

Tudor Life

The Tudor Society Magazine

THE
TUDOR
SOCIETY

Members Only

Nº 28

December 2016

Portraits and Men

#historybooksbywomen

Portraits in Tudor art

Male relatives of
Henry VIII's wives

London
Charterhouse

Charivari Rituals

Manners maketh
man

— AND —

ELIZABETH I
FESTIVE FUN



Henry VIII
& James V **A deadly rivalry**
by Gareth Russell

Merry
Christmas

FROM

THE
TUDOR
SOCIETY





Merry Christmas!

Tudor life was dominated by men, but in its popular history, the women have their revenge. In this edition, we look at what shaped the sixteenth century's powerful, and often oppressive, concepts of masculinity. I have contributed an article on political masculinity, specifically the rivalry between Henry VIII and his Scottish nephew, James V, as part of an edition where I am thrilled to formally welcome our two new regular contributors - Conor Byrne, who writes about the power of male relatives and their influence over powerful females, and Lauren Browne, who explores the fascinating *charivari* ritual in the Tudor countryside. You'll also really love our giant section on Tudor portraits written by our resident art historian Melanie Taylor, amongst other treats in this month's packed magazine.

From all who work so very hard on the Tudor Life magazine, may we wish you a wonderful Christmas period.

GARETH RUSSELL

Tudor Life

Contents

2 WOMEN'S HISTORY: AN UNDERGROUND MOVEMENT

by Amy Licence

5 DECEMBER'S GUEST SPEAKER IS GARETH RUSSELL ON HENRY VIII'S WARS

6 REFLECTIONS OF MARY BOLEYN

by Linda M. Saether

8 A DEADLY RIVALRY: James V, Henry VIII and the coming of war

by Gareth Russell

14 THE USE OF PORTRAITS IN TUDOR ART

MASSIVE 20 PAGE ART FEATURE

by Melanie V. Taylor

34 THE MALE RELATIVES OF HENRY VIII'S ENGLISH-BORN WIVES

by Conor Byrne

40 LONDON CHARTERHOUSE

Tudor Places Feature

by Tim Ridgway



DECEMBER




34

2

8

14

40



46 QUEEN ELIZABETH I FESTIVE FUN
Cut out and dress up Elizabeth!

48 CHARIVARI RITUALS IN TUDOR ENGLAND
by Lauren Browne

52 LUDLOW PALMERS' HISTORIC RESTORATION WORK
by Rory Chase

56 MANNERS MAKETH MAN
by Jane Moulder


66 DELICIOUS TUDOR MINCE PIES
by Claire Ridgway

67 MEMBERS' BULLETIN
by Tim Ridgway

72 THE DEVIL'S CHALICE
Book review
by Charlie Fenton

74 DECEMBER'S ON THIS DAY
by Claire Ridgway

56





Women's History

An Underground Movement?

Historian **Amy Licence** discusses
#HistoryBooksByWomen
and how women historians are under-
represented in modern media...

There is no doubt that women can write great history books. 2016 has witnessed the publication of important works by a plethora of female talent in the academic and popular spheres, tackling exciting, controversial and, frankly, daunting topics. From Mary Beard's *SPQR* and Lindy Grant's *Blanche of Castile* to Catherine Merridale's *Lenin on the Train* and Helen Rappaport's *Caught in the Revolution*, female historians are writing engaging and important books that women, and men, want to read. Nowhere is this more felt than in the medieval and Tudor period, where a very healthy proportion of new books published, and faces

appearing in TV documentaries, belong to women. Best-selling sixteenth-century titles from this year include Tracy Borman's *Private Lives of the Tudors*, Ruth Goodman's *How to be a Tudor*, Elizabeth Norton's *The Lives of Tudor Women* and Alison Weir's *The Lost Tudor Princess*, along with a number of new studies of dynastic families and important individuals. Browsing through Waterstones or Amazon, readers might be forgiven for thinking that there had never been a better time for the voices of female historians to be heard. And they would be correct, up to a point.

Exactly where that point exists, where the success curve for female historians turns downwards, was illuminated with an unexpected clarity this November. As usual, towards the end of the year, the newspapers print a retrospective piece about the best books published in the last twelve months, drawn from the recommendations of editors, critics, academics and other writers. Readers consume these lists in the hope of finding suitable Christmas presents or suggestions for further reading, from a source that can be trusted. A place on these lists is not just a feather in the cap of the author and publisher, or a translation into sales: it is a validation, a recognition. It is an acceptance into an elite club. It means the establishment have judged your voice to be valid. For those historians working outside the systems of academia, perhaps with small publishing houses, it could potentially be the turning point in a career. It was Lucy Worsley, well known for her work on the intimate, behind-the-scenes approach to history, who first noticed the gender imbalance in the books included. Tweeting on Saturday, November 26, she reported:

“8 of 9 of the ‘history books of the year’ in today’s Times, and 19 out of 21 of ditto in today’s Telegraph, are by men. I’m not impressed.”

Within minutes, other writers and readers had responded to express their surprise and disappointment at this discrepancy. And yet, to many of the women commenting, there seemed to be something depressingly familiar about it. Dr Sara Brown noted “the level of academic writing by women that is out there but ignored,”

while others called it a “bizarre bias” and “misogyny,” and “Chewbecca” added that national newspapers needed to “recognise female historians and their contributions as equal to men.” In response, Fern Riddell, author of *A Victorian Guide to Sex*, suggested the hashtag #Historybooksbywomen and her followers began to tweet examples of favourite authors and photographs of their books. Soon, the hashtag was trending and thousands of people on social media were engaged in the debate, enthusing into the

8 of 9 of the ‘history books of the year’ in today’s Times, and 19 out of 21 of ditto in today’s Telegraph, are by men. I’m not impressed.

- LUCY WORSLEY

small hours about those women writers who had inspired and entertained them. As a response to a disappointing representation of female talent, it was a glorious re-assertion of the breadth of talent out there, an affirmation of the confidence that was felt in the contributions of female historians. It pre-

sented an inspiring message, summed up by Leonie Hicks as “women write a lot of history; read it, profit from it, teach it.” Yet it also confirmed the fear that female historians are still something of an underground movement, a tolerated unorthodoxy, held at arm’s length by the overarching patriarchal metanarrative. It’s ok for women to write history books, or look pretty presenting TV documentaries, but not ok for them to be taken seriously.

But does it matter? I think so, very much. Of course, this is not to deny that there are lots of male historians producing great new books, or that a work should stand alone regardless of the gender of the author. For the purposes of this discussion, I’m going to make the assumption that men and women write equally well about history; differently, perhaps, but equally as well. It simply isn’t the case that men are writing proportionately better books. It’s less about


the quality of the work than about the opportunities and recognition offered to the authors, and this seems to return us to the age-old concept of the glass ceiling. While women form the larger percentage of readers in general and are amply catered for by female historians, it is an uncomfortable truth that in the twenty-first century, those authors are not promoted in the same way as their male counterparts. It is interesting to compare the gender-balance of the Telegraph, Times and Independent with that of the Costa Book Awards for 2015, voted for by readers, where the non-fiction selection was split equally between male and female authors, or Tracy Borman's top five in the BBC History Magazine's, of which three were women. But then, she's a woman.

Worryingly, this failure to bring women historians into the fold equates to the message that women's voices and the history of their lives are less worthy. In terms of Tudor history, female writers dominate the "popular" field, writing about social, cultural and personal aspects of life in the past, or reinterpreting traditional narratives from a female perspective, or simply prioritising the gender-exclusive aspects of women's lives. Their focus on topics like female sexuality, menstruation and childbirth, have created a sub-genre that struggles to find recognition alongside themes in macro history, and to garner a male readership. Female historians have taken women out of the margins, often overlooked, unrecorded and disregarded by the traditional recorders of history, and put them into the spotlight. In essence, they have been the leading figures in the new wave of women's history. And this is one of the main reasons for the explosion in the market of popular history, because it is only recently that the familiar story of politics and battles, of the lives of great men, have

been challenged by alternative voices. And yet, women also write equally well about men, about politics and policy, war and religion, about masculinity and male identity. Some of their voices might almost be androgynous in style and emphasis, when covering traditional male territory, their gender indecipherable, even irrelevant, except for the name on the book's front cover. Ideally, the experience and writing of history should be shared equally between the genders but, male voices have frequently been louder than those of women in the past, and this continues to cast a long shadow over the careers of female historians.

Despite the continuing success of big names like Alison Weir, Antonia Fraser, Philippa Gregory, Lucy Worsley, Leanda de Lisle, Helen Castor, Linda Porter, Sarah Gristwood, and the work of upcoming stars like Janina Ramirez, Suzannah Lipscomb, Tracy Borman and others, female historians still have a significant battle to fight. When it comes to being taken seriously as ground-breaking, cutting edge researchers and writers tackling important and interesting topics, it appears that women are still being capped by the proverbial glass ceiling. The only solution is the continued promotion of female historians, by publishers and the media, in as many outlets as possible, according to merit. It is for readers to buy, enjoy and review books, to enthuse about their favourites and share them with their friends. It is for teachers and lecturers to update their reading lists and literary festivals to invite women historians to speak, and to pay them accordingly. Most of all, it is for my fellow female authors, to maintain their solidarity in response to the #Historybooksbywomen hashtag, and to keep up the good work.

AMY LICENCE



December's
Guest
Speaker is
Gareth Russell
talking about
**HENRY III's
WARS**

**Available
online to all
full members**



REFLECTIONS OF MARY BOLEYN

**ANNE BOLEYN'S CORONATION/WESTMINSTER HALL
JUNE 1st 1533**
By Linda M. Saether

The silk of my crimson gown feels cool in my hands, as I arrange my kirtle about me. I sit up a little straighter, elongate my neck and make my face smile as if I am genuinely happy.

My family has of recent been elevated to one of England's leading families. With them, I, Lady Mary Boleyn, will again stand close to the crown, although in a manner I never had anticipated, but I should look as if it delights me.

I glance over at my younger sister, who as of today is the Queen of England and much the cause of our rising grandeur. Queen Anne Boleyn of England, our little Anne, the bright, graceful one who always could draw attention to herself, as easily as honey can draw a swarm of bees, is now spoken of through continents.

She sits but a few feet from me, a Queen in Westminster Hall, poised under the Cloth of State at her banquet table on her coronation day. In her belly lies the King's hope for the realm, and at her feet are all the Lords of

the land paying homage to her that people have come far and wide to see on this day.

On the day before this, she was presented to the King's subjects in a grand procession through the streets of London, where there was much revelry to honor her.

At Fenchchurch, children greeted her with a grand display, dressed as English and French merchants. At Leadenhall, she delighted in a castle adorned with roses, seeing that the white falcon of her badge was crowned by an angel of the heavens. She graciously received a purse of 1000 Marks in gold from the Recorder of London at Cheapside, and along Honey Lane she reveled in the Judgment of Paris, where Troy himself presented Anne with the golden apple meant for a goddess. There was much joy and feasting throughout the City of London, and ballads were sung from the rooftops in her honor. The town's people and nobles alike gathered closely as she spoke kindly to them and thanked them for all they had done for her, curious to see the woman for whom the King had given so much.

Now the dark eyes that captivated the King, are glowing. She looks ethereal in shimmering cloth of gold, and for someone who has spent days in processions and ceremony; she shows no sign of fatigue.

I know the King is watching her from afar. I know the look in his eyes when he beholds her. I know it because he looked at me like that, or almost like that, not so long ago. I was once his darling, but he didn't tear his Kingdom from the clenched fist of the Pope, or dispose of his royal born Queen, to conquer me.

What is different about her, why is his love for her so fierce that he would change the world for her, and yet so tender, that she can reduce him to tears if she even pretends to slight him?

I smile a little more, hiding my thoughts behind the folds of my face that are starting to ache as much as my heart.

Many wonder if my golden-haired son, Henry Carey, is the king's son, but those who value their lives will speak nothing of it. I will be forgotten as the Royal mistress, evident from the King's brotherly regard for me now. He looks upon my mother with more affection than he has for me. The passion we shared has vanished from his memory as if it never was at all, and I no longer recognize my lost lover's gaze.

My sister holds up her glass to me and to our mother, seated at my side. She winks, and I hear my mother sigh. It is the sigh of joy beyond reason, a joy that can make a heart hurt. The Dowager Duchess of Norfolk sits beside her, also in crimson, as we are all the Queens ladies, and she too smiles.

The Duchess carried my sister's train when she walked into the Abbey today, an honor that would have been bestowed upon my grandmother, Lady Elizabeth Tilney, the Countess of Surrey, had she lived. It would have given my mother great pride to have her with us to see our Anne seated in the Coronation chair, adorned in purple robes lined with ermine, as the Crown of St. St Edward was placed on her head. She bore the weight of it with the dignity of every King and Queen crowned in that seat for centuries be-




fore her. She is a marvel my sister, to whom none can be compared.

