible French invasion that he and 500 crewmen drowned when the Mary Rose sank. The Mary Rose sank.30 Lady Carew quite literally watched her husband go down with the ship, and when she fainted the king tried to comfort her.31 Lady Carew had remarried by 1547, taking Sir Arthur Champernon, Lady Denny's brother, as her second husband.32 This marriage seems to have been promoted by Sir Anthony Denny and sanctioned by the king the previous September.33

Lady Elizabeth Cawarden had married Sir Thomas Cawarden by 1542. Cawarden, a member of the king's privy chamber since 1540, was knighted in September 1544, and made a gentleman of the privy chamber in March 1545.34 Also in March 1545, Cawarden was made master of the revels and tents, a position he kept under all three of

*married Sir Wymond Carew, Katherine Parr's receiver general and later her treasurer. (Bindoff, *The House of Commons*, I, 581-2) The reason for doubting this particular identification, is because Lady Martha Carew appears on the 1547 household list as an 'extraordinary' gentlewoman.

---


33. *LP*, XXI, ii, 199(28).

34. B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 5, 14; *LP*, XIX ii, 334; XX, i, 465(28).
king's children. Cawarden's views were those of a reformer, as were probably those of Lady Cawarden, and he zealously supported the religious policies under Edward IV. Consequently, he was under constant suspicion during Queen Mary's reign. Sir Thomas Cawarden, who had received £200 in Henry VIII's will, died in August 1559. We do not have a date for Lady Cawarden's death.

The Lady Anne Cooxe who appears on the 1547 household list may have been the wife of John Cooxe, or Cock as it was spelt then. This Anne Cooxe was a daughter of Thomas Goodere of Hadley, Hertfordshire. John Cock, who was attorney-general for the duchy of Cornwall from 1532 until his death, was a member of Katherine Parr's learned council. Widowed in 1557, Anne Cooxe had married George Penruddock by 1560.

Lady Joan Denny was the daughter of Sir Philip Champernon of Modbury, Devon. In 1538 she married Sir Anthony Denny, favored servant and friend of the king. Lady Denny's husband was groom of the stool by 1535, groom of the chamber by 1536, gentleman of the king's privy chamber by 1538, and chief gentleman of the privy

35. LP, XX, i, 336, 465(28); Bindoff, The House of Commons, I, 599-600.


37. Ibid, I, 599, 602; B.L., Harleian MS 293, f. 113v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).

38. Bindoff, The House of Commons, I, 662, 664; II, 82.
chamber by 1544, the year he was knighted. In August 1546, Denny, along with his brother-in-law, John Gates, was commissioned to apply the dry stamp to official documents. Denny, who was named an executor of Henry VIII's will, was appointed to the privy council and left £300 by the king.

Among Sir Anthony Denny's reforming friends and associates may be counted Archbishop Cranmer, William Butts (the king's physician), Roger Ascham (Elizabeth's tutor), John Cheke and Richard Cox (Edward's tutors), Thomas Eliot (a distinguished humanist scholar), and Matthew Parker (later Elizabeth's first archbishop of Canterbury), to name only a very few. Given that scholars were Denny's friends, and the fact that Denny himself had had a humanist education, it is not surprisingly that Sir Anthony was well known for his patronage of scholarly works and education in general. And, it would seem, Denny was a loyal friend: Denny supported Cranmer in the plots against the archbishop in

40. LP, XXI, i, 1537(34).
41. B.L., Harleian MS 293, fols. 111, 112, 113v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).
1543. Denny's commitment to reform was attested to by John Foxe, who singled Denny out, along with several others, as supporting reform during Henry VIII's reign. The Dennys probably passed on their reforming beliefs to their children: during Queen Mary's reign, the Dennys' three sons apparently were involved in one of the 1554 up-risings and had to flee the country. In 1555 and 1556, the young men were studying at Basle with other English exiles. Denny died on 10 September 1549, while Lady Denny died four years later in 1553.

Frances Brandon, marchioness of Dorset, born July 1517, had an illustrious parentage. Her father was Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, a long-time favorite of the king, while her mother was Mary Tudor, the sister of Henry VIII and the widow of king Louis XII of France. In May 1533 Francis Brandon became the second wife of Henry Grey, marquis of Dorset. In 1544, the marchioness and her children were placed in the line of succession. In

---

44. Ridley, Thomas Cranmer, 242; Dowling, Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII, 64.


49. G.E.C., Complete Peerage, IV, 421; D.N.B.
1553, the crown was actually within reach, and Jane Grey was set upon the throne by John Dudley, viscount Lisle under Henry VIII but now duke of Northumberland. Mary's troops rallied, however, and Jane was imprisoned in the Tower only nine days after her proclamation as queen. The duke and duchess of Suffolk were treated leniently at first, but in 1554 the duke was executed for rebelling yet again against Queen Mary. The duchess continued to be received at court, even after she married her twenty-one year old groom, Adrian Stokes. The duchess died in 1559.  

The Lady Gates who appears on the 1547 household list is probably Mary, daughter of Sir Edmund Denny of Cheshunt, Hertfordshire and sister or half-sister to Sir Anthony Denny. We have no date for her marriage to John Gates. Gates was a groom of the king's privy chamber by 1542 and a gentleman of the privy chamber by 1544.  

The king's trust in Gates was such that he authorized him and Denny to apply the dry stamp bearing the king's signature to documents in 1546. Gates received a legacy of £200 from Henry VIII and was a witness to the king's will. Gates was knighted at Edward VI's coronation. In July

---


52. LP, XXI, i, 1537(34).

53. B.L., Harleian MS 292, fols. 113v, 114v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).
1553, Gates was executed by Queen Mary for his role in attempting to place Jane Grey on the throne. As regards his religious beliefs, he may have been like many at the time -- indifferent. When asked just before his execution if he would be converted to Catholicism his response was ambiguous.  

We have no date for Lady Gate's death.

Lady Anne Herbert, daughter of Sir Thomas Parr of Kendal and Maud Green, was the sister of Sir William Parr, earl of Essex, and Queen Katherine Parr. Lady Herbert had married Sir William Herbert by 1540. Lady Herbert, who had long been at court, witnessed her sister's marriage to Henry VIII in 1543 while her husband was knighted for the occasion. Sir William Herbert had been a member of the king's household since 1535; by 1540 he was gentleman of the king's privy chamber. Herbert was a particular favorite of the king's, and in the last year of the reign he shared with Sir Anthony Denny the position of chief gentleman of the king's privy chamber. Herbert, who was named an executor of Henry VIII's will, was left £300 and made a member of the privy


55. P.R.O., E30/1472, no. 5 (LP, XVIII, i, 873); Narasingha P. Sil, William Lord Herbert of Pembroke (c. 1507-1570): Politique and Patriot, (New York, 1988), 46.

56. Sil, William Lord Herbert, 44-5.

57. B.L., Harleian MS 293, f. 111 (LP, XXI, ii, 634).
council by the king. Lady Herbert, who, like her sister, was a reformer, was targeted in one of the two plots aimed at the queen in 1546. Lady Herbert died in February 1552, while her husband, who had been created earl of Pembroke in 1551, died in March 1570.

Anne, countess of Hertford, was the daughter of Sir Edward Stanhope of Rampton, Nottinghamshire. Her birth date has invariably been given as 1497, although that date seems highly unreliable. She became Sir Edward Seymour's second wife sometime prior to March 1535. With the marriage of Sir Edward's sister Jane to the King in

58. B.L., Harleian MS 293, fols. 111, 112, 113v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).


60. The D.N.B. and J. G. Nichols ('Female Biographies of English History: No. III. - Anne Seymour,' in Gentleman's Magazine, XXIII, (April 1845), 371) both give the countess's birth date as 1497. There are those, however, who question the 1497 date. Marjorie Blatcher, in her brief note on the countess's second husband, Francis Newdigate, doubts that the countess was 90 years old at her death (P. W. Hasler, ed. The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1558-1603, III, [H. M. Stationery Office, 1981], 127). The editors of The Complete Peerage also doubt the countess's birth date, citing the fact that she gave birth to a son in 1548 and a daughter in 1550 (G.E.C., XII, i, The Complete Peerage, 65, n. a). If we accept 1497 as the countess's date of birth, that would mean that she had given birth at the advanced ages of 51 and 53 years respectively. It seems highly unlikely that, in a period when women reached menopause at a much earlier age than in the twentieth century, the countess gave birth while in her fifties. The importance of all this discussion lies in the fact that the countess was a woman young enough in 1541 to have attracted the apparently serious attentions of Henry Howard, earl of Surrey, who was himself about 24 years old at the time. And Surrey's family, it will be remembered, competed with the Seymours for royal favor during the last years of Henry VIII's reign. Surrey's attentions to the countess will be taken up in chapter 3.
1536, the Seymour fortunes prospered accordingly. He was created earl of Hertford and made a privy councillor in October 1537, shortly after he had become uncle to the heir apparent. In 1541 he was elected to the garter. He served briefly as warden of the Scottish marches (October - December 1542) and as lord high admiral (December 1542 - January 1543) before becoming great chamberlain of England on 16 February 1543, post he held until he became protector of the realm for Edward VI in early 1547. He also served as lieutenant-general in the North from February 1544 to June of that year, and then again in May 1545. Hertford was named to the regency council set-up for Katherine Parr in 1544. Hertford, who was an executor of Henry VIII's will, was confirmed in his position as a privy councillor and left £500 by the king.

The countess of Hertford is best known for being something of a shrew. It has been suggested that it was at her prompting that Hertford disinherited his sons from his first marriage. It seems unlikely that Hertford would have needed prompting, given that he had separated

---

61. LP, XII, ii, 1008(22).
62. LP, XVI, 440.
64. P.R.O., SP 1/189, fols. 227-229 (LP, XIX, i, 864).
from his first wife on account of her adultery, though the countess may well have urged such an action. Lady Honor Lisle’s daughter, Katherine Basset, certainly was in no hurry to exchange the countess of Rutland for the countess of Hertford as a patroness, though the later was in a better position to forward the girl’s suit to be a maid of honor to the queen. Apparently, Katherine felt that the countess of Hertford would treat her like a servant, whereas the countess of Rutland treated her like a daughter and a guest. Although the countess of Hertford and Katherine Parr had a common interest in reform, they did not get along with each other. The question of the countess’s irascible temperament will be discussed further later.

The countess of Hertford had been long at court when the king married Katherine Parr. In April 1547, Mary wrote to the countess (who was by now duchess of Somerset) on behalf of one Richard Wood, 'who was my mothers servant, when you weer one of her graces maids, . . .'. Mary’s remark suggests that the countess served in the household of her mother, Katherine of Aragon. Whether or not the countess continued in the household of Anne Boleyn, she probably was given a place in sister-in-
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law's establishment in 1536. She may also have served in
the households of Anne of Cleves and Catherine Howard, as
the countess certainly was in regular attendance on
Katherine Parr.

Some time after her husband's execution in 1552, and
her later release from the Tower by Queen Mary, the
countess, now duchess of Somerset, married Francis
Newdigate of Hanworth, Middlesex. The duchess died in
April 1587.69

Lady Knyvet is identified by the editors of Letters
and Papers as Anne, wife of Sir Henry Knyvet, Captain of
the Horsemen of Guisnes.70 But Lady Knyvet could also
have been Anne, the daughter of Sir John Shelton of
Carrow, Norfolk. She had married Sir Edmund Knyvet, a
member of the king's privy chamber, by 1527.71

There was a Lady Knyvet present at Jane Seymour's
funeral, and an 'Anne Knevett' signed the 1539 letter to
Henry VIII. There was a Lady Knyvet in the households of
both Anne of Cleves and Catherine Howard. A 'Lady
Knevet' was scheduled to attend court for the French
Admiral's visit in 1546, but her name was later crossed
out on one of the lists prepared for the event.
Nevertheless, a 'Lady Knevett' reappeared on the 1547
funeral ordinance as a member of Katherine Parr's

69. Hasler, The House of Commons, 1558-1603, III,
125-7; G.E.C., The Complete Peerage, XII, i, 64-5.

70. LP, XXI, i, 969(iii), 1384; XXI, ii, p. 670.

71. Bindoff, The House of Commons, II, 482-3; LP,
XVIII, i, 66(xlvi).
establishment. It is entirely possible that both Lady Knyvets identified above served in the queen's households at various times. But distinguishing between the two is virtually impossible. The fact that their husbands both enjoyed the king's favor only makes identification more remote. If there is a clue to be had, it may lie in the date of their husbands' deaths: Sir Henry died sometime between 3 August and 19 September 1546, while Sir Edmund died in 1551.\textsuperscript{72} If it is Sir Henry's wife who was supposed to be at court for the French embassy, her name may have been crossed out because of her husband's recent death. And certainly the 'Lady Knevett' on the 1547 list could be a widow. Nevertheless, it is impossible to know for certain which Anne Knyvet was at court.

Lady Maud Lane, eldest daughter of Sir William Parr, lord Parr of Horton, and Lady Mary Parr (see below) was born sometime after 1511, the approximate year of her parents' marriage. She and Katherine Parr were, then, first cousins and probably near in age. Lady Lane, who married Sir Ralph Lane of Orlingbury, Northamptonshire, served in her cousin's household throughout the 1540s.\textsuperscript{73} Lady Lane, who probably shared her cousin's religious beliefs, was targeted in one of the plots against the queen in 1546.

Lady Margaret Douglas, countess of Lennox, born in

\textsuperscript{72} LP, XXI, i, 1406; ii, 129; Bindoff, The House of Commons, II, 483.

\textsuperscript{73} J. G. Nichols, Literary Remains of King Edward the Sixth, (London, 1857), I, 10.
1515, was the daughter of Archibald Douglas, earl of Angus, and Margaret Tudor, dowager queen of Scotland and Henry VIII's sister. It seems likely that Lady Margaret spent part of her youth in France with her exiled father. She returned to England in 1528 and was brought to London in 1531, at which time she was placed in Princess Mary's household. From that time forward Lady Margaret was usually at court. After the bastardization of Mary and Elizabeth, Lady Margaret was, for a short time, heir to the throne; her claim was considered better than that of her half-brother James V of Scotland because she was born an English subject. Her position changed after the birth of Prince Edward, and after the king found grounds to have her parents' marriage declared invalid. She incurred the king's anger when she formed an attachment in 1536 to Lord Thomas Howard, the duke of Norfolk's brother. Lady Margaret quickly renounced Howard in a letter to the king. Lady Margaret, however, did not learn from the experience, and in 1541 she formed another unsuitable attachment, this time to Lord Charles Howard, Catherine Howard's brother. Although Lady Margaret managed to regain the king's favor after each affair, she was warned that there would not be a pardon for a third
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indiscretion. She was back in her uncle’s favor by 1543, and she witnessed the king’s marriage to Katherine Parr. On 29 June 1544, the king’s alliance with the Scottish Matthew Stewart, earl of Lennox, was sealed with the earl’s marriage to Lady Margaret. In an attempt to prevent a Scottish monarch from inheriting the English crown, the king excluded in his will the descendants of his sister Margaret Tudor from the English succession. The king’s preventative measures of course failed and James VI, a grandson of the countess of Lennox, ascended the English throne in 1603 as James I.

Lady Jane Dudley, viscountess Lisle, was the daughter of Sir Edward Guildford and his first wife Eleanor, the daughter of Thomas West, Lord De la Warr. She married in 1526 her father’s ward, John Dudley. Dudley was the son of Henry VII’s financial minister, Edmund Dudley, who had been executed at the beginning of Henry VIII’s reign. Despite his family’s disgrace, Dudley’s rise in Henry VIII’s service was rapid. Knighted in 1523, he was a knight of the body by 1533. A year later, in July, he was made master of the armory at the Tower of London. Dudley was master of the horse to Anne of Cleves in 1540, and warden of the Scottish
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marches for a short time in 1542 and 1543. In March 1542, he was created viscount Lisle. Lisle was named lord admiral in January 1543, and in April the same year he was made a privy councillor and elected to the garter. Lisle, who was an executor of Henry VIII's will, was confirmed in his position as a privy counsellor and left a legacy of £500 by the king.

Lady Lisle remained very much in the background when her husband, as duke of Northumberland, assumed control of the government of Edward VI in 1549. The new duchess of Northumberland did, however, in cooperation with the duchess of Somerset (formerly countess of Hertford), attempt a reconciliation between her husband and the duke of Somerset while the later was in the Tower. The duchess of Northumberland, who was imprisoned when her husband's attempt to alter the succession in favor of Lady Jane Grey failed, died in January 1555, aged 46 years.

---
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86. B.L., Harleian MS 293, fols. 111, 112, 113v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)). For a somewhat dated account of Lisle's career, see also Philip Lindsay, The Queenmaker: A Portrait of John Dudley Viscount Lisle, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland 1502-1553, (London, 1951).


Lady Anne Paget, daughter and sole heir of Henry Preston of Preston, Westmorland, had married William Paget by 1536.\(^8^9\) In September 1541, Paget was sent to France as England's ambassador.\(^9^0\) He had returned to England by 23 April, when he was sworn in as one of the two principal secretaries of the privy council.\(^9^1\) He was knighted in 1544.\(^9^2\) Paget, who was named an executor, was confirmed in his position on the privy council and left £300 in the king's will.\(^9^3\) Paget died on 9 June 1563, while Lady Paget died in 1587.\(^9^4\)

Lady Mary Parr, daughter of William Salisbury of Horton and Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Wylde of Bromham, Bedfordshire, married Sir William Parr of Horton some time before 1511.\(^9^5\) Lady Parr's husband had been knighted in 1512, and from 1525 to 1536 he had served as chamberlain of the household to Henry Fitzroy, duke of Richmond, the king's natural son.\(^9^6\) Sir William's next

---
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\(^9^3\). B.L., Harleian MS 293, fols. 111, 112, 113v (*LP*, XXI, ii, 634(5)).


major honors came when his niece Katherine Parr married Henry VIII in 1543. At that time he was created baron Parr of Horton and became Katherine Parr's chamberlain, a post he held until his death in September 1547. There is some question as to how active Sir William's wife was at court. Lady Mary Parr appears as a member of her niece's household only on the 1547 funeral ordinance. Lady Parr died in July 1551.

Lady Agnes Paston, daughter of Sir John Leigh of Stockwell, Surrey, had married Sir Thomas Paston by 1544, the year he was also knighted. Lady Paston's husband was a gentleman of the king's privy chamber by 1538 and held the post until his death. Sir Thomas Paston reputedly had been 'smitten' by Catherine Howard but, unlike his fellow gentleman of the privy chamber, Thomas Culpepper, he did not pursue an affair and retained the king's favor. Paston, who had been left 200 marks in Henry VIII's will, died in 1550. Some time after that date, Lady Paston married Edward Fitzgerald. Their son became the 14th earl of Kildare.

The Lady Peckham who appears as a member of

97. LP, XVIII, ii, 516.
100. Smith, A Tudor Tragedy, 160.
101. Bindoff, The House of Commons, III, 69; B.L., Harleian MS 293, f. 113v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).
Katherine Parr's household in 1547 was probably Anne, daughter of John Cheyne of Chesham Bois, Buckinghamshire, and a sister of Lady Jane Wriothesley. Lady Peckham had married Sir Edmund Peckham by 1516. Lady Peckham's husband had risen in the king's service through his financial abilities, which culminated in his appointment in 1544 as high treasurer of the mints in England and Ireland.\textsuperscript{103} Knighted in 1542, Peckham was left £200 by the king in his will.\textsuperscript{104} Peckham was a privy councillor for a brief time in October 1549, but his Catholicism generally isolated him from court politics under Edward VI. On Mary's accession, however, he was once again made a privy councillor, a position he held until her death in 1558. Lady Peckham survived her husband, who died in 1564.\textsuperscript{105}

Lady Anne Petre was born in 1509 to a former lord mayor of London, William Browne of Flambards Hall, Essex. She was related to Lady Catherine Berkeley through William Blount, 4th Lord Mountjoy, who was Lady Berkeley's father and Lady Petre's step-father. Lady Petre's first husband had been John Tyrell of Heron in East Thorndon, Essex, who died in 1540. As the sole heir of her father, and as the widow of a man who also left no male heir, she was a relatively wealthy woman in March

\textsuperscript{103} Bindoff, \textit{The House of Commons}, III, 78; \textit{LP}, XIX, i, 610(102).

\textsuperscript{104} Bindoff, \textit{The House of Commons}, III, 78; B.L., Harleian MS 293, f. 113v (\textit{LP}, XXI, ii, 634(5)).

\textsuperscript{105} Bindoff, \textit{The House of Commons}, III, 78-9.
1542, by which time she had married Sir William Petre.\textsuperscript{106} In January 1544 Petre was knighted, made a privy councillor, and appointed one of the two principal secretaries.\textsuperscript{107} He served as a privy councillor to all three of the king's children.

Lady Petre, who appears as a member of Katherine Parr's household only in 1547, was firmly conservative and so probably was not an intimate friend of the queen's. Sir William died in January 1572, while Lady Petre died ten years later in March 1582. In her will Lady Petre affirmed her Catholicism.\textsuperscript{108}

Lady Anne Russell, daughter of Sir Guy Sapcote of Huntingdonshire, had been twice widowed before she married Sir John Russell. Her first husband, John Broughton of Toddington, Bedfordshire, had died sometime between 1517 and 1519. She married secondly Sir Richard Jerningham of London, who died in either 1525 or 1526. By the time she married Russell, probably shortly after Jerningham's death, she was a moderately wealthy widow.\textsuperscript{109} Sir John Russell, who had been a member of Henry VII's household, served in Henry VIII's
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establishment throughout the reign. Russell, who had been knighted in 1522, was a privy councillor by 30 January 1537, and was comptroller of the king’s household from 1537 until 1539, at which time he was appointed president of the council in the west. He was created baron Russell in March 1539, and in the following month was given the garter. He was appointed lord admiral in July 1540 but relinquished the office in January 1543. In December 1542, Russell was made lord privy seal, an office he probably had actually been discharging since October; it was an office he held until his death in March 1555. Russell, who was an executor of Henry VIII’s will, was confirmed in his position as a privy councillor and left £500 by the king.

Lady Russell was frequently at court and like other court ladies, she often received New Year’s gifts from the king. Lady Russell’s own New Year’s gifts to the king had a very personal touch: on at least two occasions, she gave the king shirts decorated with black work. Presumably, the shirts represented Lady Russell’s
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own skill. At other times of the year, she sent the king gifts of swan, deer, and greyhounds. During the Catherine Howard investigations Lady Russell was ordered by the king to take charge of Lady Rochford. Lady Russell became the countess of Bedford on the elevation of her husband to the earldom in 1550. The phraseology of the countess's will, which was drawn up in the last months of Queen Mary's reign, has the flavor of the reformers. Nevertheless, the countess's desire to have the catholic abbot of Westminster, Dr. Feckenham, see to her funeral would suggest a more conservative religious position. By the time she actually died, in March 1559, Elizabeth was on the throne and the countess probably could have changed the arrangements for her funeral had she been so inclined.

Lady Elizabeth St. John was the daughter of Sir William Capell, a former lord mayor of London, and Margaret, the daughter of Sir John Arundel of Lanherne, Cornwall. Through her mother, Lady St. John was probably related to Mary, countess of Arundel, and Sir Thomas Arundel, Katherine Parr's chancellor. Lady St. John


117. LP, XII, ii, 1060; Willen, John Russell, 15.

118. Thomson, Two Centuries of Family History, 192-3, 196.

married William Paulet in about 1509. Lady St. John's husband, who had been knighted sometime between 1523 and 1525, held the office of comptroller of the household from May 1532 to October 1537, at which time he became treasurer, a post he held until March 1539. In March, he was created baron St. John, and in April the following year he was elected to the garter. From about May 1543 to October 1545 he was chamberlain of the household, and in late 1545 he became great master. St. John, who was appointed an executor of Henry VIII's will, was confirmed in his position as a privy councillor and left £500 by the king. Whether Lady St. John was at court as frequently as her husband is open to some question. Although she participated in the funeral of Jane Seymour, she does not appear on any of the documents for the households of Anne of Cleves or Catherine Howard. Lady St. John was at court, though, in the last months of the reign. Her husband's elevations made her countess of Wiltshire in 1550, and marchioness of Winchester in 1551. She died in December 1558 and her husband died on 10 March 1572.
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Katherine, duchess of Suffolk, daughter of Lord Willoughby de Eresby and Maria de Salinas, was born in March 1519. Lord Willoughby died in 1526, and although Katherine was her father's only direct heir, it was almost ten years before she succeeded to her father's title. In 1528, Katherine's wardship was granted to Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, who intended her to marry his son Henry, earl of Lincoln. The duke of Suffolk was one of the king's closest companions; their relationship went back to before Henry VIII's accession. The duke had been knighted on 30 March 1512, and a year later he had been elected to the garter. He had been a privy councillor since at least May 1513, the same month he had been created viscount Lisle (a title he later relinquished).

126 At Lord Willoughby's death, his brother, Sir Christopher Willoughby, claimed title to some lands that Lord Willoughby had settled on him at the time his marriage. Lord Willoughby's widow, Maria de Salinas, disputed her brother-in-law's claim, and a legal battle ensued, causing Sir Christopher to lay claim to the entire inheritance. The duke of Suffolk intervened, and in 1536 Sir Christopher's original claim was granted by Act of Parliament; he received only those lands granted him on his marriage. The matter seemed settled. Nevertheless, nearly thirty-five years later, the duchess of Suffolk complained to Lord Burghley that she had been told to face her face (probably by Sir Christopher's heirs) that she and her children had no claim to the barony. Despite this assertion, it was the duchess's children who inherited, not the descendants of Sir Christopher (G.E.C., The Complete Peerage, XII, pt. II, 673, 701-2; H.M.C., Salisbury I, 477-8).
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duke of Suffolk.\textsuperscript{130} His third, and most prestigious, marriage was made in 1515 when he married the king’s sister Mary, dowager queen of France. When she died in June 1533, his marriage to his fourteen-year old ward created some comment.\textsuperscript{131} The duke was great master of the household by 1540.\textsuperscript{132} The duchess was widowed in 1545, when the duke died unexpectedly.

The duchess of Suffolk apparently had a close relationship with Katherine Parr, and when the queen died in 1548, the duchess was given custody of the dowager-queen’s infant daughter, Mary. It was not a happy arrangement, however, and on at least two occasions in 1549 the duchess wrote to William Cecil, Protector Somerset’s secretary at the time, complaining of the expense in keeping the queen’s daughter. Somerset had promised a pension for the girl and her nursery furniture and plate, and the duchess repeatedly wrote to both the Protector and his wife, the former countess of Hertford, for the fulfillment of their promises.\textsuperscript{133} The duchess also told Cecil in July that Katherine Parr’s brother, William Parr, by now marquis of Northampton, could not accept guardianship of his niece if she came to him
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without a suitable state pension.\textsuperscript{134} In 1553 the duchess married Richard Bertie and, shortly afterwards on Queen Mary's accession, the two fled to the continent. They returned when Elizabeth ascended the throne. The duchess died in September 1580 at the age of 61 years.\textsuperscript{135}

Lady Elizabeth Tyrwhit, daughter of Sir Goddard Oxenbridge of Brede, Sussex,\textsuperscript{136} had married Sir Robert Tyrwhit by 4 August 1539, the date of the letter sent to the king by a number of women from the queen's privy chamber. The letter would also suggest that she was to be a member of the soon to be formed household for Anne of Cleves. Certainly Lady Tyrwhit was a member of Catherine Howard's establishment.

Lady Tyrwhit's husband was also at court during the last years of the reign. By 1540 Sir Robert Tyrwhit was a member of the king's privy chamber and was acting vice-chamberlain of the king's household.\textsuperscript{137} The Tyrwhit fortunes prospered when Katherine Parr, a distant relative of Sir Robert's,\textsuperscript{138} married Henry VIII: Tyrwhit
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was knighted and made the queen’s master of the horse. Sir Robert and Lady Tyrwhit remained in Katherine Parr’s service when, after the king’s death in 1547, the queen married Sir Thomas Seymour. After Katherine’s own death in 1548, Lady Tyrwhit’s deposition to the council suggested that Seymour may have neglected his wife. Sir Robert Tyrwhit died on 10 May 1572, and Lady Tyrwhit died six years later in 1578.

Lady Elizabeth Wingfield, daughter of Sir George Vere, had married Sir Anthony Wingfield by 1528. Lady Wingfield’s husband, who had been a member of the king’s household from the beginning of the reign, was knighted in 1513. Wingfield became captain of the guard in 1539 and was appointed vice-chamberlain of the household, a post he held until 1550. He was given the garter in 1541, and left £200 in the king’s will. There is some question as to whether Lady Wingfield spent as much time at court as did her husband. Although she
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served in the household of Anne of Cleves, Lady Wingfield appears as a member of Katherine Parr's establishment only for the French admiral's visit in 1546 and for the king's funeral in 1547. Lady Wingfield survived her husband, who died in August 1552.\textsuperscript{146}

Lady Jane Wriothesley, daughter of William Cheyney of Chesham Bois, Buckinghamshire, and sister of Lady Anne Peckham, married Sir Thomas Wriothesley somet ime before 1533. Lady Wriothesley's husband was a clerk of the signet from at least May 1530 until April 1540, at which time he joined the privy council as one of the two principal secretaries.\textsuperscript{147} In 1544, he was keeper of the great seal for a brief time and, in May, he was made lord chancellor.\textsuperscript{148} Created Baron Wriothesley in 1544, he was elected to the garter in 1545.\textsuperscript{149} Wriothesley, who was appointed one of the executors of Henry VIII's will, was confirmed in his position on the privy council and left f500 by Henry VIII.\textsuperscript{150} In 1547, Wriothesley was created earl of Southampton. He did not live long to enjoy his new title, though, as he died on 30 July 1550. The
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countess of Southampton died 15 September 1574.\textsuperscript{151}

Although Sir Thomas Wriothesley appears to have had leading roles in the two plots against Katherine Parr in 1546, it nevertheless would seem that he himself was sympathetic to the reformers.\textsuperscript{152} Lady Wriothesley's beliefs are more elusive. A prayer book belonging to Lady Wriothesley survives, but its innocuous nature reveals little about its owner. The book does show, however, that she collected autographs: in one place Katherine Parr has mysteriously written, 'Madame although I have differed wryttyng in your booke/ I am no lesse your frend than you do looke/ Kateryn the Queene KP'.\textsuperscript{153} The queen's verses do not seem to be associated with any particular passage in the book, as the preceding page is blank, as is the rest of the page containing the verses. The place, however, where Princess Mary signed Lady Wriothesley's book does seem significant. Mary wrote, 'Good madame I do desyer you most hartily to pray,/ that in prosperyte and aduersyte I may have/ grace to kepe the trewe way'.\textsuperscript{154} Mary's phrases take on a particular poignancy when it is noted that they immediately follow a prayer asking that god give the supplicant a 'waking herte . . . so strong yt no
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vnworthy offecc[i]on drawe me backwarde, so stable yt no
tribulac[i]on breke it, and so free yt no election by
violence may haue any chalenge . . .'.\textsuperscript{155} Taken
altogether, it is tempting to speculate that Mary's
verses were written soon after her submission to her
father's will over Katherine of Aragon's divorce and her
own legitimacy. What Lady Wriothesley thought of the
matter is, again, unknown, but it probably is significant
that Mary felt secure in committing such thoughts to the
pages of Lady Wriothesley's prayer book.

In all, twenty-six ladies of the household appear on
the 1547 household list. Most had seen service in the
households of previous queens, and almost all owed their
places in Katherine Parr's establishment to their
husband's court positions.

* * *

Although the twenty-six ladies of the household
formed the largest part of Katherine Parr's
establishment, the 1547 funeral ordinance indicates that
the queen was also surrounded by seven maids of honor, a
'mother' for those maids, six gentlewomen of the privy
chamber, and five chamberers. Although perhaps not as
prominent as the ladies of the household, these other
women, if only by virtue of their proximity to the queen,
should not be overlooked or their influence

\textsuperscript{155}. \textit{Ibid}, f. 45-45v.
underestimated.

Anne Basset was born around 1521.\textsuperscript{156} What we know of her is due to the king's personal interest in her and her family, and to the fact that her family's papers were seized and preserved as state evidence when her stepfather, Arthur, Lord Lisle, was arrested for treason in 1540. Her stepfather's appointment as deputy of Calais, from 1533 to 1540, enabled Anne to be educated in the household of a French noble family. In 1537, after several years in what effectively was a French finishing school, and after some delicate manoeuvring on the part of her cousin, the countess of Sussex (later countess of Arundel), Anne was accepted into the household of Jane Seymour. Anne continued to served in the households of the king's last four wives.

After Edward's death in 1553, Anne resumed her court career and was admitted to Queen Mary's household.\textsuperscript{157} Anne's brother, James, was already at court in the suite of Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester and Mary's lord chancellor. Like his sister, James prospered at Mary's court, and by 1555, he had joined her in the queen's household, becoming a gentleman of the queen's privy chamber. In 1556, he married one of his sister's colleagues, Mary Clarke, the granddaughter of Sir Thomas More by his beloved daughter Margaret Roper. James

\textsuperscript{156}. St. Clare Byrne, \textit{The Lisle Letters}, VI, 319.
\textsuperscript{157}. St. Clare Byrne, \textit{The Lisle Letters}, VI, 277, 279.
became not only a trusted servant of the queen but also of King Philip, and on a number of occasions he served as personal messenger between the royal couple. James also did well financially, being rewarded with numerous gifts and grants. The prosperity of the two Basset siblings, however, was short-lived, and both predeceased their royal mistress: Anne in 1557 and James in 1558, shortly before the queen herself.\(^{158}\)

Information on the rest of the queen's maids of honor who appear on the 1547 list is very scant. Mistress Windsor was a daughter of Sir William Windsor, Lord Windsor and was a member of Katherine Parr's household probably from at least 1545. She eventually married Sir Peter Mewtas, a gentleman of the king's privy chamber.\(^{159}\) The Mistress Carew of Katherine Parr's household may be the same 'Mrs' Carew of Jane Seymour's establishment. It has been suggested by St. Clare Byrne that she may have been Katherine Carey,\(^ {160}\) although she might just as easily have been a daughter of Sir Wymond Carew, Katherine Parr's treasurer of the household.\(^ {161}\) Whichever woman she was, there was a Mistress Carew at court and in the households of three of the king's last four wives. Mistress Guildford was perhaps a daughter of


\(^{159}\) LP, XVI, 394; XXI, i, 969(i).

\(^{160}\) St. Clare Byrne, *The Lisle Letters*, IV, 191.

\(^{161}\) Sir Wymond Carew had a daughter (Bindoff, *The House of Commons*, I, 581), but her dates are unknown.
Sir John Guildford, chamberlain to Anne of Cleves. Sir John's wife was also in the household of Anne of Cleves as was probably another of his many daughters.  

Mistress Guildford, though, apparently was only just beginning her court career when the king died, as she appears only on the funeral list and on a wage sheet for the queen's dower household. Mistress Huyke was perhaps a relative of Robert Huick, physician to Henry VIII, Katherine Parr, Edward VI, and Elizabeth I. It was unlikely, however, that she was his daughter as he did not marry until 1546.  

It is difficult to estimate the length of Mistress Huyke's service: she appears on a subsidy assessment in the first years of Katherine Parr's marriage to the king but then only shows up again on the 1547 funeral list. Mistress Browne may have been one of the three daughters of Sir Anthony Browne and his first wife Alice Gage. There was a Mistress Browne in Katherine Parr's household throughout the 1540s. Mistress Goringe, who also was in the queen's household from 1543 onwards, was perhaps a daughter of Sir William Goringe, a 'lord attendant' in Prince Edward's household. Mrs. Stoner, the 'mother' of the maids of honor under Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, and Catherine Howard, continued in that capacity under Katherine Parr.

---

162. P.R.O. LC 2/2, f. 59.


Not much is known about Katherine Parr's gentlewomen of the privy chamber, with the exception of Elizabeth Cobham. Elizabeth Cobham, born 12 June 1526, was the daughter of Sir George Brooke, Lord Cobham, deputy of Calais during the later years of Henry VIII's reign.165 In a letter to Lord Cobham dated 30 November 1545, John Wylkns passed on a favorable report of Elizabeth from Mrs. Stoner.166 Mistress Cobham served in Katherine Parr's household throughout the 1540s. It no doubt was in the queen's household that Elizabeth met her future husband and Katherine Parr's brother, Sir William Parr, earl of Essex and eventually marquis of Northampton. The marquis, who earlier had repudiated his first wife on account of her adultery, formally sought a divorce in April 1547. But before the commission had reached a verdict, he married Elizabeth Cobham. When the marriage was discovered in January 1548, the marquis was dismissed from the privy council and Elizabeth sent to Katherine Parr's household. It was not until March 1551, almost four years after the commission had first convened, that the marquis was granted a divorce. The favorable decision, however, was reversed by Mary, only to be

165. G.E.C., The Complete Peerage, IX, 672-3. Although Elizabeth Cobham should, technically, have used the family name of Brooke, she nevertheless is invariably referred to as Cobham in the records, and so it is that name which I have used.

166. LP, XX, ii, 900.
reconfirmed by Elizabeth. The new marchioness of Northampton was reputed to have been influential at the court of Edward VI and to have assisted in securing the marriage of Lord Guildford Dudley to Lady Jane Grey. The marchioness died in April 1565, after having sought for many years a cure for the breast cancer from which she suffered.

The rest of the queen’s gentlewomen appear only briefly in the records. Although Mrs Hutton appears only on the 1547 funeral list, it seems likely that she was in Katherine Parr’s household from at least 1544, when the queen sent a representative, probably bearing a gift, to the christening of Mrs. Hutton’s child. There is a Mistress Norwiche listed as one of Princess Elizabeth’s attendants on the 1547 list, but whether she was related to the queen’s gentlewoman, Susan Norwiche, is unknown. The Mistress Norwich of Katherine Parr’s household served in the queen’s establishment throughout the 1540s. Anne Blechington also served throughout Katherine Parr’s tenure as queen. Mistress Sylynyn and Mistress Barbara must have joined the queen’s household

---


168. D.N.B.

169. C.S.P.Dom. 1547-1580, 29; C.S.P.For. 1564-1565, no. 287.

170. P.R.O., SP 1/195, f. 181v (LP, XIX, ii, 688).

171. P.R.O., LC 2/2, f. 48v.
late in the reign, as they appear only on the 1547 funeral list.

Not much is known about the chamberers of the queen's privy chamber. Mrs. Osborne, who appears only on the 1547 funeral list, may have been the wife of Robert Osborne, who was clerk controller of the queen's dower establishment.¹⁷² There were several Mistress Skipwiths at court during these years, and one of them served in the queen's household throughout the 1540s. Little is know about Mary Odell aside from her name.¹⁷³ It is possible, though, that she could have been related to Katherine Parr, as one Elizabeth Odell was named as Lady Maud Parr's cousin in the later's 1529 will.¹⁷⁴ Mary Odell was attached to the queen's establishment throughout the 1540s. The 'Mrs Dorothe' who appears on the list of the queen's attendants for the king's funeral is probably Dorothy Fontaine. She probably was in place by November 1544, when Katherine Parr was billed 13s. 4d. for two-and-a-half yards of black velvet for a gown for 'Doryte Fowntaine'.¹⁷⁵ In the queen's dower household 'dorathy ffountance' received 33s 4d. a quarter in wages.¹⁷⁶ The woman probably is not, however, the 'Mrs.

¹⁷². P.R.O., E101/426/2, f. 6.
¹⁷⁴. Nichols and Bruce, Wills from Doctor's Commons, 13.
¹⁷⁵. LP, XIX, ii, 677.
¹⁷⁶. P.R.O., E101/426/2, fols. 1, 5.
Dorothy's Sir Thomas Darcy mentioned as having a love affair with the earl of Oxford in a letter dated 27 June 1547. Darcy's 'Mrs Dorothy' was probably a daughter or relative of Edward Green of Sampford, with whom she was residing when the letter was written. Little is known about Mrs. Clyffe aside from the fact that served in Katherine Parr's establishment throughout the 1540s. Providing entertainment for Katherine Parr's upstairs household in 1547 was Jane the fool. After Katherine Parr's death, or perhaps even before, Jane probably returned Mary's household where she had served in the 1530s and early 1540s. Jane was still with Mary when she became queen in 1553.

One last group of women needs briefly to be discussed. There are a number of women who do not show up on the 1547 funeral list but who were, at various times, members of Katherine Parr's household. While we have their names, and in the majority of cases only their last names, we do not know for certain what positions they held. Margaret Nevell, Katherine Parr's step-daughter, certainly spent time in the queen's household: on at least two occasions, the queen paid the travelling

---


179. Loades, The Tudor Court, 56.
costs incurred in bringing the young woman to court.\textsuperscript{180} In fact, the queen seems to have felt a special obligation to Margaret. When Margaret died in 1545, the queen provided £6 to be distributed to poor householders in Greenwich. Given the involvement of the queen's groom, William Savage, in the funeral arrangements, it seems likely that Katherine Parr actually paid for her step-daughter's funeral.\textsuperscript{181} Although Lord Latimer had left money to Katherine Parr specifically to pay for the upbringing of his daughter,\textsuperscript{182} that money probably would have been insufficient to keep a young woman at court or to provide her with so expensive a funeral. The over-all cost, including the queen's contribution of £6, was £54 13s. 11d., a fairly lavish final tribute.

Mistresses Bray, Morgan, Soskyn, and Willoughby also appear to have been members of the queen's household early on in Katherine Parr's marriage to the king. A Mistress Garrett was a member of the queen's household from the time of Katherine Parr's marriage to the king until just before the king's death. Mistress Phillippa

\textsuperscript{180}. P.R.O., E315/161, nos. 112, 132.

\textsuperscript{181}. P.R.O., E179/69/59, f. D3; LC 2/2, f. 45v.; HO, 170.

\textsuperscript{182}. Testamenta Eboracensia: A Section of Wills from the Registry at York, (The Surtees Society, vol. 106, 1902), VI, 161. Since Margaret was still underage when her father died in 1543, it may well be that Latimer's first wife died in 1527 giving birth to his daughter. If this were the case, then Margaret would have been fifteen years old at the time of her father's death, and eighteen years old at the time of her own death in 1545.
Huffkyn appears on two subsidy lists for Katherine Parr's establishment: one list dates to the early years of the queen's marriage, while the other dates to the later part of the reign. Five women show up in Katherine Parr's household for the first time just after the king's death: Mistresses Aglionby, Brydges, Copeley, Suzan Hogans, and Stafford. Hypotheses can be made for only three of these women: Mistress Willoughby might have been related to Katherine Brandon, duchess of Suffolk, who was a Willoughby before her marriage; Mistress Garrett, who was no doubt a member of the Fitzgerald clan, might have been related to Lady Elizabeth Browne, who was herself a Fitzgerald; and Mistress Aglionby might have been connected to Hugh Aglionby, the queen's secretary. But these are only guesses, and must remain so without additional information.

It seems likely that other women also served in Katherine Parr's establishment but for whatever reasons do not show up on any of the household documents. Mary Finch, for example, who was a member of Mary's establishment, was given a £20 annuity on 28 July 1547 for unspecified services rendered to Katherine Parr.\(^{183}\) How many more women may occasionally have given their services to the queen probably will never be known.

* * *

\(^{183}\). C.P.R., 1547-1548, 208.
Even with what limited information there is on the gentlewomen, maids of honor, and chamberers of Katherine Parr's household, at least half apparently came from good families. The queen's maids of honor seem to have had fairly strong court connections of some kind, usually familial. Of the gentlewomen of the privy chamber, the only information available is for Elizabeth Cobham, and her father was the king's deputy of Calais. Generalizations cannot be as confidently made about the queen's chamberers, although it would seem likely that they, too, had relatives of some kind at court.

