

ABSTRACT

THE FAMILY OF LADY KATHERINE GREY 1509-1750

by Nancy Louise Ferrand

The purpose of this thesis is to trace Lady Katherine Grey's family from Princess Mary Tudor to Algernon Seymour and to discuss aspects of their relationship toward the hereditary descent of the English crown.

A threefold approach was employed: an examination of their personalities and careers, an investigation of their relationship to the succession problem, and an attempt to draw those elements together and to evaluate their importance in regard to the succession of the crown. The State Papers, chronicles, diaries, and the foreign correspondence of ambassadors constituted the most important sources drawn upon in this study.

The study revealed that, according to English tradition, no woman from the royal family could marry a foreign prince and expect her descendants to claim the crown. Henry VIII realized this point when he excluded his sister Margaret from his will, as she had married James IV of Scotland and the Earl of Angus. At the same time he designated that the children of his younger sister Mary

should inherit the crown if he left no heirs. Thus, legally had there been strong sentiment expressed for any of Katherine Grey's sons or descendants, they, instead of the Stuarts, could possibly have become Kings of England upon the basis of Henry VIII's and Edward VI's wills. That they were English rather than Scotch also enhanced their claims.

THE FAMILY OF LADY KATHERINE GREY 1509-1750

By

Nancy Louise Ferrand

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of History

1964

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to Dr. Marjorie Gesner, Dr. and Mrs. Louis Ferrand, and James Boxall, Jr. for their continued encouragement and much valued assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
PROLOGUE	1
I. EARLY ANTECEDENTS: PRINCESS MARY TUDOR	2
II. THE IMMEDIATE FAMILY OF KATHERINE GREY	19
III. THE SEYMOURS 1678-1750	51
EPILOGUE	94
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY	95
APPENDICES	99

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
I. GENEALOGY OF THE FAMILY OF LADY KATHERINE GREY	99
II. GENEALOGY OF LADY MARGARET DOUGLAS, COUNTESS OF LENNOX	100

PROLOGUE

The intention of this thesis is first to trace Lady Katherine Grey's descendants from Princess Mary Tudor to Algernon Seymour; second to focus attention on their connection with the wills of Henry VIII, and Edward VI; and third to indicate the complete absence of interest of all members of this family (after the death of Lady Jane Grey) in any scheme to usurp the crown of England.

CHAPTER I

EARLY ANTECEDENTS: PRINCESS MARY TUDOR

Mary Tudor, the youngest daughter of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, was significant in English history because of her marriage to Louis XII of France. She is remembered in relation to Henry VIII's will and the problems it created for her descendants.

From the time she was a young child Mary was regarded as a potentially important factor in diplomatic negotiations. The first problem arose in 1499. In April of that year the Duke of Milan's Ambassador requested that a marriage treaty be negotiated between Mary and the Duke's eldest son. Henry bluntly refused the offer. In the first place, Mary was only three years old. Secondly, the rank of Duke was not thought worthy of an English Princess. Thirdly, the Duke was known to have a desire for membership in the Order of the Garter, an honor reserved for Henry's friends. Finally, Milan had tried to persuade Henry to join a war against France shortly after a peace treaty had been concluded with the French king. The Milanese overtures aroused a negligible amount of interest at court and as such were received with indifference.¹

¹Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs,

They were, however, important as indicative of possible future negotiations.

Mary's childhood after 1499 was not noticeably different from other children of noble lineage. Possibly she first experienced grief at the age of seven when her mother died. At ten she began her training as a future queen when Henry VII ordered that she be accorded the same respect as her sister-in-law Katherine of Aragon, Princess of Wales.²

Following the death of his wife Henry became involved with marriage schemes both for Mary and himself. In 1505 he opened secret negotiations with France. At one juncture in the discussions it appeared plausible that he would marry either the daughter of the Count of Angoulême or the Count's mother, and that Mary would marry the Dauphin. Although the negotiations were conducted privately, they were detected by the Portuguese Ambassador, Thomas Lopez Emmanuel. His concern was derived from his mission in England to persuade Henry

Existing in the Collections of Venice, and in the Library of Northern Italy, eds. Rawdon Brown et al., 9 vols. (London: Longman and Co., 1864), I, 3, 4. Hereafter SP:Venice.

²Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere, eds. G. A. Bergenroth, et al., 13 vols. (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862), I, 338. Hereafter SP:Spanish.

to affirm a marriage treaty for Mary with the son of the king of Portugal. Henry's resistance, in view of the Ambassador's knowledge of the French plans, so disenchanted him that he advised his sovereign to dissociate himself from the English.³ A year later more serious negotiations were opened by Henry with the King of Castile in an effort to unite Mary and Don Carlos, heir to the Castilian throne.⁴ At first there appeared no obstacles to plans for an alliance; but the king of France objected, July, 1506. Louis XII protested that the marriage would endanger French security.⁵ Henry was not impressed by his objections and did not alter his plans. By September of 1507 he was sufficiently confident of success so that the Spanish Ambassador was informed of the arrangement.⁶ Louis XII proved so annoyed that he protested to the Pope, the King of Aragon, and the Diet of Constance. He criticized Don Carlos's grandfather Maximilian for having broken his word and not preventing the marriage. To ease his fears Louis insisted that a clause be inserted in the marriage treaty which would nullify the agreement should he decide within a year that his daughter Princess Claude would marry the Archduke

³Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII, ed. James Gardiner, 2 vols. (London, 1863), I, 146-147.

⁴SP:Venice, I, 323, 317.

⁵SP:Venice, I, 325.

⁶SP:Venice, I, 437, 430.

C

O

O

a

F

t

m

21

an

ye

Ro

25

se

En

gr

we

Jo

Th

and
(Lo

Charles.⁷ Louis was not isolated in his concern. Ferdinand of Aragon was equally interested in the negotiations because of Henry's failure to inform him of the sections of the agreement relating to Castile. In spite of his wounded pride Ferdinand considered the union desirable. Yet he refused to accept it until his daughter Princess Katherine was married to the Prince of Wales.⁸

The negotiations were formally concluded on December 21, 1507. At that time a decision was reached that Mary and Charles would be married by proxy before Easter.⁹ A year later, on October 11, 1508, Maximillian, King of the Romans, and Archduke Charles bound themselves to pay 250,000 crowns if there was no marriage.¹⁰ The resulting settlement was greeted with great rejoicing by both the English and French in the Port of Calais. They thought a great triumph had been achieved.¹¹ Mary and Don Carlos were married by proxy in December, 1508, at Richmond with Johannes des Berghes acting as the Archduke's proxy.¹² Three months later Henry became seriously ill and died on

⁷SP:Spanish, I, 443.

⁸SP:Spanish, I, 459.

⁹SP:Spanish, I, 465.

¹⁰SP:Spanish, I, 466.

¹¹The Chronicle of Calais, in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII to the Year 1540, ed. John Gough Nichols (London, 1854), pp. 6-7.

¹²SP:Spanish, I, 469.

April 21, 1509. When his will was read, the terms stipulated that Mary had been left 50,000 pounds to be used as her dowry. A guarantee for Mary's future welfare was also included in the will. The clause stated that should she not marry Don Carlos, then the new king and his council were responsible for arranging a marriage to another prince.¹³

Mary's brother, Henry VIII, understood the necessity for establishing friendly diplomatic relations and married the daughter of Ferdinand of Aragon. At that time Ferdinand formally approved Mary's marriage agreement with Don Carlos.¹⁴ The marriage plans progressed smoothly until September, 1513, when Don Carlos refused to proceed with the union because Mary was several years his senior.¹⁵ Conceivably the announcement had been based upon the intelligence that Henry VIII was not interested in fulfilling the contract. The Florentine Ambassador had suspected double dealing as early as August and predicted that the friendship would be dropped if England found a more profitable ally.¹⁶ Due to the rumors Henry remained extremely discreet. In March, 1514, the Flemish negotiations were assumed to be

¹³Great Britain, Public Record Office, Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII, eds. R. H. Brodie, et al., 23 vols. in 38 pts. (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1939), I, Pt. I, 2. Hereafter Letters and Papers.

¹⁴Letters and Papers, I, Pt. I, 22.

¹⁵SP:Venice, I, 122.

¹⁶SP:Venice, II, 120.

close to completion.¹⁷ While Henry's delaying tactics had proved effective the outcome as stated earlier was not wholly unexpected.¹⁸ The official announcement of the rift with Flanders stated that the treaty's provisions had not been fulfilled. For example, one provision guaranteed ratification of the treaty when the Archduke reached the age of thirteen. That step had not been taken, hence, due to the Flemish disinterest, it was expedient to select a more favorable marriage alliance; English interests were best served by an agreement with France. When Mary cancelled her father's contract in testimony before a notary public, the treaty with Flanders was officially nullified. Having performed that symbolic action she was affianced to the King of France.¹⁹ The terms of the new arrangement stated that Louis was to provide Mary with a dowry of 700,000 ducats (100,000 crowns); in addition to another million to be paid in twenty years.²⁰ This plan had been designated in lieu of a cash settlement to establish peace between England and France.²¹

¹⁷SP:Venice, II, 124.

¹⁸SP:Venice, II, 186.

¹⁹SP:Venice, II, 191-192.

²⁰Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Milan 1385-1618, ed. Allen B. Hinds (London: Hereford Times Limited, 1912), p. 439. Hereafter Milan Papers.

²¹SP:Venice, II, 184.

The Holy Roman Emperor Maximillian was so irreconcilably opposed to the shift in English diplomacy that he sent his ambassador to protest the marriage. Henry's reply was particularly sharp. He reminded the ambassador that while English funds and soldiers had willingly been sent to the continent to support the emperor the troops had not been used against France. The stalemate made a new alliance necessary.²²

Interest in Mary's matrimonial plans was strong in many European capitals. It was particularly evident in Venice where the Venetian Council approved the alliance by twenty-three votes.²³ Concurrently with Venetian approval came opposition from Archduke Charles who, annoyed at the prospect of an English alliance with France, was reported to have expressed a desire to secure the support of his brother-in-law, the king of Denmark, to fight England.²⁴ These sentiments took no concrete form and no untoward incidents marred Mary's marriage to King Louis XII on October 9, 1514.²⁵ For the ceremony she was attired in a gown of stiff brocade and wore many beautiful jewels. After the service a banquet, followed by a dance, celebrated

²² SP:Venice, II, 197.

²³ SP:Venice, II, 185.

²⁴ SP:Venice, II, 193.

²⁵ SP:Venice, II, 202.

the union between England and France.²⁶

Mary was not completely content in France, for Louis dismissed her chief confident Mother Guildford. No amount of urging could persuade either her brother or husband to recall her meddlesome serving woman.²⁷ A month after her marriage Mary was crowned on November 5, 1514, in the monastery church at St. Denis. The next day she entered Paris and was welcomed enthusiastically by her new subjects.²⁸ Jousts were then held in honor of her marriage and coronation. Among the competitors were the English lords Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, and the Marquis of Dorset. Both men were much admired for the excellence of their performances.²⁹

Mary's marriage ended abruptly when Louis died on January 1, 1515, leaving her a widow at nineteen.³⁰ Immediately following the king's death Cardinal Wolsey wrote to her and cautioned against a new marriage until she had returned to England.³¹ Henry who was also concerned

²⁶SP:Venice, II, 202, 204.

²⁷Original Letters, Illustrative of English History, ed. Henry Ellis, 11 vols. (London, 1825), I, 116-117.

²⁸Edward Hall, Hall's Chronicle; Containing the History of England, During the Reign of Henry the Fourth, and the Succeeding Monarchs, to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eighth, in Which are Particularly Described the Manners and Customs of Those Periods (London, 1809), 571.

²⁹SP:Venice, II, 213.

³⁰Hall, p. 581.

³¹Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 4-5.

for his sister's future sent a mission headed by Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, to supervise Mary's affairs and bring her unmarried to England.³²

Shortly after Charles had arrived in France there were rumors that he intended to marry the Queen Dowager.³³ The accusations were verified by Louis's successor Francis I when he questioned Charles regarding his intentions to marry and offered his support to secure Henry's consent.³⁴ Sometime after that interchange Charles and Mary were secretly married in Paris.³⁵ Following the service Charles wrote Cardinal Wolsey that Francis had encouraged his marriage. He had even offered to write Henry.³⁶ Wolsey was at first stunned by the news. He immediately wrote Charles the king had been informed and that his reaction was not pleasant. Wolsey concluded his letter with the statement: "that with good order and saving of his honor ye should have in marriage his said sister." Wolsey also included Henry's terms: Francis I should write a letter supporting the marriage; pay Mary a yearly sum of 4,000 pounds; return the gold plate and jewels given to her by Louis; finally he was bound to pay 200,000 crowns for the dowry she had brought to

³²Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 581.

³³Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 61.

³⁴Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 515.

³⁵Hall, p. 582.

³⁶Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 37.

France.³⁷ In accordance with Henry's wishes and those of Mary, Francis wrote to Henry and requested that he agree to his sister's remarriage.³⁸

Mary also wrote to her brother and reminded him that she had only agreed to marry the elderly French king for the welfare of England. Before leaving England Henry had granted her one request. If she outlived Louis she would be permitted to marry someone of her own choosing.

"Since her husband was dead, remembering the great virtue in my lord of Suffolk to whom I have always been of good mind, as ye well know." Mary had decided to marry without his formal consent.³⁹ Throughout this difficult time Cardinal Wolsey remained the principal supporter of Mary and Charles at court. In March Mary wrote to him and expressed her appreciation for his continued favor.⁴⁰

News of the remarriage provoked violent reactions among the Parisians, whose emotions became so inflamed at its suddenness, that the Duke of Suffolk would not leave the protection of the English Embassy.⁴¹ While the Parisian mobs demonstrated at the rumors, the nations of Portugal, Burgundy, and Bavaria explored the possibilities of an

³⁷ Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 75.

³⁸ Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 3.

³⁹ Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 75-76.

⁴⁰ Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 82.

⁴¹ Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 117.

alliance with England. The first move was made by the King of Portugal. He requested that the Pope assist him in securing Mary as a wife for his oldest son. At the same time a letter was sent to Cardinal Wolsey entreating that he approach Henry regarding the possibility of a Portuguese marriage for the Queen Dowager.⁴² The Archduke of Burgundy also hoped to secure a marriage treaty with England and reopen trade arrangements between the countries.⁴³ The last nation to indicate a willingness to discuss marriage negotiations was Bavaria. The Bavarian Duke was represented by his uncle the Emperor Maximilian.⁴⁴ All of the offers were formally withdrawn when Henry affirmed his sister's remarriage.⁴⁵

When the English were officially informed of the marriage, their disapproval overshadowed French reaction. The Venetian Ambassador, Andrea Badoer, observed that the uproar reached throughout the kingdom. In Parliament emotions were so strained that some members of the House of Commons almost came to blows with members of the House of Lords who refused to approve the marriage. Throughout the debate Cardinal Wolsey continued to defend Mary and Charles. He was their only advocate.⁴⁶

⁴²Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 173.

⁴³SP:Venice, II, 233.

⁴⁴Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 98-99.

⁴⁵SP:Venice, II, 239.

⁴⁶SP:Venice, III, 639-40.