Much will be expected of me now. I will be in my sister's service, I will obey her in all things, and my livelihood will depend on her. My son has already become her ward with the death of my husband, and she has much influence over my daughter Catherine as well. I must forget the touch of her husband's hand, and the delight of basking in his attention as I watch his adoration for her.

I will be expected to marry well, and at her command, to someone who will strengthen her faction and stand against those who still support the previous Queen.

My thoughts escape to William Stafford, and my smile is no longer difficult to bear, for he soothes me. Nothing gives me more joy than the kindness in his eyes and the love he has for me. Although he is low-born, and my sister would never approve,

I want him to take me away from here, from her, from the King who no longer desires me, from the madness of court, and to the countryside where we are beyond reach, were we can live free.





TUDOR LIFE EXCLUSIVE

A Deadly Rivalry James V, Henry VIII, and the coming of war

by Gareth Russell

One of the audiences that Henry VIII granted during his 1541 progress through the north of England was to Thomas Bellenden, a Scottish courtier who, during their meeting, allegedly proposed a summit between his king, James V, and his English uncle. According to R.W. Hoyle and J. B. Ramsdale in their convincing 2004 article, 'The Royal Progress of 1541, the North of England, and Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1534-1542', Henry VIII enthusiastically agreed to Bellenden's offer and even rearranged the progress's itinerary to prepare for a grand face-to-face meeting with his estranged Scottish nephew at York.

James V's tenure as Scottish sovereign had begun thanks to a clash between his country and his English mother's – the Battle of Flodden in 1513 had ended with James's father and predecessor, James IV, slain and his army defeated by English forces commanded by Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey. Since then, relations between the two kingdoms had remained strained and England's schism with Roman Catholicism in the 1530s had added a new

spice to the old animosity. Henry VIII was keen to persuade his nephew to follow in his footsteps by repudiating the Vatican's authority, but James V remained defiantly devout. In 1538, he married Marie de Guise, a noblewoman whose family were one of the most zealous defenders of Catholicism in France. Marie had been scouted as prospective bride for Henry after Queen Jane Seymour's death but, apparently, she

TUDOR LIFE EXCLUSIVE



James V of Scots (*ExploreParliament*)

and her countrymen preferred her chances in Scotland.

English attempts to weaken Scotland's centuries-old pact with France, antique enough to earn itself the nickname "the Auld Alliance", had likewise failed. James V had crossed the sea to visit his French allies, but he had, thus far, conspicuously failed to cross the border to see his Tudor uncle. By 1541, when the French ambassador to London, Charles de Marillac, wrote confidentially to his government that he was convinced from what he had seen that the English were preparing for a war, England's need to break James V away from his French treaties was pressing. If England did attack

France, nobody wanted a repeat of 1513, when Scotland came to her ally's aid by invading England from the north.

At the English court, there was also long-running suspicions that the Scottish Crown was funding and encouraging aristocratic resentment against the Tudors in Ireland and the certain knowledge that Scotland was granting asylum to political and religious refugees from Henry's reformation. Meeting like with like, Henry VIII would not extradite any Scottish asylum seekers and, as tensions mounted, the Duke of Norfolk was sent north to inspect England's border fortresses. Defence of the border territories was left under the command of Henry Clifford, 1st Earl of Cumberland, whose son and heir was married to the King's niece, Lady Eleanor Brandon, and Ralph Neville, 4th Earl of Westmorland. In the meantime, one of James's most influential courtiers, Cardinal David Beaton, was sent to Paris to liaise with the French government about a plan, if the English attacked Scotland.

Thomas Bellenden's proposal of a meeting at York, of course, famously did not happen. Some historians have argued that the entire invitation was a ruse on James's behalf to knock the English off their military preparations for long enough to give Edinburgh and Paris time to prepare a strategy of their own. Others have suggested that Bellenden, perhaps carried away by the terrifying charisma of Henry VIII's person, overstated his brief by implying a meeting was not just theoretically-desired but actually-intended, while others have opined that poor Bellenden was firing out the usual meaningless and mannerly diplomatic platitudes, only to have an enthusiastic Henry jump on the chance of a summit.

Henry's bull-headed insistence that the two kings should meet at York was a major stumbling block, because even

TUDOR LIFE EXCLUSIVE

those at the Stewart court who wanted the meeting did not think their king should travel as far into English territory as York. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, far closer to the border, was suggested, but warnings from Henry's deputies on the borders and even from his own sister, the Dowager Queen Margaret, James's mother, which told him of the strength of opposition from some of James's councillors about any kind of meeting with Henry VIII, let alone one as far south as York, fell on deaf ears.

Henry VIII, his radiant young queen, Catherine Howard, and their vast entourage waited at York, while many of those around them, including a secretly-pleased French ambassador, were nearly certain that James V would never come. When Henry eventually conceded their point, he moved south in particularly foul form, and even James V's well-meaning gift of a pair of expensive hunting falcons did not balm Henry's wounded pride.

Whatever the Scottish plan had been with the meeting, it backfired spectacularly. Relations between uncle and nephew continued to rot, culminating in the Battle of Solway Moss a year later, a defeat so catastrophic for Scotland that it is often credited with hastening King James's collapse, death, and the accession of his six-day-old daughter Mary, Queen of Scots, whose tumultuous reign began and ended, like her father's, in the debris of their country's anguished relationship with their southern neighbours.

The back-and-forth of the proposed visit of the Scottish king to York in 1541 highlights the delicate, if often exhausting, dance at the heart of sixteenth-century European diplomacy. Manners and mendacity combined to obfuscate one's true intentions. To this day, it is unclear whether James V ever offered, or meant, to visit Henry VIII. Who was the liar and who



Henry VIII

was the fool? Since the progress surrounding it is often overshadowed by the scandal that erupted at its conclusion, concerning Queen Catherine's private life, the Anglo-Scottish diplomacy at its heart has thus far received only limited academic attention, despite the role that diplomacy played in causing another war, ending one reign, and beginning another.

Henry VIII, aging, bloated, tyrannical and adrift in terms of allies, badly wanted the friendship, but also the supplication, of his Scottish nephew. James V, who had something of his uncle's histrionics but who was far less cruel, was a man caught somewhere between then the pious and the



Charles Laughton as Henry VIII and Binnie Barnes as Catherine Howard in “The Private Life of Henry VIII” (1933). The young Queen’s downfall overshadowed her country’s quarrel with Scotland. (*Confessions of a Ci-Devant*)

profane – he was a devout man, who also enjoyed the company of many mistresses. He was clever, urbane, and sensitive. To visit York, as proposed by Henry, would arguably have been a catastrophic decision for James.

The Middle Ages and the early modern period were cultures of the visual. In a world of the politics of display, Henry VIII and his contemporaries took their cue from how people behaved, what they wore, where they sat, to whom they showed favour or bent the knee. The entire progress to the north of England had consisted of one public submission after another from those northerners who had rebelled against

Henry’s government in 1536. Was the arrival of the King of Scots intended to be part of the same process? The ceremony might allude to the English monarchy’s antique insistence that it was the overlord of Scotland’s. James V could be cast as the latest in a long line of vassals who had prostrated themselves before a triumphant Henry during the progress. Even supposing Henry did treat James with the etiquette reserved for an equal, there was a very good chance that he might not let him go once he had him. Henry might keep James there indefinitely or until he caved either on his alliance with France or the English refugees in Scotland. Henry’s assurances of




safe conduct were worthless. He had promised amnesty to the leaders of the Pilgrimage of Grace in return for surrender, invited them to court, sent them home and then butchered them. This may not have been a correct interpretation of Henry's intentions in September 1541, but neither was it unreasonable – not long after his visit to York, Henry VIII's councillors had to talk him out of ordering James's kidnapping.

As with everything in early modern politics, there was far more beneath the surface of the gorgeous ceremonial. Henry VIII was grievously and hideously insulted by his nephew's non-attendance at the proposed conference, but while contemporary concepts of masculinity, particularly honour, were slighted by James's behaviour, it is hard to know what else he could have done. English aggression was increasing; Scottish commitment to Roman Catholicism was still strong, so James chose not to back-down on the issue of asylum; France was naturally ferociously opposed to a meeting between the two British kings, as were many of James's advisers and magnates. Both governments aggravated the other one in the countdown to war in 1542, but it is difficult to see if this intended meeting between two powerful, and mistrustful, monarchs would have prevented the final clash.

GARETH RUSSELL



Marie de Guise, Scotland's French-born queen
(*ExploreParliament*)





The use of Portraits in Tudor Art

Melanie V. Taylor examines some wonderful portraiture that has survived the centuries and gives us an insight into the important Tudors...

How does a 21st century audience know the movers and shakers of Tudor society? Clearly those historians who immerse themselves in documents will have a feel for the way they believe these men thought. Combine that with the first use of the portrait as a propoganda tool in the 16th century and suddenly these influential men are no longer faceless names only accessible through dry documents.

Why did the stand alone large portrait become so popular at the beginning of the 1500s? It is no coincidence that this art form parallels the Protestant Reformation. The first man to use his self-portrait to promote his work was the German artist Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528). In England it was another European, this time a scholar, who was to introduce the man who would transform the English art world. This man was Erasmus of Rotterdam whose portrait was painted and

delivered by Hans Holbein the Younger (1497-1543) to Sir Thomas More in the mid 1520s. This particular portrait is on the walls of the National Gallery, London on loan from Longford Castle and is thought to be the one that was the gift to Sir Thomas.

The religious riots we know as the Protestant Reformation were brought about by the writings of Luther, Erasmus , John Calvin, Huldrick Zwingli and many more philosophers . In this



Erasmus by Holbein



Thomas More by Holbein

febrile religious atmosphere it was impossible for an artist to make a living in Germany, which is possibly why Erasmus gave Holbein letters of introduction to his friend Sir Thomas More who immediately commissioned his own portrait from the young artist.

What I find puzzling is why one of the two most important men in England did not introduce this new artistic talent to his king. We know from surviving sketches that More commissioned a group family portrait from Holbein and the original painting eventually ended up in a collection that was unfortunately destroyed by fire a couple of hundred years later. Unlike Erasmus, who used his portrait to market himself, More appears to have used the portrait as a way of immortalising himself and his family and not realised how a portrait would be a great propaganda tool. Perhaps those portraits did not survive More's downfall.

One member of the court who took advantage of Holbein's talent was Sir Henry Guildford, Henry VIII's Master of Horse and Comptroller of the Household. Guildford's portrait is in the Royal Collection and hangs in the drawing room at Windsor Castle. Sir Henry also had his wife painted as the pendant pair to his own and her portrait now hangs in St Louis Art Museum, USA. If you put these two paintings close together you see how the curtain rail is set at exactly the same height (*see over*).

The Royal Collection has many sketches created as preliminary drawings of royal courtiers, but not all the final paintings survive. Guildford also employed Holbein as the decorator for the temporary banqueting hall in 1527, so during his first trip to England the German artist was already adorning the Henrician court with temporary artistic marvels.

The Frick Collection in New York has placed what is now accepted as Holbein's portrait of Thomas Cromwell painted sometime in the early 1530s. The curators have placed this portrait exactly opposite the one of Sir Thomas More. Cromwell's expression creates a sense of foreboding: just who is he thinking about? What

is he plotting? Whose name is written on that piece of paper he holds in his hand.

What is incredible is that it is not until after the death of Jane Seymour when the king required a new spouse does Holbein paint a portrait of Henry VIII.

http://images.tate.org.uk/sites/default/files/styles/width-600/public/images/henry_viii_large.jpg?itok=Zv_fxpUW The original portrait is in the Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum in Madrid. The National Gallery, London contains the Holbein cartoon for the Whitehall Mural where Holbein stands with his hands on his hips and legs firmly planted apart, as if standing on the deck of a ship.





Mary, Lady Guildford by Holbein



Anno D. mcccxxxvii. 62
Etatis Sua. xl ix.

Sir Henry Guildford by Holbein



Thomas Cromwell by Holbein

What dominates this cartoon is the size of Henry's codpiece suggesting that perhaps this mural was conceived when Jane was pregnant as opposed to being finalised after Prince Edward's birth. The design process would have taken a long time and we know the mural was finished by 1538. Perhaps the decision was taken not to include an infant prince because of the instance of infant mortality, but we are to supposed to acknowledge Prince Edward's presence from the size of his father's codpiece. For the purpose of this article, what is important is this is the only surviving 16th century portrait that depicts both the founder of the Tudor dynasty, Henry VII and his son, Henry VIII.

Prior to the Whitehall Mural Henry VIII had appeared in narrative paintings by the British School depicting *The Field of the Cloth of Gold* and *The Departure* for the same. Henry is seen as a triumphant warrior. Other large portraits of Henry had been rendered by Joos van Cleve, but it is unlikely the king ever sat for him, or any other artist other than Holbein and the royal illuminator, Lucas Horenbout.