In total, then, and based primarily on the 1547 household list, there were at least forty-five women who had regular contact with Katherine Parr. Of the several groupings, however, the twenty-six ladies of the household figure most prominently in the queen's establishment, primarily because of either their family relationship to the queen or because of their ties to the king's household and council. Because of those various contacts, these ladies probably were the group who had or were seen to have the most influence on Katherine Parr.
KEY TO TABLE 3

1537 = B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 91v-92v (Jane Seymour's funeral)

1539 = B.L., Cotton MS Vespasian F XIII, f. 143 (Letter sent to the king from ten women of the queen's privy chamber)

1540 = B.L., Additional MS 45,716A, fols. 15v-16 (Ordinance for the household of Anne of Cleves)

1540(2) = P.R.O., E101/422/15 (Wages for members of the household of Anne of Cleves)

1540(3) = P.R.O., E101/422/16, f. 63v (Wages for members of the household of Anne of Cleves)

1540(4) = P.R.O., SP 1/157, fols. 15, 16 (Membership list for the household of Catherine Howard)

1543-4 = P.R.O., E179/69/41, f. 1 (Subsidy list for the household of Katherine Parr)

1544-5 = P.R.O., E179/69/48 (Subsidy list for the household of Katherine Parr)

1545-6 = P.R.O., E179/69/47, f. 62 (Subsidy list for the household of Katherine Parr)

1545-6(2) = P.R.O., E179/69/55, D1 (Subsidy list for the household of Katherine Parr)

1546 = B.L., Cotton MS Vespasian C XIV, f. 107v (Membership list for the household of Katherine Parr)

1546(2) = B.L., Royal MS App 89, fols. 104v-105 (Membership list for the household of Katherine Parr)

1546-7 = P.R.O., E179/69/44 (Subsidy list for the household of Katherine Parr)

1547 = P.R.O., LC 2/2, fols. 44-45 (Ordinance for Henry VIII's funeral)

1547(2) = P.R.O., E101/426/2, fols. 1, 5 (Wages list for Katherine Parr's dower household)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Document Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arundel</td>
<td>X 1537 X 1540 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carew</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cawarden</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coxe</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knivet</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennox</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisle</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paget</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paston</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>X 1539 X 1540(2) X 1540(3) X 1543-4 X 1545-6(2) X 1546 X 1546(2) X 1546-7 X 1547 X 1547(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Document Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADIES OF THE HOUSEHOLD (continued)</td>
<td>1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrè</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrwhit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingfield</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wriothesley</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIDS OF HONOUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basset</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goringe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huyke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoner</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENTLEMEN OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF THE PRIVY CHAMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Barbera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belchington</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylynnyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMBERERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountaine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skypuith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane the Fool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN OF THE QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD WHOSE POSITIONS ARE UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garret</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffkyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soskyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN WHO JOINED THE QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD IN THE EARLY MONTHS OF 1547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aglionby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brydges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER TWO:

THE BENEFITS OF KATHERINE PARR'S MARRIAGE

TO HENRY VIII

Katherine Parr's marriage to the king in 1543 may have been held privately, with only a few intimate friends of the bride and groom as witnesses, but its immediate consequences extended well beyond the bridal couple. The marriage had an immediate impact on the members of the Parr family as a whole. They acquired land, titles, and minor appointments as quickly as had the Boleyns and Seymours in their respective ascendancies. The one family member who benefited most of all, though, was of course Katherine herself. Not only did she become a wealthy landowner in her own right, with all the privileges such ownership entails, but she acquired the outward trappings of a royal figure.

Sir William Parr, the queen's brother, did well initially from Katherine's marriage to the king. He was made lord warden of the marches, elected to the garter, and given several appointments connected with Wittle and Beaulieu in Essex just prior to his sister's nuptials, and in December he was created earl of Essex, a peerage which he had been trying to claim in right of his estranged wife for some time.\(^1\) By January the following year he had become a privy councillor.\(^2\) But despite

---

1. LP, XVIII, i, 461, 623(88); ii, 516, 529(26).
these early signs of favor, the earl failed to rise in power and influence in the fashion of Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford, whose situation in 1536 had been remarkably similar to Parr's in 1543. Indeed, while the king typically granted favors to the relations of his English wives, such favors usually were in proportion to the abilities of each respective relative. It is significant that the earl of Essex did not receive a token of favor again until the end of the reign, when he was given a sizeable grant of land. But because this grant was not formalized until January 1547, the question of whether the king was really cognizant of the transaction, or whether the grant was a preliminary bribe to support the earl of Hertford's interests, must be asked even if it cannot be answered. What seems likely is that Sir William Parr's early promotion was due in large measure to his sister's marriage and that if he failed to achieve high office in Henry VIII's reign, it probably was because the king thought he lacked ability.

The queen's uncle, another Sir William Parr, did far better than his nephew when it came to the acquisition of property. The month before Katherine Parr's marriage, Sir William received a small grant of several rectories. In February 1544, he received a substantial grant of land, again much of it former church property. The grant was worth well over £185 7s. 3d. a year and was the

4. *LP*, XVIII, i, 982(80b).
largest he was to be awarded during Katherine Parr's tenure as queen. In August 1545, Parr's interests in a number of rectories were confirmed for life and then extended for a further eight years.

Sir William Parr did moderately well in accumulating offices. He was named lord chamberlain of Katherine Parr's household, while his wife, Lady Mary Parr, became one of the queen's ladies. In December 1543, at the same ceremony at which his name-sake received an earldom, Sir William was created baron Parr of Horton. In November 1546, he was given the keepership of Rockingham park and of the deer in Corby woods within Rokingham forest. Although he received relatively few appointments, it nevertheless would seem that the king held Parr in considerable esteem. When naming the council which was to attend Katherine Parr during her regency in 1544, Sir William was deliberately added to the list: although he was not a privy councillor, as were the other men, the king nevertheless specified that Parr was to be 'used in counsil w[i]th them for all suche matieres as concerne the realme'. The king obviously believed that Parr might be of considerable assistance; it was a mark of the

5. *LP, XIX, 141(75); James, 'The Parrs of Kendal', 341.
6. *LP, XX, i, 1336(79).
7. *LP, XVIII, ii, 516.
8. *LP, XXI, ii, 476(10).
9. P.R.O., SP 1/189, f. 227b (*LP, XIX, i, 864(2)).
king's trust and respect that spoke volumes. Ill-health in the last years of the reign may have been the main reason why Sir William Parr did not rise further.

Although Lady Anne Herbert had been at court since the 1530s, her sister's marriage to the king in 1543 necessarily enhanced Lady Herbert's importance. She was appointed one of the queen's ladies and, for obvious reasons, probably was Katherine's most trusted confidant. Lady Herbert's husband also benefited from Katherine Parr's marriage. Sir William Herbert's knighthood and appointment to the captaincies of Aberystwyth and Carmarthen castles in 1543 probably were due in large measure to his sister-in-law's recent marriage.¹⁰ The substantial grant he and Lady Herbert received in January 1544 may also have been a result of the marriage.¹¹

Sir William Herbert's connections with Katherine Parr were yet more evident in 1546. Besides being named steward for the queen's lands in Dorset and Wiltshire, Herbert was given the office of doorward¹² for Devizes castle, one of the queen's properties.¹³ The queen also held the lordships and manors of Caerleon, Trelleck, and Usk in Monmouthshire, for which Herbert was named


¹¹. *LP*, XIX, i, 80(15).

¹². The *OED* indicates that in Scotland 'doorward' was the official title of a warden of a palace. It seems likely that 'doorward' indicated a similar office in England.

¹³. *LP*, XIX, i, 141(65); XXI, i, 718(11); Bindoff, *The House of Commons*, II, 341.
receiver-general.\textsuperscript{14}

Although it seems likely that Katherine Parr was responsible at least in part for Sir William Herbert's promotion, it nevertheless is extremely difficult to detail the process by which he obtained these offices. Did the queen appoint him in her own right, or did she suggest him to the king? And if the later, did the king consent to the appointments for reasons of his own? Although the only office that came directly from the king in 1546 was the stewardship of the Wiltshire properties of duchy of Lancaster,\textsuperscript{15} it nevertheless was clear that the king held Herbert in high regard. Herbert was no newcomer to royal service. He had held a number of offices before 1543 and had, in fact, been a member of the king's household since at least 1534 and a member of the king's privy chamber since 1540.\textsuperscript{16} In the last years of the reign, he shared the position of chief gentleman of the king's privy chamber with Sir Anthony Denny.\textsuperscript{17} Henry's regard for Herbert was further demonstrated in the king's will: Herbert was named an executor and privy

\textsuperscript{14} Bindoff, The House of Commons, II, 341; LP, XIX, i, 141(65).


\textsuperscript{16} Bindoff, The House of Commons, II, 341.

\textsuperscript{17} Sil, William Lord Herbert of Pembroke, 45, 46-7.
legacy.\textsuperscript{18}  

As noted earlier, the king generally was willing initially to favor his wives' relations, but he continued to advance them in his service only if they showed promise. Although Sir William Herbert's family relationship to Katherine Parr probably helped his career, so did his own ability.

Another beneficiary of Katherine Parr's marriage was her widowed cousin, Lady Maud Lane, the daughter of Sir William and Lady Mary Parr of Horton. Lady Lane, who was appointed one of the queen's ladies, received a substantial grant on 20 July, only eight days after Katherine Parr's marriage.\textsuperscript{19} The grant was worth just under £1,000.

In addition to these close relatives, a handful of Katherine Parr's distant Throckmorton cousins benefited in various ways from the queen's marriage in 1543. Of the five Throckmorton brothers, Clement, Nicholas, and perhaps John held a minor office in Katherine Parr's household.\textsuperscript{20} A fourth brother, George, may have owed his appointment in 1544, as a gentleman at arms, to the

\textsuperscript{18}. B.L., Harleian MS 293, fols. 111, 112, 113v (LP, XXI, ii, 634(5)).

\textsuperscript{19}. LP, XVIII, i, 981(88).

\textsuperscript{20}. Clement and Nicholas Throckmorton appear fairly regularly on household documents for this period: P.R.O., E101/426/2, f. 1; E179/69/41, f. 1; E179/69/48; E179/69/44; LC 2/2, f. 44. John Throckmorton's membership in the queen's household is speculative (Bindoff, The House of Commons, III, 455).
queen. Most significant, however, was the promotion of four of the brothers to parliament. The election of Clement, John, Kenelm, and Nicholas to either one or both of the parliaments of 1545 and 1547 probably was due mainly to Katherine Parr's influence.

The male members of Katherine Parr's family -- her uncle, brother, and brother-in-law in particular -- did well from her marriage to the king. To put the favors they received into perspective, a brief look at the immediate relatives of Anne Boleyn and Jane Seymour is in order.

Sir Thomas Boleyn already was well established at court when his daughter Anne caught the king's attention. Boleyn was a diplomat of some skill, and had been for a time ambassador to France and later to Spain. In addition to these official posts, he had served on a number of more informal missions to the continent. In 1521 he had been made treasurer of the household, a post he relinquished in 1525 when he was created viscount Rochford; this honor he may have owed in part to his elder daughter Mary, who was probably the king's mistress at the time of her father's elevation. After Anne Boleyn was established in the king's affections favors came more quickly and easily. In December 1529, Boleyn

22. See below, 154-7.
24. Ibid, 20, 46, 125.
was created earl of Ormond and of Wiltshire, while only a month later, in the new year, he was made lord privy seal.\textsuperscript{25} He was given two small grants of land in Kent in February and October 1531.\textsuperscript{26} In July of that year, he received jointly with his son a grant of several offices connected with lands in Essex.\textsuperscript{27} In March 1536, he and his son were granted a thirty year lease of those same Essex lands at an annual rent of f99 6s. 8d.\textsuperscript{28} A release of f20 was immediately granted on the annual rent.\textsuperscript{29}

Although Anne Boleyn's brother, George, had been in the king's household since at least 1516, when he was made a page to the king,\textsuperscript{30} it really was after Anne was established at court that he received any significant favors. George was made an esquire of the body in September 1528 and, in the following year, assumed the courtesy title of viscount Rochford when his father was elevated to the peerage. By December 1529 he was a nobleman of the king's privy chamber.\textsuperscript{31} George Boleyn followed in his father's footsteps and served on a number of diplomatic missions from 1529 forward.\textsuperscript{32}
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favor to him also took other forms. In November 1528 he was given several offices connected with Beaulieu alias Newhall in Essex, as well as the right to lease the manor and attached lands. The next year he was made governor of the London hospital of St. Mary of Bethlem. He was made constable of Dover Castle and warden of the Cinque Ports in June 1534. In April 1535, he received a small grant of a manor in Kent along with usual perquisites. And, of course, he received jointly with his father the three grants already discussed above.

Sir Thomas Boleyn profited greatly from Anne’s marriage to the king. He received two peerages, a high government office, and several grants of land, one of them quite significant. Although his family ties to the king certainly had some role to play in the distribution of these favors, the king nevertheless could easily have justified his actions: Boleyn was an experienced statesman and had had a very successful career in the crown’s service. It is not wholly inconceivable that Sir Thomas would have achieved high office and a peerage on his own had Anne Boleyn never been born. Anne’s influence with the king may simply have speeded up a process already well advanced by the late 1520s. In the case of George Boleyn, however, it would appear as though
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the favors he received were, at least at first, a direct result of Anne's alliance with the king. Although he had been at court since at least 1516, he really was not singled out until 1528, by which time the king's divorce was in progress. George may have had ability when he was appointed to early diplomatic missions, but that ability was untried in 1529. He held the title of viscount Rochford by courtesy, and the grants he received in his own right were modest. The differences in awards between father and son reflected the differences in age and experience, although given time to mature, George Boleyn might have done as well as his father had.

The advancement of the Seymour brothers followed the pattern established by the Boleyns. Sir Edward Seymour had been at work on a court career for over ten years when his sister married the king in 1536. Seymour had been knighted by the duke of Suffolk during the French campaign of 1523, and had become an esquire to the king's household in the following year. In 1529, he had been made steward of two manors in Somerset, with the power to appoint bailiffs and other officers. In 1530, he had been promoted to the post of a squire of the body. He also had received two grants in 1530: one was made jointly with his brother-in-law for three manors for f123 12s. 8d., while the other was for an annuity of 50
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marks. Although the next grant which came to Sir Edward in 1535 was to be held in conjunction with his wife and the chancellor, Sir Thomas Audley, the property and the rights pertaining to it were reserved to Seymour and his wife. The grant itself, however, was relatively small.

Until Jane Seymour's marriage with the king, Sir Edward's fortunes had prospered, but not in any spectacular way. The only certain information about his younger brother, Thomas, is that he was in the service of Sir Francis Bryan by 1530. But in 1536, with the marriage of their sister to the king, the fortunes of both men prospered accordingly. In June of that year Sir Edward was created viscount Beauchamp and given two grants, one of which was relatively small and included three manors in Wiltshire and certain rights pertaining to them. The second grant, however, was enormous, and included lands from two abbeys and three priories, the rectories of five churches, and no less than eighteen manors. Almost all of these lands were located in Wiltshire. Before the year was out, Sir Edward was given the offices of keeper, governor, and captain of
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Jersey, along with some property there, and made chancellor and chamberlain of North Wales.\(^{46}\) In August 1537, he was awarded another large grant of mostly former church property in Wiltshire; the annual value was given as £159 11s. 11d.\(^{47}\)

If the honors which came to Sir Edward Seymour were great after his sister's marriage, they became even greater after she gave birth to the long awaited heir. A few days after Prince Edward's birth, Seymour was created earl of Hertford and given £20 a year to support the title.\(^{48}\) At this point, the lands in the new earl's possession or reversion, when added to his inheritance, came to £1,054. When the annuities granted by the king were figured in, the total was £1,107 6s. 8d.\(^{49}\) And only three months later Hertford's holdings were further enlarged by a substantial grant of mostly former church property in Somerset.\(^{50}\) Hertford, of course, continued to build on his good fortune in the years which followed.

The largesse which came to Thomas Seymour on his sister's marriage was tailored somewhat to the fact that he was a younger son. He was made a gentleman of the king's privy chamber in May 1536, and in October shared a grant of a stewardship for two castles in Wales and
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the respective attached properties.\textsuperscript{51} He was given the
captaincy of the \textit{Sweepenstake} in 1537 and, after Prince
Edward's birth, he was knighted.\textsuperscript{52} At the end of the
year he was made joint master steward of Chirk and Holt
castles,\textsuperscript{53} and in March 1538 he was given a moderate
grant of mostly former church property.\textsuperscript{54} Seymour
continued to advance, though not as quickly or as high as
Hertford, a fact which no doubt contributed to Seymour's
intense jealousy of his elder brother.

The distribution of favors to Katherine Parr's
immediate male relatives, then, was along fairly well-
established lines. The queen's uncle, like Hertford and,
in particular, Sir Thomas Boleyn, had had a long career
in service to the crown before the king married his
niece. Sir William Parr was made chamberlain of the
queen's household, given a barony, and awarded several
grants, one of them quite substantial. That Parr was
singled out to serve on the regency council would seem to
indicate that he was considered as being something of an
elder statesman. Katherine Parr's brother, initially at
least, also was greatly honored. Within a seven-month
period he was made warden of the marches, elected to the
garter, given the long-coveted earldom of Essex, and
sworn a privy councillor. That he had to wait a further
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two years for a mark of the king's favor would seem to indicate only that the earl had failed, unlike Hertford, to prove himself to the king. Indeed, it seems unlikely that Hertford himself would have continued to rise so spectacularly in the king's favor had he not proved himself to be a capable diplomat and military commander. George Boleyn, it will be recalled, was gaining valuable experience in the former field while his sister reigned at court. Nor was there was anything unusual in the advancement of Sir William Herbert, Katherine Parr's brother-in-law. He was knighted, made captain of two Welsh castles, given various offices connected with the queen's properties, named a steward for the Duchy of Lancaster, and appointed a privy councillor and left a £300 legacy in the king's will. And because Herbert had been at court for at least ten years by 1543, his promotion after Katherine Parr's marriage seemed, like the advancement of Sir Thomas Boleyn and the earl of Hertford, a natural progression.

The favors, then, which came to Katherine Parr's three male relatives were not at all inconsistent with the king's policy of initially honoring the relatives of his current wife. However, such relatives continued to advance in his favor only if they showed ability.

Of course, the person who benefited most in 1543 was Katherine Parr herself. Through the enormous estate settled on her by the king, she was able to intervene in local affairs, while her position as the king's wife gave
her some influence at court. It is the first aspect which we will examine now.

Although Katherine Parr had been left moderately well-off at the death of her second husband, John Neville, Lord Latimer, the property settled on her by the king was substantial. On 22 February 1544 the queen was awarded a life-grant, 'in recompense of jointure and dower', which consisted of 105 manors, 15 boroughs, 6 castles, and numerous mills, fee farms, parks, forests, etc., and included properties formerly in the possession of the late earl of Warwick, the earl of March, the duke of Richmond, and the attainted Walter, Lord Hungerford.\textsuperscript{55} A further 28 manors were almost immediately added to this generous settlement by way of two additional grants, which brought the queen's holdings to 133 manors in twenty counties.\textsuperscript{56} Finally, on 27 February, the queen was given a life-grant of goods and chattels forfeited by felons and fugitives who held tenancy in any of the above awarded properties.\textsuperscript{57}

It would appear as though most of the properties settled on Katherine Parr had been held in turn by all five of her predecessors.\textsuperscript{58} Although no property value was mentioned in Katherine Parr's grant, the figure no
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doubt would have been in line with the amounts given for her predecessors: Katherine of Aragon's properties were valued at £4,129 2s. 4d. in 1515, and in 1540 the whole assignment was stated to be £4,751 15s. 2d. 'ob. di a. iiiij pars'. Jane Seymour's 'whole assignment' was given at £4,623 1s. 11 3/4d. in 1540, while Anne of Cleves's dower properties were valued at 4,367 marks 7s. 1 3/4d. Catherine Howard's lands were worth over £3,352. It also seems as though it was standard for the king's wives to be granted the goods and chattels of felons and fugitives who resided within their lands.

In just under a week Katherine Parr became one of the wealthiest women in England. When the modest holdings she inherited from her first two husbands were added to the king's settlement, Katherine Parr's estate
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63. Three manors were settled on Katherine Parr by her first husband, Edward Borough (LP, XII, ii, 187(6)). The settlement she received from Lord Latimer was more generous: she was given a third part of Latimer's goods and chattels, and above this was also to have such goods that were in her 'lienge chambre, and also towre of my best gilte standinge cuppes with covers, towe gilte goblettes with one cover, my best basinge and ever of silver, and my towre silver flaggons'. She was to have for life the manor of Stowe, 'with Nynche churche and litle Stowe', in Northamptonshire, and the yearly rent of £60 at Beole, in Worcester. Katherine Parr also had a reversionary interest in the manors of Nonmonkton and Hamerton (Testamenta Eboracensia, VI, 160-1).
came to a staggering 139 manors in twenty-three counties. And this figure does not even begin to reflect the valuable perquisites attached to such ownership.

The actual administration of such a vast estate was beyond one individual, and most of the responsibility for managing Katherine Parr's properties had to be left to her learned council: John Bassett, surveyor; Anthony Bourchier, auditor; Sir Wymond Carew, receiver-general from May 1544 to September 1545; John Cock, attorney and, from September 1545, receiver-general; and William Sheldon, solicitor.

The oath taken by Anthony Bourchier in 1544 partially illustrates what was expected of the queen's counsellors. First of all, he was to advise the queen in her affairs 'to the good direction of or sayde sov[er]ane ladie her lyvelode & tenites w[i]t[h]owt parcialitie or exceptiaon not leving nor eschew[ing]g so to do for affection love mede doubt or dred of any p[er]son or persons except or soveraine Lorde the kinges maiestie'.

He was to keep the council's business strictly secret, and was not to accept 'gyfte mede ne good nor promise of good' nor 'receave ne admitte for the p[ro)mocion favoringe ne for declaringe letting or hynderinge of any matter or thinge to be treted or done in the sayde Counsell'. Rather, he was to further the council's business with all his 'might and power', and 'do al that

64. SP 1/196, f. 40 (LP, XIX, ii, 798).
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a good and trewe Councillor ought to do vnto his sayde sou[er]ane ladie so helpe yove god and all sayntes'.

On a more practical level, Katherine Parr's counsellors were concerned with auditing her properties and collecting her rents and outstanding debts. Between July and August 1544, over a dozen people were ordered either to pay their debts to the queen or appear before the council to give reasons why they should not pay. The council also seems to have been authorized to adjudicate complaints from the queen's tenants. On 7 February 1545, John Freman and his mother were summoned to appear before the council to answer charges made by Geoffrey Markam that the two had denied Markam access to a four acre land parcel belonging to the demesnes of Odinglie. A year later, on 26 February 1546, Sir Thomas Arundel directed that a dispute between Katherine Parr's tenants of Stokingham over some five shilling lands be examined and settled by four men who probably were the queen's local agents. The queen's council was to be notified if the tenants proved to be obstinate.

Although the council was diligent in collecting money owed to Katherine Parr, they were not always equally prompt in paying off the queen's outstanding
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69. P.R.O., SP 1/245, f. 84 (LP, Add., 1735).
debts. Stephen Vaughan, the king's agent in Antwerp, wrote repeatedly to Sir William Paget over the course of more than two years for the payment of money owing to his late wife, who had been a silkwoman to the queen. On various occasions, Vaughan asked Paget to intervene on his behalf with Sir Thomas Arundel, Walter Bucler, Sir Edmund Walsingham, and Sir Wymond Carew. When the queen’s council finally audited Margery Vaughan’s accounts, probably in late 1545, it disallowed many of the outstanding charges. Even the audit, though, did not bring the desired result: on 7 January 1546, the long-suffering Vaughan lamented that, although 'her graces cousaille abatyth me a good porcion of my said accompt, . . . yet still I remayn vnpaide'.

Undoubtedly Katherine Parr was kept informed about her estate, but just how informed is uncertain. It would appear that the queen’s councilors were given considerable latitude in the management of her affairs, and they issued orders and directions under the authority of their respective offices. The circumstances surrounding Anthony Bourchier’s appointment as auditor illustrates this observation. At the time of Bourchier’s appointment in November 1544, some of the queen’s lands were undergoing audit by William Knyyat, assistant to the
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previous auditor, Thomas Twesell. Bourchier apparently was anxious to take up his office and had expressed some concern that the fees which generally were due to the auditor would be jeopardized by Knyat's activities. Both Sir Thomas Arundel, the queen's chancellor, and Sir Wymond Carew warned Bourchier not to interfere, and assured him that he would be no loser in respect of his fees.\textsuperscript{72} Knyat himself was content for Bourchier to join him at Marlborough, where the audit was being conducted, but he stated in no uncertain terms that Bourchier would not be able to take part in the audit.\textsuperscript{73} John Bassett added his voice to the rest and assured Bourchier that his rights and prerogatives would not be prejudiced.\textsuperscript{74} It was not until December, however, that Knyat arranged for the account books to be delivered to Bourchier, who was to get a quarter of the fees due to the office of auditor, probably a reasonable exchange given that Bourchier was rewarded for work that he did not actually do.\textsuperscript{75} So while the queen may have been responsible for appointing Bourchier as auditor, it was her chancellor and councilors who determined the circumstances under which he took up his post.

\begin{quote}
Nor was Bourchier slow to adopt the administrative
\end{quote}
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style of his new colleagues. At the end of a directive to an unnamed individual in March 1545, Bourchier stated that 'this my l[ett]re shalbe vnto yove sufficint warrante' to carry out his orders.\textsuperscript{76}

Unfortunately, the council's official interactions with the queen are not as well documented as material concerning Anthony Bourchier's appointment might suggest. On one occasion, in September 1545, the queen directed Bourchier to notify all of her particular receivers that they were to make their michaelmas payments to her new receiver-general, John Cock.\textsuperscript{77} While this communication may have been unnecessary, since Bourchier probably would have taken such action on his own accord when notified of Cock's appointment, it does demonstrate Katherine Parr's attention to detail. This particular episode aside, the queen's contact with her council remains speculative.

However much independence Katherine Parr's council was permitted, it still would seem that important decisions, such as the appointment of officers, were left to the queen's discretion. This is not to say, though, that members of the council did not make their own collective or individual recommendations. Their influence over matters concerning the queen's properties might have been considerable. John Cock, for example, must have petitioned the queen on his own behalf in order to have been appointed steward of her lands in Essex and
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Hertfordshire. But because very few records concerning the queen’s council survive, it is impossible to determine how frequently the council, or individual members, might have intervened on their own or their friends’ behalf. What is certain is that, whatever their input, final decisions most likely remained with the queen.

All but one of the men on Katherine Parr’s council were new to their job. This probably was not the case, though, with the minor officials who looked after the queen’s properties locally. The queen inherited not only Catherine Howard’s dower lands, but probably also the minor officials initially appointed to administer them. This would explain why there was no onslaught of new appointments after Katherine Parr’s settlement in February 1544. But while Katherine Parr had no need in early 1544 to re-staff her properties across-the-board, she did exercise her prerogatives when given the opportunity.

On 9 April, 1544, a little over a month after receiving her property settlement, the queen appointed Sir Richard Manners as keeper of her lordship and manor of Fodringhey in Northamptonshire. The next year, on 8 June 1545, Sir John Bridges and his son, Edmund, were granted the stewardship of Beesly and Highworth in
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Two days later, the queen appointed Robert Warner particular receiver of her manors of Fodringhey, Nassington, Yarwell, and Owndell in Northamptonshire and of other lands in Huntingdonshire. In 1546, James Stumpe was given the keepership of Little Vastern, one of the queen's Wiltshire properties. And, shortly after the king's death, Sir William Paget was appointed steward of several of the queen's Worcestershire holdings: Bromsgrove, Kings Norton, Odingley, Clyfton, and Droitwich. Paget also was named keeper and ranger of the forest and park of Fekenham, and given the responsibility of her house or mansion of Fekenham.

The circumstances surrounding the promotion of these men illustrate the various forces at work in these kinds of patronage situations. Obviously, Katherine Parr would have known Sir William Paget fairly well: not only was he a prominent, high-ranking government official, but his wife was in the queen's establishment. How well the queen knew Sir John and Edmund Bridges is more speculative. Both men were at court in the 1540s, and were constables of Sudeley Castle, Katherine Parr's last
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home. After Sir Thomas Seymour's death, the property came into the full possession of the Bridges, and Sir John was created baron Chandos of Sudeley by Queen Mary in April 1554. It seems very likely indeed that the Katherine Parr knew both father and son by 1545. The queen was probably also well acquainted with Robert Warner through his membership in her household. He appears on an early subsidy assessment for Katherine Parr's establishment, and is listed as one of the queen's sewers on the 1547 ordinance for the king's funeral. And it seems likely that he is the 'Roberte Ward' named on the subsidy list for the queen's dower establishment in the early months of Edward VI's reign. This household link gives rise to the question of whether Katherine Parr appointed Warner solely at her own initiative, or whether Warner, or an intermediary, approached the queen first. The later two probably are the most likely, given that forwardness necessarily complimented ambition at the Tudor court. The process, however, by which Warner gained this office would in no way compromise Katherine Parr's right as a landowner to appoint whomever she pleased; in this particular instance, and for whatever the reasons, she was pleased to appoint one of her chamber servants.
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The connections Sir Richard Manners and James Stumpe had with Katherine Parr are slightly less easy to establish. It does not appear as though Manners had any direct tie with the queen prior to this appointment; rather, he seems to have spent most of his time in the north of England in the last years of the reign. But even this fact may be a link, since the queen had a strong affiliation with Northamptonshire in the form of her uncle, Sir William Parr of Horton. A similar situation may surround James Stumpe's appointment in 1546. Stumpe's grant was at the promotion of 'Mr. Seymour', or possibly, Sir Thomas Seymour, the queen's former suitor and future husband. Stumpe had one further connection to Katherine Parr in the form of Sir Edward Baynton, the queen's vice-chamberlain until his death in November 1544: Stumpe was married to Baynton's daughter, Bridget, by 1542, and later was to marry Isabel Baynton, Sir Edward's widow and Bridget's step-mother.

The local staff of Katherine Parr's properties did not change much during her time as queen, and neither, probably, did the queen's tenants. This is not to say, however, that the queen did not acquire new tenants, or issue leases to previous ones on occasion. At least two grants were made shortly after the queen was awarded her

---


89. *LP*, XXI, i, 963(34).

property settlement in February 1544. By an indenture
dated 17 May, Richard Darbie was granted a twenty-one
year lease of the site, capital messuage, and demesne
lands of the manor of Wyke in Dorset. 91 In July, Thomas
Lancastre was granted the site and manor of Clarehall,
alias Clarethall, in Essex for twenty-one years for an
annual rent of £6 13s. 4d. The right of wards, reliefs,
woods, and perquisites of courts, though, were
specifically excluded. 92

Katherine Parr made at least four grants out of her
holdings the following year. In May 1545, the queen
granted a twenty-one year lease to Edith and Robert
Maundrell of her Wiltshire manor of Rowde, including the
demesne lands, certain land called 'Cortlande', pasture
in the woods of Ballangers and Dangerwell Meade, and the
rents and services of all the manor tenants. The annual
rent came to £38. 93 The following month Maurice Walshe,
who was Katherine Parr's cousin by marriage, 94 was
granted, in fee for £519 12s 8d., the reversion of the
lordship, manor, park, and borough of Sudbury in
Gloucestershire. 95 In October, Sir Robert Tyrwhit, the

---

91. C.P.R., 1566-1569, 38 (no. 336).
92. C.P.R., 1557-1558, 17.
93. C.P.R., 1557-1558, 165.
94. Bridget Vaux, Sir Nicholas Vaux's daughter and
Maurice Walshe's wife, was Katherine Parr's first cousin;
Bridget and Katherine's mothers were sisters.
95. LP, XX, i, 1081(4). Curiously, in Walshe's
grant the property was stated to be in Gloucestershire,
while in Katherine Parr's settlement, it was said to be
queen's master of the horse, was granted leases of twenty-one years on property in Surrey: pasture land called Brome Close, (alias Lordes lease), a meadow called Watermeade, and a parcel of demesne land, all in Mortlake; and the mansion house of the manor of Wimbledon, including all barns, buildings, and lands attached thereto. The yearly rent of all this came to £30 7s. 8d. In December, the queen granted the advowson of the rectory of Myldenhall, Wiltshire, to three clerks, John Walker, Anthony Smythson, and William Coppege, who in turn apparently appointed one John Elton, alias Baker, to the rectory.

Katherine Parr made at least two more grants in 1546. In March, the queen renewed Roger Cutbert's lease of a messuage, two watermills, and the homes ('lez holmes'), mill-dams ('myldammes'), and waters belonging to Wormyngton, Northamptonshire. The new lease was for twenty-one years at the yearly rent of £6 13s. 4d. In July, John Oldnall was given a twenty-one year lease of the site of the manor of Rowyngton in Warwickshire and Leciestershire, certain attached lands, and the herbage of the wood called Rowyngton Parke. The woods, wards, fines, and advowsons were specifically excluded from the

\[96. \text{C.P.R., 1556-1557, 69-70.}\]
\[97. \text{C.P.C., 1547-1548, 192.}\]
\[98. \text{C.P.R., 1557-1558, 33-4.}\]
grant, which came to a yearly rent of £8.\textsuperscript{99}

Just after the king's death, Katherine Parr leased the manor, commandry and preceptory of Balsall, in Warwickshire and Worcestershire, to her cousin, Kenelm Throckmorton, for twenty-one years at the substantial sum of £47 10d.\textsuperscript{100} Katherine Parr probably made further grants during her tenure as queen, although just how many is impossible to say.

The local management of Katherine Parr's properties would have interested the queen's neighbors to some extent, but what probably generated most concern was the queen's influence over more substantial affairs. Although it often is difficult to determine the source of influence in parliamentary elections, it probably was no accident that a number of Katherine Parr's servants or dependants were elected in 1545 and 1547 to seats from areas where the queen's properties were concentrated. This was especially true in Wiltshire, where the queen was a significant landowner: she held the boroughs of Marlborough, Devizes, Heyworth, Wooton Bassett, and Chippenham, and numerous lordships, manors, parks, forests, and chases throughout the county. In 1545, at least six of the queen's servants and one dependant were elected to Wiltshire seats: Robert Warner was returned for Chippenham, Clement Throckmorton and Geoffrey Daniell for Devizes, William Sharrington for Heytesbury, John

\textsuperscript{99} C.P.R., 1557-1558, 18.

\textsuperscript{100} C.P.R., 1563-1566, 457 (no. 2567).
Bassett for Old Sarum, Hugh Westwood for Wooton Bassett, and Andrew Baynton for Marlborough.\textsuperscript{101} At least six of the queen's servants and one dependent were elected to Wiltshire seats in the 1547 parliamentary election: John Cock was returned for Calne, Francis Goldsmith and John Astley for Chippenham, Robert Pagman for Great Bedwyn, Kenelm Throckmorton for Devizes, Robert Warner for Wilton, and Dr. Robert Huick for Wooton Bassett.\textsuperscript{102}

Without a doubt, there were a variety of forces at work in Wiltshire during the 1545 and 1547 elections. Factors such as the strength of candidates' ties to respective areas and local interests cannot be ignored. Nor was Katherine Parr the only prominent figure in the county: her brother-in-law, Sir William Herbert, was

\textsuperscript{101}. Warner's and Throckmorton's membership in Katherine Parr's household has already been established; Daniell, who previously was surveyor to Catherine Howard (P.R.O., SP 1/157, f. 13 (LP, XV, 21)), was attached to the queen's household by at least September 1545, and probably earlier (LP, XX, ii, 463); Sharrington, who had connections to Sir Thomas Seymour, was a member of the queen's household by 1544 (Bindoff, The House of Commons, III, 302-3); Basset, as noted earlier, served on the queen's council as surveyor; Westwood was the queen's collector of rents for Marlborough in 1544-5 (Bindoff, The House of Commons, III, 593; LP, XX, ii, 463); and Andrew Baynton was the son of the queen's late vice-chamberlain, Sir Edward Baynton.

\textsuperscript{102}. Cock, as noted previously, served on the queen's council as attorney and receiver-general; Goldsmith, who had joined the queen's household in late 1543, appears regularly in the household documents of the period (LP, XVIII, ii, 531; P.R.O., E101/426/2, fols. 1v, 5; E179/69/44; LC 2/2, f. 46); Astley was the husband of Elizabeth's governess, Katherine Astley (or rather, Ashley) (Bindoff, The House of Commons, I, 345); Pagman apparently was in the queen's household from 1543 forward (Bindoff, The House of Commons, III, 46-7); Kenelm Throckmorton was the queen's cousin; and Dr. Robert Huick, as noted elsewhere, was the queen's physician.
influential both as a landowner and a knight of the shire, and the Seymour brothers also had an interest in Wiltshire, where their family seat, Wolf Hall, was located.

These family ties blur the issue of Katherine Parr’s parliamentary patronage in Wiltshire. While Sir William Herbert may have supported the queen’s candidates, he also made nominations of his own and may have expected reciprocal support from his sister-in-law. Difficulties also surround Sir Thomas Seymour’s possible involvement in the 1547 elections. However, it probably was significant that the queen’s servants who were elected in 1547 were men who had been in her service well before her fourth marriage. In fact, Seymour does not appear to have had any direct dependants among the thirty-two men elected for Wiltshire in 1547. The same could not be said for his brother, by now Protector Somerset: at least eight, and perhaps as many as a dozen, members elected for Wiltshire to the 1547 parliament had strong ties to the Protector.\footnote{Victoria County History, Wiltshire, V, ed. R. B. Pugh, (London, 1957), 115.} It seems unlikely that Somerset and his brother and sister-in-law pooled their interests, given the very strained relationship that existed between the two men by the middle of 1547.

The question of Katherine Parr’s parliamentary patronage would perhaps have been made easier if the returns for the 1539 and, in particular, the 1542
elections survived. It would then be possible to determine whether or not the queen's servants and dependants had been elected previously for the county. Returns for these two parliaments, however, survive for only two Wiltshire seats: Marlborough and Salisbury, and even for the former the names are uncertain.

Katherine Parr, then, probably was responsible in varying degrees for the return of her servants to Wiltshire seats in the 1545 and 1547 parliamentary elections. To what extent her influence may have extended into other counties, though, is less clear. The queen may have been responsible in part for Anthony Bouchier's election for New Shoreham and Andrew Baynton's return for Horsham in 1547, as Sir Thomas Seymour had gained control of the two Sussex seats shortly after Edward VI's accession.\(^{104}\) The rest of the queen's servants and dependents, though, who were returned in 1545 and 1547 for counties other than Wiltshire and Sussex all appear to have had particularly strong ties to their respective seats or areas, or to prominent and influential patrons other than Katherine Parr.\(^{105}\)

\(^{104}\) Bindoff, *The House of Commons*, I, 204, 208.

\(^{105}\) I refer specifically to: Sir Thomas Arundel (Dorset), Sir Edmund Walsingham (Surrey), Sir Robert Tyrwhit (Lincolnshire), Hugh Aglionby (Carlisle), John Throckmorton (Leicester), Kenelm Throckmorton (Warwick), and Nicholas Throckmorton (Maldon), in 1545; and to Sir Thomas Arundel (Dorset), Sir Wymond Carew (Peterborough), John Bassett (Glamorganshire), Hugh Ablionby (Carlisle), and Clement Throckmorton (Warwick), in 1547. See Bindoff, *The House of Commons*, vols. I-III, for their respective entries.
Although these men may have been attractive candidates in part because of their association with the queen, it would seem as though other local connections really were the decisive factors in their election.

Katherine Parr's influence in local affairs was not confined to parliamentary elections. The results of these other interventions, though, did not always produce a favorable result, as her correspondence with Dr. Matthew Parker, dean of the college of Stoke by Clare, clearly illustrates. By the king's grant of 22 February 1544, the queen had been given not only the borough and town of Clare, but the advowson of the college of Stoke as well.\textsuperscript{106} On 14 November, nine months after the king's settlement, the queen wrote to Dr. Parker stating that 'by credible report we are informed that the bailiwick of our college of Stoke is now void to dispose as you and certain other there shall think it meet and convenient'.\textsuperscript{107} Being so informed, 'we heartily desire you, at the contemplation of these our letters, to give the same office unto our well-beloved Randall Radclyff... who hath already the goodwill of three of those that have interest in the granting of it'. In order to expedite the appointment 'we doubt not but that you will shew and declare effectuously, confirmable to our desire in this behalf, according to the expectation that we have

\textsuperscript{106}. LP, XIX, i, 141(65).

\textsuperscript{107}. Matthew Parker, Correspondence of Matthew Parker, Eds., John Bruce and Rev. Thomas T. Perowne, (Cambridge, 1853), 16 (LP, XIX, ii, 613).
hitherto conceived in you'. However authoritative the queen's letter, Parker apparently did not give the office to Radclyff.\textsuperscript{108}

Only a few months passed before Katherine Parr again requested Dr. Parker's intervention. On 24 March 1545, the queen wrote to Parker on behalf of 'our well-beloved Edward Waldegrave, servant to our most dear and entirely beloved son the lord prince', about the manor and farm of Chipley in Suffolk, which was in the dean's gift.\textsuperscript{109} The queen wanted Parker to make-over the lease in reversion to Waldegrave, 'so that he may enjoy the effect of our desire (after the term expired of one Henry Hutton now farmer there) in as large and ample manner as the same Henry now holdeth it, and for so many years as you at the contemplation hereof can find in you heart to bestow on him for our sake'.\textsuperscript{110} By granting Waldegrave the reversion, Parker would 'not only acquire . . . a farmer well reported of for his honesty and good behavior, but also minister unto us grateful occasion to have your kind conformity thankfully in our remembrance, whensoever opportunity shall serve us to do you pleasure'.\textsuperscript{111}

And Dr. Parker had need of Katherine Parr's goodwill. The Chantries Act, passed in early 1545,

\textsuperscript{108} James, 'The Parrs of Kendal', 386.

\textsuperscript{109} Parker, \textit{Correspondence}, 19-20 (LP, XIX, ii, 613).

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Ibid}, 20.

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Ibid}.
authorized the suppression of colleges and the seizure of their properties by the crown. In a letter probably dating to the middle of 1545, Parker made a report to the queen's council in which he related his fears about the college being dissolved. He argued that the college was beneficial both to the queen and the local community: not only did it bring in £300 a year in spiritual rents, but its central location meant that it was able to provide the queen's tenants with alms and hospitality, and give their children an education. It also could offer suitable lodgings for the queen's council when they had business concerning the queen's local properties. He listed these items for the queen's information, no doubt in the hope that she would repeat them to the king and thus save the college from dissolution. What effect Parker's letter had on the queen is unknown, but Sir Anthony Denny certainly intervened with the king on the college's behalf, and Stoke was saved.

Katherine Parr also took advantage of her numerous parks and chases. In July 1543, the queen sent bucks to Cranmer and Lady Kingston. In August, the queen sent a stag to the duke of Norfolk. Before the end of the

113. Parker, *Correspondence*, 31-3.
116. Ibid, no. 196.
year, the duchess of Norfolk had also received a buck from the queen.\textsuperscript{117} Prince Edward received gifts of venison from the queen every month from November 1543 to at least February 1544.\textsuperscript{118} Edward probably continued to received such gifts from his step-mother on a fairly regular basis. Katherine Parr's payments for September 1544 indicate that she sent bucks to at least nine people: the duchess of Richmond, Lady Hennage, the countess of Hertford, Lady Russell, Lady St. John, Lady 'Hampton', 'Mrs' Denny, Sir Edmund Walsingham, lieutenant of the Tower and the queen's vice chamberlain, Sir Robert Southwell, master of the rolls, and unspecified others in London.\textsuperscript{119} The queen also sent venison to the king in Bologne.\textsuperscript{120} Although there is a gap in the surviving records, it seems likely that Katherine Parr continued to send presents of this nature to her friends and contacts throughout the reign. Certainly she was doing so after the king's death. A number of documents dating mainly to 1547 show the queen sending numerous gifts of does and bucks to friends.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid, no. 185.

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid, nos. 88, 99, 107, 148.

\textsuperscript{119} P.R.O., SP 1/195, fols. 180-180v (LP, XIX, ii, 688).

\textsuperscript{120} P.R.O., SP 1/195, f. 180v (LP, XIX, ii, 688).

\textsuperscript{121} E101/426/3, nos. 3, 6, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27, 28, 31, 44. Most of the documents in this file are very badly damaged. If more of the warrants were intact, they probably would provide yet more instances of the queen's generosity.
Katherine Parr was, and acted as though she was, a wealthy landowner. Although the queen had a council which served as an executive and no doubt advisory body, she seems to have exercised fully her prerogatives as a landowner when given the opportunity. She appointed minor officers to manage her properties locally and intervened on behalf of her servants and dependants in the 1545 and 1547 parliamentary elections. Her strong connections with the college of Stoke, and her property holdings in the near vicinity, gave her some reason to expect that Dr. Parker would look favorably upon her requests. Although he was unable to grant her petitions, for reasons which may have been out of his control, he obviously was anxious to retain the queen's good-will towards the college. And while the distribution of game among her friends and contacts may not have been a patronage situation in the strictest sense, such gifts were expensive expressions of her favor and were one further dividend from her considerable estate.