Prior to Mary's departure from France, Francis agreed to a settlement of 20,000 gold crowns; payable in two equal annual installments of 10,000 crowns. When that settlement had been made, Mary obtained Henry's consent to return to England though she had to agree to pay him 24,000 pounds in installments of 1,000 pounds a year. Mary also gave Henry 200,000 pounds, her plate, jewelry, and the wardship of Lady Leslie, the heir of John Grey, Lord Leslie.⁴⁷

When both the French and English diplomats were satisfied with the terms, Mary returned to England. Before sailing she was married a second time in Calais.⁴⁸ On her arrival Mary was welcomed at Dover by the king and all of his ministers.⁴⁹ On May 13, 1515, she was legally married at Greenwich Palace in the presence of Henry and Katherine and other members of the court.⁵⁰ No public demonstrations or general festivities followed the service as the people generally opposed the marriage.⁵¹

Mary's second marriage eventually created questions in relation to the legitimacy of her children. This was due to the fact that before Charles married her he had broken a pre-marriage contract with Baroness Leslie.

⁴⁷Letters and Papers, II, 125, 102.

⁴⁸Hall, p. 582.

⁴⁹SP:Venice, II, 243.

⁵⁰Letters and Papers, II, 133.

⁵¹SP:Venice, II, 244.

When their first two children were born his second wife Lady Margaret Mortimer was alive.⁵² Legally the matter was cleared by a Papal Bull issued in 1529 which validated the marriage and assured the legitimacy of all their offspring.⁵³

The first child of Charles and Mary was born March 11, 1516, at eleven o'clock at night in the city of Bath. The christening was held the following Thursday. The godparents were Cardinal Wolsey, Queen Katherine, the Bishop of Durham, and the King. The baby's Uncle Henry was given the honor of naming him Henry.⁵⁴ After her son's birth Mary grew increasingly concerned with her dowry settlement. That topic assumed added importance when the item of the unpaid money revived the latent animosity between England and France. Henry solved the issue by signing a treaty with Spain.⁵⁵ That agreement stipulated that either Spain or England should come to the assistance of the other if a foreign power refused to pay the king or members of his family the sums agreed upon in a treaty. A clause was also inserted that the Spanish King was not bound

⁵² Alfred Bailey, The Succession to the English Crown (London: Macmillan and Company, 1879), 171-172.

⁵³ George E. Cokayne, The Complete Peerage, ed. Geoffrey H. White, et al. 2nd ed., 13 vols. (London, 1953), XII, Pt. I, 459. Hereafter GEC.

⁵⁴ Letters and Papers, II, Pt. I, 461.

⁵⁵ SP:Venice, II, 334.

to support Henry unless the Pope or the Emperor consented.⁵⁶

A year after the Spanish negotiations had closed Mary's second child Frances was born on July 17, 1517.⁵⁷ Frances was christened the Sunday after her birth amid much splendor. Her god-parents were Queen Katherine, Princess Mary, and the Abbot of St. Albans. The Queen and Princess Mary were not present at the ceremony, but they were represented by Lady Boleyn and Lady Elizabeth Grey.⁵⁸

Although legally married Charles and Mary found it difficult to regain their former positions at court. On their return Charles apparently had regained the king's friendship, but it was soon withdrawn. Charles passed a number of lonely months on his country estate.⁵⁹ Not until July, 1517, was he once more in the king's favor. At that time he was specifically requested to witness the signing of an agreement between the Pope, the Holy Roman Emperor, Spain and England.⁶⁰ In the succeeding years Mary and Charles were not often at court together other than on state occasions. One outstanding event was in May, 1520,

⁵⁶ Letters and Papers, I, Pt. II, 46.

⁵⁷ Letters and Papers, I, Pt. II, 1107-1109.

⁵⁸ Letters and Papers, II, Pt. II, 21.

⁵⁹ SP:Venice, II, 379-80, 891.

⁶⁰ SP:Venice, II, 401.

when the Archduke Charles, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire paid a state visit to England. After his arrival Mary was present at many of the parties given to honor him. Charles left England at the end of May, and shortly after his departure Henry with his queen and sister Mary left Dover by ship for a conference with the king of France.⁶¹

From 1522 to 1532 there is limited information on Mary's activities. That which does exist deals principally with financial transactions. On July 4, 1523, Mary and her husband were granted eight manors by the king.⁶² Two years later in 1525 Guovanni Gioachina, the French Ambassador, presented Mary with 10,000 ducats and informed her of Francis's intention to restore her French lands.⁶³ Also in 1525 the king presented them with twenty manors which formerly had been owned by Edmund de la Pole.⁶⁴ Mary's relations with Henry as documented by his gifts of land appeared amiable. But in the spring of 1532 she definitely disagreed with him over his plans to divorce Queen Katherine. Her name was officially connected with the opposition after the death of one of the Duke of Suffolk's relatives in a duel in Westminster Abbey. It was later learned that the duel had developed over the spiteful language Mary used

⁶¹SP:Venice, III, 36, 46.

⁶²Letters and Papers, III, Pt. II, 1322.

⁶³SP:Venice, III, 496.

⁶⁴Letters and Papers, I, Pt. I, 160.

to describe Ann Boleyn.⁶⁵ Mary further annoyed Henry when she refused point blank to accompany him to Calais where, at one time, he had planned to marry Ann.⁶⁶ Undoubtedly Mary's position as the king's sister protected her from his rage, but she might have found it increasingly difficult to preserve her safety had she continued her criticism. Charles was less honest than Mary and certainly much more of an opportunist. Publicly he paid no attention to Mary's objections. He even agreed to escort Queen Katherine to her prison at Ampthiel in Bedfordshire.⁶⁷ In May, 1533, he was invited to carry the crown at Ann Boleyn's coronation, and after the ceremony he served as high constable and steward for the banquet festivities.⁶⁸

At the time Katherine was driven from court Mary's health was extremely poor, and she found it necessary to request that Henry send her his personal physician Master Peters.⁶⁹ Her condition failed to improve, and she died quietly in her home at Westthorpe in Suffolk June 25, 1533, at the age of thirty-eight.⁷⁰ A funeral service was held

⁶⁵SP:Venice, IV, 332.

⁶⁶SP:Venice, IV, 351.

⁶⁷Charles Wriothesley, A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from A.D. 1485 to 1559, 2 vols. (Westminster, 1875), I, 17-18.

⁶⁸Wriothesley, I, pp. 20-21.

⁶⁹Letters and Papers, VI, 311.

⁷⁰Wriothesley, I, p. 22.

in Westminster Abbey July tenth,⁷¹ and she was buried on July twenty-second at the monastery of St. Edmondsbury.⁷²

Mary's death left a young half-orphaned family composed of Henry, Frances, and Eleanor, who had been born in 1590. Thus ended the life of Mary Tudor: French Queen, Duchess of Suffolk, mother of Lady Frances Grey, grandmother of Lady Jane Grey and Lady Katherine Grey. Her progeny were left to face a bitter and suspicious England, one eager to favor a potential heir or usurper of the throne and just as readily to ignore them.

⁷¹Letters and Papers, VI, 351.

⁷²Wriothesley, I, p. 22.

CHAPTER II

THE IMMEDIATE FAMILY OF KATHERINE GREY

The second phase in the discussion of the descendants of Princess Mary opens in 1534 with the death of her son Henry, Earl of Lincoln. His death is notable, for it marked the first occasion where public comment survives regarding her children as heirs to the throne. In correspondence with Charles the Fifth of Spain the Spanish ambassador Chapuys noted the Scotch ambassador's attitude of satisfaction when informed of the earl's death. The Scots feared that had Henry lived he would have provided powerful competition against the claims of the Scottish king, for he was the nephew of Henry VIII and in addition a native Englishman.¹

Henry was survived by two sisters, Frances and Eleanor. When she was sixteen, Lady Frances, the older daughter of Charles and Mary Suffolk, married Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset.² Prior to the marriage Henry had broken a pre-marriage contract with Lady Katherine Fitzalan, the

¹Letters and Papers, VII, 142.

²Agnes Strickland, Lives of the Tudor Princesses, Including Lady Jane Grey and Her Sisters (London, 1868), p. 183.

daughter of the Earl of Arundel.³ Some years after their marriage Frances's niece, the daughter of her sister Eleanor, Margaret, Lady Strange contested the legitimacy of her children on the basis of that broken contract. Margaret also alleged that they had no right to inherit the crown as had been directed by the king and the parliament in 1536.⁴

Essentially Lady Margaret's supposition cannot be qualified as accurate. In his work the Succession of the English Crown Alfred Bailey pointed out that there were no specific provisions in Henry's will which made the succession dependent upon the legitimacy of either Lady Frances's or Lady Eleanor's offspring.⁵ Henry left the succession to his son Edward followed by Mary, and Elizabeth, and in default of their having issue the crown was to be given not to Lady Frances, or Lady Eleanor but to their children. The will was unusual, for it excluded the children of his older sister Margaret, Queen of Scotland.⁶ In the Royal Succession Act 25 Henry VIII C.22 (1536) Parliament agreed to accept as heirs any person, male or female, as specified in the king's will. The Act further directed that should Henry's heirs or children usurp the crown

³SP:Spanish, XI, 334.

⁴Bailey, p. 171.

⁵Bailey, pp. 171-172.

⁶Letters and Papers, XXI, Pt. II, 320-321.

their immediate claims would be forfeited.⁷ Lady Strange's accusations were never regarded as serious detriments by supporters of Frances's children.

A very limited amount of material is available which deals exclusively with Frances's life. Nevertheless, that which does exist presents an interesting record. Frances and her husband generally attended all royal functions. The only time they were prevented from doing so was in 1537, shortly after the birth of their daughter, Jane. At that time the king specifically requested them not to attend Prince Edward's christening because the Marquis's mother lived in an area infested with the plague.⁸ Later that year Frances was present at court for a less pleasant ceremony when she served as one of the royal mourners at Queen Jane's funeral.⁹ In 1539 Henry selected Frances to serve as a maid of honor for Ann of Cleves.¹⁰ Frances greeted Ann on her arrival at Blackheath in 1540 and for the remainder of that year attended the new queen.¹¹ Six years after Henry's divorce from Ann following the execution of

⁷Statutes of the Realm, ed. A. Luders, 11 vols. (London: 1827), III, p. 660.

⁸Great Britain, Public Record Office, State Papers of Henry the Eighth 1518-1547, 11 vols. (London: His Majesty's Record Commission, 1830), I, Pt. I and II., 570.

⁹Letters and Papers, XII, Pt. I, 374.

¹⁰Letters and Papers, XIV, Pt. II, 201.

¹¹Letters and Papers, XV, 7.

Katherine Howard, Frances and her sister Eleanor were again at court. This time they served as ladies in ordinary for Queen Katherine Parr.¹² In the last years of Henry's reign the Grey's had two other children, Katherine, born in 1538,¹³ and Mary, probably born about 1540.¹⁴

Following Henry VIII's death in 1547 Henry and Frances became active participants in the most famous English treason plot. The plan developed gradually. The first instigator was the third husband of Queen Katherine Parr, Thomas Seymour, Lord High Admiral. Thomas was determined that Lady Jane could become the wife of Edward VI and Queen of England. He would supplant his brother, the Lord Protector Somerset, as the manipulator of the government. Thomas had little difficulty persuading Jane's parents to give their permission for her to live in his household and receive training needed to fill a royal position from the Queen Dowager.¹⁵

Jane remained with Thomas until the death of Katherine Parr. After Katherine's death, Thomas petitioned

¹²Letters and Papers, XII, Pt. I, 478.

¹³A. F. Pollard, "Katherine Seymour," Dict. Nat. Bioq., LI, 63 vols. (New York, 1897), p. 296. Hereafter DNB.

¹⁴The Bishop of Peterborough, "Mary Grey," DNB, XXI (New York, 1933), p. 87.

¹⁵John MacLean, The Life of Sir Thomas Seymour, Knight, Baron Seymour of Sudeley, Lord High Admiral of England and Master of the Ordinance (London, 1869), p. 71.

Jane's parents to permit her to continue living in his household. Frances and Henry eventually agreed having been reassured that Edward VI would marry Jane when he came of age. Jane's presence in Thomas's household, complicated the plans held by his brother the Lord Protector. It made it impossible for him to arrange a marriage between Edward VI and his daughter Jane Seymour. He also had planned to marry Lady Jane Grey to his son Edward earl of Hertford.¹⁶ Jane lived with Thomas until his arrest for high treason; at that time she returned to her family's home at Bradgate.¹⁷

Following Thomas's arrest a committee of inquiry was formed to determine what motives had prompted his thought of a marriage between Jane and Edward. The general consensus of those questioned was his objection to the Lord Protector's scheme to marry his daughter Jane Seymour to Edward VI.¹⁸ Jane Grey's father also testified that Thomas had planned to rid England of the Lord Protector.¹⁹ The Grey's positions at court were not affected

¹⁶MacLean, pp. 69-71.

¹⁷S. L. Lee, "Lady Jane Dudley," DNB, XVI (New York, 1888), pp. 105-107.

¹⁸Samuel Haynes, A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs In the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth 1542-1570, 2 vols. (London: William Bowyer, 1740), I, p. 106.

¹⁹Haynes, I, pp. 76-77.

by Thomas Seymour's execution. In March of 1550, as a special mark of privilege, they were given permission to eat flesh and milk foods during Lent and other fasts.²⁰ Following the death of Lady Frances's father, Charles, Duke of Suffolk, another honor was accorded them. On October 25, 1551 Henry Grey was created Duke of Suffolk.²¹ In that same year the newly appointed Duke of Suffolk was among those lords chosen to escort the Queen of Scotland when she made a state visit to London.²²

When Edward VI inherited the throne from his father, the succession proceeded without question. Moreover, at that time it seemed unlikely that the descendants of the Princess Mary would usurp the crown. This relatively peaceful situation was undone by the ambitions and intervention of the Duke of Northumberland and Frances's husband. At a time when Edward VI was extremely ill they convinced him to re-write his will, and to by-pass his half-sisters Mary and Elizabeth, naming Jane as his heir.²³

²⁰ Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI A.D. 1549-1551, 5 vols. (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1925), III, 331.

²¹ Henry Machyn, The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, From A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563, ed. John Gough (London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1848), p. 14.

²² Machyn, p. 11.

²³ SP:Venice, VI, Pt. II, p. 10797.

They assured him that the change would prevent the re-establishment of the Catholic Church.²⁴ A new will was then drawn in which Jane, her sisters Katherine and Mary, and their male heirs were named as Edward's successors. Frances was designated to serve as regent if her children were not of age. The King's Council accepted the alteration²⁵ and also consented to a marriage for Jane to Guildford Dudley, younger son of the Duke of Northumberland.²⁶ Jane was married to Dudley on May 21, 1553. On the same day Katherine was betrothed to the earl of Pembroke's son, Lord Herbert, and Mary was pledged to Lord Grey's son.²⁷

King Edward died on July 6, 1553. No public announcement was made until the ninth of July. On that day the officers and the guard swore allegiance to Jane as Queen. On the following day she was publicly proclaimed queen.²⁸ It was noticed at the time that very few were willing to give the traditional, "Good save hare." That

²⁴Patrick Fraser Tytler, England Under the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary, 2 vols. (London: Richard Bentley, 1839), II, p. 165.

²⁵The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and of Two Years of Queen Mary, and Especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt. Written by a Resident in the Tower of London, ed. John Gough Nichols (London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1805), pp. 90-91.

²⁶SP:Spanish, XI, p. 36.

²⁷SP:Spanish, XI, p. 40.