The use of the royal portrait on letters patent and other illuminated documents were for a very limited audience whereas the large portraits were designed to be seen by courtiers, diplomats and anyone privileged enough to go to Court.

The *Holbein in England* exhibition held at Tate Britain from September 2006 – January 2007 was one of those exhibitions that left lovers of Tudor history completely mesmerised at the genius of Holbein. For anyone attending the exhibition, it became obvious why large portraits became popular. Gone were the religious problems of the sin of pride – thanks to the Protestant Reformation. Provided you could afford it, who would not want to be immortalised in paint by this German genius? Sadly, Holbein's career was cut short at the end of 1543 by the sweating sickness. Some suggest it may have been plague, but this is not proven.

William Scrots was the next official painter of royal portraits. His way of portraying Prince Edward was to put him in the same stance as his father. Hands on hips and legs apart. Somehow

the young prince does not convey the same authority as his father. The prince looks more a petulant teenager and less a king. Scrots has painted a much smaller codpiece, which may be deliberate (*see over*). Edward was still a minor and it was thought unhealthy for a boy to have sexual intercourse before the age of 14. There may also be another reason. Since this may have been a portrait painted with a specific marriage in mind perhaps it was thought diplomatic not to over-emphasise the prince's genitals. It may have been interpreted that the prospective bride was only being approached for her child bearing possibilities!

In a head and shoulders portrait of the prince (courtesy of the Philip Mould Gallery) we see the Edward painted against a dingey brown background with what appears to be an embroidered E and R on either side of his head. The letters tell us this was painted after he had become king, which makes you wonder why the artist used a cheap pigment that has turned from blue to brown over time (*see over*). We see the same effect in the *Man in a Black Cap* (1545) attributed to John Bettes the Younger.



Man in a black cap
by John Bettes the Elder



Edward VI by Scrots



Edward, circle of Scots

We know the background in the portrait of the Man in the Black Cap was originally blue as analysis has identified it as the pigment, smalt. This was a much cheaper pigment than ultramarine and one which degraded with prolonged exposure to light. The contract between the artist and his unknown sitter may have specified various pigments because it was known that some were less stable than others, but it would be many years before this blue would turn brown revealing the fraud. This was one way an artist could cut corners to make a profit! What is odd is that Scrots, who was paid an annuity by the king for his services, would stoop to using inferior materials. Since art historians are always changing their minds, perhaps this portrait of Edward will be given more consideration and will be re-attributed to another artist such as Bettes, or that more prolific artist A Non.

During Edward's short reign many European Protestants fled to England to escape Hapsburg Catholic persecution. One of these religious immigrants was the artist Hans Eworth who portrayed one of his English patrons as a marine god. The portrait of Sir John Luttrell is the first example of Renaissance visual allegory in English portraiture. It is held in the Courtauld collection. At first glance it is more likely a modern audience would be reminded of photographs of a bare chested Vladimir Putin sitting astride his horse. There may be centuries between the two images but the message is the same. Both men want to be thought of as warriors. No doubt there was a similar conversation between the artist and patron as to how Sir John wished to be painted. In the case of Putin, the photographer has captured an image that is intended to show the Russian leader in the role of a traditional warrior, but we have no idea who came up with the idea of a bare chested Putin. Perhaps it was the Russian leader's idea? We have no idea how Sir John's portrait was received, but a mounted Putin is not an image I find attractive!

When Edward's sister Mary ascended the throne her thoughts were on marriage and she duly married Philip II of Spain in 1554. The Venetian master, Titian, had painted Philip's

portrait in 1551 when they were both at the Imperial Court at Augsburg. At the same time he painted a portrait of Emperor Charles V.


Titian was the imperial artist of choice. Today we are very familiar with Philip's prominent Hapsburg jaw. Despite the ornate and expensive ceremonial armour with a prominent codpiece the sitter is still not an object of beauty. Are we supposed to be awed by his presence? Perhaps a modern audience has an inbuilt prejudice against Philip because we know of his later exploits as King of Spain?

Philip commissioned a series of mythological paintings of an erotic and sensual nature from Titian and in 1554 *Venus and Adonis* was delivered to Spanish Philip, King of England, in London. The entry on the Web Gallery of Art for this painting is as follows:

"In its own day Venus and Adonis was considered one of Titian's most erotic works, especially in the compression of Venus' buttocks in her seated pose, but it also suggests the indulgent condescension of a younger man towards the frantic and overprotective reaction of an older woman."

This description taken with the fact that Philip was considerably younger than his bride might suggest a this was commissioned as a royal comment about the royal match. The story comes from Ovid and this and various other stories from Ovid provided Titian with inspiration for various other sensuous and erotic paintings for Philip's very private collection. The letters between Philip and Titian, commissioning these 'poesie' as they are known, still exist in the Venetian archives, but there is nothing written about whether this was a comment on Philip's forthcoming nuptials.

Clearly Philip wished to be thought of as a warrior hence the portrait with the ceremonial armour. However, for his personal delight he had mythical stories inspire the leading Venetian artist to paint sensual and erotic nudes for his private collection to be hung in his private apartments. What I find interesting is that there do not appear to be any surviving paintings of this type of painting for a 16th century English audience.



Sir John Luttrell by Hans Eworth



Philip II by Titian

The Elizabethan age rejuvenated a desire for the great and the good to have their portraits painted. Right from the start of her reign there are portraits of Elizabeth and the men in her life were very quick to follow her lead. The most easily accessible museum containing portraits of the key players of her court is the National Portrait Gallery in Charing Cross Road. Here the important men are hung next to, or near the queen in the Tudor section on the first floor.

Sir Christopher Hatton has a complicated double sided portrait showing his astrological birth chart, but this example is a traditional portrait (NPG Ref. 2162). The NPG has 13 portraits of Hatton including a miniature by Nicholas Hilliard.

On the same wall are portraits of Sir Walter Raleigh, Lord Burghley, Sir Francis Walsingham and next to her, Elizabeth's favourite – Robert Dudley.

Sir Walter wears the black and white colours of Elizabeth's livery, but apart from this being a visual statement of his loyalty, the portrait does not do much else other than show us what Raleigh looked like. He too had a miniature painted by Hilliard.

Sir Francis Walsingham is seated and looks directly out at us. (*see over*) His penetrating gaze reminds us that he was the queen's spymaster with the most efficient spy network in Europe. This painting was created in 1585 by John de Critz, five years before Walsingham died. Thanks to



Sir Christopher Hatton
by Unknown Artist





Venus and Adonis by Titian



Sir Francis Walsingham by
John De Critz the Elder

Walsingham's spy network the Throckmorton and Babington plots to assassinate Queen Elizabeth were foiled, and information leading to the trial and execution of Mary Queen of Scots was discovered. What we have to decide is whether de Critz has captured the menace that being in Walsingham's presence must have been felt.

His complexion was sallow, which led to Elizabeth calling him her Moor. She had pet names for Sir William Cecil whom she called her Spirit and Robert Dudley, her Eyes.

In this painting Sir William is every inch the statesman in his Garter robes (ref NPG362). There are various portraits of Cecil, but this one portrays Elizabeth's great statesman at the pinnacle of his career. This portrait is not signed, but is attributed to another Flemish religious refugee, Marcus Gheerhaerts the Younger.


Finally, but not least in Elizabeth's affections, there is Robert Dudley. This particular portrait is in Waddesdon Manor. Probably painted by an artist of the Anglo Netherlandish School in 1564 when Dudley was made Earl of Leicester. Dudley's coat of arms is portrayed twice: on the left it is surrounded with the collar of the French Order of St Michael, an order founded by Louis XI (1423-1483) in 1469; and on the right surrounded by the English Order of the Garter. In her book *Dynasties*, the art historian Karen Hearn states the painting was originally created to celebrate Dudley being created Earl of Leicester in 1564 and the coat of arms surrounded by the collar of the Order of St Michael was added in 1566, the year Dudley was given this honour by

Henry IV of France. Before anyone jumps up and down and says, "but this painting is by Steven van der Meulen", that is impossible. Van der Meulen's will has been discovered in the English National Archives at Kew. It is now known that van der Meulen died either at the end of 1563 or at the beginning of 1564 as his will was proved on 20th January 1564, hence the re-attribution to the broader soubriquet of Anglo Netherlandish School.

There are many portraits of Dudley by artists who had settled in England and visiting artists such as the Italian, Zuccaro. Many of those living in England are yet to be identified. Plus Dudley was a patron for our own English artist, Nicholas Hilliard, who created several miniature portraits of the Earl. Was Dudley vain, or was he keen to ensure he will be remembered by future generations. Certainly vanity plays a part in this group Tudor men we know from the documents of history, but at the time these were painted these images were statements of social standing and wealth – not quite the equivalent of a selfie, but just as important as a statement of self.

These are just a small sample of the surviving portraits allowing us to know the faces of these characters and so able to picture them in our mind's eye. We should not forget the artists themselves. Self-portraits of those working in England during the 16th century are rare, but we should remember them because they are the ones who have given us this rogues gallery of Tudor men.

MELANIE V. TAYLOR



Melanie V. Taylor's book, *The Truth of the Line*, tells the story of artist Nicholas Hilliard, his relationship with Elizabeth I and her various courtiers, and investigates Melanie's intriguing discovery in a fast paced novel format. Melanie runs the website www.thetruthoftheline.co.uk and is the regular art historian for the Tudor Society.



William Cecil, 1st Baron Burghley
attrib. Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger



Robert Dudley
by unknown artist.

The Male Relatives of Henry VIII's English-Born Wives

by Conor Byrne



Unusually for a sixteenth-century king, Henry VIII honoured four of his subjects with marriage. Not only was it unusual for a king to marry his own subject, but it was also extraordinary that he should marry six times (although Henry would likely argue that he was, in fact, married only to two women). For the families of Henry's English-born wives, marriage to the king afforded unique, perhaps even unparalleled closeness to their royal master and offered political and social opportunities that were hitherto unavailable. In particular, the male relatives of the queen benefited from their relative's royal marriage and were able, if so inclined, to wield considerable influence at court.

Henry VIII's second consort, Anne Boleyn, has traditionally been viewed as a member of a family that was proud, grasping and avaricious. Occasionally, it has been suggested that Anne was encouraged by her family to seduce the king, perhaps following in the footsteps of her sister, who was briefly Henry's mistress in the early 1520s. Undoubtedly, the king's attention was welcome, but it is unlikely that Anne's father, Sir Thomas, desired his daughter to become merely a cast-off mistress. The Imperial ambassador, Eustace Chapuys, at one point claimed that Anne's father disapproved of the king's courtship of her, but this is unsupported by other evidence. Irrespective of their initial reactions to Henry's love for Anne, for Thomas, his son George and his brother-in-law Thomas, duke of Norfolk, the king's decision to marry Anne ushered in splendid opportunities for the Boleyns and, by extension, the Howards, Anne's maternal relatives.

At the time of his daughter's courtship, Thomas Boleyn was already ennobled, for he had been elevated to the peerage on 18 June 1525 as Viscount Rochford. The viscount had also hoped to secure the earldom of Ormond, and Piers Butler, a competing claimant, was obliged by the king to renounce his claims in 1529. The pinnacle of Boleyn's career occurred on 8 December of that year, when he was created earl of Wiltshire and earl of Ormond. That same day, his son George was granted the courtesy title of Viscount Rochford, which had previously belonged to Thomas. The following year, Thomas was also made Lord Privy Seal.

Thomas Boleyn had long been a loyal, effective servant of King Henry VIII, having escorted the king's sister Margaret to Scotland in 1503 in readiness for her marriage to James IV. Six years later, Boleyn was created a Knight of the Bath at Henry VIII's coronation, and he was also a resident ambassador

in the Low Countries, a position which enabled him to seek an appointment for his daughter Anne at the court of the Archduchess Margaret of Austria. Later, Boleyn served as ambassador to France and was involved in the negotiations for the proceedings known as the Field of Cloth of Gold, held in 1520, and later acted as an envoy to Emperor Charles V. However, it is apparent that Boleyn's elevation to the nobility occurred at least in part due to his monarch's infatuation with Anne and desire to make her his queen. Ennobling his prospective bride's family honoured Henry as greatly as it did Thomas Boleyn. That the king's favour of Boleyn rested in part on his relationship with Anne is proven by the fact that, following her downfall in 1536, the earl was replaced as Lord Privy Seal. Boleyn continued to remain active at court and was involved in taking action against the Pilgrimage of Grace, but he did not manage to enjoy the unparalleled influence that he had wielded during his daughter's ascendancy.

Both Thomas and his son, George, shared the reformist tendencies of Queen Anne. The Imperial ambassador, who pressed for Anne's repudiation and the restoration of Katherine of Aragon, reported that Anne and her brother were "more Lutheran than Luther itself". Anne's elevation to queenship undoubtedly enabled her brother to promote the reformist cause. He is known to have translated, from French into English, two religious texts for Anne, describing himself as "her most loving and friendly brother". George is thought to have encouraged his sister to present Simon Fish's *Supplication for the Beggars* to Henry VIII.