* * *

Katherine Parr's estate quite literally supported her royal dignity: it not only provided her with the opportunity to act like a queen, but gave her the means with which to look and dress the part as well. The importance of clothes to the Tudor monarchs can hardly be underestimated. Henry VIII was highly conscious of the
image he presented; it was an image that his son later copied. Queen Elizabeth's clothes, of course, had become almost an art form by the end of the century. The notion that 'clothes make the man', and the woman as well, was particularly applicable in this period. Sumptuary laws were regularly passed in an effort to prevent people from dressing above their station. Lady Mary Howard, of Elizabeth's household, made the mistake of dressing better than her royal mistress, and was humiliated by the queen for her presumption. The general idea was to dazzle and overwhelm the viewer, to present the image of a god or goddess and thereby helping to ensure the good behavior of the monarch's subjects. This image, though, was necessarily fragile, as there was no standing army to reinforce the display. Shakespeare knew this: Richard II's deposition speech, in which the king cast away the trappings of royal office bit by bit, was particularly dangerous. Even Henry V was subversive: Henry's continual play-acting suggested to the theater audience that monarchy was nothing but a well staged play with dazzling props designed to distract the far larger audience of subjects. The character Henry V even noted that the only thing differentiating kings from commoners was 'mere ceremony'. It was within this context that Katherine Parr was expected to take up her position as


123. Shakespeare, Henry V, IV, i, 238-84.
queen. She did not disappoint.

In the first few months of her marriage to the king, Katherine Parr began as she meant to continue, spending lavishly on a royal wardrobe. She ordered two Italian gowns, one of black velvet, the other of black damask; two French gowns, one of which was of black damask; a Venetian gown of black taffeta; and a Dutch gown, also of black taffeta. Six kirtles were made for the queen: two of black taffeta, one each of black damask, black satin, black velvet, and one of unspecified color and material. She ordered wide sleeves out of say, a pair of Venetian sleeves out of black velvet, another pair of sleeves of unspecified style in black velvet, sleeves for an Italian gown of black velvet, and five yards of frieze for pleats and sleeves. She bought a flannel petticoat and four French hoods. Additionally, she purchased cloth and materials which would have been made up into further garments. In total, the bill came to f8 9s. 5d. 124

124. P.R.O., SP 1/177, fols. 123-125 (LP, XVIII, i, 443). This tailor's bill presents some intriguing problems and questions. It seems highly unlikely that the bill was actually incurred or drawn-up on 16 February 1543, the date written to the left side of the first entry. Not even in this gift-giving period was it likely that the king would have given an as yet married woman the kind of enormous royal wardrobe that appears on this bill. Yet, curiously, the bill is headed 'My lady latymer', a title that probably would not have been used to refer to Katherine Parr after July 1543, by which time she was married to the king. My guess is that the bill refers to expenses dating from 16 February and forward. Lord Latimer died on 2 March, and it is possible that the king might have given Katherine Parr some gifts of clothing before her husband's death, and then many more when he had decided to marry her. Of course, it is just possible that the bill, signed by Sir Thomas Arundel, was misdated, and then later incorrectly headed by someone else.
Over time, Katherine Parr's tastes changed a bit. Between 1543 and 1545 she was dressing in crimson, purple, green, red, russet, and silver as well as in black. Her clothes were now made of purple tissue and scarlet, as well as the standard damask, taffeta, velvet, satin, sarsenet, buckram, and fustian. She ordered one French hood lined with satin; a pair of russet Venetian sleeves; two night gowns, one of black damask, and one of black satin edged with velvet and lined with sarsenet; two petticoats, one of crimson taffeta, the other of scarlet; four ells of black sarsenet to line a furred gown; two yards and three quarters of purple velvet to turn up a pair of sleeves for a gown of purple tissue; two partlettes of crimson velvet; seven cloaks, one made of scarlet, four out of black satin, one out of scarlet decorated with embroidery, and one made simply out of black cloth; sixteen yards of cloth of silver for a French gown; eight yards of the same cloth of silver for a kirtle with French sleeves; and small pearls for the border of a gown of crimson velvet.\textsuperscript{125}

Huetton the draper billed Katherine Parr for 'sumtar clothys' of unspecified design, made in yellow, red, blue, green, white and black. The bill, which appears to have been incurred in 1543 or 1544 though not paid until 1545 or 1546, came to f10 13s.\textsuperscript{126} Vast amounts of material and related items were delivered to

\textsuperscript{125} P.R.O., E101/423/12, fols. 3-3v, 5v, 6, 7, 8.
\textsuperscript{126} P.R.O., SP 1/217, f. 54 (LP, XXI, i, 645).
the queen's wardrobe of the robes throughout this period, although there is nothing to indicate how the cloth was eventually used. 127

A detailed description of Katherine Parr on a state occasion comes from the account of the duke of Najera's visit to the English court in February 1544. Pedro de Gante, the duke's secretary, recorded that the queen had received the duke 'in an animated manner'. After greetings had been exchanged, the group went into another apartment, where the queen commanded the duke to be seated for the ensuing entertainment. Musicians played while she danced with her brother, the earl of Essex. After they had finished, others were invited to take the floor. The dancing lasted several hours, after which the queen presented the duke with gifts. De Gante noted that Katherine Parr was a good dancer, and that she was praised as a virtuous woman. He also observed that she had a 'lively and pleasing appearance'. On the occasion that de Gante had seen her, Katherine Parr had been wearing 'a robe of cloth of gold, and a petticoat of brocade with sleeves lined with crimson satin, and trimmed with three-piled crimson velvet: her train was more than two yards long. Suspended from her neck were two crosses, and a jewel of very rich diamonds, and in her head-dress were many and beautiful ones. Her girdle

was of gold, with very large pendants'.\textsuperscript{128} Katherine Parr looked every inch a queen.

As de Gante's report suggests, Katherine Parr also had an impressive collection of jewelry. The inventory taken after Henry VIII's death lists numerous ornate crosses, girdles, gold bracelets and aglettes, rings, and brooches, to name only a very few items. They were heavily decorated with diamonds, rubies, emeralds, and the occasional turquoise and amethyst. In all, the jewelry that had belonged to Katherine Parr while she was queen took up eight pages, front and back, of the inventory.\textsuperscript{129} It really is no wonder that Sir Thomas Seymour was so anxious to establish that these items were Katherine Parr's personal possessions, rather than crown property: he went so far as to consult lawyers and petition Princess Mary on the matter even after the queen's death.\textsuperscript{130} Katherine Parr, though, was not destitute of ornaments in the last year and a half of her life. An addition to the inventory, cataloging the jewelry seized at the time of Sir Thomas Seymour's arrest, takes up another four full pages, and includes over two dozen rings, over three dozen ornate buttons, \textsuperscript{128} F. Madden, 'Narrative of the Visit of the Duke of Najera to England, in the year 1543-4; written by his Secretary, Pedro de Gante', \textit{Archaeologia}, XXIII (1831), 352-3.

\textsuperscript{129} Society of Antiquaries MS 129, pt. A, fols. 178-185v.

\textsuperscript{130} P.R.O., SP 10/7, f. 33v (C.S.P.Dom., 1547-80, 15); \textit{H.M.C. Salisbury} XII, p. 24; Haynes, \textit{State Papers}, 73.
fifty-three pair of aglettes, four biliments, six jewelled girdles and pieces of girdles, and other various items. The queen owned a number of books, and these, too, were also elaborate: most of them were garnished with precious stones and gilt with silver or gold. Her English New Testament and one of her two French editions were covered with purple velvet and garnished with silver and gilt. Her primmer was covered with crimson velvet and garnished with silver and gilt, while another small book of prayers was covered with purple velvet and garnished with gold. One of her most valuable books was of gold enameled black: the front and back covers each were decorated with a table diamond, while the book was garnished with a further twenty-eight small table rubies. With the exception of only a few items, the jewelry was still in the hands of the crown at the time of Mary’s accession.

Although the records are no doubt far from complete, Katherine Parr’s expenditure on clothes was certainly considerable, especially when it is remembered that the records cover such a short period of time, only three years and six months. We know a bit more about Katherine


Parr's jewelry, and from the inventories it is clear that she had all the accessories required for a queen consort. All of this puts Queen Elizabeth's legendary wardrobe, accumulated over a period of forty-five years, into perspective.

Katherine Parr shared her good fortune with members of her family and with her step-children. The queen's wardrobe expenses for 1543 to 1545 itemize a number of gifts of clothing for her brother, sister, cousin, and other distant relatives. The queen spent a total of £7 7s. on a gown of black satin for her brother, the earl of Essex.\textsuperscript{134} She spent £21 for twenty-eight yards of black velvet for gowns for Lady Anne Herbert and Lady Elizabeth Tyrwhit. Another £1 15s. was spent on lining the gowns with black sarsenet.\textsuperscript{135} The queen laid out another £1 7s. 6d. on three ells of blue sarsenet for lining a gown of blue velvet for Lady Herbert.\textsuperscript{136} Lady Maud Lane, the queen's cousin, was given a gown of black velvet lined with black sarsenet costing a total of £11 12s. 6d.\textsuperscript{137} Margaret Nevell, Katherine Parr's step-daughter, was given a petticoat made out of scarlet, costing 16s.\textsuperscript{138}

Katherine Parr's presents to Anne of Cleves and the king's three children one New Year's were impressive.

\textsuperscript{134} P.R.O., E101/423/12, f. 3v.
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid, f. 3.
\textsuperscript{136} Ibid, f. 3v.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid, f. 3v.
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid, f. 5v.
Anne of Cleves received a kirtle made out of seven yards of cloth of silver which cost £9 16s. Elizabeth was given a kirtle with sleeves out of the same cloth of silver, costing £8 8s. Katherine Parr spent a further £2 18s. 4d. on two yards of purple velvet for the remaking of a pair of sleeves for a gown of purple cloth of gold for her youngest step-daughter. Although the queen's gifts to Mary are discussed in full in chapter three, it is appropriate to note here that Katherine Parr was extremely generous with her presents to the princess. Prince Edward, of course, received the grandest gifts of all. The queen's first two presents were complete suits of clothes. The first consisted of a crimson velvet gown, richly embroidered and lined with crimson satin and taffeta. The coat, which was also heavily embroidered, was made of white satin and had eight gold buttons and eight loops of braided gold lace. The doublet and slops were also of white satin, and the doublet had a further eight gold buttons and loops of gold lace. It cost the queen £18 21d. The second suit of clothes were in mostly purple and white velvet and sarsenet, and cost £7 15s. 8d. Edward received yet one more gift, a doublet and slops made of cloth of silver priced at £4 4s. In

141. P.R.O., E101/423/12, f. 4.
142. Ibid, f. 7v.
143. Ibid, f. 7.
all, Katherine Parr spent f30 1s. 5d. on her step-son.\textsuperscript{144}

Katherine Parr’s surroundings also pointed to her royal status. As noted in chapter one, the queen’s apartments at Hampton Court were supplied with a number of expensive permanent items. From other documents, we get some idea as to what furnishings actually formed the regular household ‘stuff’ of Katherine Parr’s chambers, the ‘stuff’ which would have been carted from place to place when the queen changed residences. In February 1544, the queen paid f3 9s. to have five ornate clocks repaired. One clock was garnished with gold and seems to have been set in a silver lion’s head. Another was fashioned like a ‘hart’ and was also garnished with gold. A third clock must have been quite small, as it was supposed to hang around the neck.\textsuperscript{145} In July 1543, Katherine Parr had been billed for six leather cases designed specifically to transport the queen’s clocks.\textsuperscript{146} Fireplace instruments, such as forks, shovels, and bellows, apparently also accompanied the queen when she changed residences.\textsuperscript{147} And of course, the queen’s close stools always traveled with her. These were quite elaborate and expensive items. One such stool, made for the queen in July 1543, was made principally from crimson

\textsuperscript{144}. P.R.O. E315/161, no. 210, incorrectly gives the figure as f30 17s.

\textsuperscript{145}. Ibid, no. 83.

\textsuperscript{146}. Ibid, no. 118.

\textsuperscript{147}. Ibid, no. 56.
velvet and was decorated with ribbon and garnished nails. The seat was stuffed with quilting wool while the 'cestorn', or rather chamber pot, was made of pewter. A special carrying case constructed out of leather and lined with yellow cotton was made for it. In all, the total expenditure on the stool came to £7 13s. 1d.\(^{148}\)

Katherine Parr's accounts also reflect her tastes in entertainment. The queen had her own hawks and a pack of greyhounds for the hunt, and in July 1544, she was billed £2 4s. 8d. for work done on her crossbow.\(^{149}\) She kept parrots in her chambers and, in October 1544, was billed for a number of items bought for her privy chamber: these purchases included three geese and a hen for Jane the Fool. Presumably, the fowl were props for Jane's office.\(^{150}\) As de Gantes report of the duke of Najera's visit makes clear, Katherine Parr enjoyed dancing and was a fairly accomplished performer. The queen apparently had her own group of Venetian minstrels, and they wore her livery of red cloth.\(^{151}\) The queen seems to have enjoyed the company of her step-daughter, Margaret Nevell, and on at least two occasions she paid all of the traveling expenses incurred in having the young woman


\(^{150}\). *P.R.O.*, SP 1/195, f. 182 (*LP*, XIX, ii, 688).

\(^{151}\). *P.R.O.*, E101/423/12, f. 5v.
brought to court.152

* * *

Katherine Parr acquired the outward visible signs of royalty almost immediately upon her marriage to the king. She became a wealthy landowner in her own right and took advantage of the many perquisites attached to such ownership. Her vast estate enabled her to live in a style appropriate to her royal dignity, and she shared her good fortune with various members of her family. The only thing she lacked was real political power, and in the summer of 1544, she temporarily acquired even that: she was given an official position in the king's government.

152. P.R.O., E315/161, nos. 112, 132.
CHAPTER THREE: POLITICS AND PATRONAGE

By the spring of 1544, preparations were well under way for an English invasion of France. By an Anglo-Imperial treaty ratified the previous year, the assault was to be in conjunction with the forces under Charles V, and it was agreed that both armies were to be in the field by no later than 20 June 1544. But throughout the winter months of 1543 and early 1544, Henry's preoccupation was mainly with Scotland, not with France.

England's relations with Scotland were fragile under Henry VIII. In theory, the marriage between Henry VIII's sister, Margaret, and James IV was supposed to improve diplomatic ties, but in the end, it only further complicated the situation. The familial and political ties uniting England and Scotland were severely damaged when James IV invaded England in 1513 and was defeated and killed by English troops at Flodden Field. James's heir, James V, though only seventeen months old, was immediately crowned.

Henry may have hoped to control Scotland through his sister Margaret, who at first was on the regency council, but she proved to be an inept politician. Instead, as James V grew into manhood, Henry attempted to exploit his position as the senior member of the family. He invariably proposed treaties which greatly favored

England, and tried to break Scotland's traditional alliance with France.

The final breakdown in the relationship between the two kings came in September 1541, when James V failed to show up at a meeting Henry VIII had arranged to take place at York. After an embarrassing nine days' wait, Henry returned to London empty handed.² For the next few months, raids took places on both sides of the border, causing both kings to complain frequently to each other. By the fall of 1542, James was wholly bent on war,³ and while Henry himself preferred to intimidate the Scots by a token show force,⁴ he nevertheless was ready when James attacked. On 24 November 1542 the Scots suffered an humiliating defeat at the hands of English troops at Solway Moss. The defeat was devastating, both in real terms and in morale: James V died shortly after the battle, leaving his country to face not only prolonged negotiations with England for the return of some 1,200 Scottish prisoners, many of whom were from the nobility, but a long minority under James's infant daughter, Mary, queen of Scots.

In the Solway Moss prisoners Henry saw an opportunity to influence Scottish affairs, and in the

---


young queen, he saw a chance finally to bring Scotland under England's domination through the marriage of his son, Edward, prince of Wales, to Mary, queen of Scots. Hence, some of the more significant Scottish prisoners were bribed to support not only the marriage but a pro-English policy. The prisoners took the king's money and made many promises, most of which they never kept.\(^5\)

Nevertheless, in the Treaty of Greenwich, drawn-up and tentatively agreed to in July 1543, it was arranged that Prince Edward would indeed marry the young Scottish queen.\(^6\) Although nothing specific was said, Henry may also have hoped that this marriage would finally break Scotland's ties to France.

After the death of James V in December 1542, Henry supported the earl of Arran, who ruled as governor in the name of the infant queen, in opposition to Cardinal Beaton. Through most of 1543, Arran gave the appearance of favoring closer ties to England, agreeing, even, to the Treaty of Greenwich, but his defection to the cardinal's party in September placed all agreements (and expectations) in jeopardy. Although Henry himself had failed officially to ratify the Treaty of Greenwich, he nevertheless was outraged when Scotland's parliament


formally renounced all ties with England in December and renewed all previous alliances with France.7

In the new year 1544, Henry was in a difficult position: he was formally (and, most importantly, personally) committed to a war with France which he could not fight so long as Scotland remained a threat to England's 'back door'. Henry's solution to the problem was to order the earl of Hertford to sack Leith and destroy the city of Edinburgh, both tasks which the earl did with efficiency.8

The severity of Henry's outrage at Arran's defection was probably due in part to the king's desire to lead the invasion into France. He was no doubt unwilling to divide his army between Scotland and the continent. But the king could not afford to leave Scotland in a position to aid France or attack England during the projected summer campaign.9 Hence, the king's military strategy for the north had to be one of violent raids rather than protracted sieges and occupations.

Hertford's destruction of the Scottish country side in the spring of 1544 probably played some part in Arran's removal from office, and the appointment of the dowager-queen, Marie de Guise, as regent for her

daughter. 10 Although nothing was settled formally between Henry and the queen-dowager, the king nevertheless felt secure enough, after Hertford's raids, to pursue his ambitions in France.

Henry's determination to lead his troops into battle resulted in his establishing a regency for the duration of his absence. Before the king left for France, he named Katherine Parr regent and set up a council which was to assist her in the running of the government. That his choice fell on his wife should not necessarily be taken as an unusual move, for his first wife, Katherine of Aragon, had been named regent when he had last gone to war with France in 1513.

Historians of Tudor history have little to say about Katherine Parr's regency, which dated from 14 July, when Henry crossed to Calais, to 30 September, when he returned to England. Most historians note only the fact that she was indeed appointed regent, if they record anything at all. 11 L. B. Smith and C. Erickson, two biographers of Henry VIII, briefly observe that Scotland was of especial concern to both Katherine Parr and her

10. Ibid, 444.

council. Jasper Ridley, another biographer of the king, writes that, while the queen was 'more than competent as a Regent', 'every decision of importance' was nevertheless referred to Henry in Boulogne. His remarks, however, are only partially correct and are certainly insufficient, as will become obvious.

The scant attention paid to Katherine Parr's regency by previous historians might lead one to think that the two and a half month period was uneventful, and that Katherine Parr herself was merely a figure-head. Neither supposition would be correct. The Anglo-Scottish political situation continued to be unsettled, with a great deal of deception and double-dealing taking place on both sides of the border. Minor raids into Scotland were launched by the wardens of the marches, and a Scottish ship carrying important documents to France was captured. These exploits resulted in the taking of many prisoners, some of whom were quite important. Additionally, the queen and council were continually plagued with the problem of finding sufficient supplies and money to send to English troops both in France and in the north of England. Scottish border lords continued to present a problem, and there were isolated matters to be dealt with, such as resident Frenchmen in England, a land


dispute between the earl of Cumberland and John Norton, and a theft within the court.

It is clear from the evidence that Katherine Parr took a great deal of interest in these matters. Five proclamations were issued in her name,\textsuperscript{14} and there are ten extant letters written by her from this period, all but one concerning primarily matters of business.\textsuperscript{15} Even the one that does not strictly pertain to business is a dutiful letter professing love and affection for the absent royal husband.\textsuperscript{16} Although the king's council in France generally addressed themselves to the council with the queen, all the letters sent to London from the earl of Shrewsbury, lord lieutenant of the north, were written directly to the queen herself. Without a doubt, the council assigned to 'assist' Katherine Parr in governing the realm did most of the 'hands on' work. This did not mean, however, that the queen did not take an active role in governing. Rather the contrary, as many of the letters sent out by the council as a whole often were phrased in such a way as to leave no doubt that the


\textsuperscript{15} B.L., Additional MS 32,655, fols. 127-128v, 168 (HP, 288, 315); Additional MS 27,402, f. 39b (LP, XIX, ii, 58); Cotton MS Vespasian F III, f. 38 (LP, XIX, i, 967); Lansdowne MS 1236, no. 14 (John Strype, \textit{Ecclesiastical Memorials}, (London, 1721), II, App. 33); P.R.O., SP 1/190, fols. 155, 156, 221 (St.P., X, 12-4; LP, XIX, i, 980, 1019); SP 1/191, fols. 52v-53, 166 (St.P., X, 28-9; LP, XIX, ii, 136).

\textsuperscript{16} B.L., Lansdowne MS 1236, no. 14 (Strype, \textit{Eccl. Mem.}, App. 33).
council was acting on the queen's advice or even at her command.

The council established by the king to assist Katherine Parr was made up of five men from Henry's privy council: Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury; Sir Thomas Wriothesley, lord chancellor; the earl of Hertford, great chamberlain; Thomas Thirlby, bishop of Westminster; and Sir William Petre, secretary. Ideally, all five would be in constant attendance on the queen, although the king made provisions for the contingency that several of them might have to be absent on occasion. The varying degrees of confidence in which the king held these men may be demonstrated in his specific instructions that either (though preferably both) Wriothesley or Hertford were to be resident with the queen. If neither could attend, then Cranmer and Petre were to be in attendance. Thirlby, however, was not singled out.\(^\text{17}\) The queen's uncle, Lord William Parr of Horton, though not specifically on the council, nevertheless was to be 'vsed in counsail wth them for all suche matieres as concerne the realme'.\(^\text{18}\) Additionally, it was clear that Hertford was to take charge of the army in England should any emergency arise.\(^\text{19}\) Henry

\(^{17}\) P.R.O., SP 1/189, fols. 227-229 (\textit{LP}, XIX, i, 864(1 & 2), and 1035(78)).

\(^{18}\) P.R.O., SP 1/189, f. 227v. (\textit{LP}, XIX, i, 864(2)).

\(^{19}\) P.R.O., SP 1/189, f. 128 (\textit{LP}, XIX, i, 864(3)); \textit{LP}, XIX, i 1035(78).
apparently later decided that Hertford’s expertise would be better applied in France, and the earl was at Boulogne by at least 2 September.\textsuperscript{20}

It would appear that the rest of the council remained in close touch with Katherine Parr. Only occasionally does it seem that Wriothesley left the queen’s side, and even when he was away, it is obvious that he was acting on council business.\textsuperscript{21} It was chiefly Wriothesley who handled the securing of supplies and money for the king’s forces, and secretary Petre who dealt with the council’s correspondence.\textsuperscript{22} The degree of participation by Cranmer and Thirlby is unclear, although both regularly signed the council’s letters.

Henry left Katherine Parr a fairly evenly balanced council: of these men, Cranmer and Hertford held reforming sympathies, while Petre and Thirlby were conservative. Wriothesley would probably be best

\textsuperscript{20} LP, XIX, ii, 174.

\textsuperscript{21} P.R.O., SP 1/192, fols. 187-187v (St.P., I, 767); St.P., I, 796 (LP, XIX, ii, 206).

\textsuperscript{22} Bindoff, The House of Commons, III, 665; Scarisbrick, Henry VIII, 456; LP, XIX, ii, 192; P.R.O., SP 1/192, fols. 187-187v (St.P., I, 767); Emmison, Tudor Secretary, 54. The war with France was an administrative nightmare, and obviously there were many more involved in operations than I can mentioned here. Bishop Gardiner, for example, was deeply involved in England with victualling the army in France (Glyn Redworth, In Defence of the Church Catholic: The Life of Stephen Gardiner, (Oxford, 1990), 209-13). I am concerned here, though, with those men who were specifically named to the regency council and their relationship to Katherine Parr. See also C. S. L. Davies, ‘Supply Services of English Armed Forces 1509-50’, (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1963).
described as a 'king's' man, ever ready to follow the king's lead. And all had previous experience as privy councilors.

One of the primary concerns throughout Katherine Parr's regency was, of course, Scotland and given the complicated nature of Anglo-Scottish affairs, it seems likely that the queen was extensively briefed on the situation before her appointment as regent took effect. Although Hertford's raids had lessened the likelihood that Scotland would launch an invasion, it nevertheless was believed at the time that such an event was still a possibility, however slight.\(^{23}\) The request of an abstinence from war for twenty days from the dowager-queen in late July may only have fuelled suspicions. On 30 July the London council informed the council in France that, at the queen's command, they had ordered the king's lieutenant of the north, the earl of Shrewsbury, to refuse the dowager-queen's request. Compliance, the London council wrote, would not be in the king's best interests.\(^{24}\)

Instead, the wardens of the marches launched numerous raids into the Scottish country-side to deter the Scots from military aggression.\(^{25}\) The queen wrote to Lord Evers, warden of the middle marches, in July

\(^{23}\) HP, 280 (LP, XIX, i, 904).

\(^{24}\) P.R.O., SP 1/190, f. 213 (LP, XIX, i, 1014).

\(^{25}\) HP, 286 (LP, XIX, i, 945), 304, 313, 318, 326, 327(1) (LP, XIX, ii, 50, 154, 191, 274, 284); LP, XIX, ii, 33, 284.
congratulating him on just such a raid: '... forasmuche as it hath pleased my sayd lord tappointe me Regent of this his graces Realme in his hieghnes absence It is not a litle to our comforth to p[er]ceyve the towardnes of s[er]vice in such minstres as his ma[jes]te hath left behinde him in place of trust and service'.

She requested that lord Evers pass on her thanks to those who deserved it, 'Assuring you that as occac[i]on shal serve we shal not fayle to reteyn the same in o[u]r good remembrance/ and endevor ourself tadvance it to all your comforthes accord[in]gly'.

On 2 September both Lord Evers and his colleague Lord Wharton, warden of the west marches, were rewarded for their further efforts with a letter from the queen.

She reiterated her position as regent and wrote that, hearing of their diligent service, 'we haue thought good bothe to yeve vnto yow by thes o[u]r l[ett]res o[u]r right harty thankes for the same ...'.

She once more requested that her thanks be passed on to those men who deserved recognition, and assured them 'thatt we negthar haue fayled to reaport nor shall fayl to declare the same to my lord the kinges ma[jes]te ...'.

Finally, the queen required that they continue in their 'accustomyed

26. B.L., Additional MS 32,655, f. 127 (HP, 288).
27. B.L., Additional MS 32,655, fols. 128-128v (HP, 288).
28. B.L., Additional MS 32,655, f. 168 (HP, 315).
29. Ibid.
diligence in this behalf accordingly especially now in the tyme of ther [Scotland's] harvest so as ther corne may be wasted asmoch as may bee'.

Katherine Parr was not simply thanking two men for loyal service. Rather her letters were probably intended to inspire further exploits, as her remark concerning Scottish corn makes clear. She was not reluctant to take harsh action and her letters seem to reflect a calculated strategy.

This strategy of continual harassment was not confined to land. On 28 July, Shrewsbury wrote to the queen that a Scottish ship had been taken the day before just off the coast of Scarborough. Ten Frenchmen, eight Scotsmen, and one woman had been found on board. It was thought at the time that one of the men was actually Cardinal Beaton, although this identification eventually proved false. One of the Frenchmen, Shrewsbury reported, had placed some papers in a casket which he then put into a linen sack. The sack was then weighted down with a piece of coal and thrown overboard. Nevertheless, the casket was retrieved before it sank, and Shrewsbury forwarded the papers to London along with his own letter. The next day, 29 July, Shrewsbury reported that yet more papers had been discovered. Apparently the queen-dowager and the French ambassador to Scotland had commissioned the Sieur de Bauldreul to carry letters to


31. *HP, 293 (LP, XIX, i, 1000).*
Francis I. These letters included messages from not only Arran, Cardinal Beaton, and other Scottish lords, but from the queen-dowager as well, declaring their allegiance to France.32

Katherine Parr informed the king personally of the taking of these prizes on 31 July. She wrote that 'certen frenchemen and Scotts being sent w[i]t[h] divers l[ett]res and credence towards the ffrench king and others in fraunce' had been captured by some fishermen of Rye.33 She forwarded to the king the most important of the letters and commented that they clearly showed the 'crafty dealing and juggling of that nation'.34 The most important prisoners were yet to be examined, but the queen promised to keep the king 'further advertised w[i]t[h] diligence'.35

The king's council thanked Katherine Parr for her good news, and expressed the hope that the prisoners would yield yet more information.36 The council in the north, however, expressed doubt as to the usefulness of at least the Sieur de Bauldreul, who was, they noted, 'diseased in the hede w[i]t[h] the french poxe and also w[i]t[h] an other vnhonest disease'.37 Nevertheless, he

32. HP, 295 (LP, XIX, i, 1010).
33. P.R.O., SP 1/190, f. 221 (LP, XIX, i, 1019).
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.
37. P.R.O., SP 1/191, f. 54 (LP, XIX, ii, 40).
and several other of the prisoners were duly sent down to London on the orders of the queen's council.\textsuperscript{38}

The Sieur de Bauldreul was not the only important prisoner taken during these many operations. In a postscript of a letter written to Katherine Parr on 20 July, Shrewsbury reported that lord Evers had captured the Laird of Fernyherst and his son in a raid made into Scotland. This father and son duo, Shrewsbury noted, had 'ben alwayes notable enemyes to Englonde', and their capture was something of a coup.\textsuperscript{39} It became clear a few days after this letter that Fernyherst was quite ill, but whether he was injured in the raid is unclear.\textsuperscript{40} He was still unwell on 17 August, though by the 23rd he had recovered sufficiently to make promises of good behavior should he be released.\textsuperscript{41} On 20 September Shrewsbury wrote to Katherine Parr that the Laird of Cessford and others, being 'friendes and kynnesmen' to the prisoner, had also offered assurances for the release of Fernyherst. Shrewsbury 'humblie' beseeched the queen 'to advertise us of your gracious pleasure, what aunswer shalbe made unto them in that bihaulfe, whiche we shall accomplishe accordinglie'.\textsuperscript{42}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[38] Ibid.
\item[39] HP, 286 (LP, XIX, i, 945).
\item[40] HP, 290 (LP, XIX, i, 969); LP, XIX, i, 1012.
\item[41] HP, 307 (LP, XIX, ii, 99); HP, 310 (LP, XIX, ii, 128).
\item[42] HP, 325 (LP, XIX, ii, 262).
\end{footnotes}
There was one Scottish lord, however, who would not speak on behalf of Fernyherst, and that was Sir Walter Scott, the Laird of Buccleuch. Although Buccleuch was himself distrusted by the English, he nevertheless warned Lord Wharton at a meeting held on 25 September that Fernyherst was 'the falsest that ever was'.\footnote{HP, 327(2) (LP, XIX, ii, 293).} He told Wharton that he had a great treasure in his prisoner and that he should keep him locked up. Fernyherst had, Buccleuch continued, 'syrcumvened' Lord Evers and would 'syrcumvene' Wharton too if given the chance.\footnote{Ibid.} More about this particular encounter later.

The king's council informed Katherine Parr on 26 September that the offers for Fernyherst's release were not to be accepted, unless those offering were willing to serve the king unconditionally in all matters.\footnote{St.P., V, 397 (LP, XIX, ii, 302).} Fernyherst was still in English custody when the king returned to England on 30 September.

These successful raids into Scotland, however, did present problems. The Sieur de Bauldrell and Fernyherst and his son were important prisoners and so most likely were kept under special guard before they eventually were sent on to London. Those taken in the border raids who could pay for private accommodation were allowed to seek it, but the problem was that most of the Scottish prisoners could not afford such luxury. On 18 July
Shrewsbury wrote to Katherine Parr explaining that the wardens of the marches were facing a serious housing problem. The gaols were already full, and if they became further overcrowded, the council could expect many prisoners to die from starvation and disease, unless relief was forthcoming from the king. Finally, Shrewsbury requested permission to repair Bernard castle, not having thought it wise to act 'without knowledge of your gracious pleasure, wherof humblie we beseeche your grace to advertise us'.

He closed his letter 'beseeching your grace to signifie unto us your gracious pleasure in the same, whiche we shall accomplishe accordingly'.

At Katherine Parr's command, the London council forwarded Shrewsbury's letters to France. It reported to Paget that the queen indeed had given an order that, if the situation required it, some of the charges incurred in keeping the Scottish prisoners would be born by the crown until the king's pleasure was fully known. It also informed Paget that the queen had given her permission to repair Bernard castle, as long as the needed improvements were under 100 marks.

Securing supplies and money for the king's war in France very quickly became another major concern for Katherine Parr and her council. Obtaining and
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48. P.R.O., SP 1/190, f. 89 (LP, XIX, i, 943).
transporting these supplies was a time-consuming business. The London council wrote on 25 July that they had issued orders for 2,000 shovels and spades to be dispatched.\(^4^9\) Apparently they were not immediately sent, as in a letter from the queen to the king's council, dated 6 August, she indicated that Sir Robert Tyrwhit had just been sent to the Tower to arrange for the shipping of not only the 'proporción of ordinaunce mentioned in your said letters, w[i]t[h] the shot according', but 'also for 2000 shovells spades and mattockes'.\(^5^0\) Nor did the specified numbers seem adequate, as on 19 September the king's council requested a further 8,000 shovels and spades.\(^5^1\)

Shovels and spades, though, were not the only pressing needs. By early September, the king's army in France was running out of gunpowder. What the king had received from the English fortresses at Calais and Guisnes, and from Flanders, was already spent, and on 5 September his council wrote to London for fresh supplies. The king's council was so desperate, in fact, that it advocated the search of all ships in port, be they English or foreign, for powder which could be bought or borrowed.\(^5^2\) On 7 September, the London council wrote that, on Katherine Parr's orders, Sir Thomas Arundel had

\(^4^9\) P.R.O., SP 1/190, f. 158 (LP, XIX, i, 981).

\(^5^0\) P.R.O., SP 1/191, f. 52 (St.P., X, 28-9).

\(^5^1\) St.P., X, 75-6 (LP, XIX, ii, 258).

\(^5^2\) P.R.O., SP 1/192, f. 18 (LP, XIX, ii, 187).
been sent to London to arrange for the transport of what powder could be obtained.\textsuperscript{53} There was some urgency to this task, as on the next day, 8 September, the council in France wrote that the king required diligence in the matter.\textsuperscript{54}

Obtaining a supply of lead proved to be an easier proposition, although securing its transport to France presented its own problems. The London council wrote to the king on 17 July reporting what was currently ready to ship and when the rest would be available.\textsuperscript{55} Almost three weeks elapsed before the king's council responded. On 5 August it reported to London that only thirteen hoy's were willing to make the trip, and even then only to the English ports of Lynne, Boston, and Newcastle. Their advice was to send the lead over in English vessels.\textsuperscript{56} The next day, Katherine Parr wrote to the council in France that arrangements had been made according to their instructions. At the same time, however, she also informed them of her reservations concerning the security of English vessels, and suggested instead that 'somme ordre may be taken there my lord Admirall now being w[i]t[h] you . . . '.\textsuperscript{57} It was better, she wrote, that 'the said leade shuld remayn here then be w[i]t[h]
danger sent forth w[i]t[h]out more suertie of wafters then can here be provided with suche spede as the thing requyreth'.\(^{58}\) She would await their further instructions. She closed the letter by refuting a rumor the council might have heard, to wit, that the French had landed on English soil. This was, of course, untrue and she assured the council that 'all thinges here ar in very good quiet and ordre'.\(^{59}\)

The question over the lead is not taken up again in the records until 23 August. Owing to some mysterious letter out of Flanders, the king had decided to postpone sending for the lead, which was ready to be shipped from England. Even so, he also indicated that it should be made ready to ship at a moment's notice.\(^{60}\) This delay may have been related to the fact that troops were being mustered in England throughout this period. On 25 July, Katherine Parr wrote to the king that, 'where by my said lordes l[ett]res your ma[jes]tes pleasour was signified vnto me', the 4,000 men the council in France had requested to have in readiness had been arranged by her council.\(^{61}\) It may be that the king did not want what ships were available to be tied up with transporting lead when he might need them to transport extra troops instead. Indeed, on 8 September, the king's council

\(^{58}\) Ibid.

\(^{59}\) P.R.O., SP 1/191, f. 53 (St.P., X, 28-9).

\(^{60}\) P.R.O., SP 1/191, f. 158 (LP, XIX, ii, 129).

\(^{61}\) P.R.O., SP 1/190, f. 155 (St.P., X, 12).
wrote to London requesting that the troops be sent on to France.\textsuperscript{62} By the 14th, though, the council had changed its mind, and indicated that the troops were to be stayed but held in readiness. However, if money had been laid out for 'cotes and conduit' for any of the men, those provided for were to be sent forward.\textsuperscript{63} This last letter was not received in London before the 19th, at which time the London council wrote that most of the 4,000 troops would be in Boulogne by the time their own letter was received.\textsuperscript{64} Apparently, somewhere along the way, the troops were halted, as on 23 September, the king’s council was asking that they be directed with all diligence to Etaples.\textsuperscript{65}

In addition to securing material supplies, Katherine Parr and her council were deeply involved with the financial aspects of the war. On 17 July, only five days after the king’s departure, the London council wrote to France that they hoped to be able to send the king the enormous sum of f40,000 shortly after the end of the month.\textsuperscript{66} On 25 July, the queen referred the council in France\textsuperscript{67} to a letter she had just written the king, in which she reported on the London council’s progress. She
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began her letter to the king by saying that she was
'fully enformed, aswell of your ma[jes]tes good helth as
also of the prosperous beginnyng in yor highnes affayres
and p[ro]cedinges against yor ennemies . . .'. 68 After
reflecting that his successes were to the glory of God,
the queen informed the king that her council had given
order for the transport of the f40,000 and that it would
be conveyed via Clement Higham. In a post-script in
Katherine Parr's hand, the queen wrote that she could 'do
no lesse but advertisseth your maieste of the good
dyligence of your conseilours here who taketh muche payne
in the settyng forthe of your hiehnnes affayres . . .'. 69

On the 29th, Paget reported to London that transport
for the money had been secured, 70 and by 5 August it was
safely with the king in France. 71 More money apparently
was sent later in the month, as on 25 August Katherine
Parr reported to the king that, 'albeit I had not at this
p[oi]nt none occurruntes of importaunce to be signified
vnto yo[u]r highnes yo[u]r realme being thankes be to
almighty god in very good order and quiet', she
nevertheless wanted to inform him that Richard Higham had
just been dispatched with a further f30,000. 72

68. P.R.O., SP 1/190, f. 155 (St.P., X, 12).
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It seems that Katherine Parr and her council were just barely able to keep up with the financial needs of the war. The council in London wrote to the king on 5 September that it would send him £2,000 that week. It would further order that the £1,000 still held in the hands of Mr. Shelley, the purveyor of victuals for Berwick Castle, be turned over for the payment of the garrisons. These amounts, however, were but small change. Sir Richard Rich confirmed on 6 September receipt of the £30,000 and told Sir Thomas Wriothesley in London that, on its arrival, there was but £1,500 in his hands. And Rich reported that the new delivery would 'scarce satisfy' the payroll, which was due to be distributed on 8 September. He begged that the sending of the next 'mass' of money be accelerated, so that the 22 September payroll could be met on time. This 'mass' of money may have been the 50,000 marks the king's council requested, on the 23rd, to be sent for the end of September.

The king was desperate for money, and he was not above forcing loans from his more wealthy subjects, loans which the queen and her council were expected to collect. One such loan came from the bishop of Bath. The king had
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written to him requesting a loan of £3,000, and to quicken his response, the London council dispatched Sir Thomas Arundel to the bishop's home. Initially, the bishop denied having such a large amount of cash available, but he finally confessed to a store of £1,000 in old angel coins, £200 or £300 in current English money, and plate to the value of all the money combined. The bishop at first promised to do his duty, but instead sent his servant, Sir John Williams, to the king with only 1,000 marks total in plate and money. Besides defaulting on the full amount of the loan, the bishop had sent Williams across the channel without the London council's necessary permission, and Williams was summoned to appear before the council. No record of that interview survives, but the council in London reported to Lord Paget in France that the king could expect a further 500 marks from the bishop, but no more. The council also hinted to Paget that it suspected that the bishop was not as poor as he was now reporting. However, it was Williams who immediately suffered the council's wrath; he had crossed into France without license, the penalty for which was forfeiture of goods. The council wrote that they would take no further action until they heard from the king.77

Furnishing the north with supplies was only slightly less pressing a concern for Katherine Parr and her
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council than seeing to the king's needs in France. On 3 August, Shrewsbury wrote to the queen and her council that the northern garrisons lacked sufficient weapons; specifically, they needed powder, matches, spears, and even string for bows, 'of the which lackes it may please your grace to have remembraunce in such sorte, as the same may be supplied from thens at your most gracious pleasure'. These items apparently were not immediately forthcoming, as on 17 August Shrewsbury reminded London of their requirements. But the most difficult problem for those in the north concerned not material supplies but rather money.

Shrewsbury wrote to Katherine Parr on 2 August that little remained of the f5,000 that had been last sent to him by the council. Although all bills were paid up to the 26th of August, there was not enough left in the treasury to meet the next month's payroll. In fact, some wages apparently were outstanding from at least midsummer's day. Lord Evers wrote to Shrewsbury on 9 August asking him to see to it that his men were paid their back wages. Shrewsbury reminded the queen on 23 August of their financial situation. Sir Ralph Sadler had delivered to John Uvedale, the under-treasurer of the garrisons, all of the crown money that he had in his

care, and while Shrewsbury anticipated that this would be enough to meet the 22 September payroll, he also wrote that the expenditure would leave him with less than £200 in his hands. He warned that, if the garrisons were to continue to be manned, money needed to be forwarded in a timely fashion.  

By 2 September, however, all the money that Shrewsbury had in his hands had been paid out, spent, apparently, on victuals, bows and arrows, and wages for the border garrisons. Shrewsbury now reported to Katherine Parr that funds to meet the September payroll were lacking, and asked that 'it may please your grace to remember the supplie of the same in tyme, with suche a convenient furnyture as to your graces wisedom shalbe thought expedient'. Two days later, Shrewsbury wrote again, and said that 'the poure soudeours do not a little grudge and complayne for want of theyr wages'. Shrewsbury's pleas eventually were heard, and on 7 September he acknowledged receipt of letters from the council which informed him that £2,000 would be sent shortly. Nevertheless, Shrewsbury reported to the queen on 28 September that the warden of the east marches had recently written to him, 'wherein he complayneth of the lacke of his wages with others, and many of the
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souldeours of Berwyke be likewise unpayde'. But on 30 September, Shrewsbury's financial difficulties ceased to be the queen's, and the problems of the north reverted back into the king's hands.

The subject of supplies and money formed only part of the correspondence to and from the north of England. The kind of problems that the English had with many of the Scottish lords, especially those along the Scottish border, is illustrated by Lord Robert Maxwell and his son, also named Robert. Lord Maxwell had been captured, or perhaps had allowed himself to be captured, at the battle of Solway Moss, and like other of the Scottish prisoners, he had promised to further the king's interests in Scotland on his release. But by the time of Katherine Parr's regency, Lord Maxwell was back in English hands, and had been since May 1544. The council in London clearly distrusted Lord Maxwell's son, who wrote repeatedly for his father's release. Sir William Paget wrote from France on behalf of the council there that Robert Maxwell was to be told that, until he proved himself the king's good servant, he could
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expect little in the way of English assurances.\(^91\) Indeed, father and son had given the king little reason to trust them, but if Robert Maxwell's deeds were to match his promises, then, perhaps, the king might be willing to show them some favor.\(^92\)

But the London council's suspicions about Robert Maxwell proved correct and from the letters taken off the ship that was captured near Scarborough on 27 July, it was clear that he was bound, in writing, to the queen-dowager.\(^93\) And shortly afterwards, on 11 August, Katherine Parr's council confirmed receipt of a letter from Shrewsbury, who apparently had reported that Robert Maxwell's men had attempted some kind of raid on English territory.\(^94\)

As mentioned earlier, the laird of Buccleuch was another distrusted Scottish lord who figured in northern politics. Shrewsbury wrote to Katherine Parr on 24 August that Buccleuch had requested a meeting, but then had not shown up. Because of this, Lord Wharton was planning retaliatory actions against Buccleuch. If, after the raid, Buccleuch again asked for a meeting, it
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would be granted, 'onles in the meane season we receive any commaundement from your grace to the contrary'.

On 29 August, Shrewsbury reported to Katherine Parr that the raid on Buccleuch lands had indeed been successful, and on 25 September, Lord Wharton reported to Shrewsbury that he had had a meeting with Buccleuch and other Scottish lords. At that meeting Buccleuch told Wharton that he and his followers had supported the proposed marriage between Prince Edward and the young queen of Scots; he cited the fact that they had even put their seal to the document. And if the king had done the same, Buccleuch continued, 'these warres hadd not beyn bygun'. In short, Buccleuch placed the blame for all the unrest in the area squarely on the king, who had failed to ratify his own treaty. Nevertheless, if the proposed marriage were still to come about, 'he wold as trewly and dwtifully serve the Kinges highnes and my lorde prince, as ever any Scotishman did any King of Scotland'. Nor would Buccleuch be alone in his support; he would bring with him the services of 'Lorde Hume, Mark Carre of Litledon, Georg Carre, and all the Carres, except Dande Carre of Fenyhirst'. And he
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offered some advice, which was to keep both Lord Maxwell and the laird of Fernyherst well locked up.\textsuperscript{100}

Buccleuch called this meeting apparently in order to ask for an assurance for one month or, barring that, for twenty days, an action which Shrewsbury interpreted as simply being a means of buying time.\textsuperscript{101} Katherine Parr and her council agreed with Shrewsbury, and wrote to him on 29 September that Buccleuch’s request probably was a move to save the Scottish harvest.\textsuperscript{102} Assurances, therefore, were not to be given.