²⁸Machyn, p. 35.

afternoon Jane entered the Tower of London.²⁹ In the beginning she was not willing to assume the responsibility of the crown. It was only after great urging that she accepted her new position as queen.³⁰ She ruled England for nine days. At the end of this time forces loyal to Princess Mary, Henry VIII's daughter, rallied to Mary's defence and Jane's father and her father-in-law the Duke of Northumberland surrendered.³¹

Lady Frances's role in the negotiations which placed Jane on the throne superficially appear minimal. Yet behind the scenes she undoubtedly played a more determining role than that which history credits her. Throughout the nine days in July, 1553, while Jane ruled Frances was much concerned for her happiness. Once Mary was restored, and Jane arrested, Frances ignored her. Instead of pleading for both her husband's and daughter's freedom she concentrated her demands on Henry's release. She even pleaded on her knees before Queen Mary who graciously granted her petition.³²

²⁹Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London, ed. John G. Nichols (London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1852), pp. 78-79.

³⁰Thomas Fuller's The Holy State and the Profane State, ed. Maximilian Graf Walten, 6 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), II, p. 309.

³¹Richard Baker, A Chronicle of the Kings of England From the Time of the Romans Government, to the Death of King James the First. With a Continuation to the Year 1660, ed. E. Phillip, 2nd ed. (London, 1830), p. 315.

³²J. M. Stone, The History of Mary I Queen of England (London: Sands and Co., 1901), p. 332.

Jane was sentenced for high treason against the crown on November 13, 1553.³³ Conceivably Mary would have ordered her release had not Jane's father been an active participant in Wyatt's rebellion in January, 1554.³⁴ Henry was condemned for his activities in the revolt and on January 26, 1554, he, along with Lady Jane Grey, and her husband Guildford Dudley, was proclaimed traitors for the second time;³⁵ the first had been on November 13, 1553.³⁶ The Duke was beheaded on the twenty-third of February between nine and ten o'clock in the morning³⁷ and Jane and Guildford were executed on Monday the twelfth of February, 1554.³⁸ Jane's final resting place was in the Church of St. Peter and Vincula within the Tower of London.³⁹

While Henry and Jane were in the Tower Frances remained at court and in the queen's favor. She was even granted precedence over the Princess Elizabeth.⁴⁰ In

³³Machyn, p. 8.

³⁴DNB, XVI, p.106.

³⁵Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth 1547-1580, ed. Robert Lemon, 2 vols. (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1856), I, 57-58.

³⁶Machyn, p. 48.

³⁷Machyn, p. 57.

³⁸The Chronicle of Queen Jane, p. 32.

³⁹Strickland, p. 114.

⁴⁰Stone, p. 279.

addition, she was given permission to occupy Craydon House with the use of all its commodities and conveniences.⁴¹

After the executions Frances was exceptionally anxious to avoid criticism. On March 9, 1554 she married her equerry Adrian Stokes, a man sixteen years her junior. Their marriage was unfortunate, for their only child, a baby girl, died at birth.⁴² Frances died five years after her second marriage on November 20, 1559, at the age of forty-two. She was buried in St. Edmund's Chapel, Westminster Abbey on the fifth of December.⁴³ As a member of the Protestant house of Tudor, her burial service was particularly fitting, for it marked the first public reading of the communion service in English.⁴⁴

Lady Frances placed self-preservation foremost in her scale of values. Possibly this was one of the factors which prevented her from establishing a close personal relationship with her children. Her inability to satisfy their needs for love and affection may have developed a certain reckless spirit in them which prompted their search

⁴¹Great Britain, Public Record Office, Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series A.D. 1554-1556, ed. John R. Dasent, 32 vols. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1892), V, 19. Hereafter APC.

⁴²Strickland, pp. 115-116.

⁴³Machyn, p. 217.

⁴⁴Cecille Goff, A Woman of the Tudor Age (London, 1931).

for affection without thought of the consequences. This is illustrated by Mary's marriage to Thomas Keyes and by Katherine's to Edward Earl of Hertford. Frances cannot be credited with imparting to her daughters the wisdom and strength needed to face life's realities.

After Jane's execution the Earl of Pembroke was anxious to demonstrate his support of Queen Mary and he had his son divorce Katherine. Lord Herbert then married Anne, the daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury.⁴⁵ Following the divorce Queen Mary invited Katherine and Mary to live at Court.⁴⁶ While under Mary's protection Katherine became aware of her significance in the issue of succession. Her first real problems emerged in 1557 when she was nineteen and Princess Elizabeth was twenty-four. In that year the Venetian Ambassador, Giovanni Michel, wrote a report to the Venetian Senate in which he urged the advisability of a marriage between Princess Elizabeth, the sister of the Queen of England, and Don Carlos, the twelve year old son of the King of Spain. Almost from the beginning he discounted the possibility of a marriage alliance due to difference in ages and Elizabeth's declared non-interest in marriage. At the time, although Elizabeth was not approachable, there was some thought that Queen Mary's second cousin Lady

⁴⁵Somer Tracts, ed. Walter Scott, 2nd ed., 16 vols. (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1809), I, pp. 257-258.

⁴⁶Strickland, p. 119.

Katherine could marry a cousin of the King of Spain. The plan might have been accepted had not Philip of Spain feared that the alliance would provoke the formation of a league opposed to Spanish interests. After numerous discussions the possibility of a continental marriage for Katherine was rejected.⁴⁷

When the marriage plans were discarded it had become increasingly apparent to Princess Elizabeth that her position as heiress presumptive to the throne was insecure and that this would continue as long as there existed any possibility that those factions opposed to her could use Edward VI's will as evidence that Katherine should be queen. Moreover, even when Elizabeth became queen, her suspicions of Katherine made it impossible for Katherine to gain her confidence. As a result Katherine was so discontented that she found it difficult to mask her annoyance with Elizabeth's attitude. In March of 1559 she informed Count DeFeria that Elizabeth had only made her a lady of the presence while under Mary she had served in the privy chamber. Katherine was convinced that her reduced position came as the result of the fact that the Queen did not want to have her as her heir.⁴⁸

Elizabeth's dislike for Katherine was not alleviated, when

⁴⁷SP:Venice, VI, Pt. II, 1079.

⁴⁸Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of Letters and State Papers, Relating to English Affairs, Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas, ed. Martin A. S. Hume, 4 vols. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894), I, 45. Hereafter SP:Spanish; Elizabeth.

on August 3, 1559, Robert Hoggins disclosed a Spanish plot which had been planned prior to the death of Francis II. The scheme, as revealed, was to have stolen Katherine and managed her marriage either to the Prince of Spain or to someone of lesser rank, depending upon the pressure of the times. The factor which had led to the development of the intrigue was derived from fear that Francis would use the English claims of his Scottish queen to conquer England.⁴⁹ The Spanish had reasoned that, if Mary of Scotland was used by the French to secure the English crown, the balance of power would be overturned. Hence their eagerness to ally themselves with any person who could contest Mary Stuart's claims.⁵⁰

In 1559 Bishop Quadra advanced another proposal for Katherine's marriage. He informed Philip of the English dissatisfaction over rumors that Elizabeth intended to marry Lord Robert Dudley. To further Spanish aims he advised Philip to permit the Spanish Archduke to visit England and to cultivate friends. Later, after Elizabeth's death, it would seem relatively natural to recall the Archduke and to have him marry the Lady Katherine Grey.⁵¹

⁴⁹Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1559, ed. Joseph Stevenson et al., 23 vols. (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1863), I, 443. Hereafter SP:Foreign; Elizabeth.

⁵⁰SP:Foreign; Elizabeth, I, 44.

⁵¹SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 114.

Elizabeth was not unaware of the discontent raised by her fondness for Dudley. To avert attention from herself she capitalized on what appeared to be a great affection for Katherine. She gave her a position as one of the ladies of the Queen's Chamber. There were reports that Elizabeth had determined to adopt Katherine.⁵² Bishop Quadra was so deceived by the Queen's devious maneuvers that he questioned Secretary Cecil as to their reliability. Cecil reportedly stated that the queen could not seriously consider such a plan.⁵³ That her aversion was not derived as much from fear of Katherine as mistrust that, if the succession went to the female side of the Tudor house, the family of the Countess of Lennox would automatically be included.⁵⁴ If so, a strong possibility existed that her son might become king of Scotland and ally himself with France. Thus Elizabeth's dynastic concerns increased.⁵⁵

Scotland entered the contest for Katherine's hand. At one time she suggested that the Queen arrange a marriage between the heir apparent to the Scottish

⁵²SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 122.

⁵³SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 176.

⁵⁴Lady Margaret, Countess of Lennox was the daughter of Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII. Lady Margaret's son Lord Darnley later married Mary Stuart against the advice of Queen Elizabeth. DNB, XV, pp. 339-343. See Appendix II.

⁵⁵SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 122.

throne, the earl of Arran, and Katherine whom they recognized as heir to that of England. Elizabeth refused to encourage the proposed arrangement. She thus discouraged a seemingly plausible solution to the succession of England and Scotland.⁵⁶ As a result of her secret marriage in the month of December, 1560, to Edward, Earl of Hertford the son of the former Lord Protector of England, dynastic plans for Katherine were doomed to failure. When Elizabeth was informed of the marriage, she became exceedingly outraged that Katherine had married without her permission. Her rage increased when it was disclosed that Katherine was enciente. Katherine was immediately interned in the Tower of London. Instructions were given to the Lieutenant of the Tower, Mr. Warner, to establish an investigatory committee to determine the number of people who had been aware of Katherine's affection for Edward.⁵⁷

At the time the secret marriage was disclosed Edward was in France.⁵⁸ When he learned of Katherine's arrest, he was forewarned by the King of Navarre and his council to remain on the continent because they feared for his safety should he return to England. The English

⁵⁶SP:Foreign; Elizabeth, III, 312.

⁵⁷Hayes, pp. 369-370.

⁵⁸Queen Elizabeth and Her Times, A Series of Original Letters, Selected from the Inedited Private Correspondence of the Lord Treasurer Burghley, The Earl of Leicester, the Secretaries Walsingham and Smith, Sir Christopher Hatton, ed. Thomas Wright, 2 vols. (London: Henry Colburn, 1838), I, p. 69.

Ambassador however succeeded in persuading him to return.⁵⁹ Shortly after Edward landed in England he was arrested and placed in prison.⁶⁰

The early days of Katherine's and Edward's imprisonment were spent in relentless examination sessions. Elizabeth was convinced that some foreign power or powerful political faction had instigated the marriage.⁶¹ When the trials first opened, the culprits were reluctant to reveal information. As the sessions progressed they became more cooperative and testified as to the date, time, location, and those in attendance at their marriage. The evidence unfortunately carried little value as the only individual who could have corroborated their testimony was Edward's sister, Jane Seymour. She had helped arrange their marriage plans, but at the time of the trial was dead. Even with their testimony, the Queen refused to acknowledge the validity of their union, or the legitimacy of a son born on September 26, 1561.⁶²

⁵⁹ SP:Foreign; Elizabeth, IV, 322.

⁶⁰ Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally at Rome in the Vatican Archives and Library. Elizabeth 1558-1571, ed. J. M. Rigg, 2 vols. (London: Hereford Times Limited, 1916), I, 46-47. Hereafter SP:Rome.

⁶¹ SP:Foreign; Elizabeth, I, 277.

⁶² SP:Foreign; Elizabeth, I, 355.

Katherine and Edward's infant son was given the name Edward in a secret baptismal service conducted by a nameless woman.⁶³ After Edward's birth the trial was resumed. At its conclusion on May 12, 1562, the Archbishop of Canterbury spoke on behalf of the Court of High Commissions and pronounced their marriage illegal.⁶⁴ Edward was also fined 15,000 pounds for the marriage and the unlawful birth of a son.⁶⁵ In various areas of England the sentence was not received favorably. Many Englishmen were quick to express their dissatisfaction. Such expressions of popular opinion were not heeded.⁶⁶

Katherine's position in relation to the succession was not again mentioned until a year after her arrest. At that time the Duke of Norfolk and other interested nobles gathered at the home of the Earl of Arundel. While there they deliberated over Katherine's position in respect to the crown. They examined the possibility of arranging a marriage between Katherine's son Edward and the Duke of Norfolk's daughter.⁶⁷ Sometime later when Elizabeth was informed of the proposal she quarreled with the Duke of Norfolk and reminded him that it was her duty and not his to select her heir. The duke's attempts to determine the

⁶³SP:Rome, I, 51.

⁶⁴SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, VI, 535.

⁶⁵Wright, I, p. 129.

⁶⁶Wright, I, p. 396.

⁶⁷SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 273.

succession did not ease Katherine's situation and by the following February, 1563, she was still in prison. Bishop Quadra wrote the King of Spain, on February 7, 1563, that her release was unlikely. He based his assumption upon knowledge that Elizabeth was aware that the nobles were not united as to their choice for her successor. Elizabeth followed the policy of keeping Katherine out of contact with the nobles so that she could not influence their decision.⁶⁸

While in the Tower Katherine and Edward jeopardized their positions even more by intermittent nocturnal visits. One result of those unauthorized meetings was the birth of a second boy on February 10, 1563. The child was duly baptized, and for his christening two warders from the Tower stood as his godfathers and named him Thomas.⁶⁹ The effect of this child's birth completely nullified the efforts Edward's mother had made to obtain his freedom.⁷⁰

A month after Thomas's birth Edward wrote Lord Robert Dudley that he was greatly disturbed by the Queen's continued displeasure and desired a reconciliation.⁷¹ He was seemingly oblivious of Elizabeth's dynastic concerns.

⁶⁸SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 273.

⁶⁹Machyn, p. 300.

⁷⁰SP:Foreign; Elizabeth, VI, 338.

⁷¹SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 221.

Elizabeth had refused to pardon him, but she was not without compassion and, at the time of the London plague, gave Edward and Katherine permission to move to the safety of the country. Assignment to separate residences constituted the sole stipulation. Katherine was given into the custody of her uncle the Lord John Grey and taken to his home in Essex. Edward was permitted to live with his mother, the Dowager Duchess of Somerset, at her home in Middlesex.⁷²

Katherine and Edward never abandoned hope for the restoration of their liberties; both sought continually to enlist the aid of influential people. In November of 1663, Katherine wrote Elizabeth and asked to be pardoned for her rash marriage.⁷³ Edward was more of a combatant than Katherine and more constant in his demands for assistance from friends. An indication of his persistency is discernable in some of his correspondence with Lord Robert Dudley. On March 18, 1564, he entreated Dudley to remind the Queen of his good will. In answer Dudley wrote that Elizabeth had not been annoyed with his plea, but Dudley cautioned Edward to wait for her to make a decision without pressure.⁷⁴ Edward was also given support by the Earl of Warwick, who promised to assist him in any available manner.⁷⁵

⁷²Wright, p. 137.

⁷³Frank Arthur Mumby, Elizabeth and Mary Stuart. The Beginning of the Feud (London, 1914), pp. 300-301.

⁷⁴SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 236.

⁷⁵SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 237.

Whatever hopes these measures had offered were dashed in 1564. In that year John Hales, Clerk of the Hanaper published an article in which he cited Katherine as the lawful wife of Edward Earl of Hertford and the legal successor to the throne.⁷⁶ After the publication had been distributed an order was issued for Hales's arrest on the basis of his denial of the Archbishop of Canterbury's sentence that the couple were not legally married.⁷⁷ Following his arrest a committee of inquiry was organized to investigate the implications, if any, of the book. Katherine's Uncle, Lord John Grey was one of the first to testify. He was asked whether he had ever possessed John Hales's work. His answer was yes that he had owned such a book but had neither kept it nor discussed its contents. He was also questioned if he had ever discussed the problem of succession. He replied that John Hale had inquired as to Lady Frances's legitimacy when the issue of succession had been raised by Parliament in January, 1563. At the time he had been amused at the absurdity of the question, but had recalled the names of three men who had sat on his brother's council who could answer Hales's queries. Hales had confronted the men; they disclosed that the issue had been raised when Edward VI was king. The result of that

⁷⁶ Historical Manuscripts Commission, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honorable the Marquis of Salisbury Preserved at Hatfield House. Hertfordshire (London: The Hereford Times Limited, 1915), Part XIII Addenda, 66.