Politically, George benefited from his sister's relationship with the king, but it is also true that his own talents were rewarded by the king's favour. In 1528, the year before his father was ennobled, George was appointed an esquire of the

body and master of the king's buckhounds; the following year he was made keeper, and then chief steward, of the Palace of Beaulieu. That same year, he was knighted and was granted the courtesy title of Viscount Rochford. Like his father, George was a talented diplomat and represented the king as his ambassador in France. He attended six foreign embassies to France and encouraged the French universities to support Henry VIII's attempts to secure an annulment. During his sister's queenship, George regularly travelled to France as the king's representative. When in England, the viscount was prominent at court. In 1533, he carried his niece, Princess Elizabeth, at her christening, and the following year was appointed Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports and Constable of Dover Castle. Anne's downfall in the spring of 1536 implicated her brother, and he was executed alongside the queen on a charge of incest that has been viewed by the majority of modern historians as dubious.

Jane Seymour's elevation to queenship after the disgrace of Anne Boleyn similarly afforded unique opportunities to her male relatives. Unlike Thomas Boleyn, there is no evidence that Jane's father had any talent as a diplomat or ambassador. Before his daughter's marriage to the king, John Seymour was highly active in his home county of Wiltshire and neighbouring counties of Somerset, Dorset and Gloucestershire as a sheriff, Justice of the Peace, constable and commissioner. He had been knighted in 1497 and was made a knight banneret in 1513. However, John Seymour never achieved the influence of Thomas Boleyn for two main reasons: firstly, his absence at court, and secondly on account of his death in December 1536, only seven months after Jane's marriage. It is also true that Seymour lacked the diplomatic talents of Boleyn, whose fluency in French, for example, was well known. It is tempting to speculate as to the influence John might have enjoyed, as father of the queen, had he lived to witness his daughter's delivery of a prince the following October. By giving birth to the future Edward VI on 12 October 1537, Jane Seymour ensured that her family would continue to enjoy the esteemed favour of Henry VIII.

The queen's unexpected death did not prevent her brothers from attaining further glory at court. Edward Seymour, an ambitious and unscrupulous man, had been created Viscount Beauchamp

on 5 June 1536 and, following the birth of Prince Edward, was made Earl of Hertford. Later he was appointed Warden of the Scottish Marches and was highly active in the region, pursuing a war against Scotland during the final years of Henry VIII's reign and during the minority of Edward VI. The earl could enjoy credit as victor at the battle of Pinkie Cleugh in September 1547. Following this victory, Hertford established a series of garrisons as far north as Dundee. He also hoped to wed his nephew the king to Mary, Queen of Scots, a splendid marriage that would potentially have united the warring kingdoms much earlier than was to be the case. Following Henry VIII's death, the earl was invested with almost regal power by the late king's executors, although Henry's will had not provided for the appointment of a Protector. It is evidence of Hertford's influence at court that he was elected Protector. As G. R. Elton noted, 'from that moment his [Hertford's] autocratic system was complete'. The Imperial ambassador later noted that the earl 'governs everything absolutely'. At the same time, the earl was created Duke of Somerset.

Somerset's unparalleled influence in the later years of Henry VIII's reign and, especially, during the minority of Edward VI occurred mainly due to his sister's marriage to the king, which enabled him to enjoy a uniquely close relationship with Henry. Although the duke was executed in 1552, only five years after Edward VI's accession, his career is a striking example of the considerable opportunities available to those related to the queen consort. It is true that Somerset's career, and the power that he attained, was extraordinary; none of the other male relatives of Henry's English queens benefited as greatly as did the duke. His younger brother Thomas Seymour's career is, perhaps, more representative of the advantages that could be gained from an Englishwoman's marriage to the king. Like George Boleyn, Thomas served in embassies that were sent to France and he was one of those appointed to welcome Anne of Cleves at Calais in December 1539. Later, he was sent to the court of Ferdinand, king of Hungary to attempt to enlist support for Henry against France and Scotland. In 1543, two months before Henry VIII's marriage to Katherine Parr, Thomas was appointed ambassador to the Netherlands.

Like Edward Seymour, Thomas's status as uncle of the prince meant that his influence at court was considerable. Like the earl of Hertford, Thomas was a member of the regency council appointed by Henry VIII to rule during the minority of Edward VI. It was surely Thomas's status as uncle of the king, coupled with his reputed charms, which led the dowager queen to wed him in the spring of 1547. Katherine probably believed that he could provide her with a degree of financial security, while ensuring her continued political relevance. Thomas was made Baron Seymour of Sudeley, where he occasionally resided with his wife. In an attempt to console his brother, the duke of Somerset appointed Thomas as Lord High Admiral, and he was later granted the wardship of Lady Jane Grey, cousin of the king. His unstable relationship with the duke, however, and his indiscreet behaviour with the king's sister Elizabeth, brought Thomas into difficulties. In other circumstances, he may have prospered even more than he had already. In an unfavourable climate, Thomas succumbed to an insatiable lust for power. In January 1549, in a desperate bid, he was caught trying to break into the king's apartments at Hampton Court Palace and was arrested and taken to the Tower of London, where he was executed two months later.

The male relatives of Jane Seymour prospered more so than the male relatives of Henry's other English wives. Mainly, this was because of their status as kin to the next king, but partly, this was due to the fact that two of Henry's English-born wives were executed for treason, which meant that suspicion fell on the involvement of their families. Following her marriage to Henry in the summer of 1540, Katherine Howard's relatives were rewarded by the king. Her brother George was granted a pension of 100 marks, several manors, and alongside his brother Charles a licence to import Gascon wine. Charles was also granted £100 annually and a range of properties. The latter's clandestine involvement with the king's niece, Lady Margaret Douglas, prevented him from attaining further favour at the king's hands. Unlike George Boleyn, the brothers of Katherine were not implicated with their sister, and are reported to have appeared in public to show that they did not share in her disgrace.

Like Jane, Katherine Howard's marriage did not benefit her father, for he had died around a year

earlier. It can only be speculated how Lord Edmund may have been favoured by Henry VIII, but extant evidence suggests that the king had never approved of Howard, who experienced financial difficulties throughout his life. In comparison to the Boleyns and Seymours, the favours bestowed upon the male Howards were slight. This may have been because Henry was waiting for his wife to provide him with a son. Undoubtedly, had she done so, her male relatives would have been rewarded further by the king and the queen herself may have been honoured with a coronation. It is also plausible that the Howard men did not benefit as greatly as did the Boleyns or Seymours, for example, because of Edmund's lack of relationship with the king alongside his death in 1539, coupled with the lesser experience of Katherine's brothers compared to that of George Boleyn or the Seymour brothers. Nonetheless, the queen's uncle and most senior male relative, the duke of Norfolk, was the recipient of both royal favour and material rewards. In January 1541 he was appointed lieutenant-general north of the Trent. However, the discovery of his niece's premarital affairs endangered the duke's position at court. In a letter of December that year, the duke pleaded ignorance to the king. As Michael A. R. Graves states, this letter contains 'the words of an experienced, self-interested courtier'. Howard's long years of service enabled him to escape punishment and, in January 1542, the French ambassador commented that the duke had been received at court 'apparently in his full former credit and authority'.

Katherine Parr's marriage to Henry VIII was surely welcomed by her relatives. Her brother, William, was like George Boleyn a talented musician, gifted scholar and experienced courtier. The year of his sister's marriage to the king, William was elected to the Order of the Garter and named Lord Warden of the Western Marches. Later in 1543, he was elevated to the earldom of Essex and was made Captain of Henry VIII's gentlemen pensioners. Parr's reformist sympathies, coupled with his status as uncle to Edward VI (following the remarriage of his sister to Thomas Seymour), ensured that the earl remained a figure of authority after the death of Henry VIII. In February 1547, Parr was rewarded for his loyalty with the title of marquess of Northampton. As with Jane Seymour and Katherine Howard, Katherine Parr's father died long before his daughter's marriage

to the king, but as a trusted and loyal royal servant during his lifetime, he undoubtedly would have been rewarded further had he lived to witness Katherine's triumph.

Henry VIII's marriages to his English subjects promised unique opportunities to these women's families. While several relatives were already well established at court and had demonstrated their talents in diplomacy, patronage and court politics, their kinswoman's marriage to the king of England ensured that they were offered further, and more lucrative, opportunities to advance their careers. Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford and duke of Somerset, benefited most greatly from his sister's marriage to Henry, and his lasting success was ensured by the birth of Edward VI and Somerset's decision

to take control of the protectorship during Edward's minority. Thomas Seymour, George and Thomas Boleyn, and William Parr were four other gentlemen who prospered during their sisters' marriages and achieved for themselves political and social renown. However, the king's marriage to an Englishwoman could also spell danger for her male relatives, as Anne Boleyn's brother and Katherine Howard's brother (on account of his alleged relationship with the king's niece) discovered to their cost, not to mention the duke of Norfolk. Both Edward and Thomas Seymour were executed for treason in political coups that were engineered, at least in part, by resentment harboured by other courtiers at their elevated standing at court occasioned by Jane's marriage to Henry VIII and deliverance of Edward VI.

CONOR BYRNE



Conor Byrne studied History at the University of Exeter. He is the author of *Katherine Howard: A New History*, published by Made Global. Since 2012 he has run a historical blog and was formerly editor of Tudor Life Magazine. He specialises in late medieval and early modern European history, with a focus on gender, sexuality and the monarchy. His current project is a study of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century queenship in England, which builds on previous research.

Conor's next book, "**Queenship in England**" is due for publication shortly and all at the Tudor Society are looking forward to this interesting study of royal women.

Exclusive Tudor Society Books

Henry VII



Henry VIII



Edward VI



Jane Grey



Mary I



Elizabeth I



OUTSOON

<https://www.tudorsociety.com/tudor-monarchs-book-series/>



LONDON CHARTERHOUSE


PHOTOS AND TEXT BY TIM RIDGWAY



Tudor Places









OUR VISIT TO CHARTERHOUSE

Continuing from last month's article about our visit to Windsor Castle, I wanted to share some of our photos of London Charterhouse, which was, for me, the highlight of my trip in September.

Charterhouse has a long history (dating back to the 14th century) and you can TELL as soon as you see the building. We were welcomed by three of the "Brothers" who live there and they were some of the most welcoming and kind people you could imagine. These brothers are not monks, they are gentlemen (and soon to be gentlewomen too) who were in need of somewhere to live and fitted the criteria for living at Charterhouse.

We were given a brief history of the building, shown how it is now half the size it used to be (due to some legal wrangling a very long time ago!) and then taken into a peaceful courtyard and on to see a whole host of Tudor-ness. There was a stunning Tudor ceiling, part of which was modern but part of which dated back to the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. We were shown the great hall where the Brothers still eat their meals, covered in portraits and ancient woodwork. We were taken into the cloisters and shown where the original Carthusian monks would have stayed, and the extreme lengths that they went to to stay in seclusion - the right angled hole for serving food was a cunning way to ensure that the monk didn't see people! And they have a beautiful old tapestry on the wall too - lots to see and talk about.

After this point, we were taken into an entrance vestibule to the chapel. I was particularly interested in the bust on the wall of John Wesley (founder of the Methodist movement) who was a student here. As a scout, I was also interested to discover that Lord Baden Powell also studied at the Charterhouse.

We were then taken into the chapel, past a wonderful (!) picture of the Carthusian monks who were cruelly killed by Henry VIII when they wouldn't accept him as the head of the church in England. The altar was fascinating, as were various other tombs and shrines in the area. We were told that it was lucky that it still survived - the building was hit by an incendiary bomb during the Second World War and was saved by a thick wooden door (pictured). I'm so glad that it did survive!

In the great hall we were told about various visits from Tudor people, including Elizabeth I, who stayed during the preparation for her coronation. James I also stayed in Charterhouse before first entering the City of London in 1603

The Charterhouse is not open to general visits at the moment, so if you wish to visit, it is recommended that you get in contact with the Brothers and arrange an acceptable time. It's well worth the trouble for any Tudor fans - the history simply oozes from the stonework!

Tim Ridgway

QUEEN ELIZABETH I

cut out dress up





Charivari rituals in Tudor England: punishments for stepping outside prescribed gender roles

by Lauren Browne

CHARIVARI SERVED AS a highly dramatic and ritualised form of moral justice, and enjoyed popularity right through the Tudor period and on to the late eighteenth century. It was usually enacted upon a man whose wife had subverted her prescribed gender role; through cuckoldry, sexual immorality or violence against her husband.