One Scottish lord whose loyalty remained unquestioned was Matthew Stewart, earl of Lennox, who was married to the king’s niece, Margaret Douglas.\textsuperscript{103} On 9 August, Katherine Parr forwarded letters to the king which she had received from the earl. She attributed Lennox’s successes to date primarily to the fact that he ‘hath given himself to serve such a master whom god doth ayd & support in all things’.\textsuperscript{104} The queen further pointed out that the earl could have chosen to serve 'the French King his old master many yeares & not have
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attayned such a victorie of his enemyes'. 105

Unfortunately, and despite the earl’s apparent loyalty to the king, Lennox was unable to fulfill his promises. During August, Lennox attempted to take Dumbarton, but as Shrewsbury reported to the queen on 4 September, his efforts ended in failure. 106 On 26 September, Marie de Guise wrote to Francis I denouncing Lennox as a fugitive. 107

*  *  *

Scotland, menacing as it may have seemed, was not the only threat to England's security. The question over French residents became an issue early on in the regency. On 19 July, Katherine Parr issued a proclamation stating that those who had previously applied to be made denizens of the country were to report to Lord Chancellor Wriothesley's house to see if their names had been recorded in the roll signed by the king. If they found their names on the roll, they were to sue out their patents before 1 September. All others were to leave the realm. 108
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Although the proclamation seemed clear enough, questions nevertheless did arise. On 5 September, the London council reported to the council in France that commissioners in some of the western counties had encountered French residents who were not on the rolls, but who also had no desire to leave the country. Indeed, some of the residents were quite old and had raised their families in England. Additionally, the commissioners questioned the safety of deporting French mariners who obviously knew the English coastline well and who were also anxious to secure denizenship.\(^{109}\) On 8 September, the council with the king indicated that the French residents in the west were to be allowed to stay, and that they would be admitted as denizens after the king's return.\(^{110}\) A week later, the London council asked that the exemption be extended to other parts of the realm,\(^{111}\) permission which was granted on 26 September.\(^{112}\)

In spite of these exceptions, there was good reason for issuing the proclamation. On 15 September, the London council reported to its counterpart in France that French ships had been harassing the southern coast, taking fishermen as prisoners and then demanding high
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ransoms for their release. On 23 August, Sir Anthony Knyvett, Richard Caurden, and John Chaderton reported to London that French ships of war had been frequenting the coast of Sussex and the southern side of the Isle of Wight, and had captured some forty small boats and their crews to date. Because of this constant threat, the three men had armed their own boat, an investment which paid off when the boat encountered a French ship. Caught off guard, the French ship hoisted too much sail and the wind caused the ship to tilt; it took on water and sank. Everyone on board was drowned except for a man and a boy, both of whom were being sent to London for further examination.

Other domestic problems seemed minor in comparison to all these affairs. On the day that Katherine Parr issued the proclamation concerning French residents, her council wrote to Shrewsbury that the earl of Cumberland's land dispute with John Norton was, at best, ill-timed. Shrewsbury was to settle the affair and inform the queen and her council of his dealings.

A theft at court, though, appears to have been a far more serious matter. One of the maids of honor had some goldsmith's work stolen by her boy servant. The boy was arrested and expected to lose his life for the offence. In light of the boy's repentance and youth, the council

---
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wrote to France on 28 September asking for clemency.\textsuperscript{116}

It can only be assumed that the king, who arrived back in

England only two days later, granted the council’s

request.

* * *

The power and authority which Katherine Parr had
during her regency can be measured in several ways, the
first, and perhaps most obvious, being to look at how she
was regarded by those around her. As noted earlier,
Shrewsbury invariably addressed his remarks and appeals
directly to the queen, while her council often indicated
that their letters and advice to Shrewsbury were at the
queen’s command and under her guidance. And scattered
throughout the London council’s letters to France are
references to the fact that they were acting on the
orders of the queen. These points have already been
noted. But perhaps the best illustration yet of the
relationship between Katherine Parr and her council may
be demonstrated by a letter Wriothesley wrote to the
council in late September.

The lord chancellor was in London, arranging for
more men to be sent on to France, when he received
letters from Lord Lisle, the lord admiral, and Sir
William Paget in France requesting that certain ships be
put to sea. Wriothesley acted immediately. On 25

\textsuperscript{116} LP, XIX, ii, 324.
September he wrote to the council with the queen that 'wherin if I haue not taken the best wayes/ I shal beseche the quenes highnes most humbly to p[ar]don me/ And for that in o[ur] l[ett]res we vse her graces name and auctoritie befor the l[ett]res com to her handes surely me thought it was not mete to lose somoch tyme as to sende to Oking and tary thanswer bak again befor doing of any thyng'.

117 The procedure usually adopted by the queen's council seems clear: the council drafted correspondence which was then passed on to Katherine Parr for her perusal and approval. In this case, Wriothesley had determined that the situation demanded immediate action, and so had acted on his own initiative. And although he did not anticipate a reprimand from the queen because of his actions, he nevertheless provided for such a contingency by stressing his willingness to take responsibility.

The relationship between Katherine Parr, her council, and the council with the king in France is less easy to determine. It would appear that the two councils generally did business directly with each other without intermediaries. This does not mean, however, that Katherine Parr was not fully involved in or informed about affairs concerning the war in France. A review of the letters that the council in France sent to the queen is in order. In her letter to the council in France, dated 25 July, it is clear that the king's council did
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indeed write to the queen; she thanked them for their communications and referred her answers to them to a letter she had just sent the king. As appears by yet another of the queen’s letters, the council in France wrote to her again on 4 August. Only a day later, the council wrote to her once more, this time just after having heard about the capture of the French ship: 'And as touching such awnswers as be written by Your Grace and the Counsail ther to the Lordes of the North for their procedinges there, His Majeste likith very wel, and acceptith the same very thankfully, thinking that better could not have bene devised ...'. They closed the letter with a request for more artillery, praying that 'Your Grace to yeve ordre that the same, with theyr shott and all other appertenances, may be sent hither with all diligence possible'. From these documents, we might assume that the council in France wrote directly to the queen at least occasionally, and perhaps more often.

A further indication of Katherine Parr's involvement can be found in the five proclamations issued in her name. As noted earlier, the king had been out of the country only five days when a proclamation concerning
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resident Frenchmen was issued by the queen.¹²² The proclamation required that resident Frenchmen check with the lord chancellor to see if they were registered with the government; those who were not were to leave the realm. The document stated that violators would be subject to penalties specified in a similar proclamation, issued in June. The earlier document determined that the galleys and 'otherwise' would be appropriate punishment. In light of the earlier document, it may be that the king ordered the July proclamation just before he set out for France. Nevertheless, it was Katherine Parr who signed it.

The second proclamation came on 18 August, was addressed to the mayor and sheriffs of London, and concerned the pricing of armor.¹²³ The war in France had inflated prices, and this proclamation, 'made by the advice and consent of his grace's most honorable council', set a limit of 9s. 6d. on armor.¹²⁴ The officials of the city were to see to it that these regulations were enforced. Violators could expect 'imprisonment without bail or manprize and to lose and forfeit £5 sterling for every pair sold contrary to this

¹²². Hughes and Larkin, Tudor Proclamations, I, 336-7 (no. 234).
¹²³. Ibid, 337-8 (no. 235).
¹²⁴. Ibid.
his highness' proclamation'. Again, the proclamation bore Katherine Parr's signature.

On 5 September the council in France wrote to the London council giving instructions for a proclamation to be issued touching the arrest and trial of deserters from France. The proclamation, duly issued on 10 September and made 'by the advice of his [majesty's] most honorable council', charged the justices of the peace 'to examine all such persons as shall come from the army' in France, and if they lacked 'sufficient passport and license for their return', they were to be imprisoned without bail. Katherine Parr signed the document accordingly.

On the day that the king actually returned to England, 30 September, another proclamation was issued which rectified a problem related to the 19 July proclamation concerning French residents. As stated earlier, the London council discovered that there were a large number of French residents who wished, for very good reasons, to remain in England but whose names did not appear on the lord chancellor's rolls. They informed the council in France about the situation and were told on 8 September that another proclamation would be issued which would grant denizenship to those who wished to stay
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in England. The proclamation of the 30th provided that 'all Frenchmen which be not yet denizens nor have not entered their names before the said Lord Chancellor of England shall by his gracious toleration remain, dwell, and abide within this his highness' realm without any punishment, danger or forfeiture to them . . . '. The document was signed by the queen.

All four of these proclamations appear to have been issued on the orders of the king. The language contained in them was entirely masculine: it was 'his highness' realm', 'his pleasur', 'his gracious toleration', and 'his present proclamation', and it was the king who 'straightly chargeth and commandeth'. Nevertheless, it was Katherine Parr's signature which appeared on them, and thus by her authority that they were actually issued. She may not have been involved in their drafting, but she certainly was aware of their contents and probably would have been expected to see them enforced. The queen and her council may, though, have been more directly involved in issuing the proclamation of the 30th, given their earlier report concerning resident Frenchmen. The fifth proclamation of the regency, however, was probably Katherine Parr's own initiative.

On 18 September, Katherine Parr issued a proclamation restricting access to her court on account of the plague. The danger to 'her grace's person, the
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Prince's grace, and other the King's majesty's children' seemed so great that the queen, by virtue of her position as 'general regent of the realm in the King's majesty's court', 'straightly chargeth and commandeth' that persons from plague areas be forbidden the court. Those who violated the proclamation did so 'upon pain of her grace's indignation and further punishment at her highness' pleasure'.

The fact that there was no mention of her having acted on the advice of her council suggests strongly that this proclamation was entirely Katherine Parr's initiative. Significantly, the king was mentioned only to indicate the queen's position as regent and to identify whose children were in danger. In terms of precedence, this proclamation was certainly no less important than the other four. In fact, it may have been more important, if only because there was an actual and immediate threat to the health of the king's heir, Prince Edward. Katherine Parr's very real concern for the prince's health may be illustrated by the fact that she frequently closed her letters to the king and his council at this time with the information that the prince, and 'the rest of the kinges ma[jes]te my lorde's children', were well.
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Katherine Parr's letters also clearly reflect her deep involvement in affairs at this time. They are quite detailed and indicate a complete understanding of the subjects which she discusses. Nothing, apparently, was too trivial for the queen's attention: not 2,000 shovels or spades; the shipment of lead; or musters for 4,000 men. The queen was obviously concerned about the transport of money for the king's army in France, and personally notified him at least twice of its imminent shipment. She wrote letters of congratulation and encouragement to those who deserved it, commended men to the king who had served him well, and generally kept the king informed of affairs in England. Nor was Katherine Parr distracted from domestic duties. She looked diligently after the health of the king's children, and wrote a letter of support for one of her servants, an action which will be discussed shortly. Indeed, the one surviving letter from the king to queen indicated quite clearly what he expected of his regent.

On 8 September, the king dictated a letter to Katherine Parr in which he reported that his troops occupied most of Boulogne and that he expected to take the rest when he received the much needed powder supplies. Already the French king was suing him for peace, Henry noted. But after having sent to discover Charles V's demands regarding any peace, Henry informed his Imperial ally of his own requirements: payment of his French pension, which was in arrears; reimbursement
for the damage he had suffered from the war; and, most impossible of all, the duchies of Normandy, Acquitaine, and Guyenne. Although Henry apparently suspected Francis I of approaching Charles V for peace terms, despite the French king's assertions to the contrary, he also seemed to believe that the emperor would reject any conciliatory moves on the part of the French. All of this information the king wished Katherine Parr to convey to her council. And finally, where she inquired about appointing certain women into her service, in place of those in her household who were ill, he believed that some she had named were also too weak to serve. Nevertheless, he wrote that she could 'take them into your chambre to passe the ty[me] w[i]t[h] you at playe . . .'.\(^{133}\) In a post-script, written in the king's own hand, he gave the queen an up-date of his affairs. He closed, saying 'nomore to you att thys tyme swethart bothe for lacke off tyme and grett occupation off bysynes sawyng we pray you to gyff in our name our harte blessynge to all our children and recom[m]endations to our cousin margrett and the rest off the lades and gentyll women and to our co[n]sell allsoo/ wryttin w[i]t[h] the hand off your lovyng howsbande'.\(^{134}\)
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Henry's letter indicated quite clearly that he recognized Katherine Parr's considerable abilities. He was not writing to a mere figure-head, but rather to an individual who had full command of the situation. He was writing to the woman he had designated as his representative, and in his letter it was tacitly understood that he expected her to be as well informed as himself. And while he questioned some of the women she had chosen to serve her, he nevertheless allowed her to appoint whomever she wanted.

There is one final letter of this period from Katherine Parr which does not fit into a 'business' category. Addressed to the king, it is a carefully composed protestation of her love and affection. She opened her letter by stating that she could not 'quyetly pleasur in any thynge, vntil I here from your maiestye', and while there was good reason for the king to be away from her side, 'yett love and affection compelleth me to desyre your presens'.\textsuperscript{135} Nevertheless, she was content to accept his 'wyl and pleasure'. She acknowledged the favor the king had shown her, just as she would acknowledge God 'for hys benefyts and gyftes heped apyon me dayly', and while not being able to express her thanks sufficiently, yet she trusted in God's 'good wyll' and the king's 'gentylnes'.\textsuperscript{136} Lest the king found her
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writing 'tedyouse', the queen closed her letter, 'commytttyng you in to the gouernance of the lord wy[i]t[h] long lyf and prossporous feylcite hare, & after [th]ys lyf to enjoy ye kyngdom of hys elect'.

Katherine Parr's letter seems to be a conventional statement of a wife's dutiful, even biblical submission to her husband. Her indirect comparison of Henry VIII to God was no accident; the king was God's representative on earth, just as a husband was equally the head of the family, images which Katherine Parr combined neatly into one. She was the deferential wife, love making her 'in all thynges to set apart myne own com[m]odyte and pleasure, and to embrace moost joyfully hys wyl and pleasure whom I love'.

It is tempting to suggest that this very conservative statement was one which the king fully expected his wife to write as a matter of course, and knowing the king's expectations, the queen obliged him. But while duty was emphasized, it was tempered with words of love and affection, words which Katherine Parr may have meant sincerely at the time.

* * *

One final measure of the degree of Katherine Parr's authority and involvement in affairs at this time may be illustrated by a comparison of her regency to that of
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Katherine of Aragon. Aside from his sixth wife, Katherine of Aragon was the only other person Henry VIII ever trusted enough to name regent. Although there was some talk of leaving Anne Boleyn in charge in 1534, when Henry was making plans to meet Francis I at Calais, and leaving Jane Seymour as head of the London government while Henry went north to deal with the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536, only the king’s first and last wives were actually given the regency.\(^{139}\)

Katherine of Aragon, the daughter of Queen Isabella of Castile and King Ferdinand of Aragon, had been at the English court, and often in the center of English politics, since 1501. Consequently, she was no novice when her father formally appointed her his ambassador to the English court in 1507.\(^{140}\) While Ferdinand appointed a new ambassador in 1510 to take Katherine’s place after her marriage to Henry VIII in 1509, there was no question that it was really Katherine who represented her father’s interests at the English court.\(^{141}\) And although Ferdinand took outrageous advantage of his son-in-law during his daughter’s early married years, he was always able to defend himself plausibly to Katherine, who was then able to persuade Henry of her father’s good
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intentions. Hence, in 1513, when England and Spain went to war with France, Henry had every reason in the world to appoint his wife regent during his absence on the continent: she was well educated, experienced, trusted, and Henry was still in love with her.

Katherine of Aragon's regency, from 30 June to early November, was of longer duration than Katherine Parr's, but the concerns of these two women were remarkably similar. Both were plagued with problems of supplying an English army in France and defending the north from a Scottish invasion. The first task Katherine of Aragon did with apparent efficiency. The second she did with considerably more courage and style.

The defeat of the Scots at the battle of Flodden Field proved to be the real highlight of England's military campaigns in 1513. James IV's letter of defiance reached Henry VIII on 11 August, and Katherine made preparations for war. There was no time to waste: in a letter to the mayor and sheriffs of Glocestershire, Katherine rebuked their slow response to the national danger. Because of Katherine and her council's foresight, the north was well prepared when
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James IV and the old earl of Surrey met at Flodden Field on 9 September. Katherine herself had planned to be in the north of England in time for the confrontation, and in early September had set out from London with troops from the home counties and artillery from the Tower.¹⁴⁷ She may have hoped to lead her army into battle as her mother had done so many times against the Moors, but she was still on her way north when news of Surrey's victory reached her.¹⁴⁸

Katherine reported the victory to the king on 16 September with a paradoxical sense of pride and due humility. She wrote that there was 'nood nede herin to trouble your grace w[i]t[h] long writing but to my thinking this batell hath bee to your grace and al your Reame the grettest honor that coude bee/ and more than ye shuld wyn al the crown of ffraunce'.¹⁴⁹ The victory, though, was not theirs alone, and the queen expressed a hope that the king would not forget to thank God accordingly. 'My husband', she wrote, 'for hastynesse . . . I coude not sende your grace the pece of the king of scotts cote whiche John Glyn now bringeth in this your grace shal see how I can kepe my premys, sending you for your baners a kings cote',¹⁵⁰ Initially, she had wanted

¹⁴⁷. Mattingly, Catherine of Aragon, 121.
¹⁴⁸. Erickson, Great Harry, 93.
¹⁴⁹. B.L., Cotton MS Vespasian F III, f. 15 (Ellis, Original Letters, 1st s., I, 88-9).
¹⁵⁰. Ibid.
to send the dead king's body, 'but our englishemens hertes wold not suffre it'.\textsuperscript{151} Instead, she asked what arrangements the king wanted her to make for the burying of James IV.\textsuperscript{152}

Katherine's letter to Cardinal Wolsey of the same date was only slightly more reserved. The queen wrote that the victory was a great 'gift that almighty god hath sent to the king'.\textsuperscript{153} It was, she continued, 'soo m[ar]velous that it seemeth to bee of godds doing aloone', and she repeated her earlier hope that 'the king shall remembre to thanke hym for it'.\textsuperscript{154}

Although Katherine had earlier written the king that it would have been better for James IV to have maintained the peace than to have suffered 'this rewarde',\textsuperscript{155} she nevertheless apparently offered some sympathy to her widowed sister-in-law, Margaret, queen of Scots. On 11 November, Margaret wrote to Katherine and thanked her for her kind letters, which had arrived on the 6th. Desiring to be remembered to her brother, Margaret also expressed the hope that her brother's kindness would now be shown to her adopted land.\textsuperscript{156}
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After the defeat of the Scots, Katherine disbanded her army and greatly reduced the earl of Surrey's forces, perhaps in the hope that Henry would now be able to influence Scotland's affairs through family ties rather than through conquest.\textsuperscript{157} Although there is no letter from the king in response to the news of this great victory, it seems likely that there must have been one.

After Flodden Field, there could have been no doubt in Henry's mind that Katherine was indeed a worthy representative, and that he had left his kingdom in the care of a woman who was well suited to the task of governing. In the only surviving letter of the period from Henry to Katherine, dated 16 July, he asked her to summon William Warham, archbishop of Canterbury and lord chancellor, to appear before her and several of her council in order to answer charges that he had interfered with John Incent, commissary to Richard Fox, bishop of Winchester and lord privy seal. She was to order the archbishop to cease his interference and to obey certain ordinances made previously between the prelate and other bishops. She was to write the king and let him know of the archbishop's conformity.\textsuperscript{158}

Almost a month later, in a letter dated 14 August, the archbishop made his defense directly to Katherine, and denied having ever troubled John Incent. He believed that the entire affair was a design to bring him into
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disfavor with the king and he expressed some surprise that Winchester would trouble the king and queen at a time when their thoughts were preoccupied with more important and pressing matters.\textsuperscript{159}

Despite the date of the archbishop’s letter, Katherine apparently did not receive it until the middle of September. On the 16th of that month, Katherine wrote to Wolsey that she had frequently asked the archbishop for his answer, ‘whiche I coude neu[er] haue til now’.\textsuperscript{160} She asked him to ‘excuse me to the king for the taryeng of it soo long for I coude haue it noo sonner’.\textsuperscript{161}

Thus, the only letter we have from Henry to Katherine during her regency charged her to investigate a dispute between two of England’s highest churchmen who were also well placed in the government. It was at the king’s command that Katherine, and not her council, took the lead, and it was to her that the archbishop made his reply. And it was Katherine who took the pains to get that response and convey it to Wolsey.

Based upon Katherine’s own letters, Henry evidently did not write his wife very often;\textsuperscript{162} instead, Katherine seems to have relied on Wolsey for information about the king. She continually asked, almost begged, Wolsey to
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send her news, however trivial.\textsuperscript{163} Apparently, the usual practice was for Wolsey to send a letter back with every messenger that brought one of hers to him.\textsuperscript{164} Consequently, Katherine worked mainly through and with Wolsey.

The small council named to assist Katherine was headed by William Warham, archbishop of Canterbury and lord chancellor, and Sir Thomas Lovell,\textsuperscript{165} both older men who had served on Henry VII's council.\textsuperscript{166} Additionally, the old earl of Surrey had been commanded to remain in England and guard the north, probably under Katherine's guidance, as she also had been named captain-general of the home forces.\textsuperscript{167} Although all three men had had considerable previous experience, it seems to have been Katherine who governed, not her council.

Katherine of Aragon and Katherine Parr clearly were active regents. Had Flodden Field occurred a week or so later, Katherine of Aragon probably would have been as close to the battle as good sense permitted. While Katherine Parr did not have an opportunity to lead an
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army north, she nevertheless advocated an aggressive policy against the Scots. Both women obviously were expected to attend personally to the king's affairs, as the disagreement between Warham and Winchester and the shipment of money and supplies demonstrated, and they kept their husband informed of their progress through various means: Katherine of Aragon usually communicated through Wolsey, while Katherine Parr's letters to the king and his council were supplemented with others from her London council. Although both women were respectful of the king's dignity, Katherine of Aragon's letters contained a certain familiarity somewhat lacking in Katherine Parr's. Henry's first wife, though, was in a position to be informal: she had known Henry since he was ten years old, came herself from a princely house, and was, probably, his first love. Katherine Parr, on the other hand, probably had seen Henry mostly from afar until just before her marriage, was descended from a respectable though hardly noble family, and was his sixth wife. Additionally, Henry's sense of royal dignity was more highly developed in 1544 than it appears to have been in 1513: gone by the end of the reign was the earlier 'hail fellow, well met' bluff king Hal. Henry himself did not shower either woman with letters, but when he did write, his letters were full of news and instructions, another indication that he expected his regents to be directly involved in his affairs. The councils Henry appointed to assist his regents were both
small, perhaps another indication of Henry's confidence
in his two wives.

It may well be that in Katherine Parr Henry saw a
reflection of his first wife. Both women were pious,
well educated (Katherine of Aragon especially), and could
be trusted to act in the king's best interests. English
court politics in 1513 were relatively stable in
comparison to 1544, when two different political and
religious groups were emerging, and it may have been
Katherine Parr's apparent neutrality that appealed most
to Henry VIII when he was considering an appropriate
representative. Henry could have appointed a regency
council, as he later did in his will, but he would then
have had to decide which group would dominate, an act
which might have committed him to one group or the other,
a commitment which he probably wanted to avoid. It was a
decision, in fact, which he put off until just before his
death. He faced the same dilemma in appointing an
individual from one of the two groups; Hertford, by
virtue of his blood-ties to the heir, probably would have
been the only choice available. Hence, in naming
Katherine Parr regent, Henry took the middle road. In
return, Henry had a regent who, while technically
inexperienced, could be depended upon to be diligent,
trustworthy, and neutral. And as with his first wife,
Henry named a very small council consisting of five men,
later reduced to four after Hertford's departure, to
assist her. And like her earlier predecessor, Katherine
Parr was an active and involved regent, a worthy representative.

* * *

Until the summer of 1544 Katherine Parr seems to have remained pretty much in the background of events, and while she probably made requests of the king prior to her regency, only three such interventions have been recorded. Early in 1544, the queen had given her support to one of the earl of Hertford's suits to the king. Hertford apparently had been seeking to gain control of the borough of Great Bedwyn in Wiltshire and had had some discussions with Sir John Russell, lord privy seal, on the subject. At the same time, Russell apparently had been engaged in an unspecified business dispute with one Mr. Crouche; the two men had agreed that their matter would be referred to Lord St. John and Mr. Southwell, possibly for arbitration. But then Crouche changed his mind, and Russell attributed his volte-face to Hertford.\(^{168}\) John Berwyke, Hertford's servant, reported on 27 March that Russell was deeply offended at Hertford's supposed interference, especially because he had worked on the earl's behalf for Great Bedwyn. Russell declared

'how much he had been your friend at all times and lately in the matter for Bedwyn, insomuch

\(^{168}\) H.M.C. Bath Longleat MSS, Seymour Papers, IV, 1532-1686, 96.
that when the Queen moved the King in this his Grace said he marvelled that she would speak therein. Whereupon her Grace was fain to declare that it was at the request and labour of my Lord Privy Seal. Whereupon the King challenged him so that he had to take it upon him, and stood to the declaration in your lordship's favour, which he would not have done save for very love for ten times the worth of the thing'.

Although Berwyke had suggested to Russell that he examine Crouche under oath, he did not believe that Russell would be satisfied until Hertford wrote to Russell personally.

The king clearly was surprised at Katherine Parr's intervention in the matter of Great Bedwyn. What is not so clear, though, is how the king viewed the queen's action. That Berwyke described the king as 'challenging' Russell suggests that the king might not have been too pleased with the queen's, and the lord privy seal's, motions in the affair. Russell certainly seems to have given Berwyke the impression that his own speech on Hertford's behalf for Great Bedwyn was somewhat courageous.

But a great deal more may have been going on than Berwyke's letter at first suggests. Russell had ulterior motives for wanting Hertford to think that he had taken considerable risks in order to forward the earl's suit. Russell believed that the earl had wronged him in his dispute with Mr. Crouche, and he wanted Hertford to know just what a good friend he recently had been. This interpretation would throw a slightly different light on
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the king's response to Katherine Parr's actions: he might have been 'marvelled' simply because her intervention was unexpected. Given that Hertford was granted the reversion of the borough in October 1544, the king probably was not overly disturbed by the suit in the first place.

In June 1544, Katherine Parr intervened yet again with the king, this time on behalf of the earl of Hertford's wife. The countess had requested information from the queen about the earl's return from the north of England, where he had been sent on the king's business. The countess, who previously had spoken with Katherine Parr on the subject, sent a letter of reminder to the queen via Princess Mary, who assured the countess that she had delivered the letter 'unto the Quenes grace who accepted the same very well'. It is clear from Katherine Parr's reply that she was a bit irritated with the countess, whose letter seems to have implied that the queen needed prompting. On 3 June, the queen informed the countess that 'youre husbandes comyng hyther is not altered, for he schall come home before the kynges maieste take hys journey over the sees, as it pleasyth hys maiestye to declare to me of late'. The queen also added that the countess could be 'ryght asseuryd I wold not haue forgotten my promyse to you in a mater of
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lesse effect than thys, and so I pray you most hartely to thynke.'

Indeed, Katherine Parr did not disdain to speak with the king about relatively minor affairs, or on behalf of more humble subjects. On 5 July, Edward Abecke, who had been displaced when the Irish parish church of Loughesede was united with the bishopric of Meath, was granted an annuity of 20 marks at the queen's request.\footnote{174}

In the first year of her marriage Katherine Parr was, so to speak, still finding her way. She had spoken with the king on behalf of the Hertfords and Edward Abecke, and graciously entertained the suite of the visiting duke of Najera in February 1544. But it was her appointment as regent in July 1544 that marked the queen's emergence as a figure of some importance and influence at court. It probably was during her two months as regent that Katherine Parr acquired not simply the confidence to take advantage of her position, but also the more practical knowledge of how to exercise her influence.

One of the first beneficiaries of the queen's newfound confidence was Henry Webbe, a gentleman usher of her privy chamber, upon whose behalf Katherine Parr wrote on 23 July 1544. The king apparently had promised Webbe the house and demesnes of the nunnery of Hallywell, but Webbe had received only the house, chambers and certain
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gardens, which amounted to £6 per annum. In light of the king's promise, and the fact that Webbe had waited patiently for the rest, the queen asked for support: 'We shall hartely desire, and pray you, to be so favorable to hym, at this oure earnest request, as that he may for his monye have ye purchase at your handes, of the saide vj li. whereof he hath thindenture'.\textsuperscript{175} And for that support she promised to 'thankefully remembre it, whencesover occasion shall forme vs, to do you pleasure'.\textsuperscript{176}

Katherine Parr's activities increased steadily after the summer of 1544. In March 1545, Katherine Parr wrote to the bishop, dean, and chapter of Exeter on behalf of one John Throckmorton, possibly one of the queen's distant Throckmorton cousins. The queen expressed the hope that Throckmorton would be given the advowson of next available prebend within their control.\textsuperscript{177} In September, Osmounde Hilling, clerk, was awarded a presentation at Katherine Parr's suit.\textsuperscript{178} Some time in November, the queen spoke to the king on behalf of the recently widowed duchess of Suffolk, who was then trying to obtain the wardship of her eldest son, the new duke of

\textsuperscript{175} B.L., Cotton MS Vespasian F iii, f. 38 (LP, XIX, i, 967).

\textsuperscript{176} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{177} H.M.C. Fifth Report, 296 (LP, XX, i, 318).

\textsuperscript{178} LP, XX, ii, 418(41).
Suffolk.\textsuperscript{179} Also in November Katherine Parr intervened on behalf of Stephen Wilde, Edmund Hodshon, and others, who were granted a pardon for the accidental murder of John Horton.\textsuperscript{180} Another pardon at the queen's suit was issued in December for Edmund Withypole.\textsuperscript{181}

Katherine Parr acted on behalf of two other men before the end of 1545. John Parker's license to 'utter', or more probably import, pins from foreign countries for five years was obtained by the queen,\textsuperscript{182} while the grant of the sixth prebend in Newarke college in Liecestershire to Richard Baldewyne, one of Mary's chaplains, was jointly at the suit of the queen and the princess.\textsuperscript{183}

Katherine Parr continued to be active in the last full year of the reign. On 28 February 1546 she wrote a letter of support for George Tresham, one of Prince Edward's gentlemen.\textsuperscript{184} Tresham had wanted to buy certain lands for some time, and the queen asked the recipient to look favorably upon Tresham's apparent proposal to pay for the lands in part with an annuity which he held. In
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March she supported the efforts of Philip Gerrarde, one of Prince Edward's servants, to marry the widow Elizabeth Cotton, and in July she was responsible for a land grant that Walter Erle, one of her servants, received. Just prior to the king's death another servant, Philip Bale, described as her chaplain, was given the parsonage of Pyworthy in Devon at her suit.

Although these suits were important to the men they concerned, in reality, such matters were relatively minor when compared to the queen's interest in other, more potentially volatile issues at court.

One of the more important affairs with which Katherine Parr was associated concerned the university of Cambridge. On 26 February 1546, the queen responded to an earlier letter from the university which had been presented to her by Thomas Smith. From Katherine Parr's reply, it would appear that university officials had been concerned about proposals to dissolve their colleges;
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the Chantry Act had been passed in early 1545, and since then three Oxford colleges had surrendered to the crown.\textsuperscript{189} The Cambridge officials had expressed fears about the future of their own colleges in the hope that she would speak to the king on the university's behalf. What is particularly interesting about Katherine Parr's response is that the university's chancellor was included in the letter's address, thus suggesting that he also had been involved in the earlier contacts with the queen. All of this was significant because the chancellor of the university of Cambridge was none other than Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. This fact generates a number of questions: first of all, what role did Gardiner actually play in the decision to petition the queen? why was it felt that the queen rather than Gardiner would be a more influential intermediary with the king? and finally, what does Gardiner's possible involvement indicate about the relationship between him and Katherine Parr?

Since letters were sent to the king and to Sir William Paget on the university's behalf in February 1546,\textsuperscript{190} a similar date probably can be placed on the missing letter which Katherine Parr also received from Cambridge. At the time these letters were sent, Gardiner was in Europe on a diplomatic mission: he had left on 18
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October 1545 and would not return until March 1546. Gardiner's physical absence from court could have influenced the university's decision to approach the queen rather than work through the chancellor. Another contributing factor could have been Gardiner's recent disputes with several prominent members of the university over such issues as the production of a play deemed heretical, the eating of flesh in Lent, and the issue of the correct pronunciation of Greek. The address of Katherine Parr's letter, which was to the chancellor as well as to the vice-chancellor and 'the whole university', may have been a formality; the university easily could have approached the queen without Gardiner's assistance, although it might not have been tactful of the queen to have acknowledged that fact in her address. There is, of course, the possibility that the queen's address was indeed correct, and that Gardiner himself had suggested that the university approach the queen. Certainly there is no reason to suppose that the bishop and the queen were on anything but good terms at this time: Gardiner's mission to the emperor was urgent and in his haste to be off, he regretted that he had been unable to take his leave of the queen. That the university


also petitioned Paget would add weight to this interpretation, as Gardiner, whether correctly or not, believed himself to be on good, even intimate, terms with Paget at this time; Gardiner could have suggested Paget as well as the queen as possible intermediaries. But whatever Gardiner’s actual role, it seems unlikely that he would have disapproved of the university’s decision to approach Paget or Katherine Parr.

The choice of Katherine Parr as an intermediary proved to be one of several good decisions made by the university. In her letter she was able to report that, having ‘attempted my lord the King’s Majesty, for the establishment of your livelihood and possession’, the king, ‘being such a patron to good learning, doth tender you so much, that he will rather advance learning and erect new occasion thereof, than to confound those your ancient and godly institutions’.  

Cambridge had been saved, but there is some question as to whom thanks was actually due. As noted above, the university had approached Paget as well as the queen, and had even written to the king himself. John Cheke, Richard Taverner, Dr. Wendy, and Roger Ascham apparently were also part of the campaign to save Cambridge, and it seems likely that Sir Anthony Denny, a well known patron
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of humanist causes, was involved too. It may very well be that the king never really intended to dissolve the colleges, but rather was planning to re-found them under his own patronage. What impact Katherine Parr's pleas, coupled with those from prominent humanist scholars, had on the king will never be known for certain, although it is interesting that the king revealed his intentions to the queen and that she was the one who imparted the good news.

* * *

Katherine Parr's known activities were for the most part in line with those of her five predecessors. The only exception to this was the interest taken by the king's first two wives in foreign affairs. But then the circumstances surrounding Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn were significantly different from those concerning the king's last four wives.

Initially, Katherine of Aragon had considerable influence over England's foreign policy. As noted earlier she served as her father's ambassador at court prior to and immediately following her marriage to Henry
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VIII; it was mainly due to her influence that the king pursued a pro-Spanish foreign policy in the opening years of his reign. Henry VIII's trust and confidence in his first wife were further confirmed in 1513, when he named her regent for the duration of his absence in France. Katherine of Aragon's influence was undermined first of all by her father's constant double-crossing in these early years. Nevertheless, she was very outspoken in her objections to the growing rapprochement with France in 1519, and worked hard to arrange a meeting between Henry and Charles V immediately prior to the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. For a while, relations between England and Spain were very good indeed, resulting even in a betrothal between Princess Mary and Charles V. But the alliance eventually soured and what little influence Katherine had had previously with the king over foreign policy was now virtually destroyed. ¹⁹⁷ When the new Spanish ambassador arrived in December 1526, after being forcibly delayed by over a year, he wrote that, while Katherine would do what she could to restore relations between their two countries, her 'means' were small. ¹⁹⁸ Although her political influence was negligible in the following years, Katherine of Aragon did receive at least two requests from abroad asking her to intervene with the king. In November 1520 the vice-dean and chapter of Our Lady's Church in Antwerp informed
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Katherine that they had approached the king on behalf of an English merchant, Alfred Kawson, who had taken refuge in their church in order to escape creditors. The queen was asked to add her voice to theirs and to persuade the king to allow Kawson to return to England so that he might 'mend his fortunes' and pay off his debts.\textsuperscript{199} Three years later, in February 1523, Pope Adrian VI informed Katherine that he had written earlier to the king about the threat to Christendom by the Turks, who had recently captured Rhodes. The pope expressed the hope that she would induce the king to peace, or at least a truce, so that he might then turn his attentions to the Turkish threat.\textsuperscript{200} The appeal was unlikely to have had any effect from the very start, mainly because Adrian had been a tutor to Charles V; every request from this pope would be viewed with suspicion in England.

Katherine's influence, however, could be felt in other areas besides international politics. When Margaret Beaufort, the king's grandmother, died, the Cambridge college of St. John's, which she had founded, was severely lacking in funds. At first the king was reluctant to part with any of the inheritance from his grandmother, but Katherine interceded with her husband for the lost revenues.\textsuperscript{201} One of Katherine's most
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memorable, and successful, interventions with the king, though, concerned the Evil May Day riots in 1517, when she, and Cardinal Wolsey, successfully begged Henry on their knees to pardon the condemned men.\textsuperscript{202}

Anne Boleyn's hold over the king is well known so only a few points need to be noted here. Anne was particularly interested in England's foreign policy, and until Katherine of Aragon's death in 1536, she actively favored a pro-French policy over an Imperial alliance, for very obvious reasons. By 1531 she was considered in some quarters to be something of a power in her own right, and the duke of Milan was counseled to send her expensive Italian presents by way of his ambassador.\textsuperscript{203}

In 1534 there was even some fear that she would be named regent while Henry met with Francis I in Calais: Chapuys reported that Anne had boasted that she would be left in charge while the king was away and that she would then solve the problem of Mary once and for all.\textsuperscript{204} But the planned meeting between monarchs did not go ahead, no doubt to the relief of the Spanish ambassador.

Anne was just as deeply involved in the theological questions of the day as she was in foreign policy, and she gave her full support to the king's new religious policies, not only because it was greatly to her benefit to do so, but also because she firmly believed in the
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righteousness of the reforms. According to Hugh Latimer, she fully supported Cromwell's first set of injunctions on the religious houses which were issued in 1536.205 It would even appear that she had some influence with the king over the appointment of new bishops: out of ten bishops appointed between 1532 and her death in May 1536, seven were her clients.206

A contemporary writer summed up perfectly Anne Boleyn's impact on the king. George Cavendish recalled in his biography of Wolsey that Anne, being so great in the king's favor, could 'work mysteries with the king and obtain any suit of him for her friend'.207 That Anne was able to obtain for her uncle, the duke of Norfolk, the valuable wardship and marriage of the king's natural son, Henry, duke of Richmond208 -- who was at one time seriously considered by the king as a possible heir to the throne -- is illustration enough of the truth in Cavendish's remarks.

Anne Boleyn's power over the king, though, had a direct and somewhat negative effect on her successors. It is especially important to note that the king's relationship with Anne, which ended disastrously,


208. Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, 259. And of course Richmond eventually married Norfolk's daughter, Lady Mary Howard.
significantly lessened his susceptibility to the influence of his later wives.

Not that his later wives did not try, however, to bring influence to bear on some very important matters. Meek Jane Seymour intervened with Henry to have Mary restored to favor. He told Jane she was a fool to promote someone who might jeopardize the rights of the children the two of them might have. Jane crossed the king again in 1536 over the issue of the dissolution of the monasteries. At the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace, she was reported to have thrown herself at the king's knees begging for the restoration of the abbeys. Henry's response was to tell her to get up and not to meddle in his affairs; he also reminded her ominously of what had happen to her interfering predecessor. Ironically, at about the time of this confrontation Henry apparently was seriously considering leaving Jane Seymour in charge of the south while he personally led his army north. Plans had progressed far enough for him to designate who among his council would remain behind to assist her. It is tempting to speculate whether or not Jane would have been more influential in affairs had she lived longer after having provided Henry with a legitimate heir. An act of parliament in the year of Edward's birth provided that any underage king or queen
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would be 'at and in the governance of their natural mother, and of such other your counsellors, and nobles of your realm as your highness shall limit and appoint by your last will . . .' 212 Jane might have had a considerable role to play had the king predeceased her.

Anne of Cleves's influence on Henry VIII was probably negligible, a hardly surprising fact given that the king had no enthusiasm for his fourth marriage after he had seen the bride and that the marriage lasted only a brief six months. The king did, however, make Anne a substantial settlement, and it is to be wondered just how subtle and shrewd the king's fourth wife might actually have been.

It would appear superficially as though Catherine Howard had considerable influence with the king. Some time around the new year of 1541, Catherine's uncle, the duke of Norfolk, persuaded her to petition the king to name Sir William Howard, Norfolk's brother, as ambassador to France in place of Sir John Wallop.213 Howard was dully appointed, and Wallop returned to London only to be charged with treason. Wallop made a 'confession' and threw himself on the king's mercy. 'At the contemplation of which submission, and at the great and continual sute of the Quenes Majestie', the king pardoned him.214 Catherine also successfully interceded for Sir Thomas
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for Sir Thomas Wyatt, who had been accused of treason at the same time as Wallop. 215 Another courtier, Sir Edmund Knevet, possibly the husband of the Lady Anne Knyvet of Katherine Parr’s household, was indebted to Catherine for preserving him from the law. Knevet had struck Thomas Clere, a servant of the earl of Surrey, in the court and had been sentenced to have his right hand cut off. At the last minute, and supposedly at Catherine’s intervention, the sentence was reprieved. 216 Later that year, Catherine successfully intervened on behalf of her cousin, John Legh, who languished in the Tower under suspicion of treason, and secured a pardon for all felonies committed by Helen Page, alias Clerk. 217

Katherine Parr’s own influence must be compared with that of her predecessors. The fact that, by the 1540s, Henry VIII was a seasoned politician and far less susceptible to influence than he had been at the time of his first and second marriages must also be taken into consideration in any analysis. What seems evident is that, generally speaking, the king was open to the influence of his wives mainly when the matter at hand coincided with his own interests. Catherine Howard’s petitions on behalf of Wallop and Wyatt can be seen in the same light as Katherine of Aragon’s pleas for the
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rioters of Evil May Day in 1517: it is important that the intervention of these two queens was considered by contemporaries to be significant, but it is equally critical to understand that the pardons resulting from the queens' intercessions probably would not have been granted if the king had not already been inclined in that direction. And there already were suspicions of Wallop's 'treason' when Sir William Howard was appointed ambassador to France. A similar analysis can be placed on Katherine Parr's intercessions for the university of Cambridge in 1546; the king probably had already made up his mind to spare the university by the time she raised the issue with him.

The activities of the king's wives also illustrated the areas in which it was acceptable for a woman to try and exert influence. Individuals of no real consequence were readily given pardons at the requests of Henry's wives. But pardons to well-placed individuals, such as Wallop and Wyatt, however, were only forthcoming after they had 'confessed' and thrown themselves wholly on the king's mercy. Both actions were requisite steps in a system in which there were only two real choices for those accused of treason: absolute denial of guilt and conviction, or confession and hopes of a royal pardon. If Wallop and Wyatt had refused to conform to expectations, then Catherine Howard's pleas for mercy might have met with the king's extreme displeasure. But once they had submitted themselves, the queen's
intercession was quite acceptable. It also seems to have been perfectly permissible for Henry's wives to intervene in matters concerning the two great universities, Oxford and Cambridge.

The example of Jane Seymour graphically illustrated the potential danger of trying to exert influence over an issue when the king was already firmly determined on a course of action: she was rebuked for trying to promote Mary's interests, and curtly told to mind her own business over the dissolution of the monasteries. Even if the king was willing to debate an issue, it nevertheless was wise to let him have the final word, as Katherine Parr learned in 1546.

The king's later wives generally seem to have been uninterested in foreign policy. But then the circumstances surrounding Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn were significantly different from their successors: Katherine was interested in forging an alliance with her native Spain, while Anne needed the support of Francis I over the divorce and her eventual marriage.

Although Katherine Parr may not have been particularly interested in foreign policy, this did not necessarily mean that foreign powers were indifferent to the queen or her potential influence with the king. One of the first concerns of the Imperial ambassador, Chapuys, on Henry VIII's marriage to Katherine Parr was how the new queen was likely to behave towards Princess
Mary. On 12 July 1544, the day of the nuptials, Chapuys wrote to Prince Philip of Spain expressing the hope that the king's sixth marriage would be successful, and that the king's affection for Mary would continue to increase.\textsuperscript{218} Not all of the king's wives had been friendly to Mary, as Chapuys knew only too well. Anne Boleyn had made veiled threats against Mary in 1534, threats which the ambassador had duly reported to his master. Chapuys also reported in December 1540 that Catherine Howard had tried to have two of Mary's maids dismissed as punishment for not showing her the respect previously accorded by the princess to Jane Seymour and Anne of Cleves.\textsuperscript{219} Mary, though, found someway of mollifying the young queen, and her two women were not discharged.

Katherine Parr was of an entirely different disposition than the king's second and fifth wives, and she quickly became friends with Mary, who was only a few years younger than herself. This budding relationship may have been helped along by the fact that the two women probably were already acquainted with each other by the time of the queen's marriage to the king. Lady Maud Parr had served in Katherine of Aragon's establishment, and Katherine Parr probably had been introduced to Mary when the princess was still a girl. Katherine Parr's second husband, Lord Latimer, had a house in Blackfriars, which
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would suggest that the queen probably spent time at court when she and her husband were in London. Chances are good that if Katherine Parr was at court in the late 1530s and early 1540s, however intermittently, she would have at least seen Mary on occasion. On 13 August 1543, Chapuys reported that the king had arranged for Mary to stay with Katherine Parr, and that the queen herself showed affection for the princess. The ambassador’s reports continued to be favorable: on 18 February 1544 he wrote that Katherine Parr was showing Mary all the favor that she could. On 5 March, Charles V advised Chapuys to continue to court the queen, to whom the ambassador was to present the emperor’s commendations.