⁷⁷ MSS. Hatfield, Part XIII, Addenda, 66.

first inquiry had been to declare Frances's legitimacy in both the Court of Arches and the Star Chamber. Consequently her livery had been sued in the Court of Wards. Sir John was also questioned as to whether Hales had indicated any interest in the legitimacy of Katherine's marriage. He stated that the topic had not been broached.⁷⁸ This incident continued to identify Katherine as a threat to Elizabeth's succession difficulties.⁷⁹

Following Hales's investigation Edward's guardian was changed and on May 26, 1564, he was placed under the supervision of the Lieutenant of the Tower of London.⁸⁰ Prison life has often so affected men's minds and debased their sense of honor that some willingly forfeit self-respect. Edward was no exception. On October 15, 1564, he lost control of himself and in a letter to the Earl of Leicester repented of his crimes. He expressed his willingness to buy his pardon with the proceeds from the sale of his lands should the idea please the Queen. Elizabeth was not approachable and nothing more was heard of his entreaty.⁸¹ That his efforts proved ineffectual was due in part to the fact that Elizabeth's rival, Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, had opposed Hales's decision that Katherine was Elizabeth's legal heir. Mary stated that her rights were stronger than Katherine's since she was descended from Margaret, the

⁷⁸Hayes, pp. 412-413.

⁷⁹Wright, p. 124.

⁸⁰SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 241.

⁸¹SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, VI, 552.

older sister of Henry VIII, while Katherine's grandmother had been his younger sister, Mary.⁸² Neither of the claims calmed Elizabeth's mind or rid her of extreme anxiety over the status of her two cousins.

While Katherine remained in protective custody, and her children were not accepted as legitimate, Elizabeth was relatively confident that no actual plots could be formed to establish them as her heirs. This confidence diminished when, on August tenth or twelfth, 1565, Katherine's younger sister Mary married secretly, Thomas Keyes, Sergeant-Porter⁸³ and Master of the Revels.⁸⁴ Elizabeth was extremely displeased. Therefore, she arrested them both and forced them to undergo a rigorous series of examinations.⁸⁵ On August 23, 1565, Thomas was committed to the Fleet. The Warden was instructed that Thomas should not be allowed communication with any person.⁸⁶ Mary was assigned to William Hawtrey of Buckinghamshire.⁸⁷ Less than twelve months after the marriage Thomas wrote a letter to the Bishop of London, Edmond Grindall, and offered to declare

⁸²SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 286.

⁸³Strickland, pp. 164-165.

⁸⁴Thomas was a relative of Queen Elizabeth. He was related to the Knolly's whom Mary Boleyn's daughter Katherine Carey had married. Strickland, pp. 164-165.

⁸⁵SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 257.

⁸⁶APC, VII, 249.

⁸⁷SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 257.

his marriage void.⁸⁸ The Bishop's apt response had been that if his marriage were to be dissolved it "had to be done judiciously."⁸⁹

Earlier the same year, on May 14, 1565, Katherine had changed guardians and was assigned to Sir John Wentworth.⁹⁰ Her imprisonment, however, had not lessened the possibility that she would be named successor to Elizabeth. The Spanish Ambassador, Guzman De Silvas, wrote, on September 14, 1566, that the Protestants were divided, some supported the Earl of Huntingdon and others Katherine.⁹¹ In November, he wrote that the Queen's Council was trying to force Elizabeth to name a successor. At that time Mary Stuart had a great amount of support in the House of Lords, while Katherine's came from nearly a majority of the members of the House of Commons. De Silvas ended his communication with the observation that the Queen would not permit the matter to be adjusted.⁹²

Katherine and Edward had been in prison for seven years when a second succession scheme was reportedly uncovered. Following the death of the king of Scotland Robert Dudley

⁸⁸ Strickland, pp. 169-170.

⁸⁹ SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 277.

⁹⁰ SP:Rome, I, 272.

⁹¹ SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 580.

⁹² SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 597.

sent his brother, the earl of Warwick, to offer Edward the use of his services in determining the succession. When the offer was made Edward was not in a position to accept even if he so desired. Thus no agreement was reached.⁹³

While in prison Katherine suffered a severe form of depression. Her condition did not improve even when she was assigned to Sir Owen Hopton after the death of her second guardian, Sir John Wentworth.⁹⁴ Mary also changed guardians on August ninth of that year and was assigned to her step-grandmother, Katherine Dowager Duchess of Suffolk, at her home in Greenwich.⁹⁵ Katherine failed to regain her health, and she died on January 27, 1568, at the age of twenty-eight.⁹⁶ She was later buried in Salisbury Cathedral.⁹⁷

Interest in Katherine's death was expressed by the Spanish Ambassador who informed Philip II that she left two small sons between the ages of six and four. De Silvas also noted that many of the Protestants who had regarded her as a possible successor to Elizabeth were moved by her death. The Catholics, on the other hand, were pleased and at once stated that her sons were illegitimate. After

⁹³SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, I, 618-619.

⁹⁴SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 300.

⁹⁵SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 297.

⁹⁶SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 304-305.

⁹⁷Strickland, p. 158.

Katherine's death Elizabeth made a point of speaking to De Silva and expressing sorrow over her cousin's death. De Silva surmised that her grief was fictitious, for while Katherine lived Elizabeth had greatly respected and resented her potential influence. However, upon Katherine's death the Queen felt secure enough to select her own successor.⁹⁸

Although Elizabeth's position seemed more stable, she still had to contend with the illegal marriage of Lady Mary. After her sister's passing Mary's guardian was changed, and she was assigned to Sir Thomas Gresham, one of Elizabeth's staunchest supporters.⁹⁹ In September, 1571, Thomas Keyes died.¹⁰⁰ Mary then wrote to Lord Burghley and requested that she be allowed to return to the Queen's favor.¹⁰¹ A year later Elizabeth, certain that no factions were interested in Mary's claim to the throne, terminated her imprisonment. Mary lived with her mother's widower Adrian Stokes at Charter House until she died on April 20, 1578.¹⁰²

Edward was released from prison in 1570. At that time Elizabeth arranged an installment plan whereby he could pay 700 pounds a year until his debt of 10,000 pounds was paid.¹⁰³ Katherine's death and her family's

⁹⁸SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, II, 4.

⁹⁹Strickland, pp. 172-178.

¹⁰⁰Strickland, pp. 172-178.

¹⁰¹SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 425.

¹⁰²Strickland, p. 181.

¹⁰³SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, I, 310.

disgrace failed to eliminate the association of their name with the succession. On December 12, 1568, the Spanish Ambassador wrote that Secretary Cecil and the Chancellor would have liked to have had the Queen of Scotland die as they had found a new king in one of the Earl of Hertford's children.¹⁰⁴ Although the statement was fictitious, it illustrates how close Katherine's survivors still stood to the crown.

Having been released from prison Edward resumed a normal life, married twice and actively served the crown. Continuous effort to obtain legitimate status for his sons constituted the only blot on his subsequent activity as far as Elizabeth was concerned. Prior to his death on April 6, 1621, his efforts were rewarded, for he obtained legitimacy for his sons.¹⁰⁵

After Katherine's death Elizabeth invited her two sons to live at court. In 1570 DeSpes wrote that although the Queen would not declare her successor, she was bringing her cousins up in great state. He also mentioned that it had even been hinted that Secretary Cecil had suggested that

¹⁰⁴SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, II, 85.

¹⁰⁵Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar Of State Papers Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I. 1619-1623, ed. Mary A. E. Green, 12 vols. (London: Longman, Brown, Longmans, and Roberts, 1858), X, 244. Hereafter SP:Domestic; James I.

Edward be called the Duke of Somerset.¹⁰⁶ Thomas and Edward were at court for only a short time, for in 1572 they were once again living at the home of their grandmother the Duchess of Somerset.¹⁰⁷

While little likelihood remained that Katherine's children would succeed to the crown, Mary Queen of Scotland was not so confident. In a letter to the Pope, she requested his immediate assistance so that neither the Protestant Hertford or Huntingdon would usurp the crown from her when Elizabeth died.¹⁰⁸ Mary's fears were essentially correct. In October, 1572, when it was thought that Elizabeth would die from the small pox, there was some speculation that either Edward or Thomas would be proclaimed king.¹⁰⁹ When that suggestion was discussed in Parliament, objections were raised from those who opposed young Edward as his parent's marriage had been declared illegal. Two years later, when the Queen's Council vigorously debated the question of their legitimacy, two points were agreed upon; first, that Thomas and Edward were not the legal successors to the throne; and second that the privilege should go to the king of Scotland.¹¹¹ Edward was not greatly concerned and was

¹⁰⁶SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, II, 229.

¹⁰⁷SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, II, 429.

¹⁰⁸SP:Rome, I, 401.

¹⁰⁹SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, II, 429.

¹¹⁰SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, II, 393.

¹¹¹SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, II, 485.

content to have his name dropped from such serious discussion.

In June of 1582 twenty-one year old Edward followed a family tradition and married secretly. Prior to the marriage when his father first had learned of his interest in Miss Honora Rogers, he had objected to her low rank and to prevent their meeting had interned Edward in his castle. Edward later escaped; married Honora; and was then forced to go into hiding. When Elizabeth learned of the marriage, she issued warrants for his arrest. Edward remained concealed for twelve days at the end of which time he permitted himself to be taken into custody by one of his father's servants.¹¹² Edward soon wearied of his imprisonment and wrote Lord Walsingham requesting that he enlist the Queen's assistance to secure his release.¹¹³ The petition was successful, and shortly thereafter he was permitted to live with his wife.¹¹⁴

Four years passed before Elizabeth permitted Edward to serve the crown. In November of 1586 he was assigned to a force of infantry and cavalry which moved Mary Stuart from Windsor Castle to the County of Cambridge.¹¹⁵

¹¹² Lady Theresa Lewis, Lives of the Friends and Contemporaries of Lord Chancellor Clarendon, 3 vols. (London, 1852), II, p. 285.

¹¹³ SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, II, 71.

¹¹⁴ Lewis, II, p. 286.

¹¹⁵ SP:Spanish; Elizabeth, III, 641-642.

In 1592 the trust in which Edward had been held was somewhat abated. In April he boarded the fly-boat of a Captain Elliot and invited him to his home. The Captain remained with Edward for two days, and during this time goods were exchanged. The Captain gave Edward fish, cheese imported from Holland; and Edward, in turn, agreed to purchase the Captain's food supply. When news of that meeting reached the court, an investigation was conducted. In the course of the trial the master of the fly-boat, William Love, was interrogated concerning what meaning, if any, lay behind the encounter. William remembered that the Captain had wanted to take Lord Beauchamp to Spain.¹¹⁶ The fly-boat incident was the only time Edward's activities appeared suspicious.

Later rumors speculated that Edward might become king of England. Although it was sometimes hinted that Edward might be supported by Lord Burghley and his son to prevent a Scottish king from ruling in England,¹¹⁷ such talk generally was regarded as meaningless. That form of conjecture was characteristic of the age and possessed no actual substance.

From the time of his release the Earl of Hertford worked relentlessly to secure a legal decision regarding his son's status. In 1599 he offended Queen Elizabeth

¹¹⁶SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, V, 39.

¹¹⁷SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, XII, 407.

by registering their birth dates in the Court of Arches.¹¹⁸
 For that action he was committed to the Tower of London;¹¹⁹
 a year later he was released, January 3, 1600. The
 Archbishop of Canterbury was assigned as his guardian.¹²⁰

Not until the reign of James I did he establish the
 legality of his first marriage.¹²¹ In 1608 James also
 granted that the earl could recover the estates and privileges
 earlier confiscated by the crown. His son Edward further
 cleared the estate when he obtained Letters Patent which
 stated that following his father's death he was to be created
 the Earl of Hertford;¹²² and that he and his male heirs
 were to become Barons of Parliament.¹²³

Edward, older son of Katherine and Edward Seymour,
 died July 12, 1611 at the age of fifty-one.¹²⁴ Among his
 surviving children was his son William who became the 2nd
 Duke of Somerset in 1661. Edward's passing closed another

¹¹⁸ Strickland, p. 161.

¹¹⁹ SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, IV, 122.

¹²⁰ SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, IV, 159.

¹²¹ Strickland, p. 161.

¹²² SP:Domestic; James I, VII, 410.

¹²³ William Dugdale, The Baronage of England; or an Historical Account of the Lives and Most Memorable Actions of Our English Nobility: Which Had their Life, After the end of King Henry the Third's Reign. And Before the Eleventh Year of King Richard the Second, 2 vols. (London: Thomas Newcomb, 1676), II, 369.

¹²⁴ SP:Domestic; James I, IX, 138.

chapter in the life of a possible contender for the crown. Had Edward possessed a more aggressive nature and pressed his claims against James I the result might have been a different history for England.¹²⁵

Edward's younger brother Thomas was also engaged with plans to establish his family's legitimacy. On October 23, 1588, he had a notorial instrument drawn up affirming that he was a true and legitimate son of Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford and Lady Katherine Grey.¹²⁶ In the course of the next two years other notorial papers were signed attesting Thomas's legitimacy.¹²⁷ On November 16, 1591, another suit was initiated and appealed to Queen Elizabeth.¹²⁸ This case too was finally settled during the reign of James I.

In 1596 Thomas was implicated in a plot to overthrow the government. On June twelfth he accompanied Sir John Smythe to the drill at Colchester. On that particular afternoon Sir John attempted to induce the soldiers to rebel against the crown. The pikemen asked him who would be their leader. He answered that they were to follow a nobleman of the royal blood, Thomas, brother of Edward Lord Beauchamp. The men refused to fight without

¹²⁵ SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, II, 554.

¹²⁶ SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, II, 554.

¹²⁷ SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, II, 626, 694.

¹²⁸ SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, III, 121.

Sir John as their captain.¹²⁹ After Sir John had made his appeal to arms Thomas immediately left him and reported his treasonous statements to the Lord Treasurer who then promptly organized an investigation.¹³⁰ At the trial Sir John denied the use of seditious words and stated that having been intoxicated he had not been aware of the importance of his speech. Furthermore, he testified that had an insurrection been planned he would have called for one the previous day when Thomas and he were present at the muster of 600 soldiers. Attorney General Coke and the Solicitor General, Mr. Fleming, examined Thomas who recalled that Sir John had been aware of his activities.¹³¹

Cleared of his connection with Sir John Smythe, Thomas was not implicated in any similar situations. Sometime later he married, with his father's permission, Isabel, the daughter of Edward Onley of Calstly. Although Thomas was never involved in any action to disturb the peace of the realm, the same was not true for his nephew, William Seymour, who will be discussed in the next chapter.

Katherine, Mary, Edward, and Thomas all were potential contenders for the crown. They, however, held one characteristic in common with Lady Jane, a very real personal disinterest in the question of succession.

¹²⁹SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, IV, 237.

¹³⁰SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, IV, 245.

¹³¹SP:Domestic; Elizabeth, IV, 245.