England during the Tudor period was a staunchly patriarchal society which was propped up by scripture, hierarchy, law, and domestic and political order. It was often said that a man was the prince of his household, and therefore dissent by his wife, children, or servants was akin to treason in the home. This can be demonstrated by the fact that if a man murdered his wife, he was hanged for murder. But if a wife murdered her husband, she was burned for petty treason. The patriarchal system was deeply ingrained in society, and set out very different roles for each gender. A woman's role was to manage the household, look after the children and oversee any servants the family may have had. Metaphors linking

women to snails or tortoises, because these animals carry their homes on their backs, were used to show how inseparable women were to their homes. The ideal woman was thought to be obedient, pious, chaste, kind and quiet. Men, on the other hand, dominated the public sphere. The social order of the period undoubtedly served male interests, but they had their duties as well as privileges. These duties were thought to be separate from a woman's, and trespass between these was seen as unnatural. Men were expected to look after their wives' moral character, as the 'weaker sex' was thought to have been more irrational, emotional, impulsive and sexually rapacious. The 'right' of a husband to use force in order



Kathy Bates as Thomasyn White in “American Horror Story: My Roanoke Nightmare”, in which her character wears the infamous “scold’s bridle.” (*Tech Times*).

to correct his wife’s behaviour was a contested subject. However, there was no such ambiguity when it came to a woman using violence against her husband. It was seen as wholly unnatural and, at times, a source of comedy and hilarity.

During the Tudor period, the civic ritual of Charivari was used against couples in which the wife had dominated or cuckolded her husband (they made no distinction between these terms during this period). It should be noted that the husband was as much the source of mocking and disapproval as his wife was- for allowing himself to be dominated by a woman. Although most modern historians refer to the symbolic, ritualised drama as ‘charivari’, there were local variations in the name. For example, in the south-west of England it was referred to as ‘skimmington’, in the northern counties it was referred to as ‘riding the stang’ or cowlstaff, and others simply referred to it as ‘riding’. It appears that they were more common in western counties such as Somerset and Wilshire, but the reason for this remains unclear. Generally, charivari were a set of rituals or customs, which could vary from town to town, and involved a raucous and mocking demonstration which

was directed at a couple who had defied societal norms. It is not known where the practice originated from, but there is evidence for charivari processions in Senlis and Saintonge from around 1400, where husbands who had been beaten by their wives were paraded through the streets sitting backwards on a donkey in order to suggest an inversion of normalcy. In Gascony, the next-door-neighbour led the donkey through the streets in order to represent the role of neighbourly surveillance. Historians such as Martin Ingram suggest that the practice of charivari in England may have derived from contact with French folk traditions during the Hundred Years War. In some French towns, during the sixteenth century, the ritual was reserved for ‘mismatched’ couples, for example if a much older man had married a young maid.

The format of a charivari could vary, however there were commonalities present in almost every event. There was a procession, which may have involved a horse, donkey, or a stout pole carried on men’s shoulders, upon which someone would sit. Sometimes, the husband and wife were forced to sit upon the mount and were pelted with mud. Often, a substitute couple was found for the

procession, usually the neighbours of the couple in question, but sometimes effigies were produced instead. There were also instances of transvestitism, where a man would dress up as the wife, which highlighted the subversion of gender roles within the marriage. The substitute couple would sit backwards on the mount and the 'wife' would often repeatedly hit the 'husband' over the head with a kitchen utensil in a mock re-enactment of the domestic discord. The rest of the participants would follow the 'couple', creating 'rough music' which usually included bells, gunfire, fireworks, the blowing of horns, raucous playing of instruments and clanging of pots, pans, and other household utensils. This once again symbolised the martial discord the event was designed to mock. The 'husband' commonly carried a distaff, which was a recognisable symbol of female authority during the period. Animal horns were often featured in charivaris; they were sometimes hung on the front door of the victims' house, or worn by the 'husband' during the procession. The inclusion of the animal horns contrasted the behaviour between human and beast and symbolised the aberrant conduct of the couple. It is interesting to note that the women of the community were not necessarily against such practices. There is evidence of women taking an active part of the public shaming, as well as providing ale or lending their clothes to the man who served the part of the wife in the procession.

The symbolism of charivari included notions of the inversion of hierarchy, role reversal, rule and misrule, order and disorder, as well as the world turned upside down. Such themes were present in other festival traditions of Tudor England, particularly Carnival and Maytime festivities. Some festival traditions also involved elements of moral judgement and holidays were often celebrated with inversionary rituals and mockery. Charivari could be carried out at any time of the year, but it is interesting to note that they often occurred on or near important holidays and were often incorporated into the wider festival. Like festivals, the majority of the community participated in Charivari

rituals which allowed them to work out social tensions. The demonstrations helped to re-establish the fundamental patriarchal ideal which gave dominance to the husband. A wife who beat her husband subverted this ideal and so charivaris could be, in part, described as a communal expression of outrage of the subversion of societal norms, giving the community a sense that they had shared in enforcing moral standards.

Charivari were not just linked to festivals, they also shared a close affinity with shame punishments that were used by local and urban courts. It is interesting to note how similar charivari was to the legally sanctioned 'carting' of prostitutes and slanderers. They both involved a procession through the streets and were accompanied by rough music or bawdy ballads which described the perpetrators' crimes. Charivaris that punished actions prohibited by law, such as adultery, could be seen as unofficial, and unauthorized, enactments of the appropriate punishment. Where a charivari was enacted in a case involving cuckoldry or female dominance, which were not in themselves against the law, it could be seen as the traditional right of the community to enforce moral standards. The public shaming rituals set clear boundaries of what was expected within the patriarchal society, and they served as a deterrent for others.

Charivari is usually discussed as a lower class folk tradition, but its links to other forms of official public shaming rituals seems to suggest that this observation ignores the nuances of social control during the period. In sixteenth century London charivaris were organised by each neighbourhood, the often elaborate forms they took may suggest that some of the wealthier citizens supported the tradition. Those involved in the procession itself were usually from middling to low backgrounds, but higher status members of the community often encouraged the performance of charivari rituals, or were prepared to remain silent on the matter. There were some moralists who were against the tradition; the bawdy procession could be seen as social



Hogarth's depiction of a charivari.

unrest. In 1587 Dr Richard Crick, a lecturer at East Berghold in Essex, asked the Dedham conference for advice on how to deal with a charivari which had taken place while he was away from the village. Although he had come out against the riding before it happened, he inquired what he should do now that it had taken place. His request went unanswered. During the Tudor period examples of moralist criticism of such public shaming rituals are sporadic. It appears that the status of charivaris as a method of social control declined over time. By the end of the sixteenth century the secular courts established that mocking verses, signs, pictures and symbols (including the cuckold's horns) posed a threat to public order and could even be prosecuted as libels. By 1700 it had been established that they were illegal, but the evidence suggests that prosecutions following charivaris and other shaming rituals were rare.

Charivari traditions appear shocking to the modern reader, but it appears that the majority of people in the Tudor period either participated in or remained neutral on the practice. It formed a part of social control that, although not officially prescribed, followed the format of official public shaming punishments. The couple was seen as equally to blame, the wife was guilty of stepping outside her usual gender role and her husband was guilty of allowing her to dominate him. The exact form of the charivari different in each locality, but the general format followed other folk festivals. Although they declined from around the beginning of the eighteenth century, there are still examples of charivari rituals continuing into the nineteenth century. Such cases punished a husband who was found to have mistreated his wife rather than for being a cuckold, showing how the tradition had changed over time.

LAUREN BROWNE

LUDLOW PALMERS SET TO CARRY OUT RESTORATION WORK IN HISTORIC MEDIAEVAL CHAPEL

The Ludlow Palmers plan to restore historic woodwork in the mediaeval St John's Chapel in St Laurence's Church, known as 'the cathedral of the Marches'. St Laurence's, rebuilt in the 15th centuries, is closely associated with the Tudor monarchs.

Arthur, Prince of Wales, the eldest son of Henry VII, died on 2 April 1502 in Ludlow Castle. On 23 April 1502, Arthur's body was carried out of Ludlow Castle to St Laurence's for an elaborate service where his 'heart' was buried near the high altar. His body was then moved to Worcester Cathedral for burial.

St John's Chapel is commonly known as the Palmers' Chapel from its original association with the mediaeval Palmers' Guild. The Guild, inspired by the ideal of pilgrimage, dominated St. Laurence's for three centuries until Henry VIII's Reformation in the mid-1500s. Henry himself enrolled as a Palmer, as did his Yorkist grandfather Edward IV. Both monarchs knew Ludlow well, as a royal castle residence and centre of government.

Restoration work will focus on a fine section of Tudor linenfold wall-panelling c.1500 as well as the High Victorian panelling and reredos (c.1900) reproduced in the same mediaeval style. Damage over the centuries includes breakages, splits, and rot from lack of ventilation between wall and woodwork (see pictures attached). Conservation of the Tudor panelling is required to ensure its craftsmanship can be admired by future generations. Restoration work includes making small ventilation holes, treating for woodworm, repairing damage, cleaning and finishing with beeswax polish.

More than half of the £12,000 required has been quickly pledged. A public appeal for the last £5,000 is now underway. Donations to preserve St Laurence's historic Tudor panelling can be made online at the Ludlow Palmers' website -

<http://www.ludlowpalmers.uk>

You can also send cheques (made payable to CTSLL) to CTSLL, 2 College Street, Ludlow, Shropshire SY8 1AN.



Photo by Ian Capper

The 'Ludlow Palmers' is the public identity of the Conservation Trust for St Laurence's, Ludlow (CTSLL) (charity registration No 1114678). The Trust is an independent body investing in the historic fabric and treasures of St Laurence's, Ludlow. Over 25 years, it has contributed £400,000 to help make the church sound, dry and warm as well as conserving some of its greatest treasures – only York Minster has more original mediaeval stained glass.

Following in the footsteps of royal Palmers, 162 modern Palmers are presently subscribing to the general work of the Trust, most by monthly standing order. In the spirit of the original Guild, legacies are encouraged. The original Guild had an entrance fee of half a mark, 6/8d in old money, worth £220 in 2016, but today's contributions vary from a little to a lot – all are valued and recognised.

Seven Palmers are leading the way in this current appeal including one donation of £1,500 which comes with an offer to double that sum to match donations from anyone signing up as a Palmer for the first time.

Donors to the appeal will be enrolled and recognised as Ludlow Palmers and have access to Palmer social activities.

Contact:

Rory Chase
Chair

Ludlow Palmers
2 College Street
Ludlow, Shropshire SY8 1AN
United Kingdom


E-mail: info@ludlowpalmers.uk

Website: www.ludlowpalmers.uk

Facebook: www.facebook.com/ludlowpalmers

Twitter: www.twitter.com/ludlowpalmers







Manners Maketh Man

by Jane Moulder

My grandfather was very fond of quoting the phrase “manners maketh man”, an adage that he believed all people should live by. Whilst I am sure I was not alone in being taught this as a young person, my concept of good manners did not have the same significance as it would have done for any self-respecting Tudor. Standards of behaviour were very formal in the Tudor period and there were certain proscribed expectations on how to conduct yourself depending on your social status. For the higher classes, or those aspiring to elevate their social status, the acquisition and demonstration of good manners could mean the difference between success and wealth or loss of face and even banishment from court.

The proverb, “manners maketh man”, can be dated back to 1519 when it was printed in the *Vulgaria*, a Latin grammar compiled by William Horman. The book contained a collection of everyday sayings covering a variety of subjects such as schools, manners, religion and natural history. (Incidentally, the proverb, *necessity is the mother of invention* was also first printed in this book.) In his introduction, Horman stated that the

acquisition of good grammar could not be perfected without the ability to understand and appreciate music.

In Tudor England, the path to social advancement, political influence and power was achieved through the royal court. The court was not only the centre of government but it was also the centre for the arts and here the two, seemingly opposing, aspects of culture and power were combined. To be a successful courtier, and to extend one’s wealth and influence, a man needed not only to be well versed in political savvy but should also have excellent manners, deportment and social mobility. This was not only the case in England but across all of Europe and each country had a shared expected code and pattern of behaviour. So across the continent, courtiers and aspiring gentlemen looked for guidance in these matters so that they could be sure that they were acting in the appropriate way. The answers to many of these social conundrums were to be found in a number of advice books, manuals and guidebooks which were written and published in response for this thirst for knowledge and the quest for upward social mobility.

In medieval times, knights and gentlemen strived to achieve and live by the clearly defined chivalric code. Men were judged and assessed on the traditionally manly pursuits of horse-riding, jousting and swordplay. Whilst these were still considered worthy attributes in the mid 16th century, other essential accomplishments such as manners and certain courtly behaviours had come to the fore.