Katherine Parr represented no threat to Mary, as Chapuys quickly realized. A tailor’s bill probably covering a period just prior to and immediately after the queen’s marriage certainly suggests that Katherine Parr intended to be on good terms with Mary from the very start: among the many clothes ordered by the queen for herself was an entry for a kirtle of black taffeta for the princess. On the day of her marriage to the king, Katherine Parr gave Mary £20 in cash. Shortly
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after this, the queen gave Mary 'a payr of Bracelettes of
golde set w[i]t[h] Diamondes and Rubies and in ayther of
them one Emaurawde'.\textsuperscript{225} More money was also soon
forthcoming: in September Katherine Parr gave Mary f60,
and in January 1544 the princess received a total of f65
from the queen.\textsuperscript{226} Katherine Parr also sent Mary a
'nyght gowne', possibly as a New Year's gift.\textsuperscript{227} In
Mary's inventory of jewerly, we find that the queen gave
her step-daughter two elaborate pieces for New Year's
gifts one year: 'a Boke of golde set w[i]t[h] Rubies',
and 'a payr of Bracelettes set w[i]t[h] small
p[ear]les'.\textsuperscript{228} The queen spent f9 16s. for a kirtle made
up of seven yards of cloth of silver for yet another New
Year's gift for her eldest step-daughter.\textsuperscript{229}

Although Chapuys was particularly interested in the
relationship between Katherine Parr and Princess Mary, he
also recognized that the queen's behaviour occasionally
had political overtones. When Chapuys was recalled in
1545, he recorded a remarkable interview he had with
Katherine Parr and Princess Mary. On 9 May, the
ambassador passed by the queen's lodgings on his way to
take leave of the the king. Chapuys was almost at the
door of the king's appartments when Katherine Parr,
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accompanied by four or five women of her chamber, and Mary came hurrying across the garden; the ailing ambassador hardly had time enough to rise in greeting. The queen had been told by the king the night before that Chapuys would be coming to take his leave that morning. She expressed great sorrow at his parting, but also stated that she knew that he would work to further the friendship between their two monarchs. Katherine Parr then emphasized at considerable length the king's sincere affection and good will towards Charles V, sentiments which she believed had not been fully conveyed to the emperor. She urged Chapuys to report the king's good intentions and to work for continued friendship. The queen then asked after the emperor's health, and expressed joy at his recent recovery. At this point, Chapuys asked to be allowed to salute Mary, a request which was immediately granted, and Katherine Parr moved away in order to allow the two a private good-bye. The princess, who did not want to detain the queen, was brief, and she thanked Chapuy's for the emperor's good wishes, which she reciprocated. Katherine Parr rejoined them and asked after the health of Mary of Hungary, Charles V's sister and his regent of the Netherlands. The queen then said that the king owned much to the emperor's sister for her continued goodwill towards him. After committing her recommendations to Mary of Hungary to Chapuys, Katherine Parr returned to her lodgings,
insisting that the ambassador remain where he was and not stir himself on her account.\textsuperscript{230}

Chapuys noted in his dispatch to Charles V that the interview with Katherine Parr was more or less repeated when he reached the council chamber: the councillors expressed sorrow at his departing, but had great hopes for the alliance. Katherine Parr's meeting with Chapuys in the garden outside her appartments was no accident; and the content of her conversation probably had been determined in advance as well. The king was trying to impress upon Chapuys that he was committed to an alliance with Charles V, and he used his wife as well as his council to get that message across.

In February 1546, Chapuy's replacement, Van der Delft, reported that there were rumors of a new queen, and that Katherine Parr was annoyed at the speculation. He also wrote that the queen had teased Mary about a possible marriage with the king of Poland, whose ambassador, Van der Delft noted, was at the English court.\textsuperscript{231} By the end of the year, Katherine Parr became something of a barometer of the king's heath. Van der Delft wrote to both Charles V and Mary of Hungary on 24 December that the king remained in London although the queen and the court had removed to Greenwich for the

\textsuperscript{230} C.S.P.Sp., VIII, 51 (LP, XX, i, 689).
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holidays.\textsuperscript{232} Ostensibly, the king had stayed behind to see through the investigation of the duke of Norfolk and his son, the earl of Surrey. On 10 January 1547, Odet de Selve wrote to Francis I that neither Katherine Parr nor Mary had been allowed the see the king, an indication of the severity of the king's illness.\textsuperscript{233} On 29 January, Chapuys wrote from Louvain that he was afraid that Henry VIII was beginning to favor the reformers, because it was known that Katherine Parr exhibited her sympathies openly, something the former ambassador knew she would not do unless she had the king's support.\textsuperscript{234} What the former ambassador did not know was that the king had died on the 27th; Chapuys had more to fear than he realized.

* * *

Katherine Parr was a figure of importance at court if only by virtue of her position as the king's wife. As wives of the king's leading ministers and courtiers, the queen's high-ranking women were also potentially influential figures. With only three exceptions,\textsuperscript{235}
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\item \textsuperscript{235} The three exceptions were the husbands of Francis Brandon, marchioness of Dorset, Margaret Douglass, countess of Lennox, and Lady Lane. The first two women were the king's nieces, and were in the queen's household by virtue of their family relationship with the king, while Lady Lane, who had been widowed in
\end{itemize}
these women owed their places in the queen’s establishment to the fact that their husbands were or had been in the king’s household and government. In the 1540s, eight of Katherine Parr’s ladies had husbands who were on the privy council: the earl of Arundel, the earl of Hertford, viscount Lisle, Sir William Paget, Sir William Petre, Sir John Russell, the duke of Suffolk, and Sir Thomas Wriothesley. And of those eight Arundel, Hertford, Lisle, Russell, and Suffolk were, or had been, in the king’s household as well. Another thirteen of Katherine Parr’s high-ranking women had husbands in the king’s household, and of that number three men held a household office (Sir Edmund Peckham, baron St. John, and Sir Anthony Wingfield); eight held coveted positions in the king’s privy chamber (Sir Maurice Berkeley, Sir George Carew, Sir Anthony Denny, John Gates, Sir William Herbert, Sir Anthony Knyvet, Sir Thomas Paston, and Sir Robert Tyrwhit); and two were both household officers and members of the privy chamber (Sir Anthony Browne, and Sir Thomas Cawarden).

The husbands of Lady Anne Cooxe and Lady Mary Parr had only slightly different ties to the king. John Cock, tentatively identified as Lady Cooxe’s husband, held two moderately important government posts: he had been attorney-general for the duchy of Cornwall since 1532, and by 1545 was on the court of general-surveyors for the

1541 (James, 'The Parr’s of Kendal', 224) no doubt owed her position in Katherine Parr’s household to the fact that the two women were closely related.
king's lands. 236 He also sat on Katherine Parr's learned council. Sir William Parr, on the other hand, was a long-standing companion of Henry VIII and had been lord chamberlain of the household of the king's illegitimate son, Henry, duke of Richmond, from 1525 until the duke's death in 1536. The king's continuing regard for Parr was amply demonstrated by Parr's inclusion on the regency council set-up in 1544 to advise Katherine Parr.

The ramifications of the marital relationships between the men in the king's household and government and the women of Katherine Parr's establishment are fairly obvious. Just how much influence these women could bring to bear on their husbands, though, is difficult to gage. However, the examples of the countess of Hertford and, to a lesser extent, Lady Paget highlight the kind of influence these women may have had with their husbands.

The earl and countess of Hertford had a very close marital relationship, as a series of letters written in November 1542 clearly show. The countess was a capable woman and when the earl was away on the king's business, which was often during the 1540s, she seems to have handled their joint affairs with efficiency and with her husband's complete trust. 237 While the earl was in the north of England fulfilling his duties as warden, Sir


Thomas Wriothesley was serving as postmaster to the Hertfords' letters to each other. On 8 November, he wrote to Hertford that the countess was 'merry'. Only two days later, he forwarded some letters from the countess, to which he asked the earl to respond promptly, as Wriothesley doubted the countess would rest easy until she heard from her husband. On the 18th, Wriothesley forwarded yet more letters from the countess, and swore to the earl that he was diligent in passing them on; Hertford had complained that he had not received all of his wife's letters, and Wriothesley asked the earl to bring them with him when he returned so that he could vindicate himself. Wriothesley apparently sent Hertford another letter from the countess on the 25th. Husband and wife obviously kept in close touch and when letters were not received, suspicions about the post immediately were raised.

The countess of Hertford was more than prepared to take on her husband's most fierce rivals at court, as a confrontation with the earl Surrey clearly demonstrates. Surrey's poem 'Eache beeste can chuse his feere', which was probably written in 1541, is an allegory on an
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242. Padelford repeats an earlier assertion that Surrey's poem was written in August 1542 (Padelford, The Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, 222). Hughen's
incident which appears to have occurred at a masque given by Surrey ostensibly to reconcile the opposing Howard and Seymour families. In the poem the lion (representing Surrey) is snubbed by the wolf (the countess), who has encouraged the lion's advances. The lion then is stirred to recount the past heroes of his family and accuse the wolf and her supporters of cowardice.\footnote{Padelford, The Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, 20-1.}

Surrey's attentions to the countess have a romantic appearance; in a later epistle to 'the fair Geraldine', Surrey continues to acknowledge the countess's beauty.\footnote{Hughey, The Arundel Harington Manuscript, II, 97.} But even if Surrey had been sincere in his attentions, and we cannot be sure if those attentions engendered chivalric love or mere lust, (the first a complement the second an insult), the countess's rejection of him necessarily placed their relationship back into the realm of mutual distrust, dislike, and political competition. Any overtures of reconciliation were firmly, probably scornfully, rejected by the countess on behalf of herself and no doubt her husband as well: the two were very much a husband and wife team.

\footnote{suggestion that it was actually written in 1541 (Ruth Hughey, The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry, (Ohio, 1960), II, 98-9), probably in the first half of the year, seems a more reliable date. In the poem, Surrey glorifies members of the Howard family, something he probably would not have done just after Catherine Howard's fall, especially considering that Surrey's 'heros' were not necessary so considered by the king.}
The extent to which the countess meddled in affairs became especially obvious after Edward VI's accession, when the earl was made duke of Somerset and Lord Protector. The new duchess's petty jealousies concerning Katherine Parr, and her interference in her husband's business, created unnecessary difficulties and often made him as well as her extremely unpopular. After Katherine Parr's marriage to Sir Thomas Seymour, the duchess refused to carry the queen's train, reputedly saying 'that it was unsuitable for her [the duchess] to submit to perform that service for the wife of her husband's younger brother'.

245 The decision to deny Katherine Parr the jewelry left to her by Henry VIII was also attributed to the duchess, who, as the wife of the Protector, felt she had a better right to wear them. The duchess also tried to deny Katherine Parr precedence at court, again on the grounds that the queen was married to a younger brother of the Protector. This last action created a stir at court, attracting even the attention of the French ambassador, Odet de Selve, who reported that the two brothers had exchanged harsh words over the matter.

246 In early 1547, Katherine Parr noted in a letter to Sir Thomas Seymour that it was the duchess's 'coustome to promys many comynges to her frendes and to performe


none'.247 In 1548, when relations were yet further strained, the queen referred to the duchess as 'that Hell' in another letter to Seymour.248

These exploits did nothing for the duchess of Somerset's later reputation. In John Hayward's The Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixt, published in 1630, the duchess was described as 'a woman for many imperfections intollerable, but for pride monstrous, she was exceeding both suble and violent in accomplishing her ends, for which she spurned ouer all respects both of conscience and of shame'.249 Thirty-one years later, Peter Heylyn asserted in his History of the Reformation that the duchess had proclaimed, among other things, that 'if Mr. Admiral [Seymour] teach his Wife no better Manners; I am She, that will'.250 Although Heylyn's speech must be taken with a boulder of salt, the sentiment behind the duchess's supposed utterance is certainly in character with what is known about the woman. After the queen's death, the duchess reputedly wrote to Seymour suggesting that two of them should be reconciled, as the cause of their quarrel had been
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removed. It was now up to Seymour, she said, to show similar good will.²⁵¹

The duchess of Somerset's temper even alienated her husband's supporters, of whom the Protector was increasingly in need. In the autumn of 1549, she accused Sir Thomas Smith, secretary of state, of being haughty, uncharitable, covetous, proud, and, most hurtful of all, 'neutrale' in religion.²⁵² His disdain and contempt for the charges (and implicitly for the duchess as well) were expressed in a long letter to the duchess. Even Edward VI's tutor, Sir John Cheke, had to make an abject apology to the duchess for some offence that his wife had given.²⁵³ The duchess of Suffolk, who previously had been a staunch supporter of the duke of Somerset,²⁵⁴ was displeased at the duke's dealings with one of her cousins. On 8 October 1550, she wrote to Sir William Cecil complaining about the affair, and in a post script


²⁵². Sir Thomas Smith to the duchess of Somerset, Archaeologia, XXXVIII, (1860), 121-2, 126.

²⁵³. B.L., Lansdowne MS 2, f. 85 (Archaeologia, XXXVIII, 115-6).

²⁵⁴. On 25 March 1550, while the duke of Somerset was in disgrace, the duchess of Suffolk wrote to Cecil, saying that 'if I colde be any ways perswayed that I myght do my lord any good I wold most gladyly put my selfe in any courte for it ...' (P.R.O., 10/10, f. 2-2v (C.S.P.Dom. 1547-80, 27)). In a post script, she expressed her relief at news she had just received, that the duke was about to be readmitted to the council. In May, she was hoping that a marriage could be arranged between her son and a daughter of the Somersets (P.R.O., 10/10, fol. 9-9v (C.S.P.Dom. 1547-80, 27)).
she expressed her belief that the duchess of Somerset was partially to blame for the duke's attitude towards her cousin.²⁵⁵ Sir William Paget, formerly a firm supporter of the duke of Somerset, confided to Van der Delft, the Imperial ambassador, that the reason for many of the Protector's troubles stemmed from the fact that 'he had a bad wife'.²⁵⁶

But Paget himself may have been open to marital influence, though probably to a lesser degree than the Protector. That Paget had a particularly happy marriage is reflected in part by a series of letters, written in April 1545, in which Paget thinks his wife has actually died.²⁵⁷ On the 3rd, he wrote to his friend Sir William Petre that he was 'the most vnhappy ma[n] in the world and desyre no longer to lyve'.²⁵⁸ Lady Paget was, he lamented on the 6th, a 'most obedient, wise, gentle, & chast weif/ the reme[m]braunce of whom sittith so deape in my hart that it makyth the same well neie to burst for payne and anguish . . .'²⁵⁹ We can only imagine Paget's joy at finding out that his wife was in fact alive. Later in the same year Paget again wrote to Petre, asking him not to let Lady Paget know that his business would
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take to Boulogne, as she greatly feared the plague which
was reported to be there.\textsuperscript{260} Lady Paget was extremely
popular with her husband’s friends and colleagues, and
they frequently asked to be remembered to her in their
letters to Paget. One example will suffice to show the
regard in which Lady Paget generally was held. On 18
June 1545, Petre wrote to Paget saying that Thomas
Thirlby, bishop of Westminster, ‘prayed me to make harty
com[m]endations to you & my ladie, saying he wold nott
gladly bee syck befor his return home because he shall
want the good keping w[hi]c[h] my ladie hath
promysed’.\textsuperscript{261} On 15 July, Thirby wrote to Paget himself,
and affectionately asked him to tell Lady Paget that he
‘wolde be lothe to be syke before my returne, for
wantinge of my keper’.\textsuperscript{262} Although there is no direct
evidence to suggest that Lady Paget exercised political
influence with her husband, certainly the love that
obviously existed between them made Paget at least
susceptible to her persuasions, if she had any to make.

Information on the relationships between the rest
Katherine Parr’s women and their husbands is
unfortunately lacking. Nevertheless, the possibility
that these women exercisèd some influence on their
husbands must always be kept in mind.
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A different kind of relationship may have been a factor in the promotion of Lady Mary Gates's husband. It has been suggested that Lady Gates's brother, Sir Anthony Denny, was responsible for bringing John Gates to the king's notice in the early 1540s. If this was indeed the case, it is tempting to speculate how much family ties had to do Denny's actions. Although it is impossible to know whether or not Lady Gates played any active role in her husband's promotion, it would at least seem reasonable to suppose that Denny would have wanted to help his sister if he could, and that by advancing her husband he was doing just that.

Many of Katherine Parr's high-ranking women not only had family ties to men in the king's household and government, but to each other as well. The marchioness of Dorset was related to three women in the queen's household: she was first cousins with the countess of Lennox and, by marriage, to Lady Elizabeth Browne, and was the step-daughter of the duchess of Suffolk, who was two years her junior. Lady Jane Wriothesley and Lady Anne Peckham were sisters, while Lady Mary Gates, through her brother Sir Anthony Denny, was sister-in-law to Lady Joan Denny. Two other of Lady Denny's sisters-in-law were in the queen's household: Lady Catherine Berkeley, who was first married to Lady Denny's brother, and Lady Mary Carew, who was to marry in 1547 yet another brother of Lady Denny. Lady Catherine Berkeley and Lady Anne

Petre were probably first cousins while Mary, countess of Arundel and Lady Elizabeth St. John were perhaps second cousins. And three of of Katherine Parr's close relatives served in her household: her sister Lady Anne Herbert; her aunt Lady Mary Parr; and her first cousin Lady Maud Parr, who was Lady Mary Parr's daughter. Lady Tyrwhit could also claim to be related to the queen, though distantly, through her husband and Lord Borough, Katherine Parr's first husband.

These relationships, though complicated for the modern reader to unwind, were nevertheless important in a society where advancement often depended on such family connections. If it had not been for the countess of Arundel, when countess of Sussex, her first cousin Anne Basset might never have become a maid of honor in the queen's household. The countess of Arundel actually had tried to have two of the Basset girls admitted to the queen's household, but Jane Seymour agreed to employ only one of the young women, and then only after having inspected them both herself before making a choice between the two.264

Katherine Parr's women frequently operated as independant agents, as the episode concerning Anne Basset's appointment clearly shows. Katherine Parr's women usually were included in the land grants awarded to their husbands by the king, but two of the queen's women

secured land grants in their own right. Lady Maud Lane, Katherine Parr's widowed cousin, was awarded a substantial grant, in fee, for £980 14s. 4d. in July 1543, while the duchess of Suffolk was given a grant, in fee, for £225 in March 1546. Other kinds of grants, though, could be equally profitable. In February 1545, Lady Mary Carew was awarded the custody of the person and possessions of Lady Anne Baldwin, a wealthy widow who was mentally unstable. In May 1546, the duchess of Suffolk succeeded in obtaining the wardship, and potentially the marriage as well, of her young son, Henry, duke of Suffolk. This suit, which had been supported by Katherine Parr in November 1545, was further confirmed in January 1547. Also in May 1546 the duchess was granted a license to retain forty persons in her livery in addition to her household servants. Although this last grant would actually have been a drain on the duchess's finances, it nevertheless was a sign of favor that she was entitled to keep more servants than was officially permitted.
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Although Anne Basset was not as prominent socially as these ladies, she, too, received marks of the king's favor. In early 1546, two warrants were issued to the great wardrobe for certain 'apparel and necessaries' given to Anne for the previous Whit Sunday and for Christmas.\(^{271}\) In the summer of 1546, another warrant was sent to the great wardrobe covering Anne's needs for that year's Whit Sunday.\(^{272}\) And at the end of 1546, Anne again received 'apparel and necessaries' for the upcoming Christmas festivities.\(^{273}\) That Anne's fellow maids of honor were not similarly favored no doubt was due to the king's long-standing regard for her. When Anne's residency in Jane Seymour's household was cut short by the queen's death, Anne was taken into the establishment of her cousin, the countess of Arundel (then countess of Sussex), on the understanding that she would resume her place as a maid of honor as soon as the king remarried.\(^{274}\) When Anne fell ill in October 1539, a few months before the arrival of Anne of Cleves, the king made special housing arrangements in order to speed her recovery.\(^{275}\) Anne's favor with the king ensured her a place in the establishments of Anne of Cleves and
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Catherine Howard, and when the later was arrested for treason and her household dismissed, the king yet again made special arrangements for Anne.\textsuperscript{276} After Catherine Howard's execution, the king's pronounced attentions to Anne were remarked upon by the Imperial ambassador, who seemed to imply that she might become the king's sixth wife.\textsuperscript{277}

Anne Basset made a concerted effort to take advantage of her situation. In 1539, Anne's mother had asked her to intervene with the king on behalf of one John Harris. Anne responded to her mother's request by saying that she was 'sorry that it was not my chance to have your ladyship's letter when I was at the Court, that I might have spoken to the King's Highness'.\textsuperscript{278} Anne obviously had regular access to the king and was unafraid to exploit that contact. In February 1540, she once again approached the king, this time on behalf of her sister Katherine, who was seeking a position in Anne of Cleves's short-lived royal establishment.\textsuperscript{279} The king responded to Anne's request, saying that he 'would not grant me nor them [other petitioners] as yet; for his Grace said that a' would have them that should be fair, &
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as he thought meet for the room'.\textsuperscript{280} Although Katherine Basset did, eventually, end up in Anne of Cleves's household, it still was something of a disappointment for the young woman's mother, who in early 1540 thought she was working towards placing her daughter in the establishment of a queen, not the king's good 'sister'.

Similar minor petitions were made by a number of Katherine Parr's women. Richard Raynold was given the reversion of the room of a yeoman of the Tower at the suit of the countess of Arundel.\textsuperscript{281} David ap Robert and Yevan Lloide, both guardsmen, were given the reversion of the fees of 4d. and 6d. respectively at the suit of the duchess of Suffolk.\textsuperscript{282} Cuthbert Horsley, who apparently had been the late duke of Suffolk's candidate, was granted the advowson of St. Sepulchre's chapel beside York at the suit of the duchess of Suffolk.\textsuperscript{283} And Levinia Terling was granted a £40 annuity in November 1546 at the suit of Katherine Parr's sister, Lady Anne Herbert.\textsuperscript{284} Terling remained a court painter, in the employ of both Mary and Elizabeth, until her death in 1576.\textsuperscript{285}
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Although the activities of only a handful of Katherine Parr's women can be documented firmly, it nevertheless seems likely that most of the queen's women used their positions at court to forward the interests of their family, friends, and dependants. Certainly this was the case with the women of Queen Elizabeth's household. Although Elizabeth admonished her women not to meddle in affairs, state affairs in particular,\textsuperscript{286} the queen's strictures were frequently ignored, as Dr. Merton has clearly shown.\textsuperscript{287} While Elizabeth was a queen regnant where Katherine Parr was not, there is no reason to think that Katherine's women were any less active than Elizabeth's in pursuing suits. That most of the activities of Elizabeth's women were documented where those of Katherine's women were not, simply reflected the differences between a queen regnant and a queen consort. That the suits of Katherine Parr and her women concerned primarily domestic or minor affairs while Queen Elizabeth's women dabbled in politics also reflected the differences in opportunities for women under male and female monarchs.

There was, then, one very good reason why all of the known, and suspected, suits promoted by Katherine Parr's women concerned relatively minor affairs. Anne Basset
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summed it up perfectly in February 1540: she might speak
to the king on behalf of John Harris and her sister
Katherine, but she was definitely hesitant to broach
matters of any real significance for fear of how the king
'would take it'.\textsuperscript{288} And this was from a woman who
obviously stood very high indeed in the king's favor.
Anne, and the women of Katherine Parr's household,
clearly were less willing than Queen Elizabeth's women to
intervene in matters of great importance. This
reluctance was based on the fact that, at this particular
time, there simply were certain matters in which it was
appropriate for women to express an interest -- and
certain matters in which it was not. The spectre of Anne
Boleyn was put before Jane Seymour's eyes when the latter
spoke out against certain of the king's policies. And
Katherine Parr, too, dangerously overstepped the line in
her religious debates with the king in 1546.

Although the king was the center of the court, he
was by no means the only important figure who attracted
attention. The conservative Princess Mary was frequently
asked to stand as godmother to the children of both her
servants and of those at court. The choice was not only
politically wise, since Mary was second in line to the
throne, but natural, as Mary was known to have a special
affection for children. A handful of Katherine Parr's
women seem to have been particular favorites of the
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king's eldest daughter, as Mary's privy purse expenses, from the years 1536 to 1539, and 1542 to 1544, clearly show. Mary stood godmother to at least one of the countess of Hertford's children, laid out money at the christening of another, and rewarded the countess's various nurses and midwives in the 1530s. Mary also sponsored at least one daughter and one son of Lady Lisle, and likewise rewarded Lady Lisle's nurses. In April 1538, Mary sent money for the christening of a child of the countess of Arundel, who was then countess of Sussex. In 1537, she rewarded Lady Wriothesley's midwife and presented money at the child's christening. Mary went through these motions again when Lady Wriothesley had another child in 1544. Mary stood godmother to one of Lady Russell's children in December 1543, and in 1545 was called upon to sponsor Lady Petre's daughter, Catherine.

Mary was also the recipient of small gifts of food from several of Katherine Parr's women. In January 1538, the countess of Hertford sent Mary cheese, and in May the
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same year the duchess of Suffolk sent a special drink as well as other unspecified things.\textsuperscript{296} In June 1543, Lady Lisle sent Mary cherries and artichokes, while Lady St. John forwarded strawberries from London.\textsuperscript{297} In early 1544, Mary received a sturgeon from Lady Denny.\textsuperscript{298} The following July, Lady Lisle sent artichokes and berries, and in November, she sent apples.\textsuperscript{299}

The most valuable presents that Mary received came of course at New Year's, and a few of Katherine Parr's women were able to put a personal touch on to what had become a standardized ritual. In January 1543, the duchess of Suffolk sent 'a payr of wrought sleves & pullers out for an Italian gown wrought'.\textsuperscript{300} Mary also received 'wrought sleves' from Lady Lisle and Lady Russell.\textsuperscript{301} The countess of Hertford and her husband, who likewise gave Mary two 'payr of sleves wrought', also sent a diamond ring.\textsuperscript{302} The following year, 1544, the earl and countess of Hertford again sent 'wrought sleves', as did Lady Lisle and the marchioness of Dorset,
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who additionally sent a smock. From the duchess of Suffolk came a 'Ring w[i]t[h] a Turques & ii wrought lynynges for p[ar]tlettes'. Lady Herbert, on the other hand, sent a 'boke cou[er]ed w[i]t[h] silu[er] and gylt', while Lady Browne gave Mary a '[per]fumyn Box of Silu[er]'. Anne Basset, whose relationship with Mary was over time to become particularly close, presented her future mistress with 'a apyr of gloves enbrawdret w[i]t[h] gold'. This list represents only a handful of the women in Katherine Parr's household who would have presented Mary, both at New Year's and at other times, with gifts.

Although ulterior motives may have been behind some of this gift-giving, it does not necessarily follow that Mary was completely lacking in genuine friends among Katherine Parr's women. Mary certainly seems to have had a special affection for the countess of Hertford, and the two women no doubt played cards with each other on more than the one occasion indicated in the princess's book of privy purse expenses. In June 1544 the countess imposed on Mary to forward a letter from her to Katherine Parr. Mary assured the countess that she had

303. Ibid, 143.
304. Ibid, 143.
305. Ibid, 144, 146.
306. Ibid, 144. In April 1538, Mary had given Anne Basset 7s. 6d. (Ibid, 65).
307. Ibid, 49.
'delyv[er]ed yor l[ett]res unto the Quenes grace who accepted the same very well'. In April 1547, Mary addressed her friend, who was by now duchess of Somerset, intimately in a letter as 'My good gossype' and 'good nane', and noted the duchess's 'earneste gentyles towards me in all my sewtes hytherto'. In the April letter, Mary asked the duchess to further the suits of two of her servants, one of whom was 'my mothers servant, when you weer one of her graces maydes'. Mary closed her letter with the hope that God would 'send you good helthe and vs shortly to meet to hys pleasure'. It seems likely that their previous cordial relations influenced Mary's decision, when queen, to release her old acquaintance from the tower. The degree to which Mary grew to trust the duchess is further evidenced by the fact that Lady Jane Grey's sisters, Katherine and Mary, were placed in the duchess's care in 1554. The 1540s, then, saw the full development of a friendship that may actually have begun in the household of Katherine of Aragon.

Lady Anne Petre may also have been close friends with Mary. Sir William and Lady Petre were hosts to Mary at Ingatestone Hall several times between 1548 and 1550.
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When Mary became queen, Lady Petre rode in her coronation procession and was made a gentlewoman of the queen's privy chamber. Although many of the high-ranking women that Mary had known in Katherine Parr's household were still alive when she succeeded to the throne, only Lady Petre was singled out to serve in her household. Not even Mary's good friend, the former countess of Hertford, had a place in the queen's establishment. Again, Mary's friendship with Lady Petre probably developed while the latter was in Katherine Parr's household.

Two other women of Katherine Parr's household had strong contacts with one of the king's daughters. Roger Ascham praised the progress of Elizabeth's studies under her tutors and Lady Champerson, who was Lady Denny's mother. Lady Denny's sister, Katherine Ashley, also happened to be Elizabeth's governess. Later, when Katherine Parr discovered the flirtation being conducted by her husband, Sir Thomas Seymour, with Elizabeth, the princess went to stay with Sir Anthony and Lady Denny at Cheshunt.

Lady Elizabeth Browne was also a particular favorite of Elizabeth's. Their relationship dated back to the late 1530s, when Lady Browne was still Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald. Much of what is actually known about the
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early years of the earl of Surrey's 'fair Geraldine' comes from the earl's poem, 'From Tuscan cam my ladies worthie race'. The reference to Elizabeth Fitzgerald having been educated with one of the king's daughters -- 'From tender yeres in Britaine she doth rest,/ with a kings child' -- probably refers to her admission to Elizabeth's household in 1539. Surrey's indication that he and the 'fair Geraldine' first met at Hunsdon -- 'Honsdon did furst present her to myn eyen' -- may refer to this time. It has been asserted that Elizabeth Fitzgerald spent very little time in the princess's establishment before she was transfered to the household of Catherine Howard. It was not until Elizabeth Fitzgerald and the earl met again at Hampton Court, probably in 1541 when Surrey attended the Feast of the Garter following his election, that the twenty-four year old earl fell in love with the young woman of about thirteen years and wrote this poem. Surrey's disappointment at Elizabeth Fitzgerald's subsequent
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marriage to Sir Anthony Browne may be chronicled in his poem, 'Wrapt in my careless cloke'.

Princess Elizabeth later had need of Lady Browne's experience of romantic affairs when her own flirtation with Sir Thomas Seymour threatened to become a national scandal. And Lady Browne had some inside information on the whole affair. After Katherine Parr's death, Seymour hoped to win Elizabeth's hand in marriage and tried to exploit Lady Browne's influence with the princess; he may even have offered Lady Browne 500 marks for her assistance. But Lady Browne recognized the danger of the situation, and declined to participate in Seymour's schemes. During the subsequent investigation of Seymour's affairs, Sir Robert Tyrwhit complained to the protector in 1549 that he wished that Lady Browne would return again to Hatfield, as he thought that no one could more wisely advise the princess or cause her to confess the truth. Elizabeth and Lady Browne, who later married Edward, lord Clinton, remained very good friends until the latter's death in 1590.

318. Hughey, The Arundel Harington Manuscript, II, 82-3. The debate concerning the details of Surrey's relationship with the 'fair Geraldine' is by no means exhausted here, where I have set out only the most recent interpretation. In addition to Hughey and Jones, see Padelford, The Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and Reverend James Graves, A Brief Memoir of the Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald, Known as the Fair Geraldine, (Dublin, 1874).


Katherine Parr's women also cultivated the good will of each other. On 31 March 1544, John Berwyke wrote to his master, the earl of Hertford, that the duchess of Suffolk was pleased that the earl liked the horse she recently had sent to him. Berwyke also reported that that very day the duchess was planning to take a barge on the river to visit the countess at Sheen.\textsuperscript{321} This sort of commerce would have been a regular part of the lives of Katherine Parr's women. Small gifts, like the food sent to Princess Mary, would have been exchanged, while other presents would have included cramp-rings, hawkes, falcons, and small pets, like birds and dogs. These were the kind of presents sent regularly by Lady Honor Lisle to her friends and prospective allies in the 1530s.

* * *

The women of Katherine Parr's household were as active as the queen in pursuing the interests of their families, friends, and dependants. They cultivated the good will of not only the king and his daughters, but of each other as well. That most of the known suits these women obtained concerned relatively minor affairs probably reflects the fact that women were more or less excluded from high politics. There was, however, one area in which it was permissible for women to take an
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active interest, and it was an area which actually became highly politicized towards the end of the reign. Katherine Parr and a number of her women inadvertently became political figures through their religious activities in the last months of the reign.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE RELIGIOUS INCLINATIONS
OF KATHERINE PARR AND HER CIRCLE
PART I: RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

Discussing intangibles is difficult under the best of circumstances, but when those intangibles are the religious beliefs of historical figures, the difficulties are increased substantially: records often are fragmented, especially where women are concerned; politics and religion are frequently inextricably mixed; and unorthodox beliefs are hidden behind enforced conformity. The records concerning the religious beliefs of Katherine Parr and a number of her women are indeed incomplete, but several well-documented events of Henry VIII's reign do provide enough evidence to point to their religious sympathies. The queen and the women discussed below considered themselves sincere in their beliefs, but for three at least of the queen's ladies, political concerns seem to have been as important as religious convictions. However, Katherine Parr and a few of her women occasionally endangered not only themselves but also those around them by exhibiting religious positions not in line with the king's official policy; their unorthodox beliefs, which were tempered to a certain degree during Henry VIII's reign, were given full expression under Edward VI.

Before examining the religious inclinations of Katherine Parr, the women of her household, and other prominent figures in the queen's establishment, certain
terms discussed earlier in part II of chapter one should be reviewed. I use 'conservative' and 'reformer' to distinguish between the two main religious positions, (though not necessarily groups or factions), at court in the 1540s. By 'conservative' I mean Henrician, those who followed and supported Henry VIII's personal lead in religion and were reluctant to see radical changes in doctrine. By 'reformer' I mean those who supported the king's religious policies but who would also have favored mild to radical changes in doctrine and practice. 'Catholic' refers solely to Roman Catholicism. In using these designations I am as specific as the material allows.

When Katherine Parr married Henry VIII in July 1543, she apparently adhered in every way to religious policies as they stood at the time. But some time between the date of her marriage and the publication of her Lamentacion of a Sinner in November 1547,¹ the queen became a reformer. Katherine Parr's 'conversion', however, probably did not take place at any precise time, but rather seems to have been a gradual process. The year 1544 probably marks the beginning of a transition which was complete by the middle of 1546. The queen's almost daily interaction with those of her household who held reforming beliefs is the most likely explanation for this change.

For obvious reasons, the religious officials of Katherine Parr's household must first be suspected of converting the queen to a reforming position. Katherine Parr's establishment boasted an almoner, four chaplains, and a clerk of the closet. The queen's almoner was Dr. George Day, appointed bishop of Chichester in 1543. During the 1530s, Day had been promoted at both Cromwell's and the king's instigation, despite his earlier associations with bishop John Fisher: Day had been elected master of St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1537, and, in the following year, provost of King's College. By 1540, Day had been appointed confessor and almoner to Anne of Cleves, but whether he retained these positions under Catherine Howard is uncertain. As these appointments implied, Day was a scholar, and he was the patron of another well-known scholar, John Cheke. Day vigorously opposed many of the religious reforms introduced during Edward VI's reign, and in October 1551, Day was deprived of his see. Dr. Day's views apparently
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were quite acceptable to Mary, and he even preached the queen's coronation sermon.7

What can be deduced from the fragmented information about Dr. Day is that he probably was mildly conservative. His favor at the hands of Cromwell and the king in the 1530s suggests that he supported their religious policies, which at the time were considered radical. His position as Katherine Parr's almoner would also suggest that he continued to support, or at least did not oppose, the religious policies of the 1540s. Any instruction which he might have given Katherine Parr probably could have been expected to be in accordance with the king's official policies.

The influence of Katherine Parr's four chaplains is complicated by the problem of identification. At the time of the king's funeral, the queen had four chaplains in attendance: Dr. Mallet, Mr. Pekyns (or perhaps Perkins?), Mr. Reynoldes, and Mr. Layton.8 Reynoldes and Pekyns apparently served in the brief establishment of Anne of Cleves.9 Layton clearly was not the Richard Layton who assisted Cromwell in the dissolution of the monasteries, as Cromwell's Layton had died by 1544.10 He might, however, have been Edward Leighton, who had
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entered the king's household by 1533, and had become the king's clerk of the closet in September 1538. Leighton continued in that post until late 1544, at which time he was replaced by John Rudde.\textsuperscript{11} The question of course is, did Leighton transfer to the queen's service in 1544? Unfortunately, we simply do not know.

Dr. Mallet is the one chaplain for whom we do have some information, however scant. Mallet apparently had strong connections with Thomas Cromwell: it was at Cromwell's promotion that Mallet succeeded Nicholas Wilson as master of Michaelhouse, Cambridge, in the 1530s.\textsuperscript{12} It was also Cromwell who set Mallet to work in 1538 on a new liturgy.\textsuperscript{13} The Dr. Mallet who appeared as a chaplain in Catherine Howard's household in 1540 probably was the same Mallet who served in Katherine Parr's establishment.\textsuperscript{14} Just exactly when Mallet became one of Katherine Parr's chaplains is uncertain, but it would appear that, sometime after Henry VIII's death, Mallet left the queen's household for that of Princess Mary. It was through his position in Mary's household that he became involved in Nicholas Udall's project of translating the \textit{Paraphrases} of Erasmus, a project


\textsuperscript{12.} Dowling, \textit{Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII}, 91.

\textsuperscript{13.} Ridley, \textit{Thomas Cranmer}, 160.

\textsuperscript{14.} P.R.O., SP 1/157, f. 13v (\textit{LP}, XV, 21).
sponsored by Katherine Parr. The Edwardian Injunctions of 30 July 1547 required that a copy of the resulting publication be made available to the public in every parish church. Mary had taken up the task of translating the Gospel of St. John at the queen's request, but after having begun work on her section, she had to stop, probably in early 1547, ostensibly for reasons of health.\textsuperscript{15} It was Mallet who finished her section.\textsuperscript{16} But it presumably was also this same Dr. Mallet whom Edward VI's council examined in April 1551. At the time, Mallet, still one of Mary's chaplains, was accused of conducting the by now forbidden Henrician mass and persuading 'certain others of the Kinges subjectes to embrace his naughtie opinions', for which he was committed to the Tower.\textsuperscript{17}

Mallet's participation in Udall's project, then, did not necessarily make him a reformer; he apparently was willing to disobey the policies of Edward VI's government. Although Mary herself may have wished to sever her ties to Udall's project, (a project which she may have feared would be used to support religious policies to which she objected), there was no good reason for forbidding her chaplain to take up where she had left
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off: the Injunctions issued in the early months of Edward VI's reign were not in and of themselves a radical departure from her father's policies, and she was in no position to antagonize her brother's recently established government. Although Mary distanced herself from Udall's Paraphrases at this time, she did later give him her patronage, and Udall wrote plays for the entertainment of her court in the 1550s.18

Just how much contact the queen's almoner and four chaplains had with Katherine Parr is impossible to determine. But of all the religious officials of the queen's household, it seems probable that Katherine Parr had frequent contact with at least her clerk of the closet, William Harper. There was a William Harper who was a fellow of New College from 1503 until 1527, and it has been suggested that he probably was the same Harper who became Katherine Parr's clerk of the closet.19 How Harper came to be in Katherine Parr's establishment is something of a mystery; he does not appear to have served in the households of the queen's immediate predecessors.

Harper, and the position of clerk of the closet, are the subjects of a still relevant article written in 1911 by Frances Rose-Troup. Rose-Troup suggests that a royal clerk of the closet probably was 'a private chaplain who was particularly employed about the person of his master


or mistress, and accompanied them upon their ordinary journeys'. The clerk of the closet also seems to have been a personal messenger as well as a close attendant. One of the main duties of the clerk was to maintain the closet, that is, supply books when requested, care for the closet plate, and see to the up-keep of closet vestments and linen. The clerk also appears to have been responsible for 'dressing' the closet, as bills covering Katherine Parr's years as queen include such items as a perfuming pan, a basket lined with lead to carry coal, a fire shovel, a hammer, thread, ribbon, and lace. Additionally, Harper supplied herbs and flowers for the closet, and was responsible for the transportation of the closet 'furniture' when the queen traveled. When the king died in 1547, arrangements were made for the closet to be decked out in mourning, presumably under Harper's guidance. Harper's appearance on a wage list dating to the first months of Edward VI's reign indicates that, initially at least, he continued to serve in the queen's establishment after Henry VIII's death. It is difficult to determine what Harper's religious views were
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at this time; later, in 1553, as vicar of Writtle, Essex, he was prosecuted for popish practices.²⁴

The kind of official religious service which might have been available in Katherine Parr's household is perhaps illustrated by part of an ordinance drawn-up for Anne of Cleves's brief royal establishment.²⁵ One of Anne of Cleves's chaplains was to be ready at 8:00 a.m. everyday to say divine service in a place to be designated by the queen. Another morning service, to be held between 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. in the queen's chapel or closet, was to be conducted 'before her graces gentrywomen & other of her famylye' who had been unable to attend the earlier service. At 4:00 p.m., another service was to be held. And in case there should be any question as to the kind of service which was to be conducted, the ordinance explicitly stated that it was to be according to English rites.

All members of the queen's household were admonished to attend these services; illness and official business were the only acceptable excuses for non-attendance. In theory, those servants who steadfastly refused to go to services were to be 'charitably monishyd & reconsyled' by the countinghouse officials. A second violation of this ordinance, however, brought dismissal. There is some question as to the rigor of enforcement of this
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requirement; in Queen Mary's reign, Edward Underhill commented that there was no better place in the kingdom for a reformer to 'shift' the Easter time than at the queen's court. In other words, there was no better place to avoid participating in the restored Catholic service than at court where, apparently, enforcement was extremely lax.

One might have expected the religious officials of Katherine Parr's household to have been most influential in shaping the queen's religious beliefs. Yet as we have seen, her almoner and clerk of the closet, respectively the queen's highest ranking and most intimate clerics, probably were conservative. There is not enough firm information on Reynolds, Pekyns, or Layton even to guess their religious inclinations. Only one event -- participation in Udall's Paraphrases project -- ties Dr. Mallet to the reformers in the 1540s, and although it is an important connection, it is qualified somewhat by his later firm adherence to the Henrician mass. This last aspect would seem to make him more conservative than reforming.

If these six men, then, were not responsible for directing the queen to a reforming position, can her beliefs be attributed to her household officers? Sir William Parr of Horton, Katherine Parr's uncle and lord chamberlain, was a vigorous supporter of the king's

religious policies of the 1530s. He took an active role in the dissolution of the monasteries and served as the chief commissioner for Northamptonshire.\textsuperscript{27} It must be pointed out, though, that Parr's support might have been due more to the financial benefits he received, or hoped to receive, than because he believed in the moral justice of the king's cause. After his niece's marriage to the king, Parr received yet more lands, again mostly former religious properties.\textsuperscript{28} He does not appear to have concerned himself with doctrinal issues, but rather simply followed the king's lead. In this sense, Parr might be considered conservative if only because he was a 'king's man'. On the other hand, it seems equally likely that, had he regularly attended court and become embroiled in court politics, he would have supported his niece, who came to hold reforming sympathies, if only to maintain the prestige, power, and influence of the Parr family. These family concerns seem generally to have been what most interested and influenced Parr's actions. As it was, Parr appears to have spent much of his time during the last years of the reign in the country, probably because of ill-health. Thus may Sir William Parr be ruled out as a person who might have contributed significantly to Katherine Parr's religious development.

Katherine Parr had three vice-chamberlains during her tenure as queen. The first holder of the office, Sir

\textsuperscript{27} James, 'The Parr's of Kendal', 258.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid, 341.
religious policies of the 1530s. He took an active role in the dissolution of the monasteries and served as the chief commissioner for Northamptonshire.\footnote{James, 'The Parr's of Kendal', 258.} It must be pointed out, though, that Parr's support might have been due more to the financial benefits he received, or hoped to receive, than because he believed in the moral justice of the king's cause. After his niece's marriage to the king, Parr received yet more lands, again mostly former religious properties.\footnote{Ibid, 341.} He does not appear to have concerned himself with doctrinal issues, but rather simply followed the king's lead. In this sense, Parr might be considered conservative if only because he was a 'king's man'. On the other hand, it seems equally likely that, had he regularly attended court and become embroiled in court politics, he would have supported his niece, who came to hold reforming sympathies, if only to maintain the prestige, power, and influence of the Parr family. These family concerns seem generally to have been what most interested and influenced Parr's actions. As it was, Parr appears to have spent much of his time during the last years of the reign in the country, probably because of ill-health. Thus may Sir William Parr be ruled out as a person who might have contributed significantly to Katherine Parr's religious development.