CHAPTER III

THE SEYMOURS 1678-1759

William Seymour, 2nd Duke of Somerset, was born September 1, 1587. He was the grandson of Katherine and Edward Seymour and the second son of Edward Seymour, Lord Beauchamp, and his wife Honora.¹ William received his education at Oxford and enrolled in Magdalene College on April 16, 1605. Subsequently, he received his B.A. in 1607; M.A. 1636; D. Med. in 1645.² After leaving the university many of his activities closely paralleled those of his grandfather Edward, Earl of Hertford. Particularly similar was his secret marriage in March, 1610, to Arabella Stuart, the first cousin of James I.³ Since James had refused them permission to marry, the service was clandestine. James wanted to prevent the union because they were both

¹GEC, Vol. XII, Pt. I, p. 70.

²DNB, LI, p. 333.

³Arabella was the daughter of Charles Stuart, Earl of Lennox, the younger brother of Lord Darnley. Through her grandmother she was the great grand-daughter of Margaret (the elder daughter of Henry VII), by her second husband Archibald Douglas Earl of Angus. Elizabeth had feared and suspected her cousin and even had her imprisoned as there were factions who regarded her claim to the throne more valid than those of James VI of Scotland as she had been born in England.

members of the two houses nearest to the throne. Possibly they could have contended for the crown against his own heirs. The couple had agreed to respect James's orders. Arabella was forgiven and promised that she could later marry with James's consent.⁴ Actually, according to law, there was no statute to prevent her from marrying anyone she chose as Henry VIII's statute of 1547 prohibiting royal marriages without the king's consent had been repealed in 1553.⁵

Arabella and William shortly broke their word and were secretly married at Greenwich on June 22, 1610, at four o'clock in the morning.⁶ This fact was soon detected, and they were arrested and later examined on July 8, 1610, by the Privy Council.⁷ William at first denied that he had married Arabella.⁸ Later he confessed that the ceremony

⁴SP:Venice, XI, p. 439.

⁵The Statutes At Large From the First Year of King Edward the Fourth to the End of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to Which is Prefixed, A Table of the Titles of all the Publick and Private Statutes During That Time, 47 vols. (London: Henry Woodfall and William Straham, 1763), II, 261.

⁶The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine, XV (1875), pp. 202-203.

⁷Wilt. XV, p. 203.

⁸SP:Venice, XIII, p. 201.

had been performed by the son of the Dean of Rochester.⁹ Unlike her husband Arabella readily admitted her marriage; but complained continually that James had interfered with her personal affairs.¹⁰ The king was not moved by Arabella's protests and placed her under the direction of Sir Thomas Parry. William was committed to the Tower of London.¹¹ Confined in separate prisons their opportunities for release seemed remote. The Venetian Ambassador Marc Antonia Carr thought their case was unique. In a special report to the Venetian Senate he speculated that Arabella's position would have been stronger if she were pregnant. James then would not have been in a position to hinder the birth of a possible contender for the throne.¹²

Arabella remained with Sir Thomas Parry until January, 1611, when James ordered her removed to Durham. The motives behind the transfer were not immediately clear. The Venetian Ambassador theorized that James hoped to limit Arabella's appeal to dissatisfied factions by eventually exiling her from England. When the decision was reached, William's guard was intensified.¹³ Arabella's journey north

⁹Wilts, XV, p. 203.

¹⁰SP:Venice, XII, p. 19.

¹¹Ralph Winwood, Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I. Collected Chiefly from the Original Papers of the Right Honorable Sir Ralph Winwood, 3 vols. (London, 1725), III, p. 201.

¹²SP:Venice, XII, p. 19.

¹³SP:Venice, XII, p. 110.

was temporarily interrupted in February when she became too ill to move.¹⁴ The following month she had not recovered her strength and petitioned the Council for more time for recovery. By March sixteenth Arabella had sufficiently improved to move to Highgate.¹⁵ After a six day rest she continued north and arrived in Salisbury on March 21, 1611.¹⁶ On April sixth she was moved from Barnet to the home of Mr. Conyers in East Barnet.¹⁷ On the seventeenth of April Arabella had again moved to the home of Sir James Crofts in Barnet. She still remained unable to resume her journey to Durham.¹⁸

Throughout the period of their imprisonment Arabella and William were continually in touch with one another and were able to make arrangements to leave England. Two months after Arabella had arrived at Croft's home she managed to elude her keepers. In the meantime William also escaped. Clever tactics characterized both flights. William's man servant was tricked into believing that his master was going to the dentist. Arabella deceived her maid by dressing herself as a man and stating that she planned to visit her

¹⁴SP:Venice, XII, p. 114.

¹⁵SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 16.

¹⁶SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 17.

¹⁷SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 20.

¹⁸SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 24.

husband. Once they had escaped their plan had been to board a French vessel and sail for France. The scheme failed when William was unable to locate Arabella's ship. Instead he was forced to secure passage on a ship from Newcastle bound for Calais. As soon as their absence was detected a proclamation was issued forbidding any person to give them assistance. Letters requesting the arrest of the Seymours were sent to France. In the excitement connected with the escape William's twenty-one year old brother Francis was questioned. Although he claimed he had not participated, he was confined at his home.¹⁹ By the time the proclamation had been issued William was sailing toward Calais, and Arabella was marooned off of Dunkirk awaiting his arrival. Her ship was easily located, and she was taken into custody.²⁰ William was more fortunate. He landed safely in Brussels and was granted asylum at the Court of Archduke Albert.²¹ He later moved to France where he remained until January, 1616.²²

William's marriage disturbed the king's treasurer, Lord Salisbury, who commented that William could no longer

¹⁹SP:Domestic; James I, IX, pp. 38-39.

²⁰Winwood, III, pp. 279-281.

²¹Lady Theresa Lewis, Lives of the Friends and Contemporaries of Lord Chancellor Clarendon, 3 vols. (London, 1852), II, p. 330.

²²GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 70.

depend on his friendship.²³ Salisbury was not alone in his abhorrence of William's conduct, for his grandfather, the Earl of Hertford, was deeply depressed. The Earl even wrote the king's council for approval of a letter he planned to send his rebellious grandson.²⁴ The letter which was sent to the English Ambassador in France arrived on June nineteenth. The Ambassador was instructed to urge the Queen of France to order William's arrest should he seek asylum in her territory. When the Queen was approached by the ambassador, she refused to commit herself and would promise only to consider the request. James was even less successful with Archduke Albert of Belgium, for he adamantly refused to release William.²⁵ James's request was received with greater respect in the Republic of Venice. With a total of one hundred and fifty-eight votes cast, one hundred and forty-four favored aiding William's arrest; four were opposed; and ten senators remained neutral. Venetian interests rather than loyalty to England determined the vote, for a general consensus believed the republic stood to gain more from aiding the English king than opposing his policies.²⁶

²³Winwood, pp. 222-223.

²⁴SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 48.

²⁵SP:Venice, XII, p. 2171.

²⁶SP:Venice, XII, p. 186.

On the continent William's friends were generally Catholics. When his grandfather was informed of the situation, he expressed great concern for William's spiritual welfare. Consequently, he sent his former tutor, John Pelling, to protect William from the influence of Catholicism and persuade him to change his associates.²⁷

By September William was reported to have moved to Liege. Meanwhile in an interview with the Venetian Ambassador Salisbury hinted that William would be pardoned if he admitted his crimes to the king.²⁸ Twenty-five days after that confession William left Belgium for Paris. At this point the Earl of Hertford wrote Salisbury William had agreed to follow the king's demands.²⁹ Although Salisbury undoubtedly informed James of William's decision, the king was not convinced of the honesty of his declaration. Furthermore, he was indignant that William had been seen on the boulevards of Paris.³⁰ William's sojourn in Paris was brief as a shortage of funds necessitated a move to Dunkirk. His grandfather who paid all of William's expenses urged him to live within his allowance of four hundred pounds a year pleaded with him to move to Geneva where he would be protected by the company of Protestants.³¹ While the Earl

²⁷SP:Domestic; James I, IX, pp. 84, 74, 92.

²⁸SP:Venice, XII, p. 201.

²⁹SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 76.

³⁰SP:Venice, XII, p. 223.

³¹Wilts, XV, p. 204.

entreated his grandson to retain his religious convictions, he repeated efforts to reconcile William and the king.³²

During William's absence in France Arabella's health steadily declined. Finally she died on Wednesday, September 25, 1615.³³ James, who was noticeably unaffected by her death, prohibited any official mourning.³⁴ When William learned of his wife's death, he petitioned the king for forgiveness and for permission to return to England. After due deliberation the king and his council announced on January 5, 1616, that he could return to England.³⁵ William arrived in England on February tenth. On the eleventh he was granted an audience with King James.³⁶ After his pardon William studiously cultivated the king's friendship. That he was made a Knight of the Bath on November 31, 1616, demonstrates the success of the reconciliation.³⁷

William, like his grandfather, must have felt that royal marriages were not always conducive to personal happiness. He was mindful of this fact when he married Lady Frances, the oldest daughter of the Earl of Essex on March 3, 1617. William's grandfather was so delighted

³² SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 237.

³³ SP:Venice, XIV, p. 38.

³⁴ SP:Venice, XIV, p. 45.

³⁵ SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 342.

³⁶ SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 349.

³⁷ SP:Domestic; James I, IX, p. 401.

with his second choice that he gave them a wedding gift of an annual grant of 3,000 pounds.³⁸ Frances and William had nine children, five boys and four girls. Their first child, William, was born in 1621 and died in 1642. He was followed by Robert who was born in 1624 and died in 1646. Another son, Edward, died shortly after his birth; a daughter, Arabella, suffered the same fate. Other daughters were Frances, Jane and Mary. Mary later married Heanage Finch, 2nd Earl of Winchelsea, who was active in the restoration movement and selected Charles II's Portuguese wife. Frances and William's other sons were Henry, born April, 1626, and John, who later became the 4th Duke of Somerset. After his marriage William's principal interest lay in obtaining acceptance from his family and friends. By loyalty to his sovereign he sought to dispel any doubts James might still hold regarding his position in view of the succession. Correspondingly, he eagerly assumed the duties of a responsible subject and entered into an active practice of law.³⁹ When his brother Edward died in August of 1618, he was given permission to use the courtesy title of Lord Beauchamp.⁴⁰

Three years later William was elected to Parliament from Marlborough.⁴¹ He served in the Lower House only a

³⁸ SP:Domestic; James I, IX, pp. 514-515.

³⁹ GEC, XII, Pt. I, pp. 514-515, 73.

⁴⁰ DNB, LI, p. 334.

⁴¹ Commons Debate 1621, The Anonymous Journal, eds. Wallace Notestein, Frances Helen Relf, Hartley Simpson, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), VI, p. 438. Hereafter Commons Debate.

short time, for on February 18, 1621, he was summoned by the king to the House of Lords as Baron Beauchamp.⁴²

Actually he did not sit in the House of Lords until the death of his grandfather in April of 1621. In the House of Lords William served on the committee of privileges February 15, 1625, to 1626.⁴³

While William was active in the upper house his brother Francis served in the House of Commons. Francis had begun his political career in 1620 as a representative from Wiltshire.⁴⁴ The Seymours were respected for their protests against the king's abuses of power. On December 15, 1621, Francis spoke against James's claim that Parliament should refrain from questioning the war in the Palatinate. This speech so annoyed the King that he sent the Duke of Buckingham to reprove Francis.⁴⁵ Undaunted by the rebuff Francis once more challenged the king's authority. On May second he reminded the House of its privilege to judge Catholics without the king's permission. "If wee preserve not the honor and power of the house," he stated, "wee preserve not ourselves."⁴⁶ In 1624 Francis militantly urged war against Spain. At the same

⁴²Commons Debate, VI, p. 446.

⁴³DNB, LI, p. 334.

⁴⁴DNB, LI, pp. 317-318.

⁴⁵Commons Debate, II, p. 522.

⁴⁶Commons Debates, V, p. 363.

time he urged a curtailment of the costly continental military expeditions.⁴⁷ Along with his Parliamentary responsibilities he was commissioned by the king to collect debts in Wiltshire. In 1625 he was returned as MP from that shire. Following this election he often expressed his thoughts on official policy. On July thirtieth he objected vehemently to Charles I's requests for increased subsidies for the Spanish war. Instead he urged a ninety per cent reduction in the amount proposed. Charles observed Francis's influence and commissioned the Duke of Buckingham to negotiate a compromise with him. Francis, however, could not be intimidated and refused to alter his position.⁴⁹ On August tenth he again criticized the government for extending the war on the continent. He also objected to the policy of selling court positions and the embezzling of public funds. Due in part to his orations the House did not increase the king's request for supplies. Subsequently, Charles dissolved Parliament on the twelfth of August.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ DNB, LI, pp. 317-318.

⁴⁸ SP:Domestic; James I, XI, p. 276.

⁴⁹ DNB, LI, pp. 317-318.

⁵⁰ The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England from the Earliest Times to the Restoration of King Charles II, ed. W. M. Sandby, 2nd ed., 24 vols. (London: J. and R. Tonson, and A. Millar, 1763), VI, p. 400. Hereafter Parliamentary History.

Francis probably was present at Charles I's coronation, but William was given the honor of carrying the Staff of St. Edward.⁵¹ That same month Francis was re-elected to Parliament. However, Charles, having determined that he was not to debate in the session, commissioned him as a sheriff from Wiltshire. The succeeding year Francis was again elected to Parliament as a representative from Wiltshire and Marlborough.⁵² On March twenty-second he spoke in defense of the men who had refused to pay benevolences and was arrested and refused a writ of habeas corpus. He urged the Commons to give King Charles honest counsel:

He is no good subject but a slave, that will let his goods be taken from him against his will, and his liberty, against the laws of the kingdom. In doing this we shall but tread the steps of our fore-fathers, who still preferred the public interest before their own right, nay before their own lives. It will be a wrong to us, to our posterities to our consciences, if we shall forgo this.⁵³

In April Francis joined with other MP's in efforts to modify the Commons law of liberties and supported Thomas Wentworth's proposal for a bill of Habeas Corpus.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Sir Simonds D'Ewes, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simon D'Ewes, Bart., During the Reigns of James I and Charles I., ed. James Orchard Halliwell, 3 vols. (London: Richard Bentley, 1845), II, pp. 174-175.

⁵² DNB, LI, pp. 317-318.

⁵³ Parliamentary History, VII, p. 363.

⁵⁴ DNB, LI, pp. 317-318.

The next year, on January 27, 1628, Francis declared himself in favor of greater protection for the Protestant faith and expressed concern should the king continue to give encouragement to the Papists.⁵⁵ On April second Francis objected to Charles's additional request for supplies, for he thought that the war was not being conducted honestly. He said, "It is not then what the subjects do give, unless his Majesty employ men of integrity and experience to disburse; otherwise all that we give will be cast into a Bottomless Bog."⁵⁶ While Francis was berating the king in Parliament, William was appointed assistant to the commissioners who were to conduct the disafforestation (the reduction of a forest to the status of ordinary land) of Roche and Selwood Forests.⁵⁷ Sir Francis continually championed the rights of abused Englishmen. In February, 1630, he wrote a letter of protest to Secretary Coke in which he denounced the policy which permitted saltpetre men to dig wherever they chose. If such conduct were left unchecked, the laws would be completely undermined. For evidence he cited an instance where Englishmen were forced to carry the saltpetre at a groat (fourpence) a mile and had their carriages confiscated during the harvest and planting seasons. Francis suggested that this method be

⁵⁵Parliamentary History, VIII, p. 263.

⁵⁶Parliamentary History, VII, p. 398.