In order to assist or “*fashion a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline*”, as the poet Edmund Spenser wrote in a letter to Sir Walter Raleigh, a number of books and publications were printed and they became hugely popular. But the one book which everyone looked to, not only in England, but in France, Flanders, Germany and the rest of Europe, was the book by Baldesar Castiglione, an Italian. Castiglione’s ‘Book of the Courtier’ was first written by 1516 but it did not get published until 1528, at which point it became an immediate success and best seller. It went on to become one of the most widely distributed books of the 16th century, appearing in 20 countries and editions were printed in six languages. Whilst it still had strong echoes of the medieval chivalric code, the Courtier was much more humanist in its approach and it featured contemporary views on women, fine arts, government as well as the nature of true love. The Book of the Courtier was probably the most widely read courtesy book in Tudor England with many of the educated elite reading it in the original Italian. However, when Sir Thomas Hoby translated it into English in

1561, it became essential reading for every aspiring gentleman. Its contents had a major influence on what it was considered to be a gentleman in the upper echelons of English society. Its rules were followed faithfully and espoused by the prominent courtiers of the day including Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Francis Drake and Sir Philip Sydney amongst others.

It was commonly agreed throughout Europe that Italy led the world in terms of the arts as well as polite accomplishments, so it was natural to look to this country for a model for their manners and modes of behaviour. It is why the Book of the Courtier and other similar Italian publications became so influential. Many wealthy young men from England attended Italian universities, where they spent as much time focusing on the art of courteous living as they did on the advancement of learning. But for those that couldn’t get there to study in person, and that was the majority, then advice books and guidance manuals would have to suffice.

The adoption of Italianate manners was not, however, universally welcomed. Roger Ascham, who was a renowned scholar and a Latin and Greek tutor to the young Princess Elizabeth, went so far as to comment that these “*fonde books, sold in every shop in London, commended by the honest titles the sooner to corrupt honest manners*”. Not surprisingly, the affected foreign manners of young Englishmen attracted much mockery. Shakespeare in Richard II comments on this by saying “*report of fashions in proud Italy, whose*

manners still our tardy apish nation limps after in base imitation”.

The acquisition of good manners was seen as a passport to being considered a gentleman as illustrated by a ‘conversation’ in the dance book, *Orchesography*, by Thoinot Arbeau. Capriol, the young student decries to Arbeau, the old master, that whilst studying law he forgot to learn fine manners. The result of this was that when he came out into society he *“was tongue-tied and awkward and regarded as little more than a block of wood”*. *Orchesography* was aimed at the aspiring middle classes whereas the *Book of the Courtier* pandered to a more elite audience. Even so, Arbeau said that to be a fully rounded and agreeable companion, a young man still needed to learn to fence, dance and play tennis. Capriol sadly recognised that unless he managed to achieve a level of skill in in all of these arts that he was unlikely to be able to find himself a wife.

Home grown guide books included Thomas Lupset’s *“Exhortation to Yonge Men, perswading them to walke in the pathe way that leadeth to honeste and goodness”* printed in 1530 and the anonymous *“Instruction of a Gentleman”*, published in 1555. This book contained advice on carrying out a variety of pastimes as well as hints on how to choose your clothes to suit various occasions. Another popular book by an Italian was ‘Galateo’. In *Galateo*, Giovanni Della Casa gave practical advice on table manners, the art of conversation (how not to bore your audience or dominate the dinner party),

also how to be polite and act with decorum (such as not picking one’s nose in public). It is a gem of a book and still makes easy and entertaining reading today. In fact, the book was considered an essential guide for young Italians right up to the 1950’s!

The *Book of the Courtier* presented its reader with an ideal picture of “Renaissance Man” who must have the traditional qualities of chivalry and courage, as well as those of a wise counsellor, a lover of the arts and the requirement to be a scholar and be *“well spoken and have faire language”*, *“wise and well seen in discourses upon states”*, as well as *“be skillfull in all kind of marciall feates*, (this included hawking, riding, swimming, wrestling, jousting as well as other sports). Castiglione could be quite cutting in his views on common people and said that one should be *“well borne and of good stocke”* and he advised that a young man must be careful not to *“runn, wrestle, leape nor cast the stone or barr with men of the country, except he be sure to gete the victorie”*. However, if all of those skills were not enough, a man must also acquire the ability to play an instrument, dance and sing. This may well seem a very tall order for any aspiring courtier but, regardless, the qualities espoused in the book became the goal for men across Europe.

However, with regards to playing music, the student courtier countered that this skill was actually far more suited to women than men, as *“it may render their minds effeminate and so cause them to fear death”*. This view was immediately

dismissed and Castiglione reminded his readers that ancient philosophy thought that the heavens were made from harmony and the universe was founded on the principles of music. He added that Plato, Socrates and Aristotle had all insisted that a well-educated man should also be a musician as music not only helped in times of peace but it could also stir a

considered effeminate to dance. He listed, amongst others, such exalted figures such as King David, Moses, Claudius, Bacchus, Castor and Pollux, Achilles, Socrates and Vulcan as all having been either lovers or practitioners of dance.

The Book of the Courtier believed, along the lines espoused by Aristotle, that any action must be balanced or moderated

with the opposite behaviour. This approach would lead to good social graces, and prevent intolerance and extreme character traits. The most important facets of the perfect courtier's behaviour were the notions of 'grazia' (good manners and an easy grace) and 'sprezzatura', (easy nonchalance). In other words, nothing that the courtier did should appear to require undue effort and his accomplishments should be the results of elegance and an easy approach. *"Even though his performance is outstanding, should he let it be thought that he has spent on it much time or trouble"*. It was important to show deference and a true gentleman would veil and underplay his talents so not to outshine his superior, especially where the skill of music was involved. As



Baldesar Castiglione by Raphael (Musée du Louvre, Paris)

man to fight more strongly. He concluded by saying that *"the man who does not enjoy music can be sure that there is no harmony in his soul"*. Likewise, Arbeau, in Orchesography, quoted Greek and Roman philosophers to prove that it was not

mentioned earlier, the Book emphasized the necessity for the courtier to distance himself from the lower classes and mix with the middle class only sparingly. Never an egalitarian, Castiglione stressed the fact that the courtier should be of

noble birth and this reflected both 16th century society's expectations and as well as his own prejudices and both believed that grazia and sprezzature occurred more naturally in the elite classes.

Castiglione suggested that the perfect courtier must also be prepared to be a warrior and display courage and skill, although this must be in moderation. In other words, he should be brave but not foolhardy. The practice of arms was important but too much war made a courtier dull and boring. The courtier must also be a practitioner of the more peaceful arts; oratory abilities were respected, as was the courtier's ability to write poetry and prose. Likewise the courtier should be gifted in music and dance.

The rise and adoption of amateur music making during the latter half of the 16th century can be partly attributed to the popularity of these guidance and manners books. The books placed as much emphasis on being able to demonstrate the art of music as expertise in the more traditional chivalric and 'knightly' skills. In the early 1500's only professional musicians and the extremely wealthy elite would have played an instrument as both the instruments and the methods of obtaining the necessary skills were out of the pocket or reach of the majority of the population. Professional and independent musicians were able to supplement their income by giving music lessons and writing out music for amateurs. The late 1500's saw musical instruments becoming more widely available. To help those that couldn't afford or didn't have access to an experienced musician, printed

music tutors were published. Between 1560 and 1570 three lute tutors as well as guides for playing the cittern and gittern were printed. The lute especially became a popular instrument for the young aspiring courtier and gentleman as this instrument was seen as 'fitting' for a nobleman. Woodwind instruments remained the preserve of the professionals as it was unbecoming and unseemly to play due to the fact that one had to distort one's face to play them.

At the end of the century Thomas Morley printed his "*Plain and Easy Introduction to Practical Music*" (which is anything but!) but even this very thorough exploration of the theory and application of music included advice on a practitioner's



behaviour suggesting that one should retain a sense of modesty with one's skills:

“Therefore, in any case, never think so well of yourself, but let other men praise you, if you are praiseworthy: then may you justly take it to yourself, so long as it is done with moderation and without arrogance.”

Morley also sums up the marriage of behaviours with music:

“You must in your music be wavering like the wind; sometimes wanton, sometimes drooping, sometimes grave and staid, otherwhile effeminate; and the more variety you show, the better shall you please.”


Being able to sing was considered to be a true art form and one that every gentleman and courtier should excel at. Castiglione said that *“truly beautiful music consists in fine singing, in reading accurately from the score and in an attractive personal style, and still more in singing to the accompaniment of the viol. I say this because the solo voice contains all the purity of music, and style and melody are appreciated more carefully when our ears are not distracted by more than one voice.”*

In England, singing became a popular pastime amongst the gentry and in 1571 the first book of English songs was published in over 40 years. As with so many other things, people in this country wanted to mimic the Italians and many of the songs in that collection were clearly

modelled on an Italianate, madrigal, style. There were soon a number of collections published and written which all contained this new fashion for Italian madrigals such as *Musica Transalpina*. This handwritten manuscript, dated 1588, was scribed by a member of St Paul's choir and it contained a note saying that the songs were for *“Gentlemen and Merchants of good accomplishment”*.

However, the popularity of singing did not mean that everyone was good at it. Giovanni Della Casa gave some very sound advice to his readers and his observations still hold true today!

“Moreover, you should take care not to sing, especially solo, if your voice is discordant and tuneless.”



A page from Galateo by Giovanni della Casa, printed in 1558

Many people are thoughtless about this and, in fact, the most frequent offenders seem to be those who have the least gift for singing". Not only were there obviously some poor singers but there were also people who like the sound of their own voice as Castiglione advises his readers not to "behave like those people who are fond of music and, whenever they are speaking with someone, if there is a lull in the conversation, always start to sing sotto voce".

Singing was sometimes unaccompanied or performed in harmony with other voices. Although, according to Castiglione, the combination of voice and musical instrument was perhaps the best: *"But above all, singing poetry accompanied by the viol seems especially pleasurable, for the instrument gives the words a really marvellous charm and effectiveness. All keyboard instruments are harmonious because they make possible many effects which fill the soul with sweetness and melody. No less delightful is the playing of a quartet, with the viols producing music of great skill and suavity.*

This shows that simply being able to sing was not enough for a courtier, he also needed the ability to play an instrument. *"I am not satisfied with our courtier unless he is also a musician and unless, as well as understanding and being able to read music, he can play several instruments".* It wasn't only the ability to play that was crucial, it was knowing when to play and having the insight to choose the right

instrument and piece of music to suit the mood of moment. *"Then as to the occasions when these various kinds of music should be performed, ... it is when a man finds himself in the company of dear and familiar friends and there is no pressuring business on hand. But above all, the time is appropriate when there are ladies present; for the sight of them softens the hearts of those who are listening and makes them more susceptible to the sweetness of the music and also quickens the spirit of the musicians themselves."*

From this it can be inferred that it was thought that being able to play an instrument well could also help with a young man's amorous intentions but Castiglione gave some stern advice for those more advanced in years.

"It is certainly unbecoming and unsightly when an old grey-haired gentleman, who is toothless and wrinkled, takes up the viol and plays and sings in front of a gathering of ladies, even if his performance is good. This is because the words of songs are nearly always amorous and in old men, love is altogether ridiculous".

The statement was questioned by the aspiring courtiers as they pointed out that sometimes an older man can sing and perform better than a younger one.

Castiglione retorted that that may be the case but an old man should still only play music or sing in private. Again Castiglione was quite cutting about the social

status of those who should play music and he advised against playing in front of a large group especially if there were “common people” in the audience.

Courtly behaviour could not only be demonstrated through the skill of music or singing, the ability to dance well also an essential skill. Dancing was a popular and important facet of renaissance courtly life and occurred at both public and private events. It was socially acceptable for women and men could dance together which presented a rare opportunity to mix and flirt with members of the opposite sex. Therefore, good and appropriate manners were essential. Thoinot Arbeau, in *Orchesography*, summed this up when his young student Capriol, said “*without a knowledge of dancing I could not please the damsels, upon whom, it seems to me, the entire reputation of an eligible young man depends*”. For an aspiring gentleman or courtier, being able to dance, knowing the correct steps and being able to “*jump high in the Italian manner*” was required.

Being able to dance was also, according to Thoinot Arbeau, a means of establishing “*whether lovers are in good health and sound of limb*” and the woman could also ascertain if they [the men] are *shapely or emit an unpleasant odour as of bad meat*”. In fact, Arbeau went as far as to claim that dancing was essential for having a well ordered society and, after a very lengthy speech about the wonders of dance and linking it to various ideals, he concluded by saying that, whether young or old, dancing

kept you fit. So it should be done for that, if no other reason!