Katherine Parr had three vice-chamberlains during her tenure as queen. The first holder of the office, Sir
Edward Baynton, had served in that capacity in the establishments of Anne Boleyn, Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, and Catherine Howard. Baynton shared Anne Boleyn's reforming sympathies and was favored by the queen; as his continuance in the royal household would suggest, he was not compromised by Anne Boleyn's fall.²⁹ He was also acquainted with Hugh Latimer and probably was friends with Nicholas Shaxton.³⁰ Although distantly related to Catherine Howard by marriage, Baynton did not suffer the disgrace that the queen's closer relatives experienced when the queen was attainted and convicted of treason.³¹ He was one of the privileged few who witnessed the king's marriage to Katherine Parr, but he was in the queen's service for only a little over a year before he died.³² It is tempting to speculate that Baynton would eventually have become close friends with Katherine Parr as the queen's reforming sympathies began to develop. But it is doubtful if he had any role in initially pushing her in that direction, given his brief time of service. His appointment to her household no doubt was based on his previous experience, and certainly made by Henry VIII, not Katherine Parr.


³¹. Ibid, 402.

³². P.R.O., E30/1472, no. 5 (LP, XVIII, i, 873); Bindoff, The House of Commons, I, 403.
Sir Edmund Walsingham replaced Baynton as vice-chamberlain. Very little is known about Walsingham's religious views. While constable of the Tower in the 1530s, he sympathized with Sir Thomas More's circumstances, if not necessarily his position, but he was equally kind to another prisoner, the reformer John Frith. 33 How long he remained in Katherine Parr's household is difficult to determine, but he had been replaced by Sir Anthony Cope by at least the first months of Edward VI's reign, as Sir Anthony was recorded receiving wages as the queen's vice chamberlain for that period. 34

It is unfortunate that we can not accurately date the beginning of Sir Anthony Cope's membership in Katherine Parr's household, because it would seem that he and the queen became good friends. Cope had been educated at Oriel College, Oxford, and was a humanist scholar of considerable standing. In 1544, he had dedicated his translation of Livy's The history of the two most noble captains of the world, Anniball and Scipio, of theire dyvers battailes and victories to the king. 35 In 1548, Cope dedicated to Katherine Parr his Meditations on twenty select Psalms as a new year's

34. P.R.O., E101/426/2, f. 1.
gift. Although the dedication will be discussed in detail later, it is appropriate to say here that a warm friendship between Cope and the queen is strongly implied in the author's epistle. Cope also suggests that he and the queen share similar religious beliefs. But while Cope's reforming views may indeed have inspired Katherine Parr to appoint him to her household, as one historian has implied, the question of whether their relationship developed before or after the queen's widowhood must remain tantalizingly elusive.

Nothing firm can be said about Sir Thomas Arundel's religious beliefs during his time as Katherine Parr's chancellor. Arundel had served in Wolsey's household and had assisted the cardinal with the king's divorce proceedings. After Wolsey's fall, though, Arundel was soon on good terms with his master's successor, Thomas Cromwell. During the 1540s, Arundel appears to have remained outside the political and religious controversies of the period. What little evidence there is suggests that his contacts with the queen concerned mainly official matters. It seems unlikely that he was emotionally close enough with Katherine Parr to have had any influence in her religious development.

36. Cope, Meditations on twenty select Psalms.
There is some circumstantial evidence for the religious views of Katherine Parr’s master of horse and later lord steward, Sir Robert Tyrwhit, and it all tends to point to a reformer’s stance. Tyrwhit must have been agreeable to Katherine Parr, as he was promoted to the office of lord steward of the queen’s dower household. Shortly after the death of the queen in 1548, Tyrwhit recounted to the duke of Somerset (formerly earl of Hertford) a conversation he had recently had with Sir Thomas Seymour, who had been staying with him and Lady Tyrwhit. Seymour had been talking to Lady Tyrwhit when Tyrwhit happened to pass by. Seymour called to him saying, 'I ame talkynge with my Lady your Wyffe in Devynnyte', to which Tyrwhit replied, 'that my Wyffe was not seyne in Devynnete, but she was halff a scripture Woman'. In other words, Lady Tyrwhit was not learned in theology, but she had a sound knowledge of the scriptures. The fact that Tyrwhit did not hesitate to report, or contradict, this piece of the conversation to the Lord Protector suggests strongly that he agreed with his wife when it came to biblical authority. The unassailable supremacy of the scriptures was an attitude and approach characteristic of the reformers. The fact that Princess Elizabeth was consigned to Sir Robert and Lady Tyrwhit’s care by the council after Sir Thomas

---

39. Haynes, A Collection of State Papers, 104. None of the OED entries for seyne (in its many and various spellings) is compatible with Sir Robert Tyrwhit’s remarks. It seems likely that seyne should be taken for sound.
Seymour's arrest also implied that both husband and wife were trusted servants of the crown and that they probably supported the government's policies in general. In this instance, Tyrwhit was given the additional job of questioning Elizabeth about goings-on in the recently deceased queen's household and about Sir Thomas Seymour's treasonable activities. It is probable that Sir Robert Tyrwhit at least sympathized with Katherine Parr's beliefs, but whether he actually encouraged her in them is impossible to tell.

The only other household official who might have been in a position to influence the direction of Katherine Parr's beliefs was her regular physician, Dr. Robert Huick. Huick was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and was for a time principal of St. Alban's Hall. Huick's reforming position, however, got him into trouble with the commissary of Oxford, who caused him to be dismissed from his position at St. Alban's; members of the Hall later pleaded with Cromwell to reinstate Huick, but to no avail. Huick left Oxford and took his medical degree from Cambridge. By his own words Huick was a reformer: in a letter to Richard Morison dated 24 January 1537, Huick compared his conversion in 1532 to the veil which was lifted off of Moses's eyes. It was at that time that he realized that justification did not


41. *LP*, XII, i, 212.
spring from 'the law'. His reforming beliefs, however, did not prevent his appointment in 1538 as physician in ordinary to Henry VIII nor his transfer in 1543 to the household of Katherine Parr. He continued to serve in the queen's household after the king's death, which Huick had witnessed, and ministered to the queen during her delivery and then, shortly afterwards, on her deathbed. One of his last acts of service to Katherine Parr was to witness her oral will. Huick was appointed physician extraordinary to Edward VI: not surprisingly, the doctor's religion did not endear him to Mary when she became queen, and he was not appointed a royal physician again until Elizabeth's reign.42

Although Huick clearly would have been sympathetic to Katherine Parr's religious beliefs, he nevertheless appears infrequently in the records. In light of the fact that he rather than Dr. Wendy seems to have been the queen's regular physician, it is interesting that Foxe named Wendy rather than Huick as having warned Katherine Parr about the plot against her in 1546.

It seems clear, then, that neither Katherine Parr's religious officials nor, probably, her household officers were in a position to contribute significantly to the development of the queen's reforming beliefs. Rather, it would seem that most of the support and encouragement that Katherine Parr received came from a completely

different source: the women of her household. Of the several groups of women serving Katherine Parr, it seems probable that the queen spent most of her time with the ladies of her household: although the official duties of the queen’s ladies appear to have been primarily ceremonial, in practice it seems likely that their main occupation was simply to attend the queen and keep her company. Certainly it was in this group that the queen’s social equals were to be found. Given these circumstances, then, it is not surprising that Katherine Parr’s ladies of the household appear to have been most influential with the queen.

A significant number of women within this rather large group had come to sympathize with the reformers by the 1540s. Various events link Lady Cawarden, the duchess of Suffolk, the countess of Hertford, Ladies Denny, Herbert, Lane, Tyrwhit, Lisle, and the marchioness of Dorset to the reformers. Given that most of these women later encouraged and supported Katherine Parr’s sympathies for the reformers, it seems likely that it was they who initially introduced the queen to reforming doctrines. Some of these women even went further in their devotion to the reformer’s cause and patronized, and in one case wrote, religious works. Their strong connections with reforming literature, however, will be discussed later in part two. Here we will look mainly at their other religious activities.
Although there is not much information on Lady Elizabeth Cawarden, what little there is points in the direction of a reforming position. In 1543, Sir Thomas and Lady Cawarden, along with others connected with the king's privy chamber, were indicted for supposedly violating the Act of Six Articles. Their accuser, Dr. London, eventually was found to have perjured himself, and the king granted pardons to the intended victims. The mere accusation of heresy is not in and of itself evidence of reforming sympathies, although it seems unlikely that heresy charges would have been brought against Sir Thomas and Lady Cawarden if such accusations were entirely improbable.

The two plots against Katherine Parr in 1546 help identify other women reformers within the queen's household. In the first plot the duchess of Suffolk, the countess of Hertford, and Lady Denny were singled out by Sir Thomas Wriothesley and Sir Richard Rich. In the second plot, three of the queen's relatives were targeted: Ladies Herbert, Lane, and Tyrwhit. As will be discussed in chapter five, it was the sympathy these women had for the reformers that put their lives, and the life of Katherine Parr, in danger. With the exception of Lady Lane, the five women concerned in the 1546 summer plots had been at court for a number of years, and could have had contacts with the reformers well before

43. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, V, 495-6; McConica, English Humanists and Reformation Politics, 221-2; Dowling, Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII, 65.
Katherine Parr's marriage to the king. But even if they were not committed reformers at the time of the queen's marriage, there is no doubt that they had become so by the end of the reign and that they had been joined by Lady Lisle, the marchioness of Dorset, and Lady Lane.

Other events also point to the religious inclinations of some of these women. Although the duchess of Suffolk had been at court since at least 1540, and probably earlier, it seems that she only began to mix with the reformers after she had joined Katherine Parr's household. Significantly, the men who stood surety in February 1546 on her behalf for the wardship of her young son were, as Dr. Gunn observes, among the leading reformers at court, including John Gates, Sir Philip Hoby, Sir William Herbert, Sir Anthony Denny, and Sir Ralph Sadler.\(^{44}\) The wives of three of these men -- Ladies Gates, Herbert, and Denny -- served in Katherine Parr's household along side the duchess of Suffolk. The duchess also appears to have been on good terms with the earl and countess of Hertford, two leading court reformers. The Imperial ambassador, Francis van der Delft, was reported to have observed in the last months of the reign that the duchess of Suffolk, the countess of Hertford, and Lady Lisle, were encouraging Katherine Parr in her sympathies for the reformers.\(^{45}\) Lady Denny's husband was a firm reformer and it may well be that she

---
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helped to foster those beliefs. Her interest in religious affairs in 1546 was further attested to by her chaplain, William Hughe, who dedicated to her a religious work. It will be remembered that Sir Robert Tyrwhit cryptically commented to Sir Thomas Seymour in late 1548 that Lady Tyrwhit was a great Bible reader. The authority of scripture was, of course, central to the beliefs of the reformers. And the interest of the marchioness of Dorset in the reformers is evidenced by the education that her daughter, Lady Jane Grey, received.

It is difficult to say who among this group might have been most influential with Katherine Parr. Certainly the queen’s relatives, her sister in particular, would have been especially close to the queen. And of course the Imperial ambassador noted the familiarity of the duchess of Suffolk, the countess of Hertford, and Lady Lisle. The kind of influence these women might have had on the development of Katherine Parr’s religious beliefs is perhaps reflected in a letter the queen sent to Sir Thomas Seymour sometime in the first half of 1547. The queen had been prepared to marry Seymour in 1543, but god ‘w[ith] stode my wyull moost

vehemantly for a tyme and through hys grace and goodnes
made me to renounce ytterly myne one wyll and to folowe
hys wyll most wyllyngle'. In other words, Katherine
Parr felt that her marriage to Henry VIII was something
of a divine calling. The whole process of subordinating
herself to what she thought was God's will was, in fact,
a deeply religious experience for her: 'I can saye
nothyng but as my lady of Suffolke sayeth go[d] ys [a]
maruelous man'. The duchess of Suffolk continued to be
a determining factor in Katherine Parr's life: it
ostensively was partly owing to the duchess that the
queen's Lamentacion was published in 1547. And after the
queen's death and Sir Thomas Seymour's imprisonment,
Katherine Parr's infant daughter was consigned to the
duchess's care.

Not all of these women, however, may have been as
sincerely committed as Katherine Parr or the duchess of
Suffolk; there were other, political reasons for
supporting the reformers at court. From at least 1543,
there were indications that the king was reconsidering
his personal and public stand on religion. Despite the
publication of the conservative work, The King's Book, in
1543, the king allowed mild religious reforms to proceed,
however slowly, throughout the remaining years of the
reign. In May 1544, an English translation of the Litany

49. Dent-Brocklehurst MSS, Sudeley Castle; also
printed in Dent, Annals of Winchcombe and Sudeley, facing
163.
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was published in which saints were demoted to the standing of patriarchs and prophets.\textsuperscript{51} Also in May, Cranmer began work on modifying the mass to include devotional passages in English. This project, though not published until Edward VI's reign, was almost finished by the time of Henry VIII's death.\textsuperscript{52} In May 1545, a proclamation was issued authorizing the use of the first English primer.\textsuperscript{53} In early 1546, the king was considering abolishing bell-ringing on All Hallows Eve, the covering of statues during Lent, and kneeling and creeping to the cross.\textsuperscript{54} These last reforms were never implemented primarily because the king, who was negotiating an Imperial alliance, did not wish to offend Charles V.\textsuperscript{55} In August 1546, according to Foxe, the king publicly indicated to the visiting French admiral that he was considering abolishing the mass in favor of a communion service.\textsuperscript{56} The king also appeared determined to protect Cranmer from his enemies, despite his and the archbishop's sometimes divergent religious views: the two had disagreed strongly on some major points
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concerning The King's Book, but at almost exactly the same time the king personally was protecting Cranmer while the prebendaries plot ran its course. And finally, while the king kept his ministers guessing as to his real intentions, political or otherwise, his heir was being given a humanist education with a reforming slant.

There were, then, strong political reasons for men such as the earl of Hertford and Lord Lisle aligning themselves with the reformers. And as it became increasing clear that the king's health was deteriorating to an inevitable end, Hertford and Lisle became yet more open in their sympathies, and so did their respective wives, as was noted above. In December 1546, the Imperial ambassador indicated that the two men had been responsible, four or five months before, for stopping the prosecution of heretics and sacramentarians. And lest any message be missed in that observation, the ambassador then stated explicitly that he believed that Hertford and Lisle were favorers of those sects.

Although Hertford and Lisle probably believed that they were sincere in their commitment to the reformers at the time, political concerns were certainly at play in their allegiance. Hertford no doubt was looking forward to the day when he would head the government in the name of his nephew, and it seemed increasingly likely that the new reign was going to favor the reformers. Hertford's

personal commitment to the reformers at this time is difficult to assess. Dr. M. L. Bush observes that, until Edward VI's accession, Hertford's association with reforming doctrines 'was understandably shadowy and provided no precise clues to the nature of his beliefs'.\(^{59}\) After Henry VIII's death, however, Hertford, as duke of Somerset and Lord Protector, implemented religious policies which favored the reformers. Bush also believes that Somerset's patronage of three radical reformers, John Hooper, William Turner, and Thomas Becon is especially relevant.\(^{60}\) Bush concludes that, during the protectorate, Somerset 'gained a reputation for being a keen and advanced protestant, and nothing detracts from it'.\(^{61}\) The countess's own religious fervour, 2though, seems to have been conveniently tied, and subordinated, to her and her husband's political ambitions. This will be further explored in part two of this chapter.

Lord Lisle, too, was concerned about the role he would play after Henry VIII's death. In the last months of 1546, he was increasing in the king's favor, and like Hertford, he no doubt believed that the next reign would favor the reformers. Politically, it was wise to align himself with Hertford and the reformers, but whether Lisle was actually emotionally committed is another

---
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question. One recent historian, Professor Beer, has argued that Lord Lisle's religious beliefs were probably less than profound: although Lisle claimed to have worked hard for the reformers, there is 'no contemporary evidence that he risked his life or career for religious considerations'. Beer concludes that Lisle's 'knowledge of theology was superficial, and we may assume that his religion, like that of most of his countrymen, was the same as the king's', meaning Henry VIII. Later, when Lisle was duke of Northumberland and in the Tower under sentence of death, Gardiner served as his spiritual advisor and ensured that the duke met a good catholic end. Just before his death, Northumberland himself stated that he had been 'seduced' by the reformers and their false preaching. While these kinds of conversions were made under great emotional stress, it is not likely that Northumberland, who was about to meet his Maker, was lying in August 1553.

Lady Lisle, like the countess of Hertford, seems to have been concerned primarily with supporting her husband's political, and therefore religious, position in the last months of Henry VIII's reign. That Lady Lisle's activities were politically motivated is evidenced in part by the fact that she actually remained in the background for most of the reign. It probably is

---
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significant that she was not targeted in the plots of 1546, despite the fact that her husband apparently had been protecting reformers. It probably is also significant that it was only in the last months of the reign that her religious beliefs became public enough for anyone to notice. Unlike the countess of Hertford and the duchess of Suffolk, however, Lady Lisle was not a great patroness of religious works, but rather her interests seem to have been more scientifically based, as will be discussed in full in part II. Although no one can see into another’s soul, especially over the distance of time, it nevertheless would seem that political concerns greatly influenced the religious activities of the countess of Hertford and Lady Lisle.

Another reformer with considerable political ambitions was the king’s niece, Francis Brandon, marchioness of Dorset. The marchioness may have been a committed reformer; certainly she was committed to promoting her family, as were most at court in general. Only the marchioness had higher aspirations and better expectations. In 1544, the marchioness and her children, as the heirs of Henry VIII’s younger sister, were placed in the line of succession failing issue of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. This fact may have influenced the decision to give Lady Jane Grey, born the same year as Prince Edward, an education as rigorous as that which the king’s heir received. The strongly reforming slant of Jane’s education may also have reflected the
marchioness’s belief that reformers would dominate the next reign. After Henry VIII's death, Jane was placed into the care of first Katherine Parr and her fourth husband, Sir Thomas Seymour, and then, after the queen’s death, into the sole care of Seymour, who paid £2,000 for the privilege. Seymour had some intention of marrying her to Edward VI; indeed, one of the charges against him in 1549 was that he intended to marry the king at his 'will and pleasure'.

Seymour could not carry out his plans, but after Edward’s death the marchioness’s ambitions were briefly realized when the duke of Northumberland, formerly Lord Lisle, placed Jane on the throne.

The marchioness’s commitment, then, to the reformers' cause, as expressed in the education which her daughter Jane Grey received, was probably tied at least in part to political and familial ambitions. This is not to say, however, the marchioness was completely lacking in genuine sympathy for reforming doctrines, but it does put that sympathy into a larger perspective.

The nine women singled out here influenced in various degrees the direction of Katherine Parr's religious beliefs during the 1540s. A number of events and activities indicate that they were sincere, or probably believed themselves to be sincere, reformers: for at least three of the women political ambitions were

---

as high or higher than religious considerations on their list of priorities. Some of these women probably converted gradually, like Katherine Parr herself, while others may already have been reformers before joining the queen's household. But whenever the conversion, and for whatever the reasons, these women clearly were interested in religious issues and were deeply involved in religious activities. It was through them that Katherine Parr was introduced to reforming doctrines, and it was from them that the queen received support and encouragement for her newly acquired beliefs.

Although Katherine Parr may have been influenced by the women of her household, the queen nevertheless seems to have been an independent thinker. More than that, she possessed an education which enabled her to discern matters for herself.

* * *

Over the last twenty years, there essentially have been two main views on Katherine Parr and the linked subjects of education and religion. The first was put forth in 1965 by Professor J. K. McConica in his English Humanists and Reformation Politics. Dr. McConica states that Katherine Parr was on familiar terms with the reformers John Parkhurst, Miles Coverdale, and Hugh Latimer before her marriage to Henry VIII, thus suggesting that her reforming beliefs were already in
place by 1543. McConica attributes the direction of Prince Edward's humanist education to Katherine Parr and says that her influence on the king in the last years of the reign 'was probably decisive'. Although McConica does not directly confront the issue of the nature or degree of Katherine Parr's learning, by emphasizing her interest in education he implies that she was a fairly well-educated woman at a court which set a very high standard for royal ladies. McConica’s perception of Katherine Parr was often repeated, with only slight deviations, over the next twenty years in books and articles on the queen, Henry VII, and related subjects.

---


The second position on Katherine Parr was set out by Maria Dowling in *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (1986) and in 'The Gospel and the Court: Reformation Under Henry VIII', in *Protestantism and the National Church* (1987). Although Dr. Dowling does not directly discuss Katherine Parr's religious inclinations prior to her marriage to the king, and while neither Miles Coverdale nor Hugh Latimer are mentioned as having a connection with the queen, Dowling does indicate that John Parkhurst joined the queen's household in 1543. Dowling takes particular issue with the tradition that 'Edward was taught with his sisters in a humanist 'royal nursery' directed by Katherine Parr'. Dowling doubts the queen's involvement on the basis that the king's children 'did not live together at court; and even when Edward and Elizabeth shared a house they had separate tutors and lessons because of the difference in age and sex. Moreover, following humanist theory Edward was taken from female company at an early age'. Dowling also argues that Katherine Parr was unqualified to provide the kind of humanist education that Prince Edward received and


that she 'displayed at times a somewhat anti-intellectual streak'.

Although Dowling accepts the point that Katherine Parr was generally interested in promoting learning, she nevertheless stresses that the queen herself had not received a particularly good education.

Dowling also rejects the possibility that the queen had any significant influence over the king.

Dr. Dowling's work had been anticipated to a large extent by C. Fenno Hoffman's 1960 article, 'Catherine Parr as a Woman of Letters', but the wide acceptance of McConica's position suggests that Hoffman's article had little impact on historians. Dowling's more recent arguments, however, seriously challenge McConica's position, and have in fact been incorporated by some historians into their work.

Professor McConica over-estimates Katherine Parr's enthusiasm and influence, while Dr. Dowling goes a bit too far in the opposite direction. There is no evidence that the reformers Coverdale and Latimer were in

---


Katherine Parr’s household during her time as queen. Nor is it likely that Parkhurst joined the queen’s establishment in 1543. Coverdale had gone into self-imposed exile in 1540, and did not return to England until after the king’s death.\(^7^8\) Latimer went into more or less enforced retirement after the passage of the Act of Six Articles; by order of the king he was forbidden to come within ten miles of London.\(^7^9\) And Dr. Ralph Houlbrooke suggests that a misreading of one of Parkhurst’s later poems has lead to the common though mistaken belief that Parkhurst joined the queen’s household at the time of her marriage to the king.\(^8^0\) Given the circumstances of these three men, then, it seems highly improbable that they and Katherine Parr had even met, much less established any kind of relationship, prior to 1543.

Dowling’s position regarding Katherine Parr’s involvement in Edward’s education rests primarily two points. First, she rejects the idea that Edward was educated in a ‘royal nursery’. ‘Royal nursery’ is the key phrase: McConica, who introduced the phrase, meant it to describe the circle of children who shared lessons with Prince Edward. The phrase, though, has been used

\(^7^8\). Barrett L. Beer, ‘A Note on Queen Catherine Parr’s Almoner’, 347.


rather indiscriminantly by other historians, and has become distorted over time. Dowling, and others, takes it wrongly to mean Edward and his sisters, who were of course the royal children. It seems quite clear that McConica himself did not include Mary or Elizabeth in his definition, and that this particular point has been grossly misunderstood by others. Dowling's own misreading, then, is somewhat understandable, even if incorrect.

Dowling's second argument rests primarily on her belief that Katherine Parr was poorly educated. Dowling suggests that Edward's June 1546 letter to the queen, in which the prince congratulates his step-mother on her progress in Latin, is an indication that Katherine Parr was only beginning to study the language. Dowling also cites the fact that the queen's only surviving response to Edward's letters is a corrected Latin draft not in her hand.81 Another example which Dowling uses to support her argument is the fact that Katherine Parr, in a response to a Latin letter she received from the University of Cambridge, denied being proficient in that language.82 Yet the queen's sister, Lady Anne Herbert, told Roger Ascham that her and her sister's and brother's education had been modeled on the schoolroom which Sir Thomas More had set up for his own children, and as Dr.
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Pearl Hogrefe observes, 'it would be something of a fiat to use the More household as a model and to leave out Latin'!\textsuperscript{83} Ascham expressed the hope that Lady Herbert would 'perfect' her Latin, or rather, continue her study of the language.\textsuperscript{84} No doubt this was what Katherine Parr was doing at the time of Edward's June letter.

As Lady Herbert's remarks suggest, Katherine Parr was probably taught Latin when still in the schoolroom. The degree of that instruction of course can not be determined. But what does seem likely is that the queen had little practical need of Latin during her first two marriages, and that only after she came to court was there stimulus to brush-up a language skill which probably had become rusty from neglect. Rather than being completely ignorant of Latin, it seems likely that Edward's letter implies nothing more than the fact that Katherine Parr was pursuing a refresher course in the language. That the queen's only surviving Latin letter to Edward was not in her hand is not evidence that she lacked Latin, as it was common practice for a secretary to handle the royal correspondence, whatever the language. In September 1547, Katherine Parr wrote to Mary in Latin in what appears to be the queen's hand.\textsuperscript{85}


\textsuperscript{84} Lawrence V. Ryan, \textit{Roger Ascham}, (Stamford, CA, 1963), 103.

\textsuperscript{85} B.L., Cotton MS Vespasian F. III, art. 37 (Green, \textit{Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies}, (London, 1846), II, 181-2). Although no year is given in the text
In early 1547, Ascham wrote to the queen in Latin and, in the course of requesting her patronage for the new parliament, complimented her on her learning. Although Ascham's praise probably was tied in part to his request for support, it nevertheless seems unlikely that he would have complimented the queen for her learning in a language she did not understand.

Dowling also accepts the 1546 Cambridge letter to Katherine Parr at face-value. Such acceptance, however, is a mistake. The letter is an artful document, with hidden messages in almost every phrase. Generally speaking, the university had petitioned the queen to intervene with the king in order to prevent the dissolution of Cambridge colleges and chantries. She responded to their letter, acknowledging the fact that it had been 'Latinly written, which is so signified unto me by those that be learned in the Latin tongue'.

of the letter, it seems probable that the document dates to 1547, not 1544 as Strype, and others including Green, have asserted. Mary had been recruited to translate the Gospel of St. John for the first volume of Udall's translations of Erasmus's Paraphrases. Udall later explained that publication had been delayed until January 1548 because Mary had fallen ill and her section had to be taken over by her chaplain, Dr. Mallet (McConica, Humanism and Reformation Politics, 214). From Katherine Parr's 20 September letter it appears as though the translation of the Gospel of St. John had only recently been completed. The queen asked Mary to send her the rough draft of the manuscript, and urged her to allow the translation to be published under the princess's own name. All of this would make sense only if the September letter was written in 1547.
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Katherine Parr was unable to recognize Latin when she saw it, after having been at court for almost three years, seems suspect in the extreme. She carries that modesty yet further when she tells them that they had

'conceived rather partially than truly a favourable estimation both of my going forward and dedication to learning, which to advance, or at the lease conserve, you by your letters move me diversely, shewing how agreeable it is to me, being in this worldly state, by bearing me in hand that I am endued and perfected with those qualities and respects which ought to be in a person of my vocation'.

Significantly, their revealing praise was not rejected: 'Truely this your discreet and politic document I as thankfully accept as you desire that I should embrace it'. In response to their original petition, the queen quotes a 'Latin lesson I am taught to say of Saint Paul, non me pudet evangelii', the translation of which she understands perfectly: she spends much of the letter admonishing those at the university 'not so to hunger for the exquisite knowledge of profane learning, that it may be thought the Greek's University was but transposed, or now in England again renewed, forgetting our Christianity, since their excellency only did attain to moral and natural things'. Rather, the queen exhorts them to 'study and apply those doctrines as means and apt degrees to the attaining and setting forth the better Christ's reverent and most sacred doctrine: that it may
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not be laid against you in evidence, at the tribunal seat of God, how you were ashamed of Christ's doctrine'.

Katherine Parr obviously expected those at the university to show due humility, the kind of modesty which she expresses about her own qualifications, to knowledge and the attainment of it. They must not become so proud that their search for knowledge leads them away from Christianity. The letter amply demonstrates how closely Katherine Parr linked education and religion.

What other languages Katherine Parr may have had is open to some speculation. She probably knew French, and may have had some Italian as well: Elizabeth addressed a letter in Italian to the queen in July 1544, and an inventory taken after Sir Thomas Seymour's arrest reveals that the queen owned 'a Book of parchment writen with Italyan'.

Although Katherine Parr was not as well educated as perhaps Edward or Elizabeth, among her peers she probably stood out as a learned woman. Nevertheless, the queen's involvement in Edward's education probably was minimal, though not for the reasons that Dowling suggests. It simply seems impossible that the king would contentedly have left the instruction of his son, his precious heir for whom he had turned the world upside down, to Katherine Parr, or to anyone else for that matter.

91. Ibid, 36-7.

92. B.L., Cotton MS Otho C X, f. 231 (Green, Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies, III, 176-7); Society of Antiquaries MS 129, pt A, f. 219v.
Edward's education was a matter of state, not a private family affair. Professor Loades must surely be correct in his observation that, 'although it corresponded very happily with her activities, and may have taken account of her views, the provision for Edward's academic training ... was the king's work and not the queen's'.\textsuperscript{93} The most, then, that can be said for Katherine Parr's involvement is that Edward sent the queen a number of brief letters, at least six in the last year of the reign, which were as much schoolroom exercises as they were expressions of love and duty.\textsuperscript{94}

However, Katherine Parr probably had influence on at least some aspects of the education of Elizabeth and Jane Grey. The queen may have been responsible in some way for Elizabeth's decision in 1544 to translate Margaret of Navarre's \textit{The Mirror of the Sinful Soul},\textsuperscript{95} a work which at one time had been placed on a French list of forbidden books; the queen might initially have suggested the work to the girl, or Elizabeth might simply have felt that such a translation would please the queen.\textsuperscript{96} In any

\textsuperscript{93}. Loades, \textit{The Tudor Court}, 121.

\textsuperscript{94}. LP, XX, i, 975; XXI, i, 900, 1036, 1446; XXI, ii, 136, 362, 886.

\textsuperscript{95}. Princess Elizabeth, \textit{The Mirror of the Sinful Soul}, photographic facsimile ed. Percy Ames (London, 1897). Elizabeth's actual title for the work is \textit{The glasse of the synnefull soule}, although it will be referred to simply as \textit{The mirror} within the text of this chapter.

\textsuperscript{96}. Anne Lake Prescott, 'The Pearl of the Valois and Elizabeth I: Marguerite de Navarre's Miroir and Tudor England', in \textit{Silent but for the Word}, ed. Hannay,
case, Elizabeth presented the work to the queen as a New Year’s present for 1545. Katherine Parr may also have suggested Erasmus’s Dialogue Fidei as an appropriate work for the young princess to translate.97 Later, when living in the queen’s dower household, Elizabeth’s tutor, William Grindal, died of the plague. Katherine Parr and Sir Thomas Seymour apparently wanted to appoint Francis Goldsmith in Grindal’s place, but Elizabeth preferred Roger Ascham, who actually had been Grindal’s tutor. That Elizabeth went up to London to discuss the matter with the queen and Seymour suggests that the princess made some kind of stand on the issue and that probably the queen could have over-ruled her step-daughter but decided against it because of the girl’s strong feelings. Given Ascham’s friendship with Sir John Cheke, it is also possible that Cheke’s influence with the privy council figured into the negotiations.98

There is no reason to suppose, however, that the dispute over who should be appointed Elizabeth’s tutor was acrimonious. Katherine Parr and Elizabeth seem to have had a particularly good relationship. The queen took an interest in Elizabeth’s academic work, as noted above, and apparently served as intermediary when the princess offended the king sometime in 1543. On 31 July

64.


98. Ryan, Roger Ascham, 103.
Elizabeth wrote to Katherine Parr in Italian thanking the queen for remembering her to the king. At the time of writing, Elizabeth had not seen the queen, and presumably the king as well, for over a year. Even after Katherine Parr discovered Elizabeth in the arms of her fourth husband, the relationship between the two women was stretched but not broken. The queen no doubt put the blame for the affair on Seymour rather than Elizabeth. At their parting, Katherine Parr promised to warn Elizabeth of any evil rumors that came to her ears, and the princess observed in a letter that 'if your grace had not a good opinion of me you wolde not haue offered frindeship to me that way', 'What may I more say', Elizabeth wrote, 'than thanke God for pouidinge such frendes to me, desiringe God to enriche me with ther longe life, and me grace to be in hart no les thankeful to receyue it, than I nowe am glad in writinge to shewe it'. The letter was brief and sober. On 31 July 1548, Elizabeth wrote again to Katherine Parr, thanking the queen for her recent commendations. Elizabeth made a stab at cheerfulness, and expressed a desire to be at the queen's delivery so that she might see the child chastened 'for the trobel [he] put you to'.

99. B.L., Cotton MS Otho C X, f. 235 (Green, Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies, III, 176-7).
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all tone of the letter, however, seems affected, and no
doubt the whole unpleasant affair, which was later to be
aired so publicly, continued to weigh heavily on
Elizabeth's mind.

Although Elizabeth probably did not share Edward's
lessons, there is a persistent tradition that Lady Jane
Grey may have been in the prince's schoolroom.\textsuperscript{103} After
the king's death in 1547, Jane was consigned into the
care of Katherine Parr, where she remained until the
queen's death in 1548. Because of Jane's youth (she
would have been 9 and 10 years of age during her time in
the queen's dower establishment), her education continued
very probably under Katherine Parr's guidance. It is
probable that Jane shared Elizabeth's tutor, Roger
Ascham.\textsuperscript{104} The impact of Katherine Parr's religious
beliefs and activities on Jane Grey can only be guessed
at, but that the queen did influence Jane's religious
development in some way seems likely, especially given
the queen's fusion of education and religion in general.

\* \* \*

It would appear that, at the time of her marriage in
July 1543, Katherine Parr accepted and followed the
official religious policies of the day. In May, two
months before the marriage, parliament passed an Act for

\textsuperscript{103} Loades, \textit{The Tudor Court}, 121.

\textsuperscript{104} Ryan, \textit{Roger Ascham}, 107.
the Advancement of True Religion in which unofficial translations of the Bible were condemned and Bible reading restricted: men of the nobility might read to their families, and well-to-do merchants and gentlewomen might read only to themselves, but the common people were forbidden to read the Bible in English altogether. At the end of the month, the king's own religious beliefs were set out in *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, or rather, *The King's Book*, as the publication became more popularly known. One of the main items of note about the book was that the notion of justification by faith alone was firmly rejected. That the book reflected the king's own views can not be doubted, as the king personally annotated the earlier *The Bishop's Book*, upon which *The King's Book* was based, and other related documents. Although Cranmer was spirited enough to disagree with the king on several points, most, though not all, of the king's 'corrections' found their way into the new publication. Neither the Act for the Advancement of True Religion nor *The King's Book* probably


disturbed Katherine Parr's conscience in 1543, although by the end of the reign she was to disagree with them both.

Katherine Parr's reputation for piety in general was established soon after her marriage to the king. Household ordinances guaranteed that the queen's household would have a religious appearance: as noted earlier, one of the 1539-1540 regulations for Anne of Cleves's brief establishment stipulated that three services were to be conducted daily, and that all members of the queen's household were to attend at least one unless ill or occupied with official business. There is no reason to suppose that, only three years later, those regulations had changed. The presence of the queen's religious officials, who appear to have been mainly conservative, also contributed to the religious atmosphere of the household. In her personal devotions, Katherine Parr at first seems to have been appropriately conservative. The queen observed not just the Sabbath but also other religious days: in the first six months of her marriage, from July until the end of the year, Katherine Parr's offerings came to over £11.109 A document covering the period January to April, possibly 1544, showed the queen's offerings totaling over £10.110 Typically, the queen offered 5s. for each Sunday and for each of the holy days. For very special occasions,

110. Ibid, no. 51.
however, the queen usually gave more: 10s. for 'thassupc[i]on of or Ladie', 'hollowemas daye', Christmas, Good Friday, and Easter Sunday; 25s. for Twelfth Day; and 30s. for Candlemas. Just after the king's marriage, a courtier commented that Katherine Parr's virtue, wisdom, and gentleness made her particularly suitable to be the king's consort. At the end of 1543, Francis Goldsmith improved on those sentiments when he wrote an effusive letter of thanks to the queen, who had accepted him into her service: he observed that everyday in her household was like a Sunday. This atmosphere, he said, was due entirely to the queen's own pious inclinations.

Katherine Parr's official religious activities probably remained conventional throughout her marriage to the king. She probably continued to contribute her usual amounts on holy days and to participate in religious ceremonies, such as the Maundy services. For the April 1544 Maundy service, Katherine Parr spent £2 18s. 1d. ob. on seventy-seven ells of livery cloth to distribute to thirty-one poor women, each woman representing one year of the queen's life. Clothes, costing a total of £3 13s. 6d., were also provided for the officers assisting the queen at the ceremony. The queen spent 8s. 4d. on aprons for herself, her almoner, Dr. Day, and her receiver, Sir

111. Ibid, nos. 51, 92.

112. LP, XVIII, i, 894.

113. LP, XVIII, ii, 531.
Wymond Carew. In all, the supplies for the 1544 Maundy services came to f7 15s. 9d. ob.\textsuperscript{114}

The year 1544 probably marks the beginning of a gradual transition in Katherine Parr's religious beliefs. The non-controversial nature of her devotional work, Prayers or Meditations,\textsuperscript{115} published almost a year after her regency, suggests that in late 1544 (when work on the book probably began) the queen was only starting to turn towards an inward-looking, personal faith. If the queen did indeed suggest to Elizabeth at that time that Margaret of Navarre's Mirror was an appropriate work for translation, then 1544 might be said to mark the beginning, but not the completion, of a conversion.

Although the queen's Prayers or meditations will be discussed in detail later, it should be noted here that the work was mainly derivative, with the exception of the prayers at the end of the book. The work was hugely popular and non-controversial, although there were aspects which hinted at the queen's later reforming beliefs.

It would seem, then, that some time between the publication of Prayers of Meditations and the moves against the queen in the summer of 1546, Katherine Parr's developing reforming views became more pronounced. The zeal of her emerging beliefs can easily be detected in

\textsuperscript{114}. P.R.O., E101/423/12, f. 6v.

\textsuperscript{115}. RSTC 4818.5. Katherine Parr, Prayers stirryng the mynd ynto heavenly medytacions collected oute of holy workes, (London: Berthelet, 2 June 1545).
her February 1546 letter to the University of Cambridge. As noted earlier, the queen warned the university of seeking knowledge at the expense of Christian faith. She expressed the hope that 'in all your vocations and ministries you will apply and conform your sundry gifts, arts, and studies, to such an end and sort, that Cambridge may be accounted rather an University of divine philosophy than of natural or moral, as Athens was'. 116 Katherine Parr discussed at some length the proper Christian approach to learning. Clearly, the queen was, for some reason, concerned at what she had heard about Cambridge, and was taking them to task. The end of her letter, however, contained good news; the king had decided to preserve the university's institutions.

The Cambridge letter indicated that Katherine Parr had thought long and hard on the subject of religion, and by 1546, her chambers had taken on a strong reforming atmosphere. Foxe recalled that the queen used to have sermons preached in her chamber to her and her ladies, 'in which sermons they oftimes touched such abuses as in the church then were rife'. 117 These sessions, Foxe noted, 'were not secretly done, so neither were their preachings unknown to the king; whereof, at first, and for a great time, he seemed very well to like'. Anyone who was interested was welcome to come and listen to the preaching. Lord Thomas Howard, a younger son of the duke

116. Parker, Correspondence, 37.
of Norfolk, came and listened, and expressed religious
opinions which got him into trouble with the privy
council. Katherine Parr, perhaps encouraged by the
king's seeming support, was even bold enough to discuss
religion with her temperamentally husband. The martyr Anne
Askew was given moral and financial support by some of
Katherine Parr's women, perhaps even by the queen
herself, and heretical books apparently circulated among
some of the women reformers within queen's chambers. The
conservatives at court made two attempts to curtail this
activity in the summer of 1546, but the plots failed when
Anne Askew refused to name her brothers and sisters in
religion and when Katherine Parr made a graceful and
timely submission to the king's will. All of this will
be examined in detail in chapter five.

Despite the sobering effect these plots had on
Katherine Parr, her religious activities apparently
continued to be well-known. On 26 January 1547, Richard
Hilles wrote to Henry Bullinger from Strasburg that he
understood that the queen and, significantly, the earl of
Hertford, were inclined to pious, or rather, reformed
document.118 Chapuys also was aware of the queen's
reforming position: citing a recent report from the
current Imperial ambassador in England, Chapuys noted on
29 January 1547 that Katherine Parr was encouraged in her
reforming beliefs by the duchess of Suffolk, the countess

118. _LP_, XXI, ii, 752.
of Hertford, and Lady Lisle.\footnote{C.S.P.Sp., VIII, 368 (LP, XXI, ii, 756).} He also observed that the queen’s reforming beliefs would not have been displayed openly unless she knew that the king approved of them.

It would seem that the observation about the queen exhibiting her religious position with the king’s tacit permission sprang wholly from Chapuys, which was in itself revealing. Chapuys knew the king far better than the current ambassador, who had been at the English court for only a very short time, and the former ambassador was clearly worried that the king was beginning to favor the reformers. There may have been some substance in Chapuys’s concerns. According to Foxe, Cranmer later reported that, in August 1546, the king had told the French admiral, who was in England to ratify the recent Anglo-French treaty, that he and Francis I should join forces and establish communion services to replace the mass.\footnote{Foxe, \textit{Acts and Monuments}, V, 564.} Cranmer obviously thought that the king was serious in his suggestion, as the archbishop stated that he had been asked to draw up proposals for a communion service to be submitted to the French for consideration.\footnote{Ibid.} Katherine Parr might well have felt free to demonstrate publicly her reforming sympathies in the last months of the reign.
Certainly after the king's death in 1547 Katherine Parr was free to express very publicly her beliefs, and her dower household became a very active reformer's establishment. She continued her habit of frequently hearing sermons, and, as the book list below makes clear, continued to read religious oriented literature. On 5 December 1547, the Imperial ambassador reported to Charles V that mass was no longer celebrated in Katherine Parr's establishment, nor in the households of the Protector and the earl of Warwick (formerly Lord Lisle). The reformer Miles Coverdale, who returned from the continent after Henry VIII's death, was appointed the queen's almoner, apparently on Cranmer's recommendation. The appointment, however, was brief, and in 1548, Coverdale preached the queen's funeral sermon.

Katherine Parr's second religious work also reflected her new-found freedom of expression. The queen's *The lamentacion of a sinner*, published in November 1547 and reprinted the following year, was once again an inward looking, devotional work, but unlike her

---
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Prayers or Meditations, the queen's new book was her own work and had a definite reforming gloss: her belief in the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and support of the idea that the English Bible should be available to all, distanced her from the policies of her former royal husband, but placed her in agreement with the policies of Edward VI's government. The queen was also connected with other reforming literature: Sir Anthony Cope dedicated his Meditations on twenty select psalms to her as a New Year's present in 1548, while at the end of January Nicholas Udall dedicated The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus uppon the newe testamente to the queen. Further, the queen's Prayers or meditations was reprinted in 1547 and 1548. All four of these works will be discussed at length in a moment.

Katherine Parr's association with the above works demonstrates the queen's considerable interest in religious literature. A list of books that the queen is known to have owned further illustrates that interest. We know from a book bill probably dating to 1544 that the queen ordered several copies of Psalms or Prayers (The King's Prayers); most likely she kept at least one copy for her own private use. The same year, her clerk of the closet, William Harper, recorded the purchase of 'a prymary for her grace in laten and englyshe w[i]t[h] epistyles and gospeles', and repair work on 'her graces
All six works were published either by or in the house of Thomas Berthelet. The second prayer book, preserved at Kendal Town Hall, is very small (6 cms by 4cms, and 1.5 cms thick) and probably was intended to be attached to the end of the queen's qirdle. The book, which is actually a manuscript copy of the queen's Prayers or meditations, is non-controversial and no doubt was intended as an aid to private devotions. Prominent in the book are laments of unworthiness and weakness in adversity, and prayers for strength and resignation to God's will, as will be seen in part II.