⁵⁷SP:Domestic; Charles I, III, p. 223.

altered to check the strain between the country people and the commons which tended to increase while such policies were condoned.⁵⁸

Although their stands could have jeopardized their personal positions, William and Francis continued to oppose the king's arbitrary measures. Charles, however, did not regard them as contenders for the crown. Therefore, he did not harass them as he might have done on many occasions. For example, William broke the law by engaging in a duel on May 26, 1636. The event which provoked the duel occurred when Mr. Brooke, one of William's men, stepped between a Mr. Undall and another man who was watching a tennis match. The men were extremely annoyed and made a number of unpleasant comments. Then Mr. Undall struck Brooke with his cane. Brooke returned the blow and broke Undall's skin. Arrangements were made for a duel, and Brooke stated that he could be contacted at the home of Lord Beauchamp. Mr. Undall then made a number of unfavorable comments about William.⁵⁹ When William learned of Undall's language, he immediately went to the tennis courts and arranged for a duel to be fought between himself and Undall in Marybone Park. The men fought two rounds. During the second, William knocked Undall down. The keeper of the park fortunately intervened and ordered the men to lay down their

⁵⁸SP:Domestic; Charles I, IV, p. 188.

⁵⁹SP:Domestic; Charles I, XXIII, p. 532.

swords.⁶⁰ The accounts terminates with the cessation of the dueling. No mention was made again to this violation of the law which could have ruined William's public career.

Charles was not disturbed by William's breach of the law, for the next year he gave him the responsibility of escorting the newly appointed French Ambassador, Bellievre, to his first audience with the king. That occasion was vividly recorded by the Venetian Secretary, Francesca Zonca. When Bellievre was notified who was to serve as his escort, he objected as William was not a Knight of the Order of the Garter. However, when he later was informed that members of the Garter only accompanied ambassadors with the corresponding rank of cavalier he was mollified. Notwithstanding the ambassador's earlier trepidations the event was particularly noteworthy because of the number of citizen soldiers who guarded the streets of London in his honor.⁶¹

William retained the king's support. In January, 1639, he was given the position of Groom of the Stole.⁶²

⁶⁰Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on Manuscripts In Various Collection, 8 vols. (London: The Hereford Times Limited, 1914), VII, p. 415.

⁶¹SP:Venice, XXIV, p. 338.

⁶²William Dugdale, The Life and Correspondence of Sir William Dugdale, Knight. Sometime Garter Principal King of Arms. With an Appendix. Containing an Account of His Published Works, an Index to His Manuscript Collections, Copies of Monumental Inscriptions to the Memory of the Dugdale Family, and Heraldic Grants and Pedigrees, ed. William Hamper (London: Harding, Lepard, and Co., 1827), p. 59.

On May 29, 1639, he received a commmssion as lord lieutenant of the county of Somerset and was held responsible for the cities of Bristol, Bath, and Wells.⁶³ The same month the king proceeded north to quell the First Bishop's War. William was not eager to accompany Charles and paid 1,000 pounds to avoid active participation in the northern war.⁶⁴ Although this payment secured his release, William was still obligated to participate in the defense of the realm. Hence, when Charles arrived in the north, he directed Secretary Windebanks to inform William of the army's progress and request that he support the king by eliciting assistance from other influential subjects.⁶⁵ While William was collecting revenue, his brother Francis refused to aid the king. On May twenty-fourth Secretary Windebank explained the situation to Charles. Although many had opposed collection of ship money, Francis Seymour offered the most objection and refused to contribute.⁶⁶

Although basically sympathetic to the institution of the monarchy because of their own royal descent, both William and Francis continued to sympathize with the cause of Parliament. In March of 1640 Francis was elected without opposition as kinght of the Shire from Wilts to the

⁶³SP:Domestic; Charles I, XIII, p. 596.

⁶⁴SP:Domestic; Charles I, XXIII, p. 605.

⁶⁵SP:Domestic; Charles I, XIV, pp. 7, 83.

⁶⁶Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers, eds.

Rev. O. Ogle and W. H. Bliss, 3 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1872), I, p. 46. Hereafter Clarendon.

Short Parliament.⁶⁷ By April he had returned to his annual topic of economic grievances and criticized the government for negligence.⁶⁸ William also actively denounced the king's policies. He was one of the twelve English lords who petitioned Charles to reconvene Parliament, cease his support of Catholicism, take greater concern for his own person, and answer Parliament's demands.⁶⁹ A month later Francis was appointed to a committee which originated plans to evacuate the Scots from England.⁷⁰ William also served Parliament in another capacity. In October he was selected on a committee of seventeen nobles to negotiate the treaty of Ripon with the Scots.⁷¹ Whereas he did not actively participate in the conference,⁷² he was among those members chosen to report the terms requested by the Scots to the King and to the House of Lords.⁷³ After the Short Parliament was dissolved Francis was re-elected in November to the Long Parliament.⁷⁴ In the following year Charles sought to

⁶⁷SP:Domestic; Charles I, XV, p. 604.

⁶⁸DNB, LX, p. 317.

⁶⁹SP:Domestic; Charles I, XVI, pp. 639-640.

⁷⁰SP:Domestic; Charles I, XVII, p. 69.

⁷¹Hist. MSS:Various Collection, VII, p. 425.

⁷²Notes of the Treaty Carried on At Ripon Between King Charles I and the Covenanters of Scotland, A.D. 1640, ed. John Bruce (Westminster: J. B. Nichols and Sons, 1869), p. 2.

⁷³SP:Domestic; Charles I, XVII, p. 175.

⁷⁴DNB, LI, pp. 317-318.

win Francis's and William's support for his policies. On February 19, 1641, Francis became Lord Seymour of Trowbridge.⁷⁵ On June third William was made Marquis of Hertford.⁷⁶

Neither of the brothers was completely reconciled by the king's honors. On March 1, 1641, William, accompanied by five other lords, petitioned Charles to sign a bill which would authorize a triennial meeting of Parliament. They included a demand that, should the king refuse to summon Parliament, the nation would be alerted. At first Charles refused to comply. Not until Parliament had exerted intense pressure did he accept the terms.⁷⁷ Shortly after he made the concession Charles, determined to nullify the positions of the men who had opposed him most violently, appointed them to the Privy Council. William was included in the group of seven new privy councillors.⁷⁸ When the appointments were made, it was generally acknowledged that the nomination of liberal minded men did not assure their policies of consideration. Most state decisions were handled by a group of the king's favorites.⁷⁹

⁷⁵Dugdales, II, p. 39.

⁷⁶DNB, LI, p. 71.

⁷⁷SP:Venice, XXV, pp. 126-127, 162.

⁷⁸SP:Venice, XXV, p. 128.

⁷⁹Samuel Gardiner, History of England From the Accession of James I. To the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642. 10 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1899), IX, p. 293.

In conjunction with his appointment as a privy councillor William was given other responsibilities. He served as one of the commissioners for the Regency during the time Charles was absent in the north in 1641.⁸⁰ Not only was he responsible for governing the country but also he was the Governor and Master of the Prince of Wales's household. William had received that position after Charles's former guardian, the Earl of Newcastle, had been implicated for intriguing against Parliament. The appointment particularly interested the Venetian Ambassador, Giovanni Guistinis, due to William's blood relationship to King Charles and his extreme popularity throughout England.⁸¹ Sometime after William had become the Prince's governor members of Parliament became fearful over the failure to shield Prince Charles from Catholic influences. Evidence was given that Charles was a frequent visitor to his mother's home at Oatlands. At such times he was invariably separated from the Marquis of Hertford, for the Queen made no provisions for him in her household. Furthermore, Mr. Pym stated that the danger of the Prince being connected to Catholicism came not only from the Queen but also from members of her household. He then proposed a joint meeting of both houses of Parliament for a thorough discussion of the situation.⁸²

⁸⁰SP:Domestic; Charles I, XVIII, pp. 80-81.

⁸¹SP:Venice, XXV, p. 172.

⁸²D'Ewes, pp. 58-60; 69-71.

When the Houses convened on Saturday, October 30, 1641, they agreed that Lord Hertford should prevent the Prince from associating with individuals whose Protestantism was suspect.⁸³ They also decided to inform the Queen of their decision and assure her that it was not meant as a personal affront.⁸⁴ To insure that their demands were followed, William received warnings from Parliament. If he did not follow their directives to keep the Prince in his company, he would be forced to account for his negligence.⁸⁵

Throughout the period of dissension between king and parliament William and Francis's opposition to the king was readily apparent. William, however, was finally induced to desert parliament when it increased demands that he undertake to prevent Prince Charles from leaving the country. William's answer on May 3, 1642, was that Prince Charles had pledged not to travel further than his father. He refused to extend his authority beyond that covenant.⁸⁶ Following this stand William continued to disagree with the king. However, loyalty to both the crown and family honor required that he and Francis support King Charles. Thus, on June 30, 1642, together with the Duke of Richmond, the

⁸³SP:Domestic; Charles I, XVIII, p. 148.

⁸⁴D'Ewes, p. 60.

⁸⁵Parliamentary History, X, p. 24.

⁸⁶Parliamentary History, X, p. 492.

Earls of Lindley, Cumberland, Huntingdon and Bath they declared their allegiance to the crown. Moreover, they declared themselves unwilling to accept decrees opposed to the laws and asserted their readiness to defend the king, his crown, and the true Protestant religion.⁸⁷ William and Francis immediately demonstrated their adherence to the king by contributing for the maintenance of his horse at two shillings six pence per day for a period of three months.⁸⁸ In recognition of William's support the king appointed him Lieutenant General for the Western counties of England: Monmouthshire, Herefordshire, and six counties in the South of Wales.⁸⁹

The military commissions given to William and other supporters of King Charles incensed the Constables of the hundreds of Somersetshire who protested that any seizure of ammunition and property by the king's commissioners was illegal and opposed to safeguards in the Magna Carta and the Petition of Right.⁹⁰ These accusations were answered

⁸⁷ Historical Manuscripts Collections, John Rushworth, Historical Collections. The Third Part in Two Volumes Containing the Principal Matters Which Happened from the Meeting of Parliament, November the 3rd. 1640 to the End of the Year 1644. Wherein is a Particular Account of Rife and Progress of the Civil War to that Period: Impartially Related. Setting forth only Matter of fact in Order of Time Without Observation or Reflection, 2 vols. (London: 1952), I, Pt. III, p. 627.

⁸⁸ SP:Domestic; Charles I, XVIII, p. 344.

⁸⁹ John Roland Phillips, Memoirs of the Civil War In Wales and the Marches 1642-1649. 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1874), II, p. 100.

⁹⁰ SP:Domestic; Charles I, XVIII, p. 370.

by William, Francis, and sixteen other commissioners in the Western Remonstrance. The document specified that the king had not given the constables any commission or injunction to contend against his subjects by destroying arms, goods, or by participating in any activity which would infringe upon English rights, or the laws of Parliament.⁹¹ The declaration failed to appease Parliament. On August 13, 1642, William was accused of high treason and of having caused war against king and the kingdom. He was commanded to appear at the bar of the House of Lords on August twenty-ninth to answer for his misconduct.⁹² Francis was also impeached for high treason on September 17, 1642. The sentence, however, was not recorded in the Journal of the House of Commons.⁹³ The decrees officially branded William and Francis members of the Royalist forces. On August seventh William established his military headquarters at Sherborne Castle in Somerset where he remained until the surrender of Portsmouth.⁹⁴

One of William's principal responsibilities was to recruit troops in Somerset. The recruitment proceeded

⁹¹Historical Manuscripts, Third Report of the Royal Commission (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1872), p. 85.

⁹²Parliamentary History, XI, p. 371.

⁹³Parliamentary History, XI, p. 425.

⁹⁴GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 71.

smoothly until Parliamentary tactics so annoyed the Royalists that one of the Parliamentary leaders, William Strode, was arrested. This action goaded the parliamentarians into battle⁹⁵ and they successfully attacked William's forces and drove him out of Wells.⁹⁶ William then retreated to Sherborne in Dorset where on the second and third of August he again engaged in battle. The opposing army withdrew on the sixth of August and terminated the conflict.⁹⁷ At the time the Venetian State Papers were filled with admiration for William and noted that, in spite of his age, fifty-four, he was particularly ambitious to defend the house of Stuart, even though its downfall would leave him as one of the more prominent claimants to the crown.⁹⁸ In September the Earl of Bedford's forces ceased fighting, and William determined to move his troops to Wales.⁹⁹ He withdrew to Minehead and sailed to Cardiff in September.¹⁰⁰ While in Wales William's success in recruiting Welsh mountaineers became legendary, and the Parliamentary commanders were discouraged at the thought of securing volunteers. The propaganda used against the

⁹⁵ SP:Venice, XXVI, pp. 129-130.

⁹⁶ DNB, LI, p. 334.

⁹⁷ SP:Venice, XXVI, p. 161.

⁹⁸ SP:Venice, XXVI, p. 162.

⁹⁹ SP:Venice, XXVI, p. 154.

¹⁰⁰ DNB, LI, p. 334.

unsuspecting Welsh had been the key to their success, for the Welsh were informed that in the summer soldiers in England wore shoes and socks and in the winter went bare-foot.¹⁰¹ William's additional exploits during the civil war involved a defeat on the plains of Tewkesbury. On that particular occasion William led the initial charge at the head of five hundred mounted men. Sir Francis commanded the Welsh Foot and had his horse shot from under him during the course of the battle. After the defeat at Tewkesbury William retreated into Wales. From there in January, 1643, he joined the king at Oxford and participated in the capture of Taunton and Bristol. After that campaign he remained with the king. William was given no additional command and returned from Bristol to Oxford.¹⁰²

The abrupt change in William's position from a lieutenant general to court follower was remedied when on October 3, 1643, the king appointed him Chancellor of Oxford University. The decision to remove William was expedient, for his campaigns had not been overwhelmingly successful.¹⁰³ William was officially installed as Chancellor on the fifth of November.¹⁰⁴ A year later on

¹⁰¹Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, 11 vols. (London, 1867), II, p. 24.

¹⁰²GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 71.

¹⁰³GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 71.

¹⁰⁴Dugdale, p. 55.

January 21, 1644, Charles appointed him Groom of the Stole.¹⁰⁵ William's service in non-military capacities was sought continually. On January thirtieth he and Francis served as king's commissioners at the conference at Uxbridge. No agreement was reached with Parliament, and on the twenty-second of February the negotiations were closed.¹⁰⁶ When Charles moved to the north in May, 1645, he designated William, Francis, the Prince of Wales, and James Duke of York to participate as members of a council to protect the city of Oxford, the University of Oxford, the counties of Oxford, Berkshire and Bucks and the garrison within each locality.¹⁰⁷

A year later William must have lost faith in the Royalist cause, for on June 24, 1646, along with Francis and the other commissioners he signed the articles of surrender for the garrison of Oxford. Forces commanded by General Thomas Fairfax then occupied the city.¹⁰⁸ William was fined 12,603 pounds 6 shillings and 7 pence for his opposition to Parliament and the sum was later commuted to 8,345 pounds.¹⁰⁹ Francis was also bound to

¹⁰⁵ SP:Domestic; Charles I, XVIII, p. 11.

¹⁰⁶ Historical Manuscripts, Seventh Report (London, 1879), Pt. I, p. 473.

¹⁰⁷ SP:Domestic; Charles I, XX, p. 464.

¹⁰⁸ Rushworth, I, Pr. IV, p. 280.