Not surprisingly, Castiglione had views on dancing which are expressed in *The Book of the Courtier*:

“There are various other kinds of recreation, such as dancing, that can be enjoyed in public and in private. And I consider that the courtier should take great care over this; for when he is dancing in front of a crowd and along with many others it is fitting, or so I think, that he should maintain a certain dignity, though tempered by the lightness and delicate grace of his movements. He may feel himself to be very light on his feet and a master of time and movement, but even so he should not attempt those quick movements of the feet and double steps which we approve of in our Barletta [a dance] but which, to be sure, are unsuitable for a gentleman. On the other hand when he is performing in a private room, of the kind we are in now, then I think he should be allowed to try them and to dance the morris and the brando as well, but not in public unless he is at a masked ball, when it does no harm even if he is recognized.” As with playing music and singing, *the Book of the Courtier* advised that a true courtier should stop

*dancing as he advanced in age
as he would not be able to do it so
well.*

There were a number of dance instruction books printed throughout the 16th century and the majority of them, as well as describing the actual steps and how to perform them, also gave some good advice on how to behave and conduct oneself at a dance. There was also advice on how to dress, how to adjust one's clothing (and swords), and how to 'carry' oneself and have good deportment. But, as important, a man should know exactly where in the social pecking order they sat. The men were advised to offer any available seating to their elders and betters and to be very aware of the correct status of each person in the room. According to Fabritio Caroso in 'Nobilita di Dame' seats must be allocated in a certain order: dukes, princes, marquises, counts lords and finally knights. If someone was already seated then you should not, under any circumstances, place your chair in front of them. Equally, you shouldn't put your chair too near to those above you in social status or too close to the area where the women were seated. The book also contained some lengthy advice on how to actually sit down and attain a look of elegance and grace. He advised that one should not sit fully back on the seat just in case one's feet couldn't touch the ground. He also suggested the two best positions for the arm (full length along the arm of the chair with the hand dropped down at the end or to lean nonchalantly on the

elbow) so that one could achieve looking either commanding or learned.

Caroso also quoted Della Casa's guidance on talking whilst at a dance and advised against giving gushing praise or being overly polite towards ones hosts or other guests and that the best tactic was to talk as little as possible and only when absolutely necessary!

The dance manuals were universal in saying that a woman should never refuse a man's request for a dance because that was unseemly behaviour. Despite this, the young student, Capriol, was worried that that might happen to him and then he would then feel great shame. Arbeau advised him to take it on the chin and act as if he had not been affronted and then immediately approach the nearest available woman to ask her to dance instead. Under no circumstances should he lose his temper. If he did all of these things, then anyone observing him would view Capriol positively and shame would fall on the woman who had rejected him.

I always enjoy dipping into the books of manners as they offer a very entertaining and informative view on the period. It also strikes me that much of the advice given is still valid today. Any dinner guest should certainly pay heed to Della Casa when he suggests that it is unmannerly to fall asleep at a dinner party when others are still talking. This, he says, is not only showing little respect for your friends but, as you are most likely to doze in an uncomfortable position, then there is a danger that you will make some unpleasant noises and even dribble at the mouth. The

books were, on the whole, written for men but some do contain snippets of advice for women. However, there is one bit of advice given by Della Casa that I, personally, have chosen to steadfastly ignore:

“I was once told by some men of learning that the goddess Athene used to enjoy playing the bagpipes and had quite mastered the art. It happened one day as she was playing them for pleasure beside

a spring she saw her reflection in the water, and when she saw how she had to distort her face to blow the pipes, she was abashed and threw them away. She did well to do this because the bagpipes are not an instrument for women and, in fact, are equally unsuitable for men, except those poor wretches who are paid to play them and make a trade of it.”

JANE MOULDER

References

- Caroso, Fabritio, *Nobilita di Dame*, translated by Julia Sutton, Dover , 1986
 Castiglione, Baldesar, *The Book of the Courtier*, translated by George Bull, Penguin Classics, 1967
 Della Casa, Giovanni, *Galateo*, translated by R S Pine-Coffin, Penguin Classics, 1958
 Hamilton, Albert Charles, *The Spenser Encyclopaedia*, University of Toronto, 1990
 Morley, Thomas, *A Plain & Easy Introduction to Practical Music*, edited by Alec Harman, The Norton Library, 1952

Jane Moulder (*far left*) has been playing traditional and early music for many years and is a researcher into music and manners of the 14th to 18th Centuries. She has compiled and edited four tune books on Medieval, Renaissance and 17th century popular music. She plays various bagpipes, recorders, renaissance flute, crumhorn, shawm and curtal.





**KEEP
CALM
AND EAT
MINCE
PIES**

Delicious Tudor Mince Pies

The medieval or Tudor “minced pye” traditionally had thirteen ingredients, which represented Christ and his apostles, and contained meat, with the mutton in the pie representing the shepherds who heard the good news of Christ’s birth from the Angel Gabriel. It was also crib-shaped to represent Christ’s birth.

The following recipe is taken from an Elizabethan recipe written by Lady Elinor Fettiplace, wife of Sir Richard Fettiplace of Appleton Manor, Oxfordshire, and published in Elinor Fettiplace’s Receipt Book: Elizabethan Country House Cooking edited by Hilary Spurling.

TO MAKE PIES

Parboile your mutton, then take as much suet as meat, & mince it both small, then put mace & nutmegs & cinnamon, & sugar & oringes peels, & currance & great reasins, & a little rose water, put all these to the meat, beat your spice and oringe peels very small, & mingle your fruit & spice & all together, with the meat, & so bake it, put as much currance as meat & twice so much sugar as salt, put some ginger into it, let the suet bee beef suet, for it is better than mutton suet.

Modern adaptation (for 48 tiny pies or one large pie to feed 10-12 people)

- 225g (8oz) lean, left-over cooked, minced mutton
- 225g (8oz) shredded beef suet
- 225g (8oz) currants
- 225g (8oz) raisins
- Large pinch each of powdered ginger and ground mace
- ½ level teaspoon of grated nutmeg
- 1 level teaspoon of ground cinnamon
- 1 well-rounded teaspoon of salt
- 2 well-rounded teaspoons of sugar
- Finely grated rind of an orange
- 6 tablespoons of rosewater (you could replace some of this with sherry)
- 675g (1 ½ lb) shortcrust or puff pastry for tiny pies, or half the amount for a larger, single, double-crust pie baked on a pie plate or shallow tin.

Mix together the mutton, suet, currants, raisins, spices, salt and sugar.

Add orange peel and mix.

Moisten with the rosewater.

Roll out pastry as thin as possible, cut it in rounds to fit the pie plate or patty-pan tins.

Spoon in filling (1-2 teaspoons for a tiny pie)

Cut out smaller rounds for tiny pie lids.

Moisten edges with cold water and crimp bottoms and lids together.

Prick tiny pies with a fork, decorate large pie with initials or motifs like flowers and knots and prick.

Glaze with milk or a beaten egg yolk.

Bake in a hot oven (220°C, 425°F, Gas Mark 7) for 20-30 minutes for small pies and 10 minutes longer for a large pie (with the temperature turned down a bit for the extra 10mins).

THE TUDOR SOCIETY

Members' Bulletin

A very Happy Christmas to you, your friends and your family!


If you're one of our brand-new magazine-only or full-access subscribers, welcome to the Tudor Society! We're thrilled that you're reading the magazine and as always, we're very happy with how the December edition has worked out.

We've had a fulfilling Tudor year here, with Claire producing her weekly chat videos about all sorts of topics, and even branching out into making her Tudor cookery videos. We hope you enjoy all the information we bring to you through the Tudor Society. We're always available on our society email address (info@tudorsociety.com) if there are any ideas and suggestions you have to make things even better than ever! We'd love to hear from you.

To end on a personal note from Claire and I, we'd like to wish you a very peaceful end to the year, and may all good things come to you.

TIM & CLAIRE RIDGWAY

**Please do get involved with the Tudor Society
WE RELY ON YOUR ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP**



OLGA HUGHES' Tudor Kitchen


Festive Fowl

Turkey is *the* traditional festive roast on tables across the Western world, and, having also made their way into lunch boxes, hundreds of millions of turkeys are consumed each year. While turkeys were domesticated for their meat and eggs by ancient Mesoamericans, it was not until the 16th century that turkeys made their way to the English menu. Tudor enthusiasts may know that King Henry VIII was the first English king to enjoy turkey for Christmas. Turkey began to replace the swan and peacock, its tender and juicy white meat earning immediate acclaim over the tough and gamey dark meat of the 'royal' birds, and in working class households, bustards and herons gave way to the succulent turkey. In fact, turkey was one of the very few foods immediately accepted and praised everywhere in Europe.¹

The turkey was unknown in Europe until Spanish conquistadors brought them to Spain in the early 16th century. The earliest English written record of turkeys comes from Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, who was attempting to curb the gluttony of the clergy. Only one "greater fowl" was permitted per dish:

"It was also provided, that of the greater fishes or fowls there should be but one in a dish, as crane, swan, turkeycock, haddock, pike, tench;"

¹ Albala, Ken, *Food Through History : Food in Early Modern Europe*, Greenwood Press 2003 pp. 68



Christmas Husbandlie Fare

*Good husband and husewife now cheefly be glad,
Things handsom to have, as they ought to be had;
They both doo provide against Christmas doo come,
To welcome good neighbour, good cheere to have some.*

*Good bread and good drinke, a good fier in the hall,
brawn, pudding and souse, and good mustard withall.*


*Beef, mutton and porke, shred pies of the best,
pig, veale, goose, and capon, and turkey well drest;
Cheese, apples and nuts, holy carols to hear,
as then in the country is counted good cheare.*

*What cost to good husband is any of this?
Good household provision only it is.*

*Of other, the like, I doo leave out a menie,
that casteth the husbandman never a penie.*

Thomas Tusser's "Five hundred pointes of good husbandrie" 1557

Despite the immediate success of the domestic turkey, both chicken and goose remained popular Christmas fare over the centuries until turkey became the dominant meal in the 20th century. A popular story has King Henry IV of France declaring that "If God keeps me, I will make sure that no peasant in my realm will lack the means to have a chicken in the pot on Sunday!" And in 1588 Queen Elizabeth announced that every household in England should eat goose as part of their Christmas dinner, as it was the first meal she enjoyed after the defeat of the Spanish Armada.



Families of all classes kept chickens, which were cheap to buy at two pence and produced eggs for years before being consigned to the pot. While poorer families kept chickens in the usual way, allowing them to forage for food and feeding them scraps, the upper classes invested in their chicken-

raising. In a manor house the dairymaid was often responsible for the brood's welfare, who were usually kept in the courtyard. The chickens were well-fed, or rather, over-fed, on rich cereal mixes to keep them "in good grease" for the table. One account describes chickens being fed a soft paste of raisins, breadcrumbs and milk, claiming that "the delight of this meat will make them eat continually; and they will be so fat (when they are but the bigness of a blackbird) that they will not be able to stand, but lie down upon their bellies to eat"² Some went so far as to keep their chickens (and geese) in coops that had the floor lined with pastes of cereal and milk.³ Chickens were so popular they were often given as Christmas gifts, with tame and wild fowl being a favourite present for New Year and Twelfth night.

We may roast chickens in a simple manner today but Tudor recipes could be staggeringly complicated.

Thomas Dawson's Spread Eagle of a Pullet

Take a good pullet and cut his throat hard by the head, and make it but a little hole. Then scald him clean, and take out of the small hole his crop. So done, take a quill and blow into the same hole, for to make the skin rise from the flesh. Then break the wig bones, and the bones hard by the knee. Then cut the neck hard by the body within the skin: then cut off the rump within the skin, leaving the bones at the legs, and also the head on. So drawing the whole body out within the skin of the hole. The bones to be laid beneath towards the claws, and the feet being left also on. You must cut off his bill.

When you have taken out all these bones and brought it to the purpose, take the flesh of the same pullet and parboil it a little, and mince it fine with sheep's suet, grated bread and three yolks of hard eggs. Then bind it with four raw eggs, and a few barberries, working these together Season it with cloves, mace, ginger, pepper and salt, and saffron. Then stuff your pullet's skin with it, putting it in at the hole at the head. When you have stuffed him, take him and lay him flat on a platter, and make it after the proportion of an eagle in every part, having his head cleft asunder and laid in two parts like an eagles head. Thus done, then you must put him in the oven, leaving in the platter a dish of butter underneath him because of burning. And when it is enough, then set it forth, casting upon him in the service, blanch powder, made of cinnamon, ginger and sugar.¹

¹ Dawson, Thomas, *The Good Housewife's Jewel*, Southover Press 1996, pp. 119

Geese were considered "in season" twice in their life, when young in early summer, and when well-fattened, in "good grease", as an adult. Geese were raised in the same way and usually alongside chickens. The barbaric force-feeding of geese to fatten their livers, now eaten as *foie gras*, was well-established by the early modern period.⁴ But it was also very popular roasted. Goose was usually served with garlic sauce, made with wine or verjuice, sauce madam, where the goose was stuffed with fruit and spices to form a rich sauce, or 'gauncil', a thick flour-based sauce.