Katherine Parr bought several books in the early months of Edward VI's reign. A book bill for the period indicates that the queen ordered a number of copies of her Prayers or meditations. At the same time, she

128. Although the book is a manuscript, the script is not Katherine Parr's. The volume is quite striking, with moderately successful attempts at illuminating capital letters and page borders. While Katherine Parr probably did not write the book herself, there is no reason to doubt that she owned it as has been claimed. According to Sir Algernon Tudor-Craig, who traced the provenance of the volume in the 1930s, the book was given by Katherine Parr to Elizabeth Tuke, daughter of Sir Brian Tuke, who married George Stanley, 3rd Lord Audley. The book descended to Lady Audley's great-great-granddaughter, Margaret Poynts, who married Sir Richard Hastings. Lady Hastings gave the book to her cousin, Thomas Lawrence, who on 7 October 1669 scribbled the history of the book on to the last several pages of the volume. From Lawrence it passed into the Offley family of Wychnor Park, Salop. This family sold their entire estate to Theophilus Levett in about 1746. The prayer book remained in the Levett family until 1927, when it was sold to a London dealer. Kendal Town Hall acquired it in the 1930s. A selection of prayers from the book can be found in the pamphlet, 'Queen Katherine Parr's Book of Prayers', transcribed by Mr. G. E. Pallant-Sidaway and printed in aid of the Kendal parish church in April 1980.
purchased an English translation of Erasmus's *Enchiridion*, or rather, *A preparation to death*, and bishop Hooper's *A Declaration of the Ten Commandments*.\(^{130}\)

At the time of Katherine Parr's death, she had in her possession at least sixteen books: three books of the New Testament, two in French, one in English; an English primmer; a book of psalms; a book of prayers; another Bible, probably having belonged to Lord Latimer; and a further nine unspecified volumes.\(^{131}\)

This list very probably represents only a small portion of the number of books that Katherine Parr actually owned or read. But it is significant that the works she is known to have possessed all were religious in nature. Her prayer book at Sudeley is especially important, given that the queen wrote a number of pious sentences on the flyleaf. It is appropriate to quote them here in full:

*Delight not thou in the multitude of ungodly men and have no pleasure in them, for they fear not God.*

*Trust not in wicked wretches, for they shall not help in the day of punishment and wrath.*

*Be gentle to hear the word of God, that thou mayest understand it, and make a true answer with wisdom.*

*Be swift to hear and slow in giving answer.*

*Be not a privy accuser as long as thou livest, and use no slander with thy tongue.*

*See that thou justify small and great alike.*

*Refuse not the prayer of one that is in*

\(^{130}\) Rose-Troup, 'Two Book Bills of Katherine Parr', 42-3.

These sentences represent, in effect, Katherine Parr's personal credo. While it is impossible to date them accurately, the sentiments are entirely compatible with both Prayers or meditations and the Lamentacion. Opposite these sentences was a poem which Dr. Charlton in 1850 attributed to Henry VIII himself. The verse is doggerel, at best. The only items of note about the poem are the sinister references in the last several lines, where the writer says that his suspicions about the recipient have been banished. Although the page containing the verse has now disappeared, there is no reason to doubt what Dr. Charlton saw. However, without the handwriting to examine, it is impossible to tell if he was correct in attributing them to Henry VIII.

The year 1546, then, saw the completion of the transition of Katherine Parr's religious beliefs. The queen was probably introduced to reforming doctrines by a number of her high-ranking women, and certainly these same women encouraged and supported the queen's newly acquired beliefs. The queen's new beliefs were reflected in virtually her every action: she admonished Cambridge University not to seek knowledge at the expense of their
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faith; encouraged Elizabeth's translations of religious works; probably instilled in Jane Grey some of the fervour the young woman displayed later in her short life; and kept on hand a number of devotional works. Indeed, the queen and a number of her women took an especial interest in religious literature.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE RELIGIOUS INCLINATIONS
OF KATHERINE PARR AND HER CIRCLE

PART II: PATRONAGE AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE

There is a compelling argument to be made that the reforming beliefs (and political commitments) of Katherine Parr and at least nine of her women either developed or matured during the time they spent in the queen's household. It is no accident that from 1547 and onwards significant numbers of women, including Katherine Parr herself, began to patronize, and occasionally even write, religious works; indeed, their patronage was actively sought. This was especially true of the more committed reformers among Katherine Parr's circle of ladies. The religious works they and the queen either patronized or wrote must be examined in order to demonstrate the profound effect their experiences in the queen's establishment later had on their public and private lives.

Lady Denny was the only one of Katherine Parr's ladies to receive a dedication before the king's death. In June 1546, Lady Denny's chaplain, William Hughe, dedicated to her his *A swete consolation, and the second boke of the troubled mans medicine.* Lady Denny's virtues were so great and numerous, Hughe wrote, that if he began to list them he would never find an end to his

---

Rather, knowing that she liked nothing less than hearing herself praised, Hughe would cover her virtues 'with the vele of silence, and leave them to the judgement of those that knowe you'. Hughe did, however, put those virtues into masculine perspective, and affirmed that she was a 'wyfe not vnworty of hym whom god the maker of al honest mariages, hathe gyuen you for youre husbande'. In other words, she was a worthy companion to the learned, and devout reformer, Sir Anthony Denny. Because Hughe wanted to show what an 'honest harte' he had towards Lady Denny, he decided to dedicate his 'lytle boke' to his mistress. The book's purpose, he stated, was to show men how they 'might learne to dye patiently, to leue the worlde willyngly, and to go vnto christ gladly'. Generally speaking, the book consisted mainly of prayers and the like which could be read to the terminally ill to ease their minds and prepare them for death.

While Hughe's book was not doctrinally controversial, his dedication to Lady Denny suggested that she had a strong interest in religious matters; it seems unlikely that Lady Denny's chaplain would have dedicated a religious work to her unless he was very sure that such a work would be appreciated.
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At a time when women were encouraged to translate religious treatises, rather than to write their own,\(^6\) Lady Tyrwhit defied convention and followed the example of her former mistress and friend, Katherine Parr, who had been dead for over twenty-five years, and published in 1574 a book of private devotions entitled, *Morning and evening prayers*.\(^7\) The book, as the title would suggest, contains a series of prayers, hymns, meditations, and other similar material, arranged chronologically, which are to be said or read over the course of a day. Although doctrinal issues are not specifically discussed, the language of the work is unobtrusively that of a reformer: Lady Tyrwhit speaks in one place of those believing in Christ as having 'fellowship with Angels, and are become Citizens of the saints, . . .'\(^8\) Only a short while later she asks God to give her grace 'to be at unitie, in quietnesse, and in charitie with all thy chosen and elect people, . . .'\(^9\) Clearly she adheres to the doctrine of justification by faith alone: she
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repeats in several places that only through Christ can anyone expect salvation. The book ends with thirty-five 'godlie sentences written by the Ladie E. T'. Morning and euening prayers was popular enough to have been included in an edition of pious womens' writings compiled by Thomas Bentley in 1582. In Bentley's book Lady Tyrwhit kept company with such illustrious women as Margaret of Navarre, Queen Elizabeth, and Katherine Parr herself, whose Prayers and Meditations was included in the edition.

In 1577, three years after the publication of Morning and euening prayers, John Fielde dedicated his translation of Jean de L'Espine's An excellent treatise of christian righteousness to Lady Tyrwhit. Fielde must have been well acquainted with Lady Tyrwhit in order for him to have addressed her as his 'very deare frend'. While one of his main intentions in publishing the book was to make the treatise generally available to the reading public, Fielde also told Lady Tyrwhit that he wanted his labors to 'be a testimony to all posterity of your forwardnes, fidelity & sinceritie in the religion of Christ Jesus'. Fielde spent the last two pages of the

10. Ibid, 105, 118, 123, 130.
dedication admonishing Lady Tyrwhit literally to keep the
faith.  

Fielde’s treatise was more overtly reforming than
Lady Tyrwhit’s own work. Justification by faith alone
was asserted and, with that doctrine in mind, the need
for ‘good works’ in a Christian life put into
perspective.  

That Christ alone was the only
intermediary between the penitent and God also was made
clear. There was a long passage on the subject of
‘righteousness’, a section on the mortification of the
flesh, and brief discussions on confession of faith and
prayers. It is probable that this treatise
corresponded to Lady Tyrwhit’s own beliefs. The strong
friendship implied in the phrase, ‘dear frend’, certainly
suggests that Fielde would have known Lady Tyrwhit’s
religious inclinations and that he would have dedicated
his work to her with that knowledge in mind. The
reforming doctrines which Lady Tyrwhit encountered during
her time in Katherine Parr’s household, then, were still
with her almost thirty years after the queen’s death.

In 1549, William Thomas, a noted scholar of Italian
who became a clerk of the privy council under Edward VI
and a mentor to the young king, dedicated his *The vanitee*

---

15. Ibid, 5-6.
17. Ibid, 57, 111.
of this world to Lady Herbert. In the preface Thomas compliments Lady Herbert in a rather round-about way, saying that he had 'founde so muche negligence in man' that he had decided to 'dedicate my boke vnto a woman ... to the entent that men ashamed, through the vertuous examples of women, maie be prouoked therby to refourme theim selfes, whiche no kinde of admonician can persuade theim to dooe'. Finding Lady Herbert 'in vertue and bountee to excelle as the draymant amongst the iewelles', Thomas decided to dedicate his book to her. Thomas's work was mildly reforming, and as the title might suggest, vanity, in its many worldly aspects, was the real subject of the book.

It has been suggested that Thomas's decision to dedicate his work to Lady Herbert may have stemmed from favors he had received from her husband, Sir William Herbert. If Thomas's work was indeed a grateful response for those favors, then the fact that he dedicated his labors to Lady Herbert and not her husband might suggest that she, rather than Herbert, actually was the one most interested in religious matters. It is just as possible, though, that Thomas dedicated his work to Lady Herbert for the reasons he professed: his


recognition of her virtues and her reforming temperament. His dedication was not out of line with Lady Herbert's position as an educated woman; although she was not considered a scholar, Roger Ascham, Elizabeth's tutor, had praised Lady Herbert for her learning.²³

The countess of Hertford was in a very good position to express her reforming beliefs after her husband became Lord Protector in 1547. From the time of Edward VI's accession until her husband's second arrest in October 1551, ten religious oriented works were dedicated to the countess, as duchess of Somerset. Her patronage began only a few months after Katherine Parr's death, when John Olde dedicated to her his contribution to Udall's second volume of Erasmus's Paraphrases.²⁴

The countess of Hertford, as duchess of Somerset, did not quite replace her rival, Katherine Parr, in the patronage of Udall's project of publishing Erasmus's Paraphrases. The first volume had been dedicated in its entirety to the queen, whereas only John Olde's translation of the canonical epistles of Saints Paul, Jude, James, and John were dedicated to the duchess. This represented only about half of the book; the book as a whole was dedicated to Edward VI. Olde's dedication also seems a bit more formal than those addressed to


²⁴. RSTC 2854.6. Udall, et. al., The seconde tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the new testamente, (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1549).
Katherine Parr. Olde noted the duchess's 'christian studies and traviales in the faithfull furtheraunce and aduauncement of the syncere worde of God', as expressed in her 'liberall reliuing, helping and with moste hartie diligence succouring the poore, as the commune patronesse and helper of all nedie & succourless settouts forth of the Gospell of Christ'.\(^{25}\) It was at the request of the duchess's 'seruaunt', the printer Edward Whitchurch, that Olde took on the job of translating a section of Erasmus's *Paraphrases*. And, 'being encouraged by youre graces muche proued clemencie towards all menne in generall, I am presentlie bolde to dedicate these symple doinges of my rude translacion vnto your moste noble and excellent name . . .'.\(^{26}\) Olde also took the opportunity to thank the duchess for procuring for him the vicarage of Cobington in Warwickshire.\(^{27}\)

The same year that Udall published his second volume of the *Paraphrases*, Nicholas Lesse dedicated his translation of *The minde and judgement of maister Fraunces Lambert of Auenna of the wyll of man* to the duchess of Somerset.\(^{28}\) Lesse thought that it was a good

\(^{25}\) *Ibid*, *1*.

\(^{26}\) *Ibid*, *1*-*1v*.

\(^{27}\) *Ibid*, *1v*.

\(^{28}\) *RSTC* 15178. Frances Lambert, *The minde and judgement of maister Fraunces Lambert of Auenna of the wyll of man*, trans. Nicholas Lesse, (London: John Day and William Seres [1548]). All quotations in the text are from the dedication, which is unpaginated.
time to have his translation of Lambert published because
the idea 'that man hathe power to do good of hym selfe',
which was asserted by 'the Papistes, of the Anabaptistes,
& of the Pelagio[n]s', flourished. Lesse singled out the
papists especially for their errors, which had

'caused them to builde monasteries, to go on
pilgrimages, to set up candels before stocks
and stones, to make holy water and holye
breade, to weare thys or that disguised cote,
to faste thys or that prescribed daye, to synge
masses for the deade and quicke to make of the
blessed supper of the Lord, a sacrifice for the
quicke and dead, to make of bread and wyne (as
they moste falselye do affirme) the naturall
fleshe and bloude of oure sauiour Jese Christe,
and to be shorte to applye the mooste fruitfull
& benefitial fruities of hys passio[n] to the
health of bruite beastes, as hepe oxen, and
swyne, as wel as to the soule of man'.

Another reason why Lesse believed his publication
was timely was because 'thys errooure of fre wyl to do
good in man' infringed upon the article of justification
by faith alone. Lesse claimed to have been 'bolde to
name youre grace a mooste Godly mother & setter forth of
this worke [Lesse's translation] vnder whose name it
cometh abrode into the handes of the people, to whom
nexte vnto God they shall yelde thankes for the fruite
therof'. The tenor of the work itself, then, was
strongly asserted in the dedication.

That writers and translators of religious works
often had ulterior motives for dedicating their pieces to
prominent people was amply demonstrated by Edward
Courtenay, later earl of Devon, son of the executed
marquis of Exeter. Courtenay, though only a young boy,
had been imprisoned by Henry VIII at the time of his
father's disgrace and execution in 1538. Twenty years later, Courtenay was still in the Tower and anxious to please the new regime and thus gain his freedom. In 1548 he translated Benedetto Luchino's *Beneficio di Giesu Cristo Crocifisso* from Italian into English and dedicated it to the duchess of Somerset. Courtenay's dedication was not so much concerned with praising the duchess as it was with lamenting his own miserable existence in the Tower: he relied on the duchess's 'gracious good will and helping hande, that by the same your godlie and pitefull meanes it may pleas my Lordis grace [the duke of Somerset] of his manyfolde and habundaunte goodnes, to deluier me out of this miserable captiuite'.

Courtenay's effort made little impact, and the unpublished manuscript eventually came into the hands of Edward VI, who signed the work in two places. Courtenay was not released until the accession of Mary in 1553.

Christopher Hamonde also wanted to gain the duchess of Somerset's good will for reasons which apparently had little to do with religion. He dedicated to her his manuscript *Maxims from the Old and New Testaments* sometime between 1547 and 1552. He was modest about

---


30. B.L., Royal MS 17 A VI.
his abilities and did not over praise the duchess. But, if her grace would be willing 'to talke wythe me for a more weyghter mator which I haue to open, at any tyme hearafter, I shalbe at your graces wylle and pleasure, redy both wythe harte mynde & panes'.\textsuperscript{31} The manuscript, which consisted of pious statements arranged alphabetically, was never published. And it is unknown whether or not Hamonde ever spoke with the duchess about his mysterious matter.

In 1549, Walter Lynne dedicated to the duchess of Somerset his \textit{A briefe collection of all such textes of the scripture as do declare ye happie estate of the[m] that be vyseted wyth syckness}.\textsuperscript{32} Two sermons by Martin Luther were appended at the end of the work. Lynne originally wrote the book after the death of a loved one and only later thought that it might benefit others.\textsuperscript{33} He therefore

'thought it most expedient to dedicate it vnto your graces name who is knowne to be (amongst the noble women of this realme) the most gracieuse patronesse & supportar both of good learnynge and also of godly men learned, ye thereby ye weake appetyte of the sycke shepe of Christe, may be the more styrrred vp to taste of this confortable fode and nourishment of theyr soules'.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{31}. B.L., Royal MS 17 A VI, f. 2v.

\textsuperscript{32}. RSTC 17119. Walter Lynne, \textit{A briefe collection of all such textes of the scripture as do declare ye happie estate of the[m] that be vyseted wyth syckness. Wherunto are added two sermons by M. Luther}, (London: Walter Lynne, 1549).

\textsuperscript{33}. \textit{Ibid}, A2v.

\textsuperscript{34}. \textit{Ibid}, A3v-A4.
Aside from the two sermons by Luther at the end, the book consisted mainly of paraphrased passages from the bible; there was no coherent narrative.

The duchess of Somerset received three dedications in 1550. Two were again from Walter Lynne: The true belief in Christ and his sacramentes, set forth in a Dialogue betwene a Christen father and his sonne, and Henry Bullinger’s bible concordance, A briefe and compendious table. Lynne, who specialized in the works of the German reformers, did not know the author of the first piece, but stated that it had been written long ago in Dutch and later translated into Latin. The book declared 'effectuously and very pythyly the .xii. Articles of the Christian faith and insidently the righte vnderstandinge of the sacramentes'. Lynne had decided to dedicate the work to the duchess because she had 'of longe tyme found suche fauoure in the syghte of God', and because she had 'a muche greater desyre to se Goddes trueth both preached & set forth in writtinges . . . then a greate numbre of noble men & wome[n] of this realme


37. Ibid, A2v.
haue had'. 38 Lynne considered the duchess a 'most worthy example of al noble women, whose Godlye studye all Christen hertes do greatly reioyce in . . .'. 39 The information contained in the dedication of the concordance also was significant. Lynne stated that he was informed 'by such as be nygh about your grace, that youre graces chiefe and daylye study is in the holy Byble', and with this in mind, he 'coulde not presente your grace wyth any juwell more acceptable and pleasaut to your grace then suche a bryeefe concordaunce'. 40 In order to 'forther youre grace in youre godly studye', and also so that others might follow her example, Lynne dedicated the publication to the duchess. 41 Lynne's observation that the duchess was an avid Bible reader probably was an accurate report; it seems unlikely that such information would have become widely known unless there was at least some truth to it.

The third book dedicated to the duchess of Somerset in 1550 was a translation by Nicholas Lesse of A worke of the predestination of saints, by St Augustine. 42 The purpose of Lesse's publication was to refute those who

38. Ibid, A2.
40. Lynne, dedication of A briefe and compendious table . . ., A2.
41. Ibid, A2v.
42. RSTC 920. St Augustine, A worke of the predestination of saints, trans. Nicholas Lesse, (London: the widow of John Herford, [1550]).
doubt 'that there is any predestination', and who believe that 'al good workes are of our selfe . . . and that al good workes are in our power ether to do the[m] or to leave them vndone, procedig of our owne fre wyl'.

Although Lesse mentioned the duchess only briefly, he nevertheless praised her as a 'faythfull mother of all good workes'.

The duchess of Somerset received a manuscript dedication of An Homilie or sermon of Basile the great from Mildred Cecil, Sir William Cecil's wife, in about 1550. Although the work was a considerable piece of scholarship -- a translation from Greek into English, no less -- Mildred Cecil obeyed convention and down-played her achievement. She described herself as the duchess's 'hu[m]ble servuant & dettor'. Mildred Cecil thought it 'mete w[i]t[h] these fewe leaues thus by me translatyed to moue yor goodness ether to take the[m] as some meane frend to intreat for my dett'. The 'dett' was not literal, but rather was a nice literary conceit. The pleasant turn of phrase was about the extent of Mildred Cecil's praise of the duchess.

The last dedication the duchess of Somerset received during Edward VI's reign came in 1551 from her servant,

---
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Thomas Becon: The flour of godly praiers.\textsuperscript{48} Becon considered the duchess 'a worthye patrones bothe of the godlye and of godlynesse, bothe of the learned and of learninge'; his work was 'small and slender' when compared to her 'lyberalyte'. But because he was

'so fullye persuadde of your graces mooste gentle nature and godlye dysposyon toward so many as are godlye and well bent and vertuouslye minded, . . . I feere nothinge to offer this my booke vnto your grace . . .'.

Becon asked her to accept his

'small gyft in good part which comminge as it were from your Grace into the handes of many, shal (I doubt not) doo manye good, and bee the occasion that vyce shal decresse, and vertue abundauntly encreasse among vs'.

After her husband's execution in January 1552, the duchess of Somerset received only two more dedications, and these came in the middle years of Elizabeth's reign. Whether this gap was due entirely to the duchess's loss of power and influence is unknown, although her family's disgrace probably discouraged men from seeking her patronage in the last years of Edward VI's reign. In 1570, Edward Carne dedicated to the duchess his translation of The Fortresse of Fayth, by Stephanus Bodonius.\textsuperscript{49} Surprisingly, the praise that the duchess

\textsuperscript{48} RSTC 1720. Thomas Becon, The flour of godly praiers, most worthy to be vsed in these our daies for the sauegard, health, and confort of all degrees, and estates, (London: John Day, 1551). All quotations from the text come from Becon's dedication, which is unpaginated.

had typically received in the earlier dedications was completely lacking in Carne's epistle: her name was used only to indicate to whom Carne was dedicating his work. The work itself was extremely mild, with a great deal of paraphrasing of the bible and St Augustine. Ephriam Pagitt was not extravagant in his compliments, either. In 1585 he dedicated his translation of The Book of Ruth expounded in twenty eight Sermons, by Ludwig Lavater, to six women, of whom one happened to be the Duchess; Pagitt addressed them all as 'worthy Matrons and Mirrors of vertue', and that was the extent of his praise.\textsuperscript{50}

Only the Duchess of Suffolk rivalled the Duchess of Somerset (countess of Hertford) in the patronage of reforming literature. Not only was the Duchess of Suffolk involved in the publication of Katherine Parr's own Lamentacion, which will be discussed in a moment, but she was associated in various ways with thirteen works spanning three decades.

Over a thirty year period, the Duchess of Suffolk received six direct dedications: three dated to the first four years of Edward VI's reign, while the other three dated to the first half of Elizabeth's reign. The first dedication to the Duchess was Nicholas Lesse's translation of A very fruitful & godly exposition vpon the .xv. Psalms of David, by Jean de l'Espine, which

probably was published in 1548.\textsuperscript{51} Lesse initially had made the translation in order to benefit a friend, who had not received a good education, but seeing that the book might benefit the population at large, Lesse decided to publish it.\textsuperscript{52} He also believed that the common people would take note and heed of such a book only if it were dedicated to a noble person, and so 'amonge all other your grace came first vnto my minde, whose excelle[n]cie being a goodly & a bright spetacle to womanhood: and no small reproch to a great meany of men, which ar slogardes in ded and be ni idel bodies'.\textsuperscript{53} Also influencing his choice was the 'arde[n]t loue & desire that your grace doeth beare to the holy worde of God'.\textsuperscript{54} The work itself was strongly reforming: justification by faith alone was asserted while 'papists' generally were abused.\textsuperscript{55}

The following year, 1549, Thomas Some sponsored the publication of The fyrste Sermon of Mayster Hughe Latimer, which Some dedicated to the duchess.\textsuperscript{56} Some knew that the book would appeal to the duchess, not simply because of its excellent content, but also because


\textsuperscript{52}. Ibid, A2-A3v.

\textsuperscript{53}. Ibid, A4v-A5.

\textsuperscript{54}. Ibid, A5.

\textsuperscript{55}. Ibid, F2, G3, I5v, K4v.

of the good which would ensue from its publication. He noted the duchess’s ‘most godly disposition, an unfaynèd loue towards the lyuyngge, almightye, eternal God and his holye worde practysed daily bothe in your graces most vertuous behauyour, and also godly charitie towards the edificatio[n] of euerie membre graffed in christe Jesu . . .’. Latimer’s sermon praised Edward VI for delivering the kingdom from ignorance and the captivity of the pope. The king generally was admonished to obey God’s will, to live chastely, and to take a wife who was devout. He also was warned against desiring worldly riches.

The next dedication to come to the duchess of Suffolk was a classical work: John Harington’s 1550 translation of Cicero’s The booke of freendship. Harington, who had been a servant of Sir Thomas Seymour, was imprisoned in 1549, and during his ten months in the Tower he taught himself French. To practice his new language skill, and to pass the time, he decided to translate a French edition of Cicero’s work. Having finished the book, there was no one ‘to whom I shoulde rather offre it, than vnto your grace, whom the freendelesse dayly find their defence, and the helpes

57. Ibid, A2v.
59. Ibid, A4v.
The duchess was 'of all other most worthy this smal fruite of my prisons labour, as a fitte patronesse to the honour of such a worke, and a trew example, in whom it is fulfilled'. Because Harington was released from the Tower in October 1549, and his book not published until some time in 1550, it seems unlikely that his dedication was an indirect plea for the duchess to obtain his freedom. On the other hand, his references to her compassion probably are subtle hints that he himself had been on the receiving end of her friendship at one time; perhaps even while he was in the Tower.

The rest of the dedications to the duchess of Suffolk come in the reign of Elizabeth. In 1560, 'A. L.' dedicated to the duchess a translation of *Sermons of John Calvin, vpon the songe that Ezechias made after he had bene sicke, and afflicted by the hand of God*. 'A. L.' did not need to instruct the duchess in religion, because 'your graces profession of his worde, your abidyng in the same, the godly co[n]uersion that I haue sene in you, do proue that your selue do better vnderstand & practise than I can admonishe you'. John Phillips wrote in the

---


63. Ibid, A5.
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dedication of his poem, *A friendly Larum, or faythfull warnynge to the true harted Subiectes of England*, (published in 1570), that the duchess’s virtues were ‘open and manifest to the louers of Gods sincere & Catholique Gospel’, as was her desire to convert those who were enemies to God’s word.\(^6\)

According to Phillips, God had ‘framed so good a gift’ in the duchess’s heart, and so filled her eyes ‘with his deuine knowledge’, that she was well able to ‘discerne falshood from truth, light from darkensse, pure religion from unwritten verities, and Gods Euangely from mens tradicions . . .’.\(^7\) In the epistle to the reader, Phillips stated clearly that faith alone lead to salvation.\(^8\) The poem probably was a response to the publication of the papal bull of excommunication against Elizabeth; it was long-winded and not surprisingly railed against Roman Catholics and their religion.

The last dedication to the duchess of Suffolk came in 1580 from John Field, who presented to her his translation of Theodore Beza’s *The other parte of Christian Questions and Answeares*.\(^9\)

---


\(^7\) Ibid, A2v.

\(^8\) Ibid, A4v.

work to the duchess because he knew that only the 'glory of God & desire of advancing his trueth, hath beene the chiefe Prouokers of this your goodnesse'.\textsuperscript{70} It was 'a poore pledge of my humble duety, and a testimony too the posterity of your hearty good will, and vnfained loue, to the glorious trueth of God'.\textsuperscript{71} As far as the content of Field's book is concerned, it can best be described by a colloquial formula: 'everything you wanted to know about religion but were afraid to ask, set forth in two-hundred-and-fifty questions and answers'.

In addition to these six works, the duchess also was mentioned briefly in two other books: a 1571 publication of Hugh Latimer's \textit{Seven Sermons made vpon the Lordes prayer}, which had been preached before the duchess of Suffolk in 1552;\textsuperscript{72} and Thomas Wilson's \textit{Vita et obitus}, published in 1551.\textsuperscript{73} This last work was in memory of the duchess's two young sons, who had died of the plague in 1551. Additionally, the duchess's coat of arms appeared on five other publications over a two year period, from 1548 to 1549. All the books were religious in nature and were published in London by John Daye and William Seres: a translation of Pierre Viret's \textit{A verie familiare &

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid, *2.

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid, *2v.

\textsuperscript{72} RSTC 15284. Hugh Latimer, \textit{Seven Sermons made vpon the Lordes prayer}, (London: John Daye, 1571).

\textsuperscript{73} RSTC 25816. Thomas Wilson, \textit{Vita et obitus duorum fratrum Suffolciensium, Henrici et caroli Brandoni duabus epistolis explicata}, (London: Richard Grafton, [1551]).
fruiteful exposition of the xii. articles in the Apostles crede, (1548?); An exposicion vpon the v., vi., vii. chapters of Matthew, (1548), by William Tyndale; A notable sermon [on the plough], (1548), by Hugh Latimer; The newe testament of our sauour christ, newly set forth after the beste copie of W. Tindales translation, (1548); and The volume of the bokes called Apocripha, (1549). It should be noted that Daye published three of the direct dedications that the duchess received, and that he and Seres together published yet a fourth.

The duchess of Suffolk's association, direct or otherwise, with all these works demonstrated the strength and continuation of her reforming beliefs, beliefs which had developed during her time in Katherine Parr's household. While we can not accurately date the duchess's conversion, we can at least be certain of its lasting impact.

As suggested earlier, Lady Lisle's religious activities seem to have been motivated primarily by political concerns. This assessment is borne out by Lady Lisle's literary patronage, where her interest is clearly shown to be more scientific than strictly religious. At the request of Lord Stafford, Humfre Lloyd in 1550 dedicated his translation of Pope John XXII's medical treatise The treasury of healthe to Lady Lisle, who was

---

74. RSTC 24784, 24441a, 15291, 2853, 2853, 2791A, respectively.
by then duchess of Northumberland. \footnote{75} It was Lord Stafford who had ties to the duchess and it was he who commissioned Lloyd to translate the work. Lloyd was only obeying Stafford's instructions when he dedicated the work to the duchess, hence Lloyd's references to her were extremely brief and formal. Perhaps more revealing is the work the duchess commissioned from Dr. John Dee, the famous Elizabethan astrologer, who was attached to her household in the last years of Edward VI's reign. Dr. Dee recalled that in 1553 he had been asked by the duchess to write two scientific tracts: \textit{The true cause, and account (not vulgar) of Fluds and Ebbs} and \textit{The Philosophicall and Poeticall Original occasion, of the Configurations, and names of the heavenly Asterisms}. \footnote{76} It is unfortunate that these two tracts were not published, as the prefatory epistles might have provided yet further information on the duchess's unusual interests.

Nor was the marchioness of Dorset a patroness of religious works. She was mentioned in a brief, formal, and unrevealing epistle by Thomas Wilson in his 1551 \textit{Vita et obitus}, a work which had been produced in memory of

\footnote{75}{RSTC 14651.5. Pope John XXII, \textit{The treasury of healthe}, trans. Humfre Lloyd, (London: Wylyam Coplande [1550?]). The dedication is brief, but unfortunately also unpagedinated.}

\footnote{76}{James Crossley, ed., \textit{Autobiographical Tracts of Dr. John Dee}, (Chetham Society, vol. 24, old s., 1851), 75.}
her late half-brothers, Henry and Charles Brandon, the sons of the duchess of Suffolk.

The fact that neither Lady Lisle nor the marchioness of Dorset received dedications of religious works probably reflects nothing more than a general lack of genuine interest in religious affairs on their part. In the last years of Edward VI's reign, Lady Lisle and the marchioness of Dorset were in high-ranking social positions, positions which they could have exploited had they been so inclined. That these two high-ranking women did not attract dedications of religious works can be interpreted in two ways: either their lack of influence discouraged writers from seeking their patronage, or the two women had little interest in religious matters. Probably a combination of the two is most accurate. As we have seen, it generally was only when there was some political advantage to be gained that they publicly exhibited a reforming stand.

Lady Denny, Lady Herbert, and Lady Tyrwhit, on the other hand, fall into a entirely different category of reformer. Lady Denny's dedication came in 1546, and even though it was not an overtly reforming work, it nevertheless indicated that she was interested in religious affairs. This notion was further emphasized by the fact that the dedication came from her chaplain, a man who was in a good position to know Lady Denny's religious inclinations. Even if the dedication to Lady Herbert was tied to her husband's patronage, it
nevertheless was significant that the work was presented not to Sir William, but to Lady Herbert. If Lady Herbert and Lady Denny had lived longer (they died in 1552 and 1553 respectively), they might have been associated with religious works during Elizabeth's reign, perhaps in the fashion of Lady Tyrwhit. In the 1570s, Lady Tyrwhit was still actively interested in religious matters; so interested was she that, in the tradition of Katherine Parr herself, she wrote a book of private devotions.

The duchess of Somerset (formerly countess of Hertford) and the duchess of Suffolk actively patronized reforming literature on a rather larger scale, though, perhaps, for different reasons. The duchess of Somerset's active public commitment to the advancement of reform seems to have been limited mainly to the years during which her husband was in power. After the death of the duke in 1552, the duchess of Somerset ceased to be a serious patroness of religious works. This of course was due to first her family's disgrace and then Mary's accession. But even after Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, it still was not until the middle of the reign that the duchess's name was again connected with religious works, and even then the two epistles were hardly effusive. It is not as though the duchess simply went into retirement after her husband's death, since she maintained her court connections and continued to be actively involved in her family's affairs well into her
old age. Rather, it would seem that her adherence to, and patronage of, the reforming cause in the 1540s and early 1550s was tied in large part to her and her husband's political ambitions. When it was no longer politically profitable to patronize religious works, the duchess's public, and perhaps private, interest in religious matters dropped proportionally. So while the dedications which came to her in 1570 and 1586 still point to the duchess's reforming beliefs, their brief mention of her name suggests that she was no longer an active promoter of religious concerns.

The duchess of Suffolk's commitment to the religious beliefs she had encountered in Katherine Parr's household were not only deeply felt but exhibited publicly throughout the rest of her life. Her self-imposed exile on the continent during Mary's reign was testimony to the sincerity of her beliefs. The duchess's relief and joy at Elizabeth's accession was expressed at length in a congratulatory letter to the queen on 25 January 1559:

77. The duchess of Somerset corresponded with William Cecil in April 1561 about immediate plans for her son; later in the year she wrote to him again, denying any knowledge of her son's marriage to Lady Katherine Grey (C.S.P.Dom., 1547-1580, 174, 184). By early 1564, Queen Elizabeth's anger over Lady Katherine Grey's marriage had subsided somewhat, and the duchess was honorably received at court (C.S.P.Dom., 1547-1580, 236). In 1568, the queen agreed to the duchess's suit requesting the payment of her jointure, which was in arrears to £10,000 (C.S.P.Dom., 1547-1580, 310). On 24 August 1580, Sir Francis Walsingham reported to Lord Burghley (William Cecil) the queen's intention of dining with the duchess the next day (C.S.P.Dom., 1547-1580, 672). For the duchess's involvement in her family's affairs, see H.M.C. Bath Longleat MSS, Seymour Papers, IV, 1532-1686.
'nowe is our assessed if ever any were off rejoyssing/ &
to say after sakkery blessed be the lord god of isseral
wyche hathe vysseted & delvered your majeste & by you vs
his & your mysserable afffected subiecttes for if the
isserallsenes might joye in ther deborah who muche more
we englyshe in our Ellezabethe'.

The duchess's relief, however, was considerably
abated only two months later, and she did not hesitate to
express her worries about the queen's religious
inclinations to her good friend, Sir William Cecil. The
duchess wrote that if there were but eleven good men
around her majesty, all would be well, 'but alack the
reaporte is other wis'.

She recalled that Cecil's old
master, the duke of Somerset, had started out with good
intentions for reform but had later been distracted by
worldly devices: 'you can as wel as I tell wat came of
it the ducke lost al that he sought to kepe w[i]t[h] his
hede to bount/ & his counsler slypt ther collers tornyed
ther cottes/ & hath serued sens to play ther parttes in
other matters'. Finally, the duchess came to the
point: she had heard a report that at one, probably very
public, church service, Elizabeth had stayed only for the
reading of the Gospel, and then departed without hearing
the sermon. Without an accompanying sermon, the duchess

78. P.R.O., SP 12/1, fols. 17-17v (C.S.P.Dom. 1547-80, 120).
79. P.R.O., SP 12/3, f. 28 (C.S.P.Dom. 1547-80, 123).
80. Ibid.
believed that the multitude would take the Gospel 'for some hooely charme than any other thing'\textsuperscript{81}. There was, she wrote, 'no feare of innovation in restoring old good lawes & repealing the nue eville/ but it is to be fyered men haue so long worn the gospul slope wyes that the wold not gladyly have it ageyn strayt to ther lyges'.\textsuperscript{82} In the duchess's rather forward opinion, the queen was not setting the right example for her subjects.

The duchess of Suffolk, however, was quite prepared to set the example herself. Her household, like that of Katherine Parr, was something of a reformer's salon. She employed Miles Coverdale and supported him in the vestments controversy.\textsuperscript{83} She patronized other reforming preachers, and was closely associated with the Minories in London, a haven for reformers.\textsuperscript{84} She also was connected with four religious publications between 1560 and 1580. The duchess held fourteen advowsons in the diocese of Lincoln, and to at least five she and her second husband Richard Bertie appointed men trained in Latin and

\textsuperscript{81}. Ibid, f. 28v.

\textsuperscript{82}. Ibid, f. 28v.

\textsuperscript{83}. H.M.C. Ancaster, XIII, 459, 468; Merton, 'The women who served Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth', chapter 7.

The duchess's reputation for piety and perseverance lasted into the early part of the next century. In 1607, only 27 years after her death, Thomas Deloney wrote a ballad eulogizing the duchess and all she had suffered on account of her religion. In 1631, Thomas Drue's play, *The Life of the Dytches of Syffolke*, was published, and he, like Deloney, highlighted the duchess's persecution.

Ambition no doubt played some part in the decisions to dedicate religious works to Lady Denny, Lady Herbert, Lady Tyrwhit, the duchess of Somerset, and the duchess of Suffolk; most of the authors clearly stated in their dedications that by linking a well-known woman to their work they hoped to gain a larger audience. Some authors, Courtenay and Hamonde in particular, were more explicit about their expectations. But even with this consideration in mind, these women would not have been sought-out for their patronage unless they were known to be actively interested in religious, and in some cases political, affairs. It is significant that all five were targeted in the attempts by court conservatives on

---


Katherine Parr's life in 1546. These were the women who were thought to be the leading reformers in Katherine Parr's household and, in light of their activities in the 1540s and their patronage (and in one case authorship) of religious works, that assessment turned out to be accurate.

*   *   *

By publishing her *Prayers or meditations* in June 1545, Katherine Parr unwittingly led the way for the patronage (and limited authorship) of reforming literature by these and other noble women. Although Katherine Parr was not a full-fledged reformer at the time of publication, her *Prayers or meditations* appears to have become associated with official English reform policies; it probably is significant that the queen's book was most frequently reissued during Elizabeth's reign. Very little of Katherine Parr's work, though, is actually original; the queen borrowed heavily from Book III (chapters 15 to 50) of Richard Whitford's translation of the *Imitation of Christ* by Thomas 'a Kempis.88 Dr. Philippa Tudor observes that the queen's 'method of selecting extracts was to remove the sense of dialogue which is inherent in the Latin version of the

---

As Dr. Tudor notes, the main body of the queen's book was largely derivative.

There are two prayers at the end of the book which appear to be the queen's own work: a prayer for the king and another for men to say before entering into battle. This last prayer probably can be dated the last half of 1544, when war was very much on the queen's mind. Three more prayers were added at the end of the November 1545 edition of the queen's book: one is an extended version of the Lord's Prayer, while the other two are taken from two psalms.

Katherine Parr's Prayers or Meditations must have met with the king's approval: not only was the book frequently bound up with The King's Prayers, (about which more in a moment), but Elizabeth thought it was an appropriate New Year's gift to present in translation -- French, Italian, and Latin -- to her father in 1546.

Katherine Parr had chosen a traditional, even conservative religious piece from which to borrow, and had turned it into a private devotional work. But while the book is non-controversial, there nevertheless are aspects which anticipate the queen's later reforming beliefs. The queen emphasizes a one-to-one relationship with God: there are no intermediaries between her and

---

89. Tudor, 'Changing Private Belief . . .', 67.
91. Parr, Prayers or Meditations, D7-D8.
92. B.L., Royal MS 7 D X.
God, and only rarely does she use 'we' or 'us'.
Professor Haugaard believes her omissions also are revealing: the queen does not mention saints or prayers for the dead.  

The publication history of Katherine Parr's Prayers or Meditations is directly linked with another book. On 18 April 1544, bishop John Fisher's Psalms seu precatio- 
tones ex varis scripturae locis collectae, compiled in about 1525, was published in England. Some time later, it appeared in English translation under the title Psalms or prayers taken out of holie scripture, or rather, The King's Prayers, as the book popularly became known.  

Dr. Susan James suggests that The King's Prayers was actually Katherine Parr's translation from the Latin. In support of her argument, Dr. James cites the fact that

---


94. RSTC 3001.7. John Fisher, Psalms or prayers taken out of holie scripture, trans. anonymous, (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1544 or 1545). There is some question about the date of the English translation. The RSTC gives the date as 1544, but the Hand List of English Printers 1501-1556, (part III, 10), indicates that the English translation was not published until 2 July 1545. There is a book bill for Katherine Parr probably dating to 1544 which records the purchase of 'the psalme prayers' (P.R.O., E315/161, no. 46; Rose-Troup, 'Two Book Bills of Katherine Parr', 40). The question is, did the queen purchase the Latin Psalms seu precatio- 
tones and the printer, Thomas Berthelet, simply record it in English, or did she purchase the English translation, Psalms or Prayers? Because Berthelet records in a later book bill for the queen the purchase of the 'Enchiridion of Erasmus in engilise', it seems likely that he would have indicated the Latin book in the earlier bill if that in fact had been the book ordered. Since he did not, I am inclined to accept that Katherine Parr ordered a copy of Psalms or prayers in 1544, thus following the RSTC dating.
Udall, in his dedication of the Paraphrases, said that the queen had composed and set forth 'many goodly Psalms and diverse other contemplative meditations'; James believes Udall's use of the word psalms was 'significant'. She also notes that a book bill dating to 1544 includes charges for fourteen of the 'books of the psalm prayers, gorgeously bound and gilt on leather'. James believes that these were presentation copies of The King's Prayers, and that Katherine Parr bought the books because of her close connection with them. James implies that, because the queen ordered bulk quantities of her Prayers or Meditations in 1548, she probably would have ordered multiple copies of The King's Prayers in 1544 because they were her own work. Finally, as the last piece of evidence, James observes that the 1544 English publication of The King's Prayers includes Katherine Parr's 'Prayer for the king', which can be found at the end of the queen's own Prayers or Meditations published a year later in 1545.\(^5\)

Dr. James makes an intriguing case, although her first arguments seem a bit stretched. Udall's reference simply is too obscure to pin-down, and might even refer to the queen's Lamentacion, published in November 1547. Bills documenting the queen's expenditures are very incomplete, so we do not know if Katherine Parr was in the habit of bulk book buying in general, and not just of

\(^5\) James, 'The Devotional Writings of Queen Catherine Parr', 137.
her own work. If *The King's Prayers* had the king's approval, as the title would suggest, then it would have been prudent for the queen to demonstrate her complete compliance with official policy by buying numerous copies. Of all of James's arguments, though, her last is her most plausible. The fact that the first English edition of *The King's Prayers*, which was published almost a year before the queen's own *Prayers or Meditations*, included a prayer which apparently was written by Katherine Parr makes it at least possible that she translated Fisher's book into English.

The non-controversial nature of Katherine Parr's *Prayers or Meditations* was evidenced not only by the king's apparent acceptance of it, but also by the fact that it was published during Mary's reign. In fact, by the end of the sixteenth century the book had been reprinted fourteen times. That the last edition of the book was issued in 1640, almost one hundred years after its initial publication, is testimony to the general popularity, and relevance, of the work.

By at least 1545, then, Katherine Parr's interest in religious matters was widely known, if only through the publication of her *Prayers or Meditations*. Although there were subtle signs in the book that she was beginning to consider a more personal, non-intermediary faith, her work over-all was non-controversial. There is

96 This figure includes the reprint which appeared in Thomas Bentley's *The Monument of Matrones*, published in 1582.
nothing to suggest that the king did not approve of her actions.

By the end of the reign, Katherine Parr probably disagreed with the king on at least two religious points: justification by faith alone, which the king firmly rejected, and the availability of the English Bible to the common people, doubts about which the king had expressed in his last speech to parliament. Contradicting the king had almost cost the queen her life in 1546, and it was not until after the king's death that she was able to publish a more radical position than that contained in her earlier religious piece. The queen's *The lamentacion of a sinner*, published in November 1547, was once again an inward looking, devotional work, but unlike her *Prayers or Meditations*, the queen's new book had a definite reforming gloss and was the queen's own work.

Professor McConica observed over twenty-five years ago that the *Lamentacion* bore a striking resemblance to Benedetto Luchino's *Beneficio di Giesu Cristo Crocifisso*, which was first published in Italy in about 1543. In 1984, Dr. Tudor made a comprehensive study of the two works, and her conclusions are revealing. Benedetto's book was popular and received a wide circulation, but the strong reforming nature of the book caused it to be

---


placed on the Roman Index of condemned books in 1549. That the book should have been considered heretical to catholic authorities is not surprising, given that those who apparently influenced Benedetto included the continental reformers Bucer, Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Calvin.\textsuperscript{99}

Although Benedetto's book was translated into several languages, it was not until 1548 that the work was translated into English by Edward Courtenay, and even then it remained in manuscript form until the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{100} While it is possible that Katherine Parr had seen some of these earlier non-English translations, or perhaps even the Italian original as Dr. Roland Bainton suggests,\textsuperscript{101} by noting the many significant differences between Benedetto's and the queen's work, Dr. Tudor convincingly concludes that it seems 'unlikely that Catherine Parr would have had access to a copy of the Beneficio when she was preparing her own work on the Lamentacion of a sinner'.\textsuperscript{102} Rather, it would appear that the queen was 'independently influenced by some of the northern reformation writers who had earlier

\textsuperscript{99}. Tudor, 'Changing Private Belief . . .', 70-2.

\textsuperscript{100}. Tudor, 'Changing Private Belief . . .', 70-2. As noted earlier, Courtenay's translation was printed in The Benefit of Christ's Death (1855) with an introduction by Churchill Babington.