¹⁰⁹ GEC, XII, Pt. I, pp. 72-73.

pay Parliament 3,725 pounds.¹¹⁰ On August 3, 1645, Parliament decided that the Chancellorship of the University of Oxford had been given illegally to the Marquis of Hertford and returned it to the Earl of Pembroke.¹¹¹ Some months later King Charles surrendered to the Scots and was ultimately transferred to Parliament. Charles was permitted few visitors, and it was a particularly noteworthy event when in October of 1647 Parliament considered and granted his request to speak with the Marquis of Hertford, the Marquis of Ormond, the Earl of Southampton, and the Duke of Richmond.¹¹²

On June 28, 1648, William's son Henry Seymour, Lord Beauchamp, married Mary Capell, the daughter of the Royalist leader Baron Capell of Hadham and his wife Lady Elizabeth.¹¹³ In September William was involved in more weighty matters when he met with representatives at Newport to arrange terms for a trial for King Charles; Charles refused those offered.¹¹⁴ The king's resistance to Parliament's demands decreased the likelihood of his

¹¹⁰DNB, LI, p. 318.

¹¹¹Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1600, eds., C. H. Firth, and R. S. Rait (London: Wyman and Sons, Limited, 1911), pp. 995-996.

¹¹²Clarendon, I, p. 393.

¹¹³GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 74.

¹¹⁴GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 71.

pardon. In January, 1649, Lord Craven wrote to Prince Rupert that he thought the only possibility open to secure his release depended upon the testimony of the Marquis of Hertford and others of his supporters called to justify his arbitrary rule.¹¹⁵ Lord Craven recognized that there was slight hope for such expectations, and his fears were realized when Charles was executed. On February 12, 1649, William and three other peers attended the king's funeral service at Windsor Castle.¹¹⁶ Following the execution William was ordered to remain at his home at Netley in Hampshire. Ultimately he was permitted to travel without restrictions.¹¹⁷ Francis in some ways was treated with more leniency, for during the Protectorate members of the House of Commons endeavored to clear him and his son, Charles, for their support of the Royalist cause. A bill to clear Francis which was passed by the House met defeat in the House of Lords on January 18, 1648.¹¹⁸

The death of King Charles failed to destroy Royalist aspirations. In November, 1649, Charles's former Ambassador to Venice, Sir Gilbert Talbot, urged the exiled Charles II

¹¹⁵Historical Manuscripts Commission, Fifteen Report, The Manuscripts of J. Eliot Hodgkin ESQ., F.S.A., of Richmond, Surrey (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1897), Appendix, Pt. II, pp. 110-111.

¹¹⁶GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 72.

¹¹⁷DNB, LI, pp. 334-335.

¹¹⁸Hist. MSS Comm. Seventh Report, p. 2.

to organize a committee of prominent Royalist residents in England who were in a position to prepare plans for an uprising against the Protectorate. Richmond, Southampton, and Hertford were suggested by Talbot, but they all declined further active involvement.¹¹⁹ Although William refused to cooperate, Charles appointed him Lieutenant General for England.¹²⁰ While William was not eager to engage in a conspiracy, his son Henry was less hesitant and became one of Charles's most able supporters.¹²¹ In March, 1650, Henry moved his family to his father's home at Netley where his father thought that they would be relatively secure.¹²² Possibly Henry had been influenced to leave London by certain rumors which had accurately reported his appointment in February as General of the Horse in the West.¹²³ Henry's first act as General of the Horse was to contact commissioners in each county and determine their willingness to support the Royalist cause. At the conclusion of his mission he was unimpressed with his findings and reported to his uncle, Henry Seymour, that the Commissioners were not prepared to signify support for the king unless they had the assurance

¹¹⁹David Underdown, Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649-1660 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 20.

¹²⁰Underdown, p. 29.

¹²¹Underdown, p. 31.

¹²²Hist. MSS Comm. Fifteenth Report, p. 156.

¹²³GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 74.

of assistance from a minimum of two thousand men. Though Henry agreed with the commissioners, he was confident that their hesitation would be reduced if, prior to his restoration, Charles guaranteed that a ban would be placed on penal statutes.¹²⁴ In answer to Henry's demands the exiled Charles wrote the Prince of Orange and requested that he send two thousand men to Torbay. Without additional assistance there would be no uprising as the Scots could not be relied upon for aid.¹²⁵

After this last communication Henry's participation in the Royalist conspiracy is surrounded by secrecy. Much of the available information was supplied by informers. One such agent was Thomas Coke who was arrested in April of 1651. Coke testified that Henry was one of the Royalist leaders.¹²⁶ That information provided the basis for Henry's arrest on April fourteenth, and his subsequent internment in the Tower of London.¹²⁷ Henry's confinement was a matter

¹²⁴The Nicholas Papers, Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State 1641-1652, ed. George F. Warner, 4 vols. (Westminster: Nichols and Sons, 1869), I, pp. 178-80.

¹²⁵Clarendon, II, p. 71.

¹²⁶Historical Manuscripts Commission, Thirteenth Report, The Manuscripts of J. B. Fortescue Esq., Preserved at Droghmore, 10 vols. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1892), Pt. I, Appendix, p. 379; 583.

¹²⁷Historical Manuscripts Commission, Fourteenth Report, The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey, 10 vols. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894), III, p. 194.

of grave concern to his family and for Royalist ambitions.¹²⁸ Months passed before he was permitted to receive a letter from his father. In a note written on June 15, 1651, the Marquis noted his satisfaction at reports that Henry's health had not been seriously impaired. He added the well known statement, "It seems it [the Tower] is a place entailed upon our famylie, for wee have now helde it five generations,¹²⁹ yeat toe speake the truth I like not the place soe well but that I coulde be very well contented the entayle should be cutt off and settled upon some other familie that better deserves it."¹³⁰ Henry remained in good health until July at which time his doctors Welderbaine, and Paggot testified that it was necessary that he leave the Tower to take the waters at Epsham. The terms of his parole included posting a bond of 10,000 pounds and 5,000 pounds for security. Henry also had to agree not to participate in Royalist activities and to return immediately if the Council determined it was necessary for the safety of the kingdom. Henry was at Epsham fourteen days when he was recalled. No reason was advanced for the order. On the ninth of

¹²⁸GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 74.

¹²⁹1. Edward Seymour, Lord Protector, 2. Lady Jane Grey, 3. Henry Marquis of Gray, 4. Katherine and Edward Seymour, 5. Edward and Thomas Seymour born in the Tower, 6. William Marquis of Hertford, 7. Henry Lord Beauchamp.

¹³⁰Historical Manuscripts Commission. Twelfth Report, The Manuscripts of the Duke of Beaufort, K. G., the Earl of Donoughmore and Others (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1891), Appendix, Pt. IX, p. 48.

September he was again permitted to go to Epsham.¹³¹

Charles was not unappreciative of Henry's service and wrote him a letter of gratitude in which he commended his loyalty and expressed confidence that their ambitions would be realized.¹³² A year later on March 1, 1654, Charles wrote again and sympathized over his continued poor health. His concern was so great that a special agent was assigned to keep a constant watch on Henry and send him regular reports. The exiled king also cautioned Henry, against melancholy, a condition which he studiously avoided.¹³³ No amount of cautious pampering permitted Henry to regain his health, and he died on March 15, 1655, at Tilsay at the age of twenty-seven.¹³⁴ When the Royalists were informed of Henry's death, many were gravely alarmed; for they feared that without his guidance it would be extremely difficult to reorganize the troops in the West.¹³⁵ Though some doubted the success of their cause, they presumed that the Marquis of Hertford would undertake Henry's responsibilities.¹³⁶

¹³¹Hist. MSS Comm. Twelfth Report, Pt. I, p. 48.

¹³²Clarendon, II, p. 167.

¹³³Hist. MM Comm. Twelfth Report, Pt. I, p. 48.

¹³⁴GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 74.

¹³⁵Clarendon, II, p. 350.

¹³⁶Nicholas Papers, II, p. 66.

The exiled Charles was stunned by Henry's death. In a letter to Lady Beauchamp he expressed his sympathy for their joint loss. Charles vowed that the debt of gratitude he owed her family would not be neglected. Moreover, the king wrote to Henry's mother-in-law, Lady Capel,¹³⁷ and to his own parents. In that letter he assured William that he would continue to support his family. Having given that guarantee he reminded the Marquis that he would not be in a position to carry through his commitments until after his restoration. However, should William die before that time, he pledged that he would execute any of his requests. To ensure their execution he signed a duplicate set of papers.¹³⁸

Although grief and infirmity possibly could have deterred William from taking an active interest in the conspiracy, he refused to submit to such natural excuses. In 1657 William, along with Colonel Popham, Mr. Morgan, and Major Hopton, was engaged in a project to recruit six thousand men.¹³⁹ Additional substance was given to William's participation in the royal cause from the testimony of George Hutchinson before major-general William Gaffe in the city of Winchester on April 27, 1658. At the time

¹³⁷Hist. MSS Comm. Twelfth Report, Pt. IX, pp. 48-49.

¹³⁸Clarendon, II, pp. 359-360.

¹³⁹Clarendon, III, p. 315.

of his inquiry Hutchinson stated that William was to become "the generalissimo" of Charles Stuart's party in England. His son-in-law, the Earl of Winchelsea, was to be a general in Kent.¹⁴⁰ Two years later Charles II was restored to the throne of England, and William was rewarded for his many services by reappointment as Chancellor of Oxford University. The House of Lords approved his appointment on the twenty-sixth of May,¹⁴¹ and the College accepted him formally on the sixth of June.¹⁴² The day after William had been received as Chancellor the king conferred the Order of St. George upon him.¹⁴³ Francis was also honored for his loyalty to the Stuarts and was re-instated as Chancellor of the Ducey of Lancaster.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe Esq.; Secretary First, to the Council of State and Afterwards to the Two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell, 7 vols. (London: Thomas Woodward and Charles Davis, 1742), VII, p. 98.

¹⁴¹Calendar of the Journal of the House of Lords From the Beginning of the Reign of King Henry VIII to 30th August 1642; and from the Restoration in 1660, to 21st January 1808 (London: George Eyre and A. Straham, 1810), p. 214.

¹⁴²White Kennet, A Register and Chronicle Ecclesiastical and Civil: Containing Matters of Fact, Delivered in the Words of the Most Authentick Books, Papers, and Records; Digested in Exact Order of Time. With the Proper Notes and References Towards Discovering and Connecting the True History of England, From the Restauration of King Charles II (London: R. Williamsons, 1728), pp. 161, 141, 153.

¹⁴³Kennet, p. 162.

¹⁴⁴SP:Domestic; Charles II, p. 457.

The succeeding month William was appointed Gentleman of the Bedchamber to Charles II.¹⁴⁵

William's position was now more secure than in many years, and he petitioned the king to restore to his family the title of Duke of Somerset.¹⁴⁶ Parliament deprived them of this honor during the reign of King Edward VI.¹⁴⁷ Charles eventually granted William's request. In September the king addressed Parliament and asked them to support an "extraordinary bill." He stated that the title had been re-established because of the services the Seymours had performed both for himself and for his father.¹⁴⁸ On September 13, 1660, William was restored as Duke of Somerset and Baron Seymour. The viscounty of Beauchamp and the Earldom of Hertford were not restored and remained under attainder.¹⁴⁹ Shortly after he had regained his title William's health declined. On October 24, 1660, he died at the age of seventy-three from a "general decay of nature."¹⁵⁰ William was a remarkable man. Although

¹⁴⁵GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 72.

¹⁴⁶SP:Venice, XXXII, p. 190.

¹⁴⁷Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest to the Present Time, 23 vols. (London: T. C. Hansard, 1809), I, pp. 526-528.

¹⁴⁸Kennet, pp. 255-256.

¹⁴⁹GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 72.

¹⁵⁰SP:Domestic; Charles II, I, p. 324.

placed by birth in positions of authority he never abused his privileges or called attention to his royal ancestry. He was recognized as a moderate who sought to maintain England's security within the framework of the law. Francis died four years later on July 12, 1664, and was buried in the Chancel of Bedwyn Magna Church.¹⁵¹ He should be remembered for his spirited eloquence in Parliament on behalf of the Constitutional rights of all Englishmen. Both brothers were sincere patriots who steadfastly refrained from re-enacting the drama of Lady Jane's nine days as queen.

After William's death the dukedom was inherited by his grandson William, son of Henry Lord Beauchamp.¹⁵² William died in 1671 at the age of nineteen at his stepfather's (the Duke of Beaufort) home in London. He was survived by one sister, Elizabeth, who married Thomas (Bruce) 2nd Earl of Ailesbury on August 31, 1676. It is through her that the Tudor strain of the Princess Mary is represented at the present time.¹⁵³ Following William's death the dukedom was inherited by his uncle Lord John Seymour, the fifth son of the 2nd Duke of Somerset. Prior to 1671 John had been mildly interested in politics and in 1660 ran for Parliament from Marlborough. He was victorious in spite

¹⁵¹DNB, LI, p. 318.

¹⁵²Hist. MSS Comm. Seventh Report, Pt. I, pp. 138-39.

¹⁵³GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 75.

of spirited opposition.¹⁵⁴ The next year John married Sarah, widow of George Grimston, and the daughter of Sir Edward Alston M.D. President of the College of Physicians.¹⁵⁵

John's interest in politics led to his appointment in August, 1672, as Lord Lieutenant of Wiltshire.¹⁵⁶

Five years later he was commissioned to serve as game warden for Wiltshire.¹⁵⁷ The Duke's marriage was not satisfactory, and after eleven years he and his wife agreed to separate.¹⁵⁸ Throughout the time preceding the separation and afterwards John was occupied with his responsibilities as Lord Lieutenant of Somersetshire.¹⁵⁹ On August 26, 1674, Charles II commended him for his careful inspection of the militia money and for having uncovered a discrepancy in the accounts. Because of the disclosure he was given authority to prosecute the receiver.¹⁶⁰ A year later, on April twenty-ninth, John died at his home in Amesbury Wiltshire and was buried

¹⁵⁴Hist. MSS Comm. Fifteenth Report, Pt. VII, p. 162.

¹⁵⁵GEC, XII, Pt. I, pp. 75-76.

¹⁵⁶SP:Domestic; Charles II, XII, p. 460.

¹⁵⁷SP:Domestic; Charles II, XII, p. 662.

¹⁵⁸Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings, Esq. of the Manor House, Ashby-De-La-Zouche, ed. Francis Bickley, 4 vols. (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1930), II, p. 159.

¹⁵⁹SP:Domestic; Charles II, XIV, p. 232.

¹⁶⁰SP:Domestic; Charles II, XVI, p. 342.

on the tenth of June in Salisbury Cathedral.¹⁶¹ After his death there was some speculation that a second will had been composed which would have prevented Lady Elizabeth Seymour, sister of the 3rd Duke William, from her inheritance. Such conjecture was fallacious, and the will was cleared without question. The Dukedom then reverted to Francis, Lord Trowbridge, the fourth and only surviving son of Charles Seymour, 2nd Baron of Trowbridge, grandson of Francis Seymour.¹⁶²

Francis was educated at Eton and is listed in the Eton College Register as having enrolled in Eton and Harrow Colleges.¹⁶³ In 1678 he traveled to Italy. While in the town of Leric in the Republic of Genoa he insulted the wife of a Genoese nobleman Horatio Botti. Botti was so incensed that he shot at Francis from a window as he was leaving his inn and mortally wounded him.¹⁶⁴ His body was returned to England on the ship Newcastle, and on October 15, 1678, he was buried at Great Bedwyn in the County of Wiltshire.¹⁶⁵ Francis was survived by his brother Charles who became the 6th Duke of Somerset.