² Wilson, C. Anne, *Food and Drink in Britain: From the Stone Ages to recent times*, Penguin Books 1984 pp. 119

³ *Ibid* pp. 110

⁴ Albala, Ken, *Food Through History : Food in Early Modern Europe*, Greenwood Press 2003 pp. 68

Sauce Madame

Take sage, parsley, hyssop and savoury, quinces and pears, garlic and grapes, and stuff the geese therewith, and sew the hole that no grease come out, and roast him well. And keep the grease that falleth thereof. Take galytine and grease and add in a posset; when the geese be roasted enough; take and smite them into pieces[...]and add in a posset and put therein wine if it be too thick. Add thereto powder of galangal, powder-douce and salt and boil the sauce and dress the Geese in dishes and lay the sauce onward.¹

¹ Butler, Sharon, (ed) Heiatt, Constance B., (ed) Curye on Inglysch: English Culinary Manuscripts of the Fourteenth Century, Early English Text Society, 1985, pp. 104

Sauce for a Goose

Take parsley, grapes, cloves of garlic, and salt, and put it in the goose, and let roast. When the goose is ready shake out that which is within, and out it all in a mortar, and do thereto, and add to it three hard yolks of eggs, and grind altogether, and temper it with verjuice, and cast it upon the goose in a fair charger and serve it forth.

The first turkey Henry had for Christmas would likely have been stuffed and roasted. French chef Massiolat's *Le Cuisinier royal et bourgeois* popular 17th century cookbook has a wonderful recipe with the sort of haphazard instructions I prefer, with a delightful note about using the leftovers.

Turkey Stuffed with Fine Herbs

Take the turkeys and truss them for roasting, but do not blanch them at all. You must separate the skin above the stomach so you can stuff it. The stuffing is made with chopped raw bacon, parsley, onion and all sorts of fine herbs, all well chopped, or funded in a mortar and well-seasoned. You stuff the turkeys between the skin and flesh and put a bit inside the body. You must next skewer them well and let them roast. Being roasted, dress them in the plate, and place a good ragout over it, and arrange all sorts of garnishes, and serve it hot. You can do the same with chickens, pigeons and other birds. And to dress them up to serve the next day, you can braise them being stuffed as above, being cooked, drain them and serve them with a good ragout of truffles and sweetbreads, all well strained, defatted, and garnished with little croquettes.

Adapting the above recipe for your Christmas dinner is simply a matter of seasoning and basting the bird well. A question I am constantly asked is how to keep the bird from drying out. All you need is a stick of butter (or two American sticks). Stuffing should be placed in the cavity. A traditional stuffing of breadcrumbs, bacon, onion and sage does nicely but experiment with whatever flavours you like. Then make a herb butter with your favourite herbs, chopped well and mixed into soft butter. Ease the skin of the turkey away from the breast and smear the herb butter between the flesh and skin. Rub the skin with salt and olive oil for a crispy finish. Cooking time depends on the weight, but be sure to rest it well. Some chefs recommend resting it for as long as you have cooked it, and this works wonderfully. But allow for at least 90 minutes resting under foil. The bird will still be piping hot when you carve it.

A very happy holiday season to all of our readers, and please come and visit the forum and share some of your festive recipes with us!

OLGA HUGHES

Charlie Brown Books



THE DEVIL'S CHALICE by D.K.Wilson

Derek Wilson (also known as D.K. Wilson) has become a popular name with readers of both non-fiction and historical fiction. He has written many history books on the 16th century over his 45-year career, but he has recently branched out into fiction. His Thomas Treviot series is unique in the fact that the books are inspired by real Tudor crime records and the author constantly strives to be as accurate as possible. *The Devil's Chalice* is the third book in this series, however, as each book is on a different case, they do not have to be read in order. When details from the other books are mentioned (which is rare), Wilson helpfully refers to a footnote in which he briefly explains it.

Many novels are set during Henry VIII or Elizabeth I's reign, due to their popularity, yet *The Devil's Chalice* is set during Edward VI's reign. We are subtly told in one of the conversations that Edward is 'some twelve months short of his twelfth birthday', making this set during Somerset's protectorate.

The novel begins with a mysterious prologue, with an unknown man buying a potion from an

alchemist. He is warned about speaking about what he has done, yet the information is deliberately withheld from the reader, leaving them questioning what this is about and what it will lead to. It hooks the reader from the beginning and makes them want to find answers to the many questions they soon have.

After the prologue, it changes to Treviot's point of view for the rest of the novel. The rule of Somerset is quickly established as being unpopular and those who know about Edward's reign will be well aware of the warning signs of his demise: "*He is only young King Edward's uncle, permitted to rule by the royal council. He cannot afford to continue on his reckless way of making enemies.*" Even in their historical context, some of the words will sound familiar to readers now, especially when Treviot questions as to who people want to replace Somerset once he is overthrown: "*Oh, 'tis far easier to complain about bad government than shoulder responsibility for producing better government.*"

Wilson explores the uses of 'magic' and the dark arts, which was very much believed in back then.

By writing as if it is real, it shows that the narrator believes it as well, until it is explained to him:

"I still don't see how you can know the name of this magician. You burned the paper it was written on."

"Only after holding it before the candle flame until the secret writing was revealed."

"Secret writing?"

"My little flask contained a strong solution of lemon juice - colourless normally, but brown when heated. The name was quite clear."

This was the same trick used by prisoners to write secret messages by prisoners at the time. It was famously used by the Jesuit Priest John Gerard in 1597, he was held in the Tower of London on charges of treason and used orange juice to write secret messages.

A nice touch by Wilson, one that is often overlooked in fiction, is making even the minor characters seem real. He has a way of capturing ordinary life. For example, at one point in the novel Treviot overhears several men talking about a sorcerer:

One: "What think you of this sorcerer?"

Two: "That I would like to make him feel the flat of my sword - the horse-thief."

One: "But what of his conjuring of evil spirits?"

Two: "Mystical nonsense to impress old women and love-sick wenches wanting potions to get their men into bed."

Three: "Nonsense, say you? You jumped out of your skin when you saw that evil eye."

Wilson does not give names to the men as they are only passers-by in this story, yet he still makes

them realistic and interesting enough that you do not mind the brief break in the narration.

There are reminders throughout of England's recent history, giving a sense to the reader as to how fragile the country was at the time. It was still recovering from the Wars of the Roses and the youth of Edward VI was subject to comparisons with Richard II and Henry VI, which is directly implied here:

"Some people in London are speculating about the outbreak of another barons' war," I said. "Surely that could not happen."

"'Tis scarcely half a century since England had another child-king on the throne. That led to regicide and the clash of rival armies. Think you that men and their ambitions have changed since those bloody days?"

The one issue with reading this book is that it can be a little complicated getting to grips with who's who, with the

magician also having two names not helping this confusion. It could probably do with a small guide at the beginning like in books such as *Wolf Hall*. However, it is still interesting and compelling enough to make you want to read more and find out what happened, especially to poor William West in the Tower at the start of the story.

Wilson's words have an authentic feel to them; none of the language or descriptions seemed out of place, which helps the reader fully immerse themselves in the story and Edward VI's reign. His knowledge of the subject is shown throughout and the inclusion of a historical note at the end was reassuring, it is good to see where authors get their facts from and how they form their conclusions. Due to how realistic it feels and Wilson's ability to turn real historical facts into a good story, I would recommend this to anyone wanting to read a historical and/or crime novel.




CHARLIE FENTON

TudorLife

DECEMBER'S ON THIS

<p>1^{Dec} 1530 Death of Margaret of Austria at Mechelen. She was buried alongside her second husband, Philibert II, Duke of Savoy, in their mausoleum at Bourg-en-Bresse.</p>	<p>2^{Dec} 1560 Death of Charles de Marillac, French diplomat and Archbishop of Vienne, at Melun in France.</p>	<p>3^{Dec} 1600 Death of Roger North, peer and politician in Elizabeth I's reign, at his London home in Charterhouse Square.</p>	<p>4^{Dec} 1531 Execution of Rhys ap Gruffudd for treason. He was beheaded after being accused of plotting against the King</p>
<p>8^{Dec} 1538 Death of Sir William Coffin, courtier and Master of the Horse to Queens Anne Boleyn and Jane Seymour.</p>	 <p>Charles de Marillac</p>	<p>9^{Dec} 1538 Sir Edward Neville, Gentleman of the Privy Chamber, was beheaded on Tower Hill.</p>	<p>10^{Dec} 1541 Thomas Culpeper and Francis Dereham were executed at Tyburn.</p>
<p>15^{Dec} 1558 Funeral of Reginald Pole, Cardinal Pole and Mary I's Archbishop of Canterbury.</p>		<p>16^{Dec} 1591 Burial of Sir Christopher Hatton, courtier, politician and favourite of Elizabeth I, at St Paul's Cathedral.</p>	<p>17^{Dec} 1538 Pope Paul III announced the excommunication of Henry VIII.</p>
<p>21^{Dec} 1549 Marguerite of Navarre died in Odos in France at the age of fifty-seven.</p>	<p>22^{Dec} 1541 Members of the Howard and Tilney family, plus their staff, were indicted for misprision of treason for covering up the "unlawful, carnal, voluptuous, and licentious life" of Queen Catherine Howard while she lived with the Dowager Duchess of Norfolk at Lambeth.</p>	<p>23^{Dec} 1607 Death of Sir John Fortescue, Chancellor of the Exchequer.</p>	<p>24^{Dec} 1545 King Henry VIII made his final speech to Parliament.</p>
<p>FEAST DAYS 6 December – Feast of St Nicholas 8 December – Feast of the Immaculate Conception 21 December – St Thomas's Day</p>		<p>27^{Dec} 1539 Anne of Cleves landed at Deal in Kent. Anne was to be Henry VIII's fourth wife and their marriage was agreed upon by a treaty in September 1539. Henry had never laid eyes on Anne but instead, had commissioned his court artist, Hans Holbein, to paint her.</p>	<p>28^{Dec} Childermas commemorated the massacre of baby boys which King Herod ordered in Bethlehem.</p>

DAY IN TUDOR HISTORY

<p>5^{Dec} 1560 Death of King Francis II of France and King Consort of Scotland as husband of Mary, Queen of Scots.</p>	<p>6^{Dec} Tudor people would often celebrate the Boy Bishop, a tradition which had been going on since the 10th century.</p>	<p>7^{Dec} 1549 Hanging of Robert Kett, leader of Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk. Kett was hanged from the walls of Norwich Castle after being found guilty of treason by a commission of oyer and terminer. He had been captured the day after the Battle of Dussindale, which ended the rebellion.</p>	
<p>11^{Dec} 1608 Burial of Douglas Sheffield (née Howard), Lady Sheffield, at St Margaret's Church.</p>	<p>12^{Dec} 1574 Birth of Anne of Denmark, Queen of England, Scotland, and Ireland as consort of James I, at Skanderborg Castle, Jutland, Denmark. Anne was the second daughter of Frederick II, King of Denmark and Norway, and his wife, Sophia.</p>	<p>13^{Dec} 1577 Sir Francis Drake left Plymouth with five ships on a journey which would see him circumnavigating the Globe.</p>	<p>14^{Dec} 1542 James V died at Falkland Palace in Falkland, Fife, Scotland, after being taken ill following Battle of Solway Moss.</p>
<p>18^{Dec} 1555 Burning of John Philpott, former Archdeacon of Winchester and Protestant martyr, at Smithfield.</p>	 <p>John Davis, Explorer</p>	<p>19^{Dec} 1583 John Somerville, was found dead in his cell at Newgate Prison. It was said that his death was suicide.</p>	<p>20^{Dec} 1583 Execution of Edward Arden, convicted of high treason, along with John Somerville, plotting to kill Elizabeth I.</p>
<p>25^{Dec} Christmas Day in Tudor times was an end to the fasting of Advent.</p>		<p>26^{Dec} 1546 Henry VIII made some changes to his will to ensure successful transfer to Edward VI</p>	
<p>29^{Dec} 1606 Death of John Davis (Davys), navigator and explorer, near Bintang, off the coast of Borneo!</p>	<p>30^{Dec} 1546 Henry VIII signed his last will and testament, authorising the changes which he had ordered.</p>	<p>31^{Dec} 1600 The East India Company, was chartered, i.e. given royal approval, by Queen Elizabeth I.</p>	

TudorLife

Tudor Life



REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS

Claire Ridgway
Gareth Russell
Charlie Fenton
Melanie V. Taylor
Kyra Kramer
Beth von Staats
Jane Moulder
Olga Hughes

LAYOUT Tim Ridgway

VIDEOGRAPHER Tim Ridgway

MAGAZINE EDITOR

Gareth Russell
info@tudorsociety.com

CONTACT

info@tudorsociety.com
Calle Sargento Galera, 3
Lucar 04887
Almeria
Spain

ONLINE

www.TudorSociety.com

Copyright © 2016 All Rights Reserved
Reproduction in whole or part without
written permission is prohibited.

~IN THE~ JANUARY~ TUDOR LIFE MAGAZINE

JAMES PIERCE

William Salesbury and Tudor
propaganda

LAUREN BROWNE

The Tudor Sense of the Past

CONOR BYRNE

Barren and Blessed

BETH VON STAATS

The Buggery Statute 1533

JANE MOULDER

The Propaganda of Spectacle

+

Much More from
Charlie Fenton
Conor Byrne
Melanie V. Taylor

DON'T MISS

OUR MONTHLY
EXPERT TALKS!