\textsuperscript{102}. Tudor, 'Changing Private Belief . . .', 72, 83, 84-5, 87-8.
influenced Don Benedetto'. Dr. Tudor notes that the queen could have become acquainted with the doctrines of the European reformers from the men who came to preach in her chambers and from her own private readings. This kind of contact with continental reforming theology would account in part for Katherine Parr’s sometimes imperfect grasp of certain doctrines and for her unsophisticated presentation of them in her Lamentacion.

The Lamentacion was published only a little over nine months after Henry VIII’s death, and in that time were packed the king’s funeral, Edward VI’s coronation, the establishment of the queen’s dower household, and the courtship of the queen by Sir Thomas Seymour. That Katherine Parr could have written and published a work within that time-frame suggests that the queen probably had been composing her work, at least in her mind, before the king’s death. But it was only after the king’s death that Katherine Parr could have published her work, as she strongly disagreed with two key points of the king’s religious policy.

The doctrine of justification by faith alone, which Henry VIII had firmly rejected in The King’s Book in 1543, was just as firmly asserted by Katherine Parr in her Lamentacion. Previously, she had ‘worshipped visible idoles, and ymages made of mennes handes, beleuing by them to haue gotten heauen[.]’, and had ‘sought for such

103. Ibid, 73.

rifraf as the bishoppe of Rome hath planted in his tyranny and kingdom, trusting with great confidence by the vertue & holynes of the[m], to receyue full remission of my sinnes'.

But she had turned away from such profanity, and now she had 'no hope nor confidence in any creature, neyther in heauen, nor earth, but in Christe my whole and only Sauiour'. Because she is 'moost certayne & suer, that no creature in heauen nor earth, is of power: or can by any meane helpe me, but god, who is omnipotent, almighty, beneficiall, and mercyfull', she 'wil seke non other meanes nor advocat, but Christes holy spirite, who is only the Aduocat, and mediatour betwene god and man to helpe and relyue me'. In support of her position, the queen quotes St Paul, who 'sayeth, we be iustified by the fayth in Christe, & not by the deades of the lawe'.

Although good works by themselves can not save, they nevertheless have some role to play, 'for oute of this fayth springeth all good workes'. But unless 'this great benefite of Christe crucified be felte, and fixed surely in mannes harte, there ca[n] be no good work doen, acceptable before god'. The queen describes Henry VIII as a kind of

105. Parr, Lamentacion, A4, A4v-A5.
106. Ibid, A8v.
109. Ibid.
110. Ibid, D3v.
Moses, who had delivered his people out of the bondage of a pharaoh, 'and I mene by this Pharao the bishop of Rome, who hathe bene, and is a greater persecutor of al true christians, the[n] euer was Pharao . . . '.

The queen made her feelings on the 'bishop of Rome' quite clear: 'he is a persecutor of the gospel, and grace, a settur furth of all supersticion, and counterfeit holynes, brynging many soules to hell . . . '; he and his clerics are 'the head spring of al pride, vaine glorie, ampcion, hipocrisie, and fayned holynes'.

Dr. Tudor observes that, 'in matters of religious imagery, Catherine is for the most part a traditionalist', but this is probably because the queen paraphrases liberally from a very traditional source: the Bible. In fact, Katherine Parr manages to work passages from the Bible into almost every page. But the queen also had adopted new conventions: by 1547, it was becoming standard practice in reforming literature to rail against the pope, and Udall and Coverdale also compared Henry VIII to Moses.

Henry VIII might have been pleased with the favorable comparison to Moses, and the general abuse of the pope, but Katherine Parr's position on justification

111. Ibid, D6.
112. Ibid, D6v, F5v.
113. Tudor, 'Changing Private Belief . . . ', 73.
by faith alone was contrary to the king's own beliefs. By emphasizing a scripturally based faith, the queen implied strongly that the Bible should be available to all, and not just the upper classes. This stand, too, was in opposition to the king's policy. In his speech to parliament in 1545, the king indicated his belief that making the English Bible available to all had caused divisions.\textsuperscript{115} The queen directly opposed the king's view in her \textit{Lamentacion}: those who truly followed God did not go around trying to persuade men 'yt muche knowledge of scripture maketh menne heretikes . . .'.\textsuperscript{116} But aside from these two main points, and they are significant ones, Katherine Parr's \textit{Lamentacion} was not a radical work when compared to other literature of the Edwardian period. Nor was the queen a militant reformer; she clearly adhered to Christ's own example of non-resistance.

Three other people apparently were closely associated with Katherine Parr's \textit{Lamentacion}. It was at the 'instaunt desire of the righte gracious ladie Caterin Duchesse of Suffolke, & the earnest requeste of the right honourable Lord, William Parre, Marquesse of North Hampton' that the queen's book was published.\textsuperscript{117} The preface was written by William Cecil, (Protector Somerset's secretary at the time), who, 'hauing taken

\textsuperscript{115}. Dickens, \textit{The English Reformation}, 213-4.
\textsuperscript{116}. Parr, \textit{Lamentacion}, E7v.
\textsuperscript{117}. \textit{Ibid}, title page.
muche profit by ye reading of this traetyse folowing, wisheth vnto euery christian by ye reading therof like profit with encrease from god'. The *Lamentacion*, though, was not nearly so popular as the queen's earlier *Prayers or meditations*, and it was reprinted only twice: in 1548 and again in 1563.

Yet another work has been attributed to Katherine Parr. In the Cecil papers preserved at Hatfield is a short French poem attributed to the queen.¹¹⁸ In the poem, the writer warns against worldly concerns, and, after lamenting that her heart is 'marbrin, obstine, intraitable', advises the reader to prepare himself for the day of judgement. Although these sentiments are compatible with what is known about Katherine Parr's beliefs, there is no certainty that she wrote this poem.¹¹⁹

In the new year, 1548, Katherine Parr was associated with two more reforming works: Sir Anthony Cope's *Meditations on twenty select Psalms*, dedicated to the queen as a new year's present, and Nicholas Udall's *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon*


¹¹⁹. I am inclined to doubt the attribution of the poem to Katherine Parr. The poem is in a non-cursive Italianate hand. When this writing is compared to the letter the queen wrote to Mary on 20 September 1547, which is also printed in an Italianate hand, the differences are notable. The script of the queen's letter to Mary is more angular than the writing of the poem, which is quite rounded.
the newe testamente,\textsuperscript{120} published 31 January and also
dedicated to the queen. Both men had close ties with the
queen.

Sir Anthony Cope, of course, was the queen's vice
chamberlain, and although the date of his appointment is
uncertain, he was in place by at least early 1547. It
will be recalled that Cope was a humanist scholar of
considerable repute and that in 1544 he dedicated his
translation of Livy's The history of . . . Anniball and
Scipio to the king. In 1548, Cope presented his
Meditations to Katherine Parr, and it is in his
dedication that we find evidence for a strong friendship
between him and the queen. New year's gifts were, Cope
wrote, to be 'a testimony of the hearty service or loving
minds of the givers'.\textsuperscript{121} He had thought a long time on
what gift he might make to the queen, 'wherein I might in
some part declare my loyal and obedient heart towards
you, of whose heaped goodness I have so much tasted, that
I can never be able to deserve the thousandth part, but
only with my prayer and hearty service'.\textsuperscript{122} After
considering the queen's 'gracious intent and godly
purpose in the reading and study of holy Scripture and
the advancement of the true Word of God', Cope decided

\textsuperscript{120}. RSTC 2854. Nicholas Udall, et al, The first
tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the newe
testamente, (London: Edwarde Whitchurch, 31 January
1548).

\textsuperscript{121}. Sir Anthony Cope, Meditations . . ., xxvi.

\textsuperscript{122}. Ibid, xxvii.
that he could do the queen no 'more pleasant service than to make an Exposition of certain Psalms of the noble Prophet David . . .'. 123 He explained that he wanted to stir the queen 'and all other of the flock of Christ, to the reading of Psalms . . .'. 124 The end of Cope's dedication reads very much like a prayer and blessing, as he indicated that he would

'pray to God, Who is the Author and Giver of all good gifts, so to illuminate the eyes of your Grace's heart, that ye may proceed in the path of His laws, wherein you are already entered, according to the ardent desire which ye have hitherto had to attain the knowledge of them; so that when ye shall leave this transitory world (whose pleasures in all you time ye never esteemed) ye may ascend to the place prepared for God's elect, there to receive joys perdurable, world without end.' 125

Unlike the many dedications to the women of Katherine Parr's household, Sir Anthony Cope's epistle seems to suggest a certain warmth and familiarity between him and the queen. Certainly he compliments Katherine Parr, as convention demands, but not in the extravagant and artificial fashion which writers used, for example, with the countess of Hertford (when duchess of Somerset). Cope also implies strongly that he and the queen share similar religious beliefs, but whether or not religion played a significant role in the queen's decision to appoint him to her household is unknown.

123. Ibid.

124. Ibid, xxx.

125. Ibid, xxxi.
Udall’s relationship with the queen probably also was a close one, given that the two worked for several years on compiling translations of Erasmus’s Paraphrases. In his dedication to Katherine Parr, Udall noted that the queen had shortened the time it would have taken one person to translate all of Erasmus’s work by parcelling out the sections to several scholars.\(^{126}\) One of those scholars had been Princess Mary, who worked on the translation of the Gospel of St John until ill-health forced her to hand over the work to her chaplain, Dr. Francis Mallet. The queen was also apparently responsible for procuring the translation of the Gospel of St Matthew, for which ‘al ye simple Englishe congregacion is bound continually to praie for your highnesse’.\(^{127}\) It principally was due to the queen’s sponsoring of the Paraphrases, Udall said, that the people of England could ‘with a coumfortable and pleasaunt readying in theire owne mother tounge, bothe encrease from daie to daie in knowelage, & also continually bee edified in true religion, nouresed in right opinions, trained in sincere doctrine, and confirmed to walke in perfeciet innocencie and integritie a true Christian life accordingly’.\(^{128}\) But then, the queen had always sought ‘to auau[n]ce, and to encrease the publique commoditee and benefite of this common weale.

\(^{126}\) Udall, et al, Paraphrases, C1v.

\(^{127}\) Ibid, C2v.

\(^{128}\) Ibid.
of Englande'.\textsuperscript{129} Udall could 'onely th[a]nke God in you, and you in God, for causyng these Paraphrases of Desiderius Erasmus of Roterdam vpon the newe testamente to be translated into Englishe for the vse and commoditie of suche people' who hunger and thirst for God's word.\textsuperscript{130}

Katherine Parr's 1547 letter to Mary concerning the princess's translation of the Gospel of St John indicates that work on the Paraphrases project had begun during Henry VIII's reign. Professor McConica believes that the project was 'undoubtedly conceived as part of the apparatus of Henry's final religious settlement',\textsuperscript{131} whatever that was supposed to be. The question is, would the king actually have allowed distribution of the Paraphrases to the common people when he only recently had denied them the English Bible? Of course we shall never know. But under his son, Edward VI, the Paraphrases did become part of the official religious settlement: the Paraphrases were to be available in every church, while every parson, vicar, curate, chantry priest and stipendiary were further ordered to have their own personal copies.\textsuperscript{132} If Katherine Parr had lived longer, she rather than her former lady of the household, the duchess of Somerset, probably would have sponsored

\textsuperscript{129}. Ibid, C1.

\textsuperscript{130}. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{131}. McConica, English Humanists and Reformation Politics, 232.

\textsuperscript{132}. Hughes and Larkin, Tudor Royal Proclamations, I, 395, 398 (no. 287).
Udall's second volume of the *Paraphrases*, published in 1549.

* * *

It would appear that Katherine Parr agreed with the king's religious policies at the time of her marriage in 1543. But probably between the middle of 1544, when the queen began work on her *Prayers or Meditations*, and the middle of 1546, Katherine Parr became a convinced reformer. The religious officials of her household, probably all of whom were conservative, did not introduce reforming doctrines to queen and neither probably did her household officers. Rather, it would seem that it was through her high-ranking women, with whom the queen spent most of her time, that Katherine Parr encountered reforming beliefs.

The queen's conversion, however, was a very gradual process, taking probably two years. Although her *Prayers or Meditations* is essentially non-controversial, there are nevertheless signs in the book that by at least 1544 Katherine Parr already was turning to look in the direction of the reformers. By the middle of 1546, that conversion was complete and the queen and a number of her women were taking an increasingly active interest in religious affairs. The depth and long-lasting nature of that interest was partially illustrated by the religious literature they later patronized, and in two instances,
wrote. Katherine Parr again led by example, and wrote a second, overtly reforming work, was patron to a well-respected humanist scholar, and was the moving force behind a translation project which figured into the official religious settlement under Edward VI. Katherine Parr and the women of her household made a significant contribution to the establishment of the English church under Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth.

Although Katherine Parr and the women of her household were later able to give full vent to their religious beliefs, they had to be far more circumspect under Henry VIII. Indeed, their unorthodox religious beliefs, which were well in place by the summer of 1546, almost proved to be the downfall of the queen and a number of her high-ranking women.
CHAPTER FIVE: ANNE ASKEW AND THE PLOTS OF 1546

By 1546 Katherine Parr was a committed reformer. In the last year of her marriage to the king, the queen's religious activities had become increasingly more pronounced; what worried some at court was the fact that the king seemed inclined to let his wife hold and express her sympathies so openly. It was fear over Katherine Parr’s apparently growing influence with the king over religious affairs that caused some conservatives at court to plot her downfall in the summer of 1546. And the conspirators at first thought they had a perfect weapon in the form of Anne Askew.

Much of what we know about Anne Askew comes from John Bale's *Lattre Examinacyon* and John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. Bale's religious beliefs were too extreme for him to live safely in England during the last years of Henry VIII's reign, and it was while Bale was in self-imposed exile in Germany that he received the material to write his account of Anne Askew. Either Anne, or someone in her name, had recorded the particulars of the investigation and forwarded them to Bale.² Bale's account of Anne Askew's first examination was published in November 1546, while a narrative of Anne's second examination, which included the details of her


incarceration in the Tower of London, was published in January 1547.

Foxe drew heavily on Bale's account of Anne Askew; in fact, in many places, Bale's narrative appears verbatim in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. Nevertheless, Foxe's account supports and supplements Bale's in that Foxe had access to documents that would have been unavailable to an exiled Bale. Foxe's sources for his *Acts and Monuments* included parliamentary acts and royal proclamations, 'verbatim reports of disputations and examinations, treatises, sermons, letters, personal narratives', and various registers.³ When later editions appeared, corrections and additions appeared with them.⁴ Foxe seems to have attempted to be as accurate as possible. This does not, however, obscure the fact that he, and Bale, wrote with a pronounced reforming bias, but it does suggest serious efforts by Foxe for factual precision.

Anne Askew had first been brought before the privy council in March 1545. She was remanded into custody and more fully examined by Edmund Bonner, bishop of London. After intense questioning, she eventually signed a document drawn-up by Bonner wherein, according to his writing, she affirmed her belief in, among other things, transubstantiation. This 'profession', however, was more or less nullified by Anne's ambiguous though qualifying

---


hand-written statement at the end: 'I, Anne Askew, do believe all manner of things contained in the faith of the catholic church, and not otherwise'. Bonner was furious and said that 'he was nothing deceived' by her. Nevertheless, and through the petitions of her friends, Anne was released on bail several days later.

A year after Anne Askew's first arrest, and shortly before her second, Lord Thomas Howard, a younger son of the duke of Norfolk, was brought before the privy council on 7 May 1546 to answer charges that he had disputed official sermons preached in Lent. The council told Howard that if he would fully disclose what he had said about these sermons and other religious matters, the king was willing to be a 'Gratious Lord unto him'. While Howard admitted his fault and expressed remorse for his behavior, he nevertheless failed to 'confesse the particulars which the Counseill would have had him confesse', and so was remanded into custody.

The question is, of course, what was it that the privy council wanted him to confess? Ostensibly it would seem that the council merely wanted Howard to repeat what he had said 'in the Quenes chambre, and other places in the Court'. But was it that simple? Howard would not

5. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, V, 542-3; LP, XX, i, 390 & 391.

6 Foxe, Acts and Monuments, V, 543.

7. A.P.C., I, 408; LP, XXI, i, 759.

8. Ibid.
have been expressing his opinions to empty rooms, and it may be that the privy council believed that he could name others who held opinions similar to his own and that such individuals might be located in the queen's apartments. It must then be asked if members of the queen's household were in fact indirect targets of the interrogation. Indeed, Wriothesley later used this same tactic when questioning Anne Askew: while he had her confession, he was more interested in those she could implicate for heresy, and he clearly wanted her to name members of the court.

It is important to note that the conservative members of the council outnumbered their reforming colleagues at the 7 May meeting. Present were Sir Thomas Wriothesley, Lord St. John, the bishop of Durham, the bishop of Winchester, Sir Anthony Wingfield, Sir William Petre, Sir John Gage, Sir John Russell, and the earl of Essex. John Foxe considered St. John, Durham, Winchester, and Wingfield 'papists', and we probably can also add Gage to his list. Wriothesley we will discuss in a moment. Petre and Russell may have been 'king's men' in the sense that they would follow the king's lead in matters of religion. And Essex, of course, had a vested interest in seeing that nothing tainted his sister the queen, but he, Petre, and Russell were outnumbered on this occasion. The very timing of the meeting may

---


have been deliberate, as the two most prominent reformers on the council, the earl of Hertford and Lord Lisle, were absent on that day. Had they been present, they might have been able to counter-balance the conservatives.

On 19 June, less than a month after Lord Thomas Howard’s examination, Anne was arrested again. After a preliminary interview, the privy council sent Lord Lisle, the earl of Essex, and Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, to question Anne further. All three men urged her to 'confess the sacrament to be flesh, blood, and bone'.\textsuperscript{11} Anne replied 'to my lord Parre and my lord Lisle, that it was a great shame for them to counsel contrary to their knowledge'.\textsuperscript{12} According to Anne's account, the two men did not dispute the insinuation, but merely expressed a wish that 'all things were well'.\textsuperscript{13}

This exchange may have suggested to Gardiner that Anne could, if she wanted, name some on the privy council, including Lisle and Essex, who held opinions similar to her own. Certainly after her encounter with these three men, the interrogation became more brutal and, importantly, specific. Anne left the council in no doubt as to her opinions on the subject of religion, as she had laid them out in a letter sent to the king.

\textsuperscript{11} Foxe, \textit{Acts and Monuments}, V, 544; Bale, \textit{The lattre examinacyon}, fols. 17v-18.

\textsuperscript{12} Foxe, \textit{Acts and Monuments}, V, 544; Bale, \textit{The lattre examinacyon}, fols. 17v-18.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
through Wriothesley. So when the lord chancellor and Sir Richard Rich went to the Tower to question Anne further, after her official condemnation, the central issue was no longer Anne’s beliefs.

Wriothesley and Rich seem to have approached their interrogation with a definite purpose and strategy in mind, even going so far as to suggest to Anne those they wanted her to accuse. They asked her specifically about the duchess of Suffolk, the countess of Sussex, the countess of Hertford, Lady Denny, and Lady Fitzwilliam. Anne responded that she could prove nothing against them. She then was told that the king was informed that she could name others of her sect, to which she replied ‘that the king was as well deceived in that behalf, as dissembled with in other matters’, She was maintained in prison by women of the court, Wriothesley and Rich insisted. Anne admitted receiving money and said that her maid had told her it came from the countess of Hertford and Lady Denny. But Anne could only repeat, not prove, what she had heard. The counsellors then stated that there were some on the council who maintained her. This she also denied. It was at this point in the questioning that Anne was put on the rack.


15. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, V, 547; Bale, The lattre examinacyon, fols. 40-42v; LP, XXI, i, 1181.

16. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, V, 547; Bale, The lattre examinacyon, fols. 43-45; LP, XXI, i, 1181.
Anne indicated that she had been racked because she 'confessed no ladies or gentlewomen' of the court to be of her opinions. Undoubtedly she was correct, but only partially. If the countess and Lady Denny had been arrested, it is entirely possible that their downfalls would have encompassed not only the queen's, but their husbands' as well, which was probably the intention all along; both the earl of Hertford and Sir Anthony Denny were prominent reformers at court and in great favor with the king. But Anne refused to incriminate any women at court. It was only then that Wriothesley and Rich questioned her specifically about the privy council. But in addition to Hertford and Denny, the inquisitors may also have hoped to snare Lisle and Essex. Gardiner earlier had heard Anne suggest that these two men had sympathy for her position, and while it would not appear as though the bishop played any leading role in Anne's interrogation, he could have passed that information on to Wriothesley, or someone else, without becoming fully involved in the affair.

The duchess of Suffolk was targeted for reasons slightly different from those concerning Lady Denny and the countess of Hertford. Although the duchess was a widow, and so had no husband in the king's household or government, the conservatives were nevertheless definitely

17. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, V, 547; Bale, The lattre examinacyon, fols. 44v-45; LP, XXI, i, 1181.

interested in forestalling any future influence she might have with the king. To understand her political importance in June 1546, we must look back four months earlier.

On 27 February 1546, Van der Delft reported to Charles V that he had heard rumors to the effect that there was to be a new queen. But while there was speculation about Katherine Parr’s fertility, Van der Delft continued, it was believed that the king would not make changes in his domestic situation until the war with France was over. The ambassador hinted that the duchess of Suffolk was considered a possible successor to the queen, as the duchess was ‘much talked about and in great favor’. But even so, the ambassador had not noticed any change in the king’s attitude to the queen.¹⁹

In March, Stephen Vaughan, the king’s agent, became alarmed at how widespread the rumors had become even in Antwerp. On the 7th he wrote to Wriothesley and Paget that he had been visited by a Dutch merchant who told him ‘that he [the merchant] had this day dyned emonge certyn of his friendes emonge which was one that wold haued layed a wager w[i]t[h] hym, that the k[ing]es ma[jes]te wold haue an other wyfe’.²⁰ The merchant had come to Vaughan because he wanted the agent’s opinion on the truth of the matter before he laid any bets. Vaughan, who denied that there was any truth in the rumor, tried

¹⁹. C.S.P.Sp., VIII, 204 (LP, XXI, i, 289).
²⁰. P.R.O., SP 1/215, f. 17 (LP, XXI, i, 347).
to get information from the merchant about the source of the gossip, but without success. Scepperus, Charles V's envoy in London, discretely reported the following month that some change was expected with regard to the feminine sex.21

The rumors concerning the king's marital affairs did not die out. Shortly before Anne Askew's second examination, Robert Baker, Richard Latham, and William Weston were interrogated about certain prophesies made concerning the king. The origin of these predictions and how widespread they had become is unclear, but the notion that the king would soon take a new wife, and then shortly afterwards lose his throne because of his religious policies, circulated among the three.22

The significance of these rumors is abundantly clear. If in fact the king was inclined to take another wife, and if the rumors earlier in the year promoting the duchess were true, then tainting the duchess with heresy might effectively have removed her from the marriage market. Certainly the conservatives would not have wanted another reforming queen. These rumors offer an additional weighty explanation for the conservative group's interest in the duchess.

The conservatives' interest, then, in the countess of Hertford, Lady Denny, and the duchess of Suffolk is evident enough. The targeting of the countess of Sussex

22. LP, XXI, i, 1027.
and Lady Fitzwilliam is less clear. The countess probably was not a regular member of the queen's household; although she attended the court for the visit of the French embassy in August 1546, her name does not appear on the household list in 1547. It may be that in 1546 the countess of Sussex was already exhibiting the signs of unstable behavior which later formed the basis of a charge of sorcery against her and eventually caused her husband to divorce her and bar her from her dowry;\textsuperscript{23} hers might have been a relatively easy case of heresy for the conservatives to prove. Lady Fitzwilliam's situation, though, is more obscure. She too appeared at court for the French Admiral's visit, but is not included on the 1547 household list.\textsuperscript{24} Because there were specific reasons for focusing on at least three and probably four of these women, it seems unlikely she alone of the five would have been singled out for no particular reason. But just exactly what those reasons were has not been recorded.

Anne Askew may initially have been arrested for heresy, but her personal religious beliefs quickly became a secondary concern. While Katherine Parr may have been an indirect target, so were certain men on the privy


\textsuperscript{24}. Lady Fitzwilliam has been identified as Jane Ormond, daughter of John Ormond, who was married to Sir William Fitzwilliam, the first of Milton. Fitzwilliam, who had been an alderman of London, died in 1534 (\textit{Ibid}, 312-3).
council and in the king’s privy chamber. The conservatives at court probably were hoping to charge the countess of Hertford and Lady Denny with heresy. If things went according to plan, the conservatives probably also hoped to charge their husbands as well. But along with these two women, they intended to accuse the duchess of Suffolk, the countess of Sussex, and Lady Fitzwilliam. Part of their strategy, then, was guilt by association; if the countess of Hertford and Lady Denny were guilty, then so probably were their husbands. And if any of the queen’s ladies were guilty, then so must be the queen, who theoretically knew and sanctioned what went on in her household. Chapuys wrote in January 1547 that the countess of Hertford and the duchess of Suffolk, along with Lady Lisle, encouraged Katherine Parr’s religious position.25 His letter implies an intimacy perhaps stronger than what Katherine may have shared with the other women of her household. Had the conservative plot been successful, history might have recorded a seventh wife and a more conservative regency for Edward VI. But all this would be assuming that the king was no longer a player in his own peculiar game of politics.

The question that now arises is how much the king actually knew about the Anne Askew affair. Did he sanction Anne’s torture or recognize the episode as an a conservative attempt to remove high ranking reformers at court? According to Foxe, Sir Anthony Knevet, lord

lieutenant of the Tower, refused to rack Anne a second time, despite threats from Wriothesley that the king would know of his disobedience. When Knevet continued to refuse, the lord Chancellor and Sir Richard Rich threw off their gowns and operated the rack themselves. When Wriothesley and Rich left the Tower by horse to return to court, after yet another unsuccessful exchange with Anne, Knevet took a boat and so arrived at court before the two men. Knevet related to the king 'the racking of Mistress Askew, and how he was threatened by the lord chancellor, because, at his commandment, not knowing his highness's pleasure, he refused to rack her; which he, for compassion, could not find in his heart to do, and therefore humbly craved his highness's pardon'.26 The king 'seemed not very well to like of their so extreme handling of the woman' and so granted Knevet his pardon.27

The clue to interpreting Foxe's passage may lie in the fact that neither Wriothesley nor Rich seem to have been reprimanded for their zealousness, which the king certainly would have done had he been seriously displeased, as in fact he did later when Wriothesley attempted to arrest Katherine Parr. There is the suggestion, then, that the king may indeed have known about Anne's interrogation and may in fact have authorized force. But he could not, for honour's sake,

27. Ibid.
betray his knowledge of the investigation to a fellow knight who was reacting gallantly to the idea of racking a woman.

Bale's account of the racking differs from Foxe's narrative. There is no mention any chivalrous protest by the lord lieutenant of the Tower, but rather simply the fact that the council was displeased that the account of her racking had become public knowledge and that they were afraid the king would thus find out what had happened. 28 Certainly many knew or at least suspected Anne had been racked; Otwell Johnson wrote to his brother John at Calais on 2 July that Anne 'hath ben rakked sins her condempnacion (as men say) which is straunge thing in my understanding'. 29 Suspicions were only confirmed when she had to be carried in a chair to Smithfield. 30

Because it would have been impossible to have kept the details of Anne Askew's examination from the king indefinitely, and because it would have been highly risky to have tried to do so, it seems unlikely that the king was in ignorance of the investigation. But some of his council most certainly were kept in the dark. Lisle and Essex quite obviously were half-hearted in their interrogation of Anne, and neither they nor Hertford would have supported a line of questioning that brought

them under suspicion. Who, then, on the council knew the direction and methods of the interrogation? Probably only the conservatives, lead, perhaps, by Wriothesley, about whom more in a moment. Whether the king fully supported the purpose behind the plot or whether he was simply playing one group off against the other, is impossible to say. What ever the case, the conspirators were undeterred by the failure of this first attempt.

However, the king's increasingly unpredictable temper provided another opportunity. Foxe's story of the second attempt on the queen's life is particularly well known. According to Foxe, Katherine Parr devoted much of her time to the study of scripture and retained in her household ' divers well learned and godly persons to instruct her thoroughly in the same '. During Lent, these learned men daily preached sermons to the queen, her ladies, and anyone else who was interested. The king was aware of these activities and even seemed to support them. The queen was also in the habit of regularly discussing religious matters with the king, again, without incurring his displeasure. The situation changed, however, when the king's health declined and he became more irritable. On one occasion, the king broke off their conversation and, after the queen had left the room, he expressed to Gardiner his dislike at being instructed by his own wife. Gardiner jumped at the

32. Ibid, 554.
opportunity and convinced the king that there was much he would dislike about the queen’s opinions if he knew them more fully. The king dully authorized an investigation.  

The investigation was to begin with the arrest of Ladies Herbert, Tyrwhit, and Lane, all three Katherine Parr’s relatives. Their coffers would be searched in anticipation that enough incriminating evidence would then be gathered to arrest the queen. Interestingly, only a short time before, on 20 May, Prince Edward ended a letter to Mary by asking his sister to make his recommendations to three women at court: Ladies Herbert, Tyrwhit, and Lane. That the second plot was to focus on three women held in particular regard by the heir to the throne hardly seems coincidental. But the second plot went awry when the warrant, or a copy of the warrant, fell into the queen’s hands. After some coaching from the king’s physician, Dr. Wendy, who knew of the plot, Katherine Parr made a graceful and timely submission to the king. No one bothered to tell Wriothesley of the rapprochement, however, and the minster was verbally abused by the king when he came to arrest the queen.  

As with the Anne Askew affair, Katherine Parr’s reforming beliefs formed the basis of the second attempt

---

33. Ibid, 554-6.

34. LP, XXI, i, 867.

on her life. When Anne Askew failed to incriminate anyone at court, the plotters resorted to connecting the queen and three attendant relatives to forbidden books. There is a persistent tradition that the queen and some of her women received controversial books from Anne Askew between the dates of Anne's first examination in March 1545 and her arrest in June 1546.\textsuperscript{36} Significantly, witnesses to and recipients of these gifts were said to have been Lady Herbert, Lady Lane, Lady Tyrwhit, and ubiquitous 'others'.\textsuperscript{37} Although neither Foxe nor Bale mentioned Anne giving books to Katherine Parr and her women, Anne nevertheless was associated with the queen's household in some way; certainly it was believed that she was close enough to some at court to be able to incriminate them for heresy. Anne's zeal was sincere and she may well have given Katherine Parr and some court ladies controversial books. But the fact of the matter was that, from at least the king's point of view, forbidden books really were not the issue in the second plot.

Perhaps the most significant thing about the second attempt on Katherine Parr's life was its timing. It would seem that what most outraged the king was not his wife's religious beliefs but rather the fact that she had


\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.
contradicted him and, to make matters worse, had done so in front of others. In the heat of the moment the king had been persuaded to an action which he latter regretted. That he revealed the plot to Dr. Wendy and then sent him to attend to the hysterical queen hardly seems accidental. It was, rather, a way of saving the queen while maintaining his own dignity; letting her know of his displeasure while allowing her a way out. This would suggest that in at least the summer of 1546 the king was not thinking about taking a seventh wife. Nor was he overly disturbed by Katherine Parr's religious beliefs. Otherwise, he might well have allowed the investigation to run its course. He was, though, sending a very clear message to whoever cared to notice that he was not going to manipulated in the same way as he had been in the past, as, for example, over Cromwell's case in 1540.

The king's proclamation concerning heretical books could not have come at a better moment for the queen and her women. The proclamation, issued 8 July, stated that 'no man, woman, or person, of what estate, condition, or degree soever he or they be, shall, after the last day of August next ... receive, have, take, or keep' any books appearing on an accompanying list. All such books were to be handed over to the proper authorities for burning. As an incentive, the proclamation included a pardon

whereby no one could be arrested for having forbidden books to turn over in the first place.

While it probably is extreme to suggest that the proclamation was devised specifically for the queen, it would not be out of line to suggest that it generally was designed for high-profile reformers at court, which included members of not only the queen’s household but the king’s as well. It gave the queen, her women, and reform-minded courtiers in the king’s establishment, time to dispose of any books which Wriothesley’s men might have found had the king permitted the investigation to proceed.

Although the two plots against Katherine Parr were connected, neither have been precisely dated. Obviously, Anne’s examination and torture took place sometime between her condemnation on 28 June and her execution on 16 July, while the second plot against the queen probably occurred close in time to those events. An analysis of a time-table suggests circumstantially possible dates. Anne Askew was condemned on 28 June. By 2 July, rumors circulated among the London populace that the condemned woman had been tortured. Although Otwell Johnson’s report of the rumors was not proof that the woman had indeed been racked by early July, it probably was significant that such rumors, which eventually were proved correct, existed at all at that time. It therefore seems likely that Anne’s examination and torture probably took place within a five day period,
between the date of her condemnation, 28 June, and the
date of Johnson's letter, 2 July.

It seems highly likely that the second attempt
against Katherine Parr followed closely upon the failure
by Wriothesley and Rich to obtain from Anne Askew the
names of leading reformers at court. Since Anne refused
to incriminate anyone, other means had to be found. Foxe
and Bale indicated that the second plot was to involve a
search of the queen's apartments for heretical and
forbidden books. This second plot would only make sense,
then, if it was to be put into operation before 8 July,
the date of the proclamation which granted amnesty to
those who turned in officially banned books.
Significantly, this pardon was extended to everyone,
whatever their station. Based on this information, the
second attempt on the queen's life probably took place
between 2 July, the date by which it generally was
thought that Anne Askew had been racked, and 8 July, the
date of the king's proclamation.

One last issue about the summer plots of 1546
remains unexamined: who were behind them? Dr. Redworth
argues convincingly that Gardiner's role in the Anne
Askew affair was minimal. Redworth's statements
concerning the second attempt to remove Katherine Parr,
though, seem less authoritative. Redworth dismisses
Gardiner's involvement by generally dismissing the whole
of Foxe's narrative as 'melodrama'.

---

indeed take outrageous literary license with the story, especially where the speeches and conversations were concerned, and he certainly superimposed a reforming interpretation on the material in general. But while Foxe's details may be less than accurate, (for lack of complete information if nothing else), that there was some attempt on Katherine Parr's life, and that the attempt was based on her reforming beliefs, simply cannot be dismissed out of hand. It does not appear as though Foxe generally was in the habit of making things up. Quite the contrary. Foxe's corrections to later editions would suggest that he was interested in getting his facts straight, whatever the interpretation he then put on that information.

Dr. Redworth may be correct in suggesting that Gardiner was not the arch-villain portrayed by Foxe. Certainly it would appear as though Foxe had a particular dislike for Gardiner, and that he was predisposed to think the worst of the bishop. But this does not mean that the plot was merely a figment of Foxe's imagination or that Gardiner was wholly innocent. And Foxe indicated that there were unnamed others in addition to Gardiner who persuaded the king to agree to the drawing up of articles against Katherine Parr.

The only other high-ranking minister who was named in connection with both plots of 1546 was Sir Thomas

---

Wriothesley, lord chancellor. He examined Anne Askew in the Tower and supposedly operated the rack when the lord lieutenant refused. He also was the minister who came to arrest Katherine Parr in the second attempt on her life. Dr. A. J. Slavin argues against Wriothesley's involvement in both plots on the grounds that the chancellor actually was sympathetic to the reformers. It is possible that Foxe held Wriothesley in only slightly less contempt than he held Gardiner, and if this were the case, then Foxe might have been only too ready to accuse the lord chancellor along side Gardiner. But again, we are faced with the problem that Foxe does not appear to have been in the habit of inventing fictions. What generally has not been considered is the possibility that Wriothesley may have been motivated for reasons which had nothing to do with religion.

There may have been political reasons for Wriothesley wanting to orchestrate Katherine Parr's downfall. After the king's death, the lord chancellor made an uneasy alliance with Protector Somerset, an alliance that did not hold, and it may well be that in the summer of 1546 Wriothesley anticipated the rise of the earl of Hertford to power and attempted to taint the earl with heresy through his wife. Certainly the earl was growing noticeably in the king's favor by the end of the reign. According to Foxe, Wriothesley first asked

---

Anne Askew about the countess of Hertford and other court ladies, and then proceeded to inquire about members of the privy council. Significantly, it was only then that the woman was put on the rack. Indeed, from Foxe's account, it almost appears as though Wriothesley and Rich were most interested in the privy councilors. It seems likely that any investigation of Katherine Parr's reading material would eventually have implicated the countess of Hertford and perhaps her husband as well. Even if the earl escaped, his political career would have been severely, perhaps irrevocably, damaged. To put this theory into perspective, the treasonous activities of yet another prominent reformer, the earl of Surrey, probably stemmed from similar fears of Hertford's growing influence with the king. It may well be that there was more to Wriothesley's involvement than Foxe, or anyone since, realized.

As the facts of the second plot against Katherine Parr would suggest, it was not her religious opinions and activities that disturbed the king. In fact, there was, if we believe Foxe, some evidence to suggest that the king may actually have had some sympathy for the queen's position. If the king was indeed serious about adopting a more radical religious policy, then Katherine Parr might well have felt free to express her opinions openly, and with the king's protection if not overt support. Richard Hilles and Chapuys separately commented in January 1547 that the queen was publicly displaying her
reforming sympathies; the queen's sympathies must have been open indeed for them to have become known on the continent. And both men must have been referring to reports dating to the last few months of the reign. This analysis further supports the earlier interpretation of the second plot against the queen in July 1546, that the queen's religious beliefs were not the issue, as least as far as the king was concerned.

In 1546, then, there may have been good reason for some conservatives at court to fear Katherine Parr's influence with the king. Her chambers had the appearance of a reformist salon, and she even was in the habit of discussing religious matters with the king, with his apparent permission. She was left frightened but unscathed by the summer plots of 1546; indeed, the second attempt on the queen's life only took shape when the king was momentarily outraged at being lectured to by his wife. After the king had had time to cool off, he took the unprecedented step of warning his wife and giving her the opportunity to save herself. If the king had been seriously concerned about Katherine Parr's opinions, he could have allowed the investigation to proceed. That he did not is significant. It would appear instead that the king had some sympathy for the queen's position: his conversation with the French admiral suggests that, only a month after the July plots, the king was leaning

---

43. LP, XXi, ii, 752; C.S.P.Sp., VII, 368 (LP, XXI, ii, 756).
towards a more radical religious policy. And although Katherine Parr was given a clear warning as to what could happen to her if she incurred the king's displeasure, her sympathy for the reformers nevertheless was still pronounced enough to have generated comment from two well-informed men on the continent.
CONCLUSION

Benefits and rewards flowed to Katherine Parr and her family immediately upon her marriage to Henry VIII in 1543. Her uncle, brother, and brother-in-law were given titles, offices, and numerous grants of land. The queen's female relatives -- her aunt, sister, and cousin -- were rewarded with appointments in the queen's household and, more indirectly, through the favor shown to the male members of their family. These rewards, though generous, were graded along already established lines. Katherine Parr, of course, benefited most of all. The queen was given her own establishment, modeled loosely on the king's own household, with an appropriate complement of staff. In early 1547, at least 117 people served in the queen's chambers, and of that number about forty-five were women. These figures are probably fairly representative of Katherine Parr's three-and-a-half years as queen. One of the remarkable revelations stemming from the examination of Katherine Parr's household is the apparent sense of continuity of staff, both above stairs and below, within the establishments of the king's last four wives. It also was significant that, with only a few exceptions, the high-ranking women who served in Katherine Parr's household were the wives and near relations of men in the king's household and government. This fact was an especially important element in the summer plots of 1546, where one of the women
targeted was married to a prominent privy councillor, while two others were the wives of the chief members of the king’s privy chamber.

Katherine Parr’s inheritance from her predecessors included not only a number of their household staff, but their dower properties as well. Indeed, much of the land settled on the queen apparently had been held previously by all of the king’s wives. The jointure settlement made Katherine Parr one of, if not the, wealthiest women in England. The queen had a learned council to administer her vast estate, and while the council may have had considerable influence when it came to appointments and leases, final decisions no doubt actually rested with Katherine Parr. Certainly the queen took advantage of the perquisites that such ownership brought: she sent gifts of venison to a number of people on a fairly regular basis; promoted a variety of suits; intervened in the parliamentary elections of 1545 and 1547 on behalf of her servants; and quickly became accustomed to a lifestyle appropriate to a queen of England.

While Katherine Parr may have seemed the natural choice for the regency in 1544, it does not necessarily follow that she was merely a figure-head. Quite the opposite. Henry VIII clearly expected his wife to be informed, active, and diligent in his affairs; he expected her to be as committed as any servant of the crown. And this she certainly was. Katherine Parr probably saw most, if not every, communication sent by
the London council to the council with the king in France and to the earl of Shrewsbury in the north of England. The dispatches indicate that not only was Katherine Parr consulted as a matter of course, but that many of the actions taken by the London council were at her command. The king’s one letter to Katherine Parr shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that he expected her to be at the center of affairs.

Although the king’s trust in Katherine Parr was amply demonstrated in his appointment of her as regent, it does not appear as though the queen actually had any real political power. Nor does it appear as though she sought such influence. Rather, the queen seems to have confined herself to more domestic matters. In this, she was following the examples set by the king’s three previous wives. Unlike Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn, who took an interest in foreign policy for their own particular reasons, Katherine Parr had no reason to look to Europe for support. Not, however, that continental powers were wholly uninterested in Katherine Parr: clearly, she was seen to be a potentially powerful influence on the king. But the queen and her women were more or less excluded from political affairs, and were probably discouraged, implicitly if not actually directly, from taking a more active interest. Hence their secular activities tended to concern the promotion of family, friends, and dependents.

When it came to religion, however, it was perfectly
permissible for the queen and her women to take an active public interest. At the time of her marriage to the king, Katherine Parr probably adhered to the letter to the religious policies of the day. But over a two-year period, from 1544 to 1546, the queen’s beliefs underwent a gradual transition. It seems likely that Katherine Parr’s conversion was urged and supported by a number of her high-ranking women. By 1546, the queen’s chambers had become something of a religious salon, and Katherine Parr had even taken to debating religious matters with the king. It was the debating part that got the queen into trouble. Indeed, Katherine Parr’s religious position was not the issue in the summer of 1546, but rather the fact that she had dared to lecture the king in front of others. Once she had publicly accepted the fact that wives were subject to their husbands, and so submitted herself to the king’s will, the king seemed content to allow her to exhibit her religious position openly. The king himself may have had some sympathy for the reformers in late 1546.

The fact that the king seemed to be moving away from the conservatives no doubt played some role in the allegiance of some at court to reforming doctrines. It is no coincidence that the religious sympathies exhibited by a number of women within the queen’s chambers conveniently supported their husbands’ political positions. There no doubt was sincere commitment behind the patronage of religious literature by these women, but
the political considerations are also prominent. Katherine Parr herself may have been motivated partly by such reasons: she was, after all, deeply involved in a project which figured into the religious settlement of Edward VI, while her Lamentacion added further weight to the government’s new policies. Although Katherine Parr may not have been the leader of reform in the last years of the reign, certainly collectively she and her women contributed greatly to its flourishing, and the queen and a number of her women assumed yet more prominent roles in the next reign.

* * *

In the midst of the continuing debate over Katherine Parr's role in the 1540s, one particular aspect has been completely missed or simply ignored. Katherine Parr's importance as an historical figure does not rest solely on the fact that she was Henry VIII's last wife. She is an important figure in her own right because her experiences better highlight the circumstances of women at the Tudor court.

Katherine Parr is fairly representative of aristocratic Tudor women in general. With increased educational opportunities, many women were literate in not just English, but in other languages including Latin. Marriage was as much an alliance between families as it was a religious contract between individuals, and all
involved expected to benefit in someway. A large number of women married more than once, and by doing so accumulated considerable wealth by way of their jointures. Wives frequently were entrusted with the administration of their husbands' estates, named as executors of their husbands' wills, and given the wardship of their underage children. And even if not actually at court, many aristocratic women nevertheless had strong contacts with those who were, and they exploited those relationships.

More specifically, Katherine Parr's experience of court life was very much like that of the high-ranking women appointed to attend her. What differentiates Katherine Parr's experiences rests primarily on degree: all the queen's women would have had jointures, only Katherine Parr's settlement was more substantial; all the queen's women had their own servants, Katherine Parr simply had more; all the women at court would have been expected to dress well, Katherine Parr especially so; and so on. The suits that the queen promoted further illustrates the similarities. There is evidence to show that a large number of the queen's women actively promoted the interests of their family, friends, and dependants in much the same fashion as Katherine Parr herself. That the movements of the these women were largely undocumented seems only to reflect the difference in status between Katherine Parr and her attendants; the queen's activities came under more scrutiny if only
because she was in fact the queen. Katherine Parr may have had more success in her endeavors because of her position as the king's wife, but certainly the women of her household seem to have done well enough. Even Katherine Parr's regency can be seen in a larger perspective; many men who had to be away from home, whether because of business or war, left the administration of their estates in the capable hands of their wives. The activities of this Tudor queen-consort were very much like those of the average aristocratic woman, and a study of Katherine Parr is also a study of women at the Tudor court.
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