¹⁶¹ GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 75.

¹⁶² Hist. MSS Comm. Fifteenth Report, Pt. XVII, p. 176.

¹⁶³ Wasey Sterry, The Eton College Register 1441-1698 (Eton: Spottiswoode, Ballantyne and Co. Ltd., 1943), p. 301.

¹⁶⁴ GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 77.

¹⁶⁵ SP:Domestic; Charles II, XX, p. 395.

Charles was born August 13, 1662, and received his education at Harrow and Trinity Colleges Cambridge.¹⁶⁶ When he was twenty he married Elizabeth, Countess of Ogle,¹⁶⁷ the sixteen year old widow of Thomas Thynne. Her father was Joceline (Percy), Earl of Northumberland, and her mother was Lady Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton.¹⁶⁸ Six months after their marriage Charles was commissioned as a lieutenant of East Riding Yorkshire.¹⁶⁹ Charles and Elizabeth's first child was born the next year in March.¹⁷⁰ Unfortunately he died less than six months later.¹⁷¹ After his death the Duke and Duchess of Somerset had eight other children, four boys and four girls. In June of 1683 a plot was uncovered which hinted that the Whigs planned to assassinate the king. Therefore, Charles was ordered to be prepared to protect the king at any time.¹⁷²

The following year Charles was elected to the Order of the Garter and was initiated into the order on April 7, 1684.¹⁷³ Charles II died on February 7, 1685,¹⁷⁴ and the

¹⁶⁶GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 77.

¹⁶⁷Hist. MSS Comm. Seventh Report, p. 353.

¹⁶⁸GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 78.

¹⁶⁹SP:Domestic; Charles II, XXIII, pp. 533-534.

¹⁷⁰Hist. MSS Comm. Seventh Report, p. 351.

¹⁷¹GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 79.

¹⁷²Hist. MSS Comm. Third Report, p. 96.

¹⁷³Hist. MSS Comm. Third Report, p. 96.

¹⁷⁴Hist. MSS. Comm. Third Report, p. 96.

Duke of Somerset served as one of the mourners at his funeral service.¹⁷⁵ The new sovereign, James II, selected Charles to carry the orb at his coronation.¹⁷⁶ Shortly following the Coronation Charles was appointed as lord of the Bedchamber, a position he had held earlier under Charles II.¹⁷⁷

James II's brief reign was one of continual stress. In June of 1685 the kingdom was disrupted by the invasion of forces loyal to the Duke of Monmouth. At the time Monmouth landed at Lyme Charles was ordered to raise militia companies to turn back the invasion.¹⁷⁸ After the rebellion had been quelled Charles retired to private life. However, on July 7, 1687, his Protestant sympathies proved overwhelming against the king's tolerance of Catholicism, and he refused to attend a ceremony for the Pope's Nuncio Ferdinand, Count of Adda. Correspondingly, Charles was deprived of all his earlier positions.¹⁷⁹ During the Revolution of 1688 Charles fought for Prince William of Orange.¹⁸⁰ For his service Charles was appointed Chancellor

¹⁷⁵GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 77.

¹⁷⁶Hist. MSS Comm. Third Report, p. 96.

¹⁷⁷Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry, K.G., K.T., Preserved at Montagu House Whitehall, 3 vols. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1899), I, p. 342.

¹⁷⁸Hist. MSS Comm. Third Report, p. 7.

¹⁷⁹Memoirs of Sir John Reresby, ed. Andrew Browning (Glasgow: Jackson, Son and Company, 1936), p. 459.

¹⁸⁰GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 77.

of Cambridge University.¹⁸¹ In 1705 Charles's older son, Algernon, was elected to Parliament from Marlborough.¹⁸² In 1706 Charles was one of the Commissioners who secured the ultimate union of Scotland and England.¹⁸³

While Charles was involved in the political activity of his times, his son Algernon served with some distinction in Flanders from 1708-1713.¹⁸⁴ He was a volunteer at the battle of Oudenardle. In 1708 he was with the Duke of Marlborough when he completed the capture of the Spanish Netherlands. He also served as ADC to the Duke of Marlborough at the battle of Malplaquet.¹⁸⁵ Algernon ran again for Parliament in August, 1710¹⁸⁶ and was returned for Marlborough. Five years later on July thirteenth Queen Anne was so seriously ill and her death believed so imminent that the Council met to determine the course of affairs. The Duke of Somerset and the Duke of Argyle presented themselves and sat in on the Council.¹⁸⁷ Although Charles was not a member of that group, his views were considered

¹⁸¹GEC, XII, Pt. I, pp. 77-78.

¹⁸²Hist. MSS Comm. Fifteenth Report, Pt. VII, p. 189.

¹⁸³GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 78.

¹⁸⁴GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 80.

¹⁸⁵Charles Dalton, George the First's Army 1714-1724, 2 vols. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1910), p. 96.

¹⁸⁶Hist. MSS Comm. Portland, IV, p. 575.

¹⁸⁷Hist. MSS Comm. Portland, V, pp. 477-478.

vital when the succession was settled upon the House of Hanover, possibly due to his own royal claims. As a result of the Hanoverian succession he became a member of George I's council and was given his old post of master of the Horse.¹⁸⁸ George I honored Charles by asking him to carry the orb at his coronation.¹⁸⁹ Algernon was given in September an appointment as Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Prince of Wales.¹⁹⁰

In March, 1714, Algernon married Frances, the oldest daughter of the Honorable Henry Thynne.¹⁹¹ Two years later Charles was present in Parliament and vigorously protested the annihilation of the Triennial Parliaments.¹⁹² The Duke's life was severely interrupted in November, 1722, when his wife Elizabeth died of cancer. Charles remarried on February 4, 1726, Lady Charlotte, second daughter of Daniel and Ann Finch, 7th Earl of Winchelsea and 2nd Earl of Nottingham. They had two daughters who lived to adulthood.¹⁹³ In 1727 Algernon was promoted to Brigadier General. In 1735 he became a Major General. From September,

¹⁸⁸GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 78.

¹⁸⁹GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 77.

¹⁹⁰Hist. MSS Comm. Portland, IV, p. 496.

¹⁹¹GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 81.

¹⁹²Historical Manuscripts Commission, Calendar of the Stuart Papers Belonging to His Majesty the King Preserved at Windsor Castle, 8 vols. (London: Mackie and Co., 1904), II, p. 122.

¹⁹³GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 79.

1737, to 1742, he served as Governor of Minorca. Algernon continued to receive new positions and he was commissioned as a Lieutenant General in 1739. In March 1742, he became the Governor of Guernsey.¹⁹⁴ From February 8, 1744-1750, he served as Colonel of the Royal Regiment of the Horse Guard.

Algernon's only son George, Viscount Beauchamp, died in Bologna Italy in 1774 of smallpox.¹⁹⁵ The Viscount's body was returned to England and buried July 6, 1745, in Westminster Abbey.¹⁹⁶ Four years after the death of his grandson the Duke of Somerset died on December 2, 1748. Charles was buried on the twenty-sixth in Salisbury Cathedral at the age of eighty-seven.¹⁹⁷ Following Charles's death Algernon took his seat in the House of Lords.¹⁹⁸ The Seventh Duke of Somerset died on February 7, 1750, at his home Percy Lodge in Iver, Bucks and was buried in St. Nicholas's Chapel in Westminster Abbey. At the time of his death the various titles which had been bestowed upon his family

¹⁹⁴GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 80.

¹⁹⁵ Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Denbigh Preserved at Newnham Paddox, Warwickshire, 5 vols. (London: The Hereford Times Limited, 1911), Pt. V, p. 257.

¹⁹⁶GEC, XII, Pt. I, pp. 81-82.

¹⁹⁷GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 79.

¹⁹⁸Journal of the House of Lords, p. 629.

were distributed in the following manner: the Barony of Percy created by writ in 1722 was given to his daughter Elizabeth and her heirs, the Earldom of Northumberland and Barony of Warkworth were given to his son-in-law, Sir Hugh Smithson, the Earldom of Egremont and Barony of Cockermouth were given to his sister Catherine Windham's son, Sir Charles, the Earldom of Hertford, the Barony of Beauchamp, the Barony of Seymour, and the Barony of Trowbridge became extinct. The Dukedom of Somerset and the Barony of Seymour then devolved to the male line represented in the person of Sir Edward Seymour, 6th Bart, a distant cousin of the 6th duke.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁹GEC, XII, Pt. I, p. 81.

EPILOGUE

The family of Lady Katherine Grey from Princess Mary Tudor to Algernon Seymour could have advanced claims to the crown, based on the wills of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Since they were both Protestants and Englishmen, there is reason to believe that many preferred this line rather than the Stuarts. When Thomas Wriothsesley who in 1538 was in the process of negotiating an alliance between Flanders and England for Henry VII's daughter the Princess Mary was questioned as to the Princess's right to inherit out of the kingdom of England, he answered, "We have an olde lawe, that all women of the blodd royall, marryed oute of the Realme, shuld loose all tytell, for them and theirs so being oute and straungiers borne to the crown."¹ In light of this evidence, though the crown descended to the Stuarts and later to the Hanoverian line, it could be argued that it rightfully belonged to the English heirs of the hero of Bosworth field. Nevertheless, the descendants of Lady Katherine Grey chose to lead private lives and made no attempt to usurp the crown.

¹Letters and Papers, VIII, p. 101.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

Primary Material

The following primary materials were used in the preparation of this geneological study. The Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 53 vols. edited by Robert Lemon, M.A.E. Green and S. C. Lomas (London, 1856-72) is invaluable in establishing the sequence of English domestic affairs throughout the reigns from Edward VI to Charles II. The Calendar of State Papers Foreign Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth, 25 vols. edited by W. B. Turnbull and Joseph Stevenson (London, 1861-1950) is valuable for its elaboration of English involvements on the continent between 1547 and 1603. Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII, 23 vols. in 38 parts (London, 1862-1939) contains a more detailed account of foreign transactions than do the calendars. State Papers King Henry VIII, 11 vols. (London, 1830-32) has been superceded in depth by the material in Letters and Papers. The Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, 13 vols., edited by G. A. Bergenroth (London, 1862-1954) depicts English affairs through the eyes of Spanish Ambassadors who were often prejudiced and hyper-critical. For this study they have provided a greater fund of information than many of the other primary materials.

The Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 9 vols., edited by Rawdon Brown (London, 1864-1898) serves the same purpose as the Spanish Papers though it casts more light upon the Seymour's activities. The Spanish Papers convey broader accounts of Princess Mary's marriage negotiations and the secret marriage of Edward and Katherine Seymour.

The Statutes of the Realm, 11 vols., edited by A. Luders (London, 1810-28) furnish comprehensive record of statutes to 1713 but are supplemented by The Statutes at Large From the First Year of King Edward the Fourth to the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to Which is Prefixed, A Table of the Titles of all the Publick and Private Statutes During That Time, 47 vols. (London, 1763). Other valuable sources for constitutional and legal history are found in a variety of additional accounts. The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England from the Earliest Times to the Restoration of King Charles II, edited by W. M. Sandby, 2nd ed., 24 vols. (London, 1763) is an important source for its record of discussions of the House of Commons while in session. Another aid though not as comprehensive is The Commons Debate 1621, edited by Wallace Notestein, 7 vols. (New Haven, 1935). Material relating to appointments and parliamentary proceedings is located in The Calendar of the Journal of the House of Lords from the Beginning of the Reign of King Henry VIII to 30th August 1642: and from the Restoration in 1660, to 21st January 1808 (London, 1810).

Henry Ellis, Original Letters, Illustrative of English History, 11 vols. (London, 1824-46) is particularly useful for the reigns of King Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth as the letters present an invaluable study of the difficulties of such personalities as the Princess Mary. Samuel Haynes, A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth, 2 vols. (London, 1740) provides useful documentation pertaining to both foreign and domestic affairs as does Thomas Wright's, Queen Elizabeth and Her Times, A Series of Original Letters, Selected from the Inedited Private Correspondence of the Lord Treasurer Burghley, The Earl of Leicester, the Secretaries Walsingham and Smith, Sir Christopher Hatton, 2 vols. (London, 1838), and Ralph Winwood's Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and James I, 3 vols. Two of the more helpful chronicles for this paper were The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and of Two Years of Queen Mary and Especially the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyat, Written by a Resident in the Tower, by J. G. Nichols, Camden Society xlviii (1850) and The Grey Friars of London Chronicle, by J. G. Nichols, Camden Society liii (1852).

Secondary Materials

Secondary material is generally dated and extremely biased. However, there are works worth mentioning. Both

R. P. B. Davey, The Nine Days' Queen, Lady Jane and Her Times (London, 1909) and Agnes Strickland's, Lives of the Tudor Princesses Including Lady Jane and Her Sisters (London, 1868) present an extremely accurate depiction of Lady Jane's life. Hester W. Chapman's, Two Tudor Portraits (Boston, 1960) gives a very enlightening description of Katherine Grey's difficulties with Queen Elizabeth over the problem of succession. One of the standard works on the history of the English Civil War is Samuel Gardiner's, History of England from the Accession of James I. To the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642, 10 vols. (London, 1899). It clearly records the basis underneath much of Parliament's dissatisfaction with the King. Of the works discussing the legal process of succession, Alfred Bailey's, The Succession to the English Crown (London, 1879), proved one of the more valuable sources of information for this thesis.

Genealogy of the Family of Lady Katherine Grey

Elizabeth = Henry VII of 1485-1509 York			
Henry	Margaret	Mary	1. Louis XII of France d. 1515 2. Charles Brandon Duke of Suffolk
Henry	Francis = 1. Henry Grey Marquis of Dorset	2. Adrian Stokes	Eleanor
Jane = Guilford Dudley	Katherine = Edward Seymour Earl of Hertford	Mary = Thomas Keyes	
	Edward = Honora Rogers	Thomas = Isabel Onley	
Edward = Anne Sackville	William 2nd = Duke of Somerset = 1. Arabella Stuart d.v.p. = 2. Frances da. Earl of Essex	Francis = 1. Frances Prinne	
Robert d.v.p.	Henry = Mary Hadham	John 4th Duke of Somerset	Charles Lord Trowbridge
Elizabeth	William 3rd Duke of Somerset	= Sarah Alston d.v.p.	= Elizabeth Allington
		Frances 5th Duke of Somerset d.v.p. unm.	Charles 6th Duke = Elizabeth Percy
			Algernon 7th Duke of Somerset = Frances Thynne
	¹ Elizabeth = Sir Hugh Smithson		George b. 1725 d. 1744 unm.

¹The Literary Remains of Lady Jane Grey: With a
Memoir of Her Life, ed. Nicholas Harris Nicolas (London:
Harding, Triphook, and Lepard, 1825).

Genealogy of Lady Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox

Elizabeth = Henry VII
 of 1485-1509
 York

Henry	Margaret	Mary
	= 1. James IV of Scotland	
	= 2. Archibald Douglas, 6th Earl of Angus	

Margaret = Matthew Stuart
 Earl of Lennox

Henry Stuart
 Lord Darnley
 = Mary Queen of Scots
 1

Charles Stuart
 = Elizabeth
 Cavendish
 sister of 1st
 Earl of Devonshire

James VI of Scotland
 and King of England

Arabella Stuart
 d.v.p. 2
 = William 2nd
 Duke of Somerset

¹"Lady Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox," by
 T. F. Henderson, DNB, XV, pp. 339-343.

²GEC, VII, pp. 597-601.

ROOM USE ONLY

ROOM USE ONLY

~~ROOM USE ONLY~~

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03056 